Animal Trainer’s Code

I would like to correct an error of omission left by the article on The HSUS Animal Trainer’s Code in the Winter 79 issue of The News. Although the code was written by HSUS staff, professional animal trainers worked with us in developing each point. This makes the code even more important because, if some professional trainers are able to run their business while adhering to these guidelines for humane treatment, then there is no excuse for any trainer to do otherwise.

Sue Pressman
Director of Wildlife Protection
The Humane Society of the United States

Tuna Poaching

I would like to add my agreement to the continuation of the tuna boycott. I note that in your December issue that although your response was light, it indicated a strong desire to protect these animals, since it was known that poachers are on the hunt in this area. With only 290 remaining, it may not be long until the poacher, and the encroaching, expanding population will wipe them out completely.

R. C. Guyon
Meridian, Idaho

Golden Zoo
Is Golden in Name Only!

HSUS Investigators Close Down Decrepit Roadside Zoo in Florida

The Golden Zoo in Fort Meyer was a nightmare—a collection of rickety old cages occupied by starving animals. HSUS Director of Wildlife Protection Sue Pressman and Southeast Regional Investigator Bernard Weller went on the trail following a tip from a local informant. Here, in Sue Pressman’s own words, is what they found and what they did about it.

There were no souvenir stands, tourits with cameras, or any of the other standard fare for Florida sights. There was just a decrepit roadside zoo well off the tourist track. For a tourist attraction it was certainly in the wrong place! But you can’t tell that to the animals. They still need to eat whether the tourists come or not. Indications of starvation could be seen in nearly all the cages—skinny animals and little or no food.

We observed a group of very thin young lions, 18 to 24 months old, that looked like they hadn’t eaten in weeks. In the cougar and fox cages we saw some water and dirty dog food pans. The pans were empty.

In a chimp cage we saw beer and cola cans and some table scraps mixed with food. This chimp appeared to be the only animal that had eaten regularly. Mr. Golden, owner of the zoo, gave this primate a cigarette which the animal had eaten regularly. Mr. Golden’s ill-informed optimism was disturbing me a great deal. Mr. Golden had in mind to make a few paltry dollars profit, anything else, unless consumers noticed anything else, unless consumers

It didn’t appear to be the only animal that had eaten regularly. Mr. Golden, owner of the zoo, gave this Macaque monkey lying on its face in a prone position. It didn’t appear to be breathing.

I asked Mrs. Golden about the condition of the monkey. Mrs. Golden replied she didn’t know, but had “lost one yesterday.” Bernie Weller opened the cage and lifted the monkey out. I examined the monkey and noted it was tremendously dehydrated and its stomach cavity was sunken. I opened its eating pouch and found it was tremendously dehydrated and its stomach cavity was sunken. I opened its eating pouch and found
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It didn’t appear to be the only animal that had eaten regularly. Mr. Golden, owner of the zoo, gave this Macaque monkey lying on its face in a prone position. It didn’t appear to be breathing.

I asked Mrs. Golden about the condition of the monkey. Mrs. Golden replied she didn’t know, but had “lost one yesterday.” Bernie Weller opened the cage and lifted the monkey out. I examined the monkey and noted it was tremendously dehydrated and its stomach cavity was sunken. I opened its eating pouch and found
that it was full of bark and sand. After clearing the pouch and the rest of the mouth, I began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Mrs. Golden had told me that the monkey's name was "Sissie," so I kept repeating "Sissie, Sissie, Sissie." She seemed to respond so I asked for a hot bath to raise its body temperature. The monkey was discovered near death as Pressman and Bernard Weller, Investigator for HSUS' Southeast Region, inspected the Golden Zoo near Fort Meyer, Florida. Following the bath, Pressman vigorously dried the animal's body to increase circulation and bring it out of shock.

Her temperature rose and the clammy condition of her skin disappeared. All the while Bernie Weller assisted by handing me towels and taking pictures.

There was a question in our minds that the Golden Zoo was in violation of the state's anti-cruelty statutes. I wondered about the hidden conditions of the other animals. Were any of them getting close to Sissie's state?

When Sissie appeared to be past the crisis point, we left the zoo and went directly to the State Attorney's office where we filed an official complaint charging the Goldens' with cruelty to animals. Bernie signed the arrest warrant.

The next day, The Florida Fresh Water Fish and Game Department took charge of the animals. Feeding was begun and Bernie began the difficult task of searching for new homes for the residents of Golden Zoo.

At this writing, Weller has managed to find new homes for all of the animals. Pressman informed The News that the Goldens will, if convicted, hopefully not go to jail because there are at least nine young children in the family. The HSUS has asked the State Attorney not to press for incarceration of the Goldens. There has already been enough inhumanity in this situation," said Weller.

The combination of poor location, lack of professional business knowledge, and the absence of proper training created this cruel situation. There may be hundreds of other Golden Zoos out there," said Pressman. "The only way we'll ever know is through our members and friends. If we hadn't been informed of this case," she went on, "there would be a lot of dead animals at the Golden Zoo today. We caught this one at the last possible moment."

Two Societies Newly Accredited

HSUS' Accreditation Committee has approved accreditation of two west coast animal welfare groups, The Humane Educator and Animal Sheltering and Control, Garden Grove, California, and the Whatcom County Humane Society of Bellingham, Washington.

The Animal Care Center in Garden Grove operates a shelter facility that handles surrendered animals, cruelty investigations, and humane education. Two years ago, a request allowed this organization to begin building improvements that would eventually help them meet the strict accreditation standards. Changes included adding a new kitchen, new offices for the humane educator and cruelty investigator, and painting and reflooring kennel areas.

The Animal Care Center also runs a spay/neuter clinic. The self-supporting program, which also provides general veterinary care, has evening hours several times a week to make it accessible to more people. In 1977, 15,578 animals were treated. A program to provide veterinary services to pet owners who need financial assistance will be expanded in coming years.

As aresult of the pressure, a group of veterinarians visited the shelter, and their appraisal resulted in a new health care plan for the sheltered animals along with medical training for staff members.

ABC Exposes Plight of Wild Horses

The sad story of wild horses and the Bureau of Land Management's Adopt-A-Horse program was featured on the popular ABC television show "20/20" in January.

HSUS Chief Investigator Franz Dantzler worked closely with ABC in researching the story, which examined abuses of the Adopt-A-Horse program. Dantzler provided information about several cases in which wild horses were adopted through BLM, then sold to slaughterhouses. Although it is illegal to use wild horses for profit, BLM has not done a good job of investigating potential adopters before turning over the horses, or following up after the sale to ensure the animals are being humanely treated.

Dantzler characterized the "20/20" story as "highly productive." He said it will be "important in increasing congressional interest in monitoring the BLM program. But perhaps more important, it illustrated the horrible problems in the Adopt-A-Horse program to the American people, who may not have had any idea of what was happening. It brought to light things we have been saying all along in giving testimony before congress."

There has been no word, Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri, chairman of the Senate subcommittee on governmental efficiency, has scheduled oversight hearings on BLM's handling of wild horses. These hearings, scheduled in April, will examine how the Adopt-A-Horse Program is operating and the effectiveness of the laws involved. Eagleton himself appeared on the "20/20" broadcast because some of the horses adopted through the program ended up in his home state in extremely inhumane conditions.

BEAUTY AND THE BEASTS

by Dr. Andrew Rowan
Associate Director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems

Cosmetics have been with us for thousands of years, but are now a billion dollar business. Behind the image and promises of beauty is the less attractive reality of how almost a billion animals suffer and die in the testing of new cosmetic products each year. The cosmetic industry is a multi-billion dollar business, and is now a ten billion dollar business.
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What Are the Tests Done?

The cosmetic industry is a multi-billion dollar business, and is now a ten billion dollar business. The courts are also suspicious of the Draize test. The FDA lost a court case in 1974 because the test should not be included in all new regulations since "without careful reevaluation these tests result in unreliable results." They based their conclusion on the results of a collaborative study involving twenty-four major government and industrial testing laboratories in which the same substance could be assessed as irritant by one laboratory and non-irritant by another.
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What Are the Alternatives?

There are possible alternatives to some of the current tests and the potential for further testing. Laboratory techniques have progressed considerably since 1944 when the Draize test was developed, yet there has been little effort to develop and apply the new technology. For example, one of the few attempts to develop an alternative to the Draize eye irritation test was funded by a private source in 1970 and carried out in Britain. The preliminary study was carried out by Hazleton Laboratories in North Carolina. The results were sufficiently promising to suggest that a cell culture system might be able to replace the rabbit eye test.

There is no alternative present to goit the use of animals in the Draize test, but one could use far fewer animals than by the Draize test. In 1943, a test was devised to measure the approximate Lethal Dose which required testing on ten animals (in contrast to the Draize test with the 60-100 for the LD50) which was quite adequate for the determination of the level of oral toxicity.

New methods of testing are also available, if at all, only in certain industries. Companies feel safest relying on what has been accepted as adequate by the past. It is as if companies are developing and evaluating alternative testing methods is an expensive process. The initial development may cost up to $500,000 and there are extensive evaluation costs afterward.

The cosmetic industry has the resources and could provide funds for the development of new tests. In the United Kingdom, the cosmetics trade association has promoted further work into a cell culture alternative to the Draize test. In the USA, the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association is trying to reduce toxicity testing in the industry via their Cosmetic Ingredient Review Program. This program involves collecting research results on various substances from the files of cooperating companies, and then evaluating these results available to companies planning to use the new substances in a new product. In this way duplication of testing can be avoided and, consequently, many animals can be spared. However, much more could be done.

What Can the Consumer Do?

A number of animal welfare groups have attempted to survey the cosmetic industry to determine which companies test their products on animals. As far as we can determine, the major manufacturers (about 35 companies accounting for 80% of the trade) appear to test animals in order to satisfy the FDA requirement of "adequate substantiation of safety" and in order to protect themselves in the event of a lawsuit. Smaller manufacturers may not test because they do not have the facilities or because their sales are based on well-tried marketing methods which have been demonstrated by years of human consumption to be safe.

Beauty Without Cruelty, an English cosmetic company with an office in the USA, has opposed a possible change in manufacturing policy on not using animal ingredients in its cosmetics and has been involved in developing an alternative. Where necessary, products are tested by human volunteers. However, companies are concerned about the possibility of legal action should any of these tests be harmful. This is apparently because they have not developed procedures for the testing of animals and plants. It is not to say that, if they were to develop some new product lines, they would not test them on animals.

Therefore, apart from certain small groups of individuals, and those companies, there are "no humankindly produced cosmetics. However, cosmetics that are already in existence are unlikely to be subjected to further testing unless new regulations are promulgated by the FDA. The consumer who is concerned about animal testing should purchase cosmetics which have not been available for some time, avoiding those labeled "new" or "improved." We should not be sold into supporting animal testing by the expensive advertising campaigns promoting the "latest in "cosmetics.

There are many other actions the individual can take. First, you can write to Beauty Without Cruelty, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, 1333 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, requesting there be a vote on the development of alternative testing techniques amongst their member companies.

Second, you can write to the individual companies concerned and ask them to devote funds to the development of alternative tests. Do not write to small companies because they are merely following a certain requirement of the FDA and are unlikely to be subjected to new regulations. It is not the FDA that is doing what is wrong but the requirement by the FDA. Finally, you can write to your Senator and Representative and ask them to support legislation that would appropriate funds for research on non-animal alternatives. Whether or not such legislation is possible, it will certainly be supported by those who are concerned about animals and the environment.

Trophy Hunters Thwarted—For Now

Pressure from The Humane Society of the United States and many other environmental groups recently prompted the withdrawal of an outrageous permit application submitted to the Endangered Species Office last December. The application, from the Safari Clubs International (SCI), requested permission to import 1,025 leopards from the endangered species list.

The SCI hoped to see hung on a wall were 5 orangutans, 5 gorillas, 10 jaguars, 100 leopards, 50 slender snouted crocodiles, and 150 leopards. Consideration of the obliteration of wildlife if left unchecked is questionable why the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service even considered it, or printed it in the Federal Register. Safari Club International, which arranges hunting trips for its members, has been agitating a good deal lately because of restrictions placed on their sport by the 1973 Endangered Species Act. Among other things, the Act forbids trophy hunting of the world’s most seriously endangered species. The SCI has suggested that SCI’s application may have been a preliminary to a suit against the Endangered Species Office to force delisting of some of their favorite trophy animals.

Although trophy hunting is not solely responsible for the dramatic decline in wildlife in the last century, it has certainly been a contributing factor. Habit destruction and overpopulation of some of our wildlife stock into wildlife rangelands, pollution and over-hunting are all responsible.

Trophy hunting is perhaps the most objectionable factor because it serves no purpose except to pardon to the emotional insecurity of the hunter. This is no excuse for the slaughter of the world’s wildlife. Furthermore, the concept of trophy hunting is the most beautiful specimen is biologically unsound, since obviously the best trophy is also the best genetic stock.

In the application, SCI sought to cultivate the interest of certain trophy hunters suggesting that, by creating a demand for an animal, they will encourage its survival. Unfortunately, when a species is endangered because it is severely limited in the last century, it will be impossible to stop it. The demand for the animal that is threatening it.

There is a doubt that SCI will return in the future to their never-ending battle for the right to force us to hunt, kill, and import any animal. The SCI has been agitating a good deal in years of milestones on the road to force us to hunt, kill, and import any animal. The SCI has been agitating a good deal in order to keep us from hunting the most beautiful specimen is biologically unsound, since obviously the best trophy is also the best genetic stock.
Run To Death

When drugs and racing mix, it’s the horse that loses

Easy Edith was a five-year-old mare with arthritic knees and chronic soreness in the legs. Time spent grazing in the pasture might have healed her legs, but in the racing game time spent off the track means expense with no income for the owner. So Easy Edith, her knees treated with corticosteroids and with a pre-race injection of phenylbutazone to dull the pain, would not be allowed to race at Pimlico on May 3, 1978.

It was her last race, but Easy Edith did not go down easy. Rounding the final turn of the course, her left cannon bone shattered. Three days later, on May 6, she was destroyed.

Breakdowns in track racing have increased significantly in the past 20 years. In 1976, the track was witnessing more and more frequent breakdowns since the era of permitted medications. In December, 1976, were racing with phenylbutazone.

Bute

Phenylbutazone, called “bute” for short, is the best known of the drugs involved in racetrack abuses, and has drawn the most attention nationwide. It is an anti-inflammatory, anesthetic drug, relieving the pain of an injury by reducing the inflammation associated with it. Phenylbutazone is helpful for people with arthritis; and when used correctly on horses, it can give great relief from pain.

According to Stephen Paulhus, a Harvard investigator, "Many horses that are found to be hopelessly crippled are sold for mere $20 to $400 each to the 'killer man,' who, conscious of the escalating demand for horse meat in foreign countries, is able to make a fat profit off the flesh of racing's casualties." The drugged, injured horse is unable to compete at the track, cannot look forward to a pleasant retirement at the breeding farm. It is far more likely that this once promising money-maker will suffer additional pain and injury while trucked from track to auction to slaughterhouse. His torment may continue for days or weeks.

When pre-race injections of butazolidin were legalized in Pennsylvania, on-track breakdowns at the Keystone Racetrack in Philadelphia increased by 400%. The following article written by Larry McCullum for the Philadelphia Daily News, clearly describes the horror of one of those breakdowns:

Rokamali tried to win. He ran as hard as he could; as far as he could... By mid-stretch he was dead.

He ran his legs off. Both of his front legs snapped at the knees. They bent three ways as he went down. The jockey, Stephen Papano, was thrown clear. Rokamali struggled to get up. He was standing straight up in the rear but his legs in front were flapping from the knees.

All of his weight in front was pressing down on the top half of his legs. The bottom part of his legs were bent the wrong way, just lying on the track.

This happened in the eighth race, the feature at Keystone Race Track yesterday. Rokamali was eligible for the race under all conditions, including the unwritten one that says the life of a thoroughbred means nothing.

Rokamali was three years old and a gelding, which means that when he was through racing, he could not have been used to breed other racehorses. Bettors are able to turn away without guilt. They had to see Rokamali. It was the worst breakdown most of them had ever witnessed. You could feel them cringing. In the clubhouse on the third level at Keystone, bettors shouted at Rokamali, "Stay down horse."

Finally, the groom reached Rokamali and he was lying on his side and then the horse ambulance came up. The veterinarian must have injected death into his veins as he lay there.

I don’t know because I couldn’t look anymore.

He died in bright sunshine and on a fast track. By the time his car was cased away in the ambulance, the tot board in the infield showed money had already been bid on the ninth race.

Citizen’s outrage at such cruel abuse of animals forced a temporary ban on pre-race medication in Pennsylvania.
which increases the flow of urine, thereby diluting the amount of other drugs in the animal's urine to levels which may be too low for test- ing laboratories to detect. It is known that Lasix is capable of diluting such strong narcotics as mor- phine and methadone below detect- able levels.

Many states have legalized the use of Lasix for racehorses in the belief it helps prevent nosebleeds. There is no belief it helps prevent nosebleeds, nor has the drug been approved by the FDA for use in racehorses. The drug, like any other, must be studied. It is often used for reasons other than its claimed effect on bleeders. The drug is the only source of abuse. Many of the drugs given to racehorses are illegal cough syrup or the like. As the 1990's unfold, horses were given narcotics such as opium, cocaine, and morphine. Later, when it became obvious that drugs were being administered and horses were soon racing with sophisticated stimulants to spur them to greater speeds, many horse owners started to demand that other drugs be used. By 1980, drug use was widespread in the racehorses. A vast amount of money was pumped into the sport of horse racing. The horses racing received Lasix, which increases the flow of urine, thereby diluting the amount of other drugs in the animal's urine to levels which may be too low for testing laboratories to detect.

the stress on the bone and joints is tremendous.

when the total impact of a horse's weight falls on one leg at top speed, the

its ability to dilute other, illegal, drugs may account for its use in many cases. Another reason for the popularity of Lasix is its diuretic weight-loss effects. Administered the day before a race, Lasix can re- duce a horse's weight six to eight pounds by dehydrating it. This weight loss could be the difference between losing and winning a race. The problem is that Lasix, like any strong drug, has dangerous side ef- fects. According to the manufacturer, overdose of Lasix can increase the risk of circulatory collapse, thrombosis and embolism. To ad- minister such a drug to horses that have no medical need of it is dan- gerous and cruel.

More Drugs

Although bute and Lasix are the medications most commonly legal- ized for horse racing, some states have relaxed controls on other substances, or are under pressure to do so. Included here are corticosteroids, anabolic steroids, and the growth hormone, which are widely used and flagrantly mis- used. Corticosteroids are capable of re- ducing or stopping inflammation, and are frequently used to treat equine joints and tendons. For ex- ample, the New York Racing and Wagering Board Drug Medication Study showed that at some tracks 78% of the horses tested received Lasix, even though only 2% of them were bleeders.

injury. The quick cure is likely only to increase or stop inflamma- tion, but the long-term result is the destruction of the horse's bone, which becomes the long-term crippler. "Rocket fuel!"

Medications are not always given to increase a horse's performance. If the desired result is to fix a horse race, it is much less risky to drug two or three of the horses in order to make them lose, than bet heavily on the un- druged horses. This can be done effectively because most states only require blood, urine, or saliva tests for their horse races, and not tests for the finish line. According to the Horseman's Benev- olent and Protective Association, 95% of horse own- ers lose money on racing. One horse owner has noted that "Lasix is the most dangerous drug on the market today." The only reason it is not not the an- swer to the horse owner's problem, and can be terribly inhumane to the horses.

Racing is a gambling game, and those who cannot afford to lose money should not be in it. According to Equus magazine, "It costs up- wards of $14,000 per year to keep one horse in training. The average earnings-per-start an owner can expect his horse to win is a paltry $50 to $70 per race." With the use of drugs to keep a horse running for 25 races in a year, the average earnings would be only $35 per race. Lasix, in its small doses, can be significantly reduced if racetracks are required to conduct thorough pre-race inspections of all horses. In addition to a physical examination for soundness, samples should be taken for imme- diate biochemical analysis. Pre- race testing would allow the dis- qualification of drugged horses before they are allowed, saving them from the possibility of aggravated injury.

In 1983, the Illinois Racing Board voted to allow pre-race medication before horse racing. The reason was to allow unsound horses to race, but at the same time the racing commission was allowing unsound horses to race. The result is to allow unsound horses to race, and to fix races. In 1977, the Chicago Daily Racing Form ran an article, "TheLicensed to race means not being injured. There is no need to have a horse race. If the desired result is to fix a horse race, it is much less risky to drug two or three of the horses in order to make them lose, than bet heavily on the un- druged horses. This can be done effectively because most states only require blood, urine, or saliva tests for their horse races, and not tests for the finish line. According to the Horseman's Benev- olent and Protective Association, 95% of horse own- ers lose money on racing. One horse owner has noted that "Lasix is the most dangerous drug on the market today." The only reason it is not the an- swer to the horse owner's problem, and can be terribly inhumane to the horses.

Racing is a gambling game, and those who cannot afford to lose money should not be in it. According to Equus magazine, "It costs up- wards of $14,000 per year to keep one horse in training. The average earnings-per-start an owner can expect his horse to win is a paltry $50 to $70 per race." With the use of drugs to keep a horse running for 25 races in a year, the average earnings would be only $35 per race. Lasix, in its small doses, can be significantly reduced if racetracks are required to conduct thorough pre-race inspections of all horses. In addition to a physical examination for soundness, samples should be taken for imme- diate biochemical analysis. Pre- race testing would allow the dis- qualification of drugged horses before they are allowed, saving them from the possibility of aggravated injury.

HSUS has determined that the best hope for racing reform will come through federal legislation. HSUS and the American Horse Pro- tection Association are preparing specific proposals for pre-race test- ing and the prohibition of medi- cations which will be shared with a congressman who is also concerned about racing reform. HSUS investigator Marc Paul- us, who has studied the drugging issue in depth, believes "It is most important that HSUS members and friends help us to sensitize the gen- eral public and political leaders to the fact that the practice of drugging horses is morally and ethically un- justifiable. In order to protect horses, owners, trainers, jockeys, sy- sters, breeders, and racing fans, the horses cannot be allowed to race on anything but hay and oats."
MAIL ORDER MAYHEM

Hi: We've been killing porcupines here in the woods and one we killed took three darts to drop him, another took one dart from his head, a third hole out in a crevasse, was stubborn and took six, but last night at dusk we spotted a big, tough one in a tree well anchored. All three of us commenced firing darts into him. He squealed at the first volley of darts, but did not drop even though at least five struck him. We kept shooting until we had put 26 darts into him, before he finally dropped from the tree. I guess his needles really protected him and he was an old tough hided hombre. We love these new weapons. Thanks.

Curtis Gibson, Orem, Utah.

The blowgun comes in four different sizes, ranging from 6½ to 30 inches, said to be highly accurate, to a 20-inch model, called the “Assassin Gun,” which is promoted as being easily concealed. Although the company’s brochure admits that “most states do not allow any sort of drugs or poison to be used in hunting...” it nevertheless describes a number of poisons that could be used on the dart to make it possible to kill big game. Some of the poisons can be made at home with easily available materials, such as rotten meat or certain weeds.

Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, of New Jersey, to petition the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission in 1974 to put strict controls on the sales of these weapons to minors. In building a case for these controls, the Forsythe petition re-vealed that even the National Rifle Association had taken the position on blowguns that “the same safeguards which attend the sale of firearms to minors should apply to any device which can be lethal,” and would support legislation to do this. At the time the Consumer Prod-uct Safety Commission investig-ated, they were told by the House of Weapons owner that he was getting out of the blowgun business. On the basis of the information that no more blowguns were going to be manufactured, the Commission de-nilied the petition for formal con-trols.

It is now clear that these weapons are again being manufactured and sold to the public. HSUS is consid-ering petitioning the Food and Drug Administration to have the product taken off the market, or have strict controls put on its sales, because it is a dangerous mechani-cal device with the potential to abuse and injure animals, espe-cially when used with poisons known to cause suffering before death. The FDA can take such an action when a clear danger exists. Last year, it banned the sales of electric shock collars that were ac-tivated by a dog’s barking, when it was shown that these collars could cause burns on the dog’s neck.

It is hoped the authorities will see that the Jivaro Blowgun is not a target-practice toy, but a ready-made instrument of cruelty to animals.

MAIL ORDER MAYHEM

HSUS seeks ban on blowgun sales

It's a silent, deadly weapon, easily capable of killing small animals. With the addition of a little homemade poison, it could kill large ani-mals, even people. It costs under ten dollars, and is available by mail order to anyone, anywhere in the United States. It is highly accurate and easy to use—a child can do it.

HSUS wants it taken off the mar-ket, and is considering petitioning the Food and Drug Administration to ban its sale.

The weapon, called the Jivaro Blowgun, is widely advertised in hunting and outdoor magazines. It is sold by the House of Weapons, a mail order company in Provo, Utah, which also features bow and arrow outfits, rifles, shotguns, and even submachine guns.

This blowgun is by no means a toy. HSUS investigators found that the spring tempered steel darts would easily pierce through a soda pop can, or, at a range of 30 feet, pierce through a half-inch plywood board. The efficiency of the blowgun as a killing weapon is further at-tested to in letters from satisfied customers, which the House of Weapons reprints and sends to prospective buyers. Here are just a few of the more than 200 letters re-printed:

Sir: I am very happy with my new blowgun. I've never had so much fun in my life. From my bedroom window I'm picking off big pesky black crows at 30 yards. Boy are those an-noying birds. And there's one damn cat that won't ever bother us again! Thanks again. Willie Hankin, Shal­low Water, Kansas.

Dear Gents, My friend and I got our 4½ foot blowguns. The first day we bagged two large rats, a deer, three rabbits, ten squirrels, 1½ dogs, among other things. Need I say more? Jay Hewitt, Chester, New Jer­sey.

Dear Sirs: The blow gun and darts are so powerful and accurate that the first day I had it I got 1 rabbit, 4 birds, and 2 squirrels. I am 13 and I must say that the blowgun is even more powerful than I thought it would be. Peter La Forge, Denver, Colorado.

The weapon is used for legal hunt­ing, the blowgun can cause great suffering to the animals because of the difficulty of killing an animal with only one dart. An animal that is able to escape with a dart stuck in its side probably faces a slow death from infection at the wound site. If the animal is disabled by the first dart, it is likely to be peppered with more darts, turned into a liv­ing pincushion for the pleasure of the blowgunner, until it finally succumbs. To kill instantly, with only one dart, it would be necessary to hit the animal very accurately in the heart or brain.

Even more frightening for pet owners, some of the blowgunners seem to feel free to use this weapon on dogs and cats. Although hunting and shooting domestic pets is illegal in all states, the fact that the blowgun is a silent weapon makes its use in this way difficult to detect.

The blowgun is also hazardous for people. When grown-ups with guns so often injure each other in the woods, it is safe to assume that young children shooting their blowguns in urban and suburban areas are going to have accidents, too.

Furthermore, the manufac-turer’s literature promotes the blowgun for hunting and defense. It is not clear what defense means to the manufacturer, but some readers may take it to mean defending themselves against other people.

The blowgun user is at risk. Even though the weapon is labeled "Caution: Do Not Inhale Darts," it would be easy to forget and draw a deep breath while holding the blowgun to your lips. A dart drawn into the throat or lungs could cause death by choking or bleeding unless medical help was given quickly.

This dangerous situation caused Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, of New Jersey, to petition the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commiss-ion in 1974 to put strict controls on the sales of these weapons to mi-nors. In building a case for these controls, the Forsythe petition re-vealed that even the National Rifle Association had taken the position on blowguns that “the same safe-guards which attend the sale of fire­arms to minors should apply to any device which can be lethal,” and would support legislation to do this. At the time the Consumer Prod-uct Safety Commission investig-ated, they were told by the House of Weapons owner that he was getting out of the blowgun business. On the basis of the information that no more blowguns were going to be manufactured, the Commission de-nilied the petition for formal con-trols.

It is now clear that these weapons are again being manufactured and sold to the public. HSUS is consid-ering petitioning the Food and Drug Administration to have the product taken off the market, or have strict controls put on its sales, because it is a dangerous mechani-cal device with the potential to abuse and injure animals, espe-cially when used with poisons known to cause suffering before death. The FDA can take such an action when a clear danger exists. Last year, it banned the sales of electric shock collars that were ac-tivated by a dog’s barking, when it was shown that these collars could cause burns on the dog’s neck.

It is hoped the authorities will see that the Jivaro Blowgun is not a target-practice toy, but a ready-made instrument of cruelty to animals.

Hi: We've been killing porcupines here in the woods and one we killed took three darts to drop him, another took one dart from his head, a third hole out in a crevasse, was stubborn and took six, but last night at dusk we spotted a big, tough one in a tree well anchored. All three of us commenced firing darts into him. He squealed at the first volley of darts, but did not drop even though at least five struck him. We kept shooting until we had put 26 darts into him, before he finally dropped from the tree. I guess his needles really protected him and he was an old tough hided hombre. We love these new weapons. Thanks.

Curtis Gibson, Orem, Utah.

The blowgun comes in four differ-ent sizes, ranging from 6½ to 30 inches, said to be highly accurate, to a 20-inch model, called the “Assassin Gun,” which is promoted as being easily concealed. Although the company’s brochure admits that “most states do not allow any sort of drugs or poison to be used in hunting...” it nevertheless describes a number of poisons that could be used on the dart to make it possible to kill big game. Some of the poisons can be made at home with easily available materials, such as rotten meat or certain weeds. One suggested poi­son, made from cigarette tobacco, is known to cause a particularly pain­ful death, by paralysis and suffoca­tion.

HSUS believes that even when the weapon is used for legal hunt­ing, the blowgun can cause great suffering to the animals because of the difficulty of killing an animal with only one dart. An animal that is able to escape with a dart stuck in its side probably faces a slow death from infection at the wound site. If the animal is disabled by the first dart, it is likely to be peppered with more darts, turned into a liv­ing pincushion for the pleasure of the blowgunner, until it finally succumbs. To kill instantly, with only one dart, it would be necessary to hit the animal very accurately in the heart or brain.

Even more frightening for pet owners, some of the blowgunners seem to feel free to use this weapon on dogs and cats. Although hunting and shooting domestic pets is illegal in all states, the fact that the blowgun is a silent weapon makes its use in this way difficult to detect.

The blowgun is also hazardous for people. When grown-ups with guns so often injure each other in the woods, it is safe to assume that young children shooting their blowguns in urban and suburban areas are going to have accidents, too.

Furthermore, the manufac-turer’s literature promotes the blowgun for hunting and defense. It is not clear what defense means to the manufacturer, but some readers may take it to mean defending themselves against other people.

The blowgun user is at risk. Even though the weapon is labeled "Caution: Do Not Inhale Darts," it would be easy to forget and draw a deep breath while holding the blowgun to your lips. A dart drawn into the throat or lungs could cause death by choking or bleeding unless medical help was given quickly.

This dangerous situation caused Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, of New Jersey, to petition the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commiss-ion in 1974 to put strict controls on the sales of these weapons to mi-nors. In building a case for these controls, the Forsythe petition re-vealed that even the National Rifle Association had taken the position on blowguns that “the same safe-guards which attend the sale of fire­arms to minors should apply to any device which can be lethal,” and would support legislation to do this. At the time the Consumer Prod-uct Safety Commission investig-ated, they were told by the House of Weapons owner that he was getting out of the blowgun business. On the basis of the information that no more blowguns were going to be manufactured, the Commission de-nilied the petition for formal con-trols.

It is now clear that these weapons are again being manufactured and sold to the public. HSUS is consid-ering petitioning the Food and Drug Administration to have the product taken off the market, or have strict controls put on its sales, because it is a dangerous mechani-cal device with the potential to abuse and injure animals, espe-cially when used with poisons known to cause suffering before death. The FDA can take such an action when a clear danger exists. Last year, it banned the sales of electric shock collars that were ac­tivated by a dog’s barking, when it was shown that these collars could cause burns on the dog’s neck.

It is hoped the authorities will see that the Jivaro Blowgun is not a target-practice toy, but a ready-made instrument of cruelty to animals.

It’s a silent, deadly weapon, easily capable of killing small animals. With the addition of a little home­made poison, it could kill large ani­mals, even people. It costs under ten dollars, and is available by mail order to anyone, anywhere in the United States. It is highly accurate and easy to use—a child can do it.
Whale Quotas Lowered At IWC Meeting In Tokyo

Almost 3200 whales' lives will be spared this year as a result of lowered whaling quotas decided at a special meeting of the International Whaling Commission this December.

HSUS Vice President Patricia Forkan attended the meeting as a member of the U.S. delegation. In that role she was able to directly influence U.S. policy as well as work on an official basis to reduce whale quotas.

The meeting got off to a promising start when Australia arrived with a proposal to stop sperm whaling off their coast. This was based on findings by their scientists that the sperm whale population was in worse shape than previously thought. Australia's own whaling company has closed down, and both Japan and the Soviet Union agreed not to take whales in that area. Thus, 561 whales (the quota previously set) were unexpectedly saved this year.

The primary purpose for the special meeting was to establish a quota for North Pacific sperm whales. The scientific committee had been unable to reach an agreement on that quota at the regular IWC meeting in June, 1978.

At the December meeting, the scientists recommended a zero quota on female sperm whales and a "conservation" plan for males, meaning a quota no greater than last year's of 6,105.

They also warned that the data on North Pacific sperm whale stocks was inadequate and predicting a quota was very difficult. Their recommendation sparked a debate about whether or not males and females could be treated the same at sea. Japan and the USSR claimed that a zero quota on females meant they would not be allowed to make any mistakes when killing males.

They said this was impossible to do. To accommodate this problem, the Commission decided to set a zero quota on females, but allow a "misteak" factor of 11.6% in the quota for males. This means the final male quota of 3800 includes a bycatch of 435 females. The United States unsuccessfully proposed a zero quota on both males and females.

The total quota allowed for all whales for the 1978-79 whaling season is 19,541, as compared to 23,520 last year and nearly 28,000 in 1976-77.

The HSUS will continue to fight for a total moratorium on all commercial whaling. It would be a terrible tragedy to allow the destruction of these beautiful creatures.

The next regular meeting of the IWC will be held in London in July.

A Talk with President Carter

At the request of over seventy environmental and animal welfare organizations, President Carter agreed to meet with several of their representatives to discuss their concerns. The Humane Society of the United States was one of those asked to attend by the White House, and was represented by Vice President Patricia Forkan.

Since the orientation of the meeting was the environment, and the meeting was only thirty minutes long, participants were restricted in the number of issues which could be addressed.

All the groups agreed that wildlife was an important topic, and Forkan was chosen as the spokesperson for the whaling issue. She asked the President to increase U.S. efforts to stop commercial whaling worldwide. Other topics covered included asking for greater efforts to save endangered species and a request that the President oppose the reintroduction of poisons in federal predator control programs.

President Carter responded positively and with great understanding of the issues. Commenting after the meeting Forkan said, "I was very impressed with his depth of knowledge and commitment to doing the right thing for wildlife. The fact that President Carter would meet with us face to face shows the importance he attributes to many of our issues."
How To Stop Cruelty by Living Humanely

by Dr. Michael Fox

Sane and sensible animal lovers often become incensed when they hear or see someone pampering a pooch with clothes, nail polish, hair tint, and other extreme indulgences. Some people seem to go overboard in treating their pets, even to the extent of dressing them up like children. The sane and sensible critics claim that it’s abnormal and cruel to make a dog live like that. This common conclusion I cannot support, unless the overindulgence (as with an improper diet) is actually detrimental to the pet’s health. If a lonely person chooses to pamper an already dependent pet and finds emotional satisfaction in so doing, there is surely more good than harm in such a relationship.

One of the worst abuses of pets today is their commercial mass production on the puppy mill farms that supply large pet-store chains. I have visited such puppy farms and can attest that the conditions under which the dogs are kept were inhumane and unsanitary—in one word, atrocious. This, together with absolutely no quality control in the breeding, and then the consequent stresses of crating and shipping very young puppies to the retail outlets, makes of this whole business one of the most sickening forms of the commercial exploitation of animals. Often the stores charge prices for inferior quality pups that a local breeder wouldn’t dream of which doesn’t make the animal a better pet.

Another inhumane fad, outlawed in England, is ear cropping. Breeds like the Doberman pinscher, Great Dane, and schnauzer commonly have this operation performed at a psychologically critical age in their lives. The operation is itself extremely painful and postoperative care, including splinting the ears, which often become infected, is both cruel and barbaric. Some dogs are permanently head-shy after this early trauma. Even if it hurts only a little, why do it at all? The animal’s suffering is an unnecessary human indulgence which doesn’t make the animal a better pet.

In regard to mistreatment and abuse of other animals, I believe that we must begin with a firm ethical premise: namely, domestic (farm) and wild animals should be destroyed or otherwise used by man only when it is essential to end suffering or for the essential benefit of mankind. By the essential benefit of man I mean the killing required to control certain diseases and in order to provide food and other animal by-products that we require for subsistence. Much exploitation of animals falls into the luxury category—sport hunting or trapping or raising animals in captivity for their fur—a commodity used more frequently out of vanity than simply to keep warm.

If a woman could feel the pain and terror of the wild animals who died so that she could wear their fur—American lynx, beaver, bobcat, wolverine, fox, raccoon, and countless other varieties—the very touch of her coat would make her ill.

I am sure that many people would become vegetarians tomorrow if they were to see the conditions under which cattle and pigs are kept on many large feed lots and intensive factory farms today. Vegetable protein (lentils, beans, soya, etc.) is no less nutritious, and can be produced more economically, than beef or pork.

Lipstick, perfumes, and other cosmetics should be of vegetable origin only. Oils and ambergris from whales are used by the cosmetics industry in many foreign countries. They support the slaughter of these incredible, beautiful creatures on the verge of extinction and so indirectly does the person who buys such products so indirectly does the person who buys such products in ignorance and innocence. Hopefully alternative ingredients will be in wide use soon, as they already are in the U.S., before all the whales are gone.

Vegetable and other synthetic substitutes are avail-
Jaws, a movie that depicts the killing of countless sharks, has contributed to the public's perception of sharks as dangerous and voracious predators. This has led to a decline in the shark population and has negatively impacted the ecosystem. However, the depiction of sharks as one-dimensional creatures does not reflect the complexity of shark behavior and biology. By simplifying the narrative of sharks, the film promotes a way of viewing sharks that is not only inaccurate but also harmful to their survival.

The depiction of sharks in media is not limited to films. TV shows and documentaries also contribute to the narrative of sharks as a threat. These programs often use sensationalized stories to capture the audience's interest, which can be misleading. The portrayal of sharks as one-dimensional creatures can lead to a lack of understanding and appreciation for their role in the ecosystem. It is crucial to promote a more balanced and accurate portrayal of sharks, one that reflects their complexity and significance in the ocean.

The Animals We Enjoy

Be on the lookout for TV shows and films, adult and children's books that abuse or demean our animal kin. Voice complaints to the TV networks and their sponsors; write letters to newspapers, magazines, and book publishers. Media materials that create or perpetuate false or negative myths and attitudes toward animals and that detract from the humane ethic of animal rights should be protested against and boycotted. Dog and cockfight "entertainments," greased-pig catching, bullfights, raccoon baiting, and fox hunting are inhumane and should be boycotted and protested against. Animal abuse is a form of violence that is frequently and often unavoidable, horse racing and greyhound racing (which in many states involves prior training and cruel treatment of the animals) should also be boycotted. Other "sports" including trophy and big-game hunting, and hunting with bow and arrow are to be condemned. Hunting as a nonsubsistence activity is ethically and ecologically indefensible. There are so many zoos, and circuses with various animal acts demand rigorous scrutiny. Alternatives and substitutes are many: search for rabbit, baseball for the spectator; nature photography and natural history study for the hunter/killer; and roulette or backgammon for the gambler!

The Humane Society News

The following notes are respectfully offered as a guide to a more humane and ecologically balanced lifestyle.

The Food We Eat

Some modern intensive farming systems are inhumanely extensive for veal calves and to a slightly lesser extent for pigs, poultry, and battery-egg-laying hens. Eating meat is the single greatest means of destroying our planet. The modern and wasteful farming systems of livestock are not only inhumane but also contribute to climate change and the destruction of ecosystems. Modern farming systems are also responsible for the loss of biodiversity and the erosion of soil fertility.

The shows and sports we enjoy

Be on the lookout for TV shows and films, adult and children's books that abuse or demean our animal kin. Voice complaints to the TV networks and their sponsors; write letters to newspapers, magazines, and book publishers. Media materials that create or perpetuate false or negative myths and attitudes toward animals and that detract from the humane ethic of animal rights should be protested against and boycotted. Dog and cockfight "entertainments," greased-pig catching, bullfights, raccoon baiting, and fox hunting are inhumane and should be boycotted and protested against. Animal abuse is a form of violence that is frequently and often unavoidable, horse racing and greyhound racing (which in many states involves prior training and cruel treatment of the animals) should also be boycotted. Other "sports" including trophy and big-game hunting, and hunting with bow and arrow are to be condemned. Hunting as a nonsubsistence activity is ethically and ecologically indefensible. There are so many zoos, and circuses with various animal acts demand rigorous scrutiny. Alternatives and substitutes are many: search for rabbit, baseball for the spectator; nature photography and natural history study for the hunter/killer; and roulette or backgammon for the gambler!

House and Garden

Avoid using nonselective pesticides and herbicides: they kill indiscriminately, innocent creatures as well as pests and weeds, and they may kill or harm you or your children. Turning lights off on the patio will keep bugs away, as will personal bug repellents. Don't use bug sprays or electric bug "roosters"—only a few of the millions you would kill have bitten you and some insects are useful or necessary in the many natural cycles. If you have a garden bug or weed problem, grow your own food on a small scale and create a meadow for butterflies and other insects, for birds and reptiles; and you will provide in this manner your own food and medicine during the early spring and the winter. And the more energy you can conserve, the fewer goods you buy, and the less meat you use, the more energy there will be available for the rest of the animals that are dependent on you for their food. The pest control that will be done to areas where the wildlife is threatened by strip-mining, oil spills, deforestation, hydroelectric dam construction, and pollution.

The Animals We Enjoy

Before you obtain a pet—be it a dog, cat, gerbil, parakeet or whatever—read up first on how to care for it. You may discover that your lifestyle is not compatible with having a dog or your house is not right for a new cat or other pet.

As far as wild creatures are concerned, do not purchase a pet from a breeder of any kind where, even those that have been imported or raised in captivity. To sell wild animals as "pets" is a gross misrepresentation (I think it should be labeled fraud). Any life form taken from the wild for study or education should be returned as soon as possible to the same place in the same condition in which it was found (or better).

Excerpted from Understanding Your Pet, by Dr. Michael Fox, (Coward, McCann, & Geoghegan, Inc. $9.85)
In 1978, $18 million dollars of federal tax monies were spent to trap, poison, and shoot 68,000 coyotes and 83,000 non-target species on 1080 sprayed lands. In response to inflated loss figures from sheep and cattle ranchers, whose livestock graze on public lands, the Animal Damage Control (ADC) division of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is systematically destroying our native wildlife.

Fox, raccoon, opossum, badger, bobcat, and ermine, are all considered "non-target" animals because the primary activity of this anachronistic and entrenched federal agency seems to be to kill coyotes. This emphasis on coyotes follows the deliberate extermination of the wolf in all of the lower 48 states except Minnesota.

Predator control has been a national policy since the 1600's, and settlers were soon successful in killing the larger predators in the northeastern United States. In 1931, the first federal legislation on the use of 1080, HSUS was enacted. The mandate was handed down to conduct campaigns for the destruction, eradication, suppression, or control of wild animals that interfered with agriculture, livestock, or game animals. This obviously outdated law needs to be repealed and replaced with a biologically realistic mandate that takes into consideration the multiple interests in wildlife, rather than exclusively those of the rancher.

HSUS has been active for more than a decade in opposing the indiscriminate killing of predators and other wild animals. In 1970, HSUS joined with other environmental groups in a suit to stop the use of the poison 1080 to kill predators. The suit never went to court because a report from the Council on Environmental Quality said the suits were "frivolous" and "of no effect.

In 1978, HSUS was a main party to a protest against Fish and Wildlife because of the agency's non-compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. That Act requires that an environmental impact statement be prepared before any actions are taken that could significantly affect the environment. The Fish and Wildlife Service had not filed such a statement on its animal damage control programs, but agreed to do so when faced with this protest. The first draft of this statement has now been released, and public hearings are being held to receive comments on the draft. Margarette Perkins, HSUS Legislative Associate, and Dr. Michael Fox, Director of ISAP, have both appeared at these hearings to demand that the environmental study be redone. Calling the study "factually inadequate," Perkins argued that the statement did not present a realistic view of alternative measures to the present program of trapping, poisoning, and shooting. Fox pointed out that the stated purpose of the program, i.e., to "resolve wildlife conflicts," is misleading in that the conflicts only arise when man displaced natural prey with domestic livestock.

The conflict between livestock and wildlife is the crux of the predator control issue. Private ranchers have been allowed to graze their herds of cattle and sheep on public lands for more than a century. Although they are charged a fee for this privilege, the cost to the rancher is considerably lower than the cost of buying and maintaining private grazing land.

Most livestock owners have been increasingly interested in proper husbandry methods, and have allowed larger and larger herds to roam free and unattended, easy prey to the elements, disease, starvation, and sometimes predators.

The inhumanity of this misnamed program is also evident in the report's recommendation of the problem to be considered. Herds of up to 6,000 head of sheep are allowed to uproot crops, go without shepherds, and with no lambs sheds for the period when the ewes are most susceptible to disease, injury, and predation. The ranchers expect the federal government not only to take away their prey, but to do it systematically, eradicating non-target species. In the case of the coyote, the Fish and Wildlife Service have, in part, created a predator problem by ignoring obvious biological realities. The true role of the coyote is that of rodent control. Coyote pups are pulled from their dens with fish hooks and beaten to death, or poison is thrown into the animal's water. The coyote's dietary capacity is such that it can only handle 10 sheep a year if it were to consume nothing else. In reality, most or all of the coyote's diet is small rodents and carrion.

Indiscriminate poisoning and trapping has killed off many rodents, others have been delibera-
tely eradicated in certain areas. For instance, many prairie dog villages have been destroyed because ranchers fear their unattended sheep and cattle might suffer "cruelty to humanitarians, is a major weapon in ADC's arsenal. With the cyanide a standard poison throughout the United States, and in some parts of Canada, effective reimbursement programs like this are in effect. A recent internal audit by the Department of Interior revealed that 60% of the animal damage control program's funding cannot even be accounted for. This mystery of missing funds alone should prompt a complete review of the program. Furthermore, even though they are mandated to take preventative measures to "resolve" problems with predating animals, tens of thousands of non-target animals are killed every year under the guise of predator control.

At the request of ranchers who want to use a range area, government agencies are required to "sterilize" the area before livestock are moved into it. This shotgun approach destroys a large percentage of all the animals in the area, rather than focusing in on the very few that might prey on livestock.

The methods of killing used are unacceptably cruel. The steel jaw leghold trap, virtually a symbol of cruelty to humanitarians, is a major weapon in ADC's arsenal. With the cyanide a standard poison throughout the United States, and in some parts of Canada, successful reimbursement programs like this are in effect. A recent internal audit by the Department of Interior revealed that 60% of the animal damage control program's funding cannot even be accounted for. This mystery of missing funds alone should prompt a complete review of the program. Furthermore, even though they are mandated to take preventative measures to "resolve" problems with predating animals, tens of thousands of non-target animals are killed every year under the guise of predator control.

The irony of the situation is that, despite this huge government program to destroy coyotes, and despite the activities of private trappers who kill more than 200,000 coyotes annually for their fur, the overall coyote population has remained about the same until recently. Coyote populations are self-regulating to some extent. When many coyotes are killed in an area, the remaining females tend to breed more frequently and have more pups in each litter.

However, the numbers of coyotes in the west are now diminishing rapidly under the pressure of government programs and fur trappers. Given enough time and economic incentive, these people may yet succeed in pushing the coyote to the edge of extinction as was done to the wolf.

With all this killing, Fish and Wildlife officials estimate the average value of a sheep as $42. It might be cheaper to reimburse the ranchers for each of their animals lost to predators than to lavish money on the slaughter of coyotes. In the state of Minnesota, and in some parts of Canada, successful reimbursement programs like this are in effect. A recent internal audit by the Department of Interior revealed that 60% of the animal damage control program's funding cannot even be accounted for. This mystery of missing funds alone should prompt a complete review of the program. Furthermore, even though they are mandated to take preventative measures to "resolve" problems with predating animals, tens of thousands of non-target animals are killed every year under the guise of predator control.

The cost of the Animal Damage Control Program, in money and in animal lives, is scandalous. ADC spends almost $265 to kill each coyote.

Fish and Wildlife estimates the average value of a sheep as $42. It might be cheaper to reimburse the ranchers for each of their animals lost to predators than to lavish money on the slaughter of coyotes. In the state of Minnesota, and in some parts of Canada, successful reimbursement programs like this are in effect. A recent internal audit by the Department of Interior revealed that 60% of the animal damage control program's funding cannot even be accounted for. This mystery of missing funds alone should prompt a complete review of the program. Furthermore, even though they are mandated to take preventative measures to "resolve" problems with predating animals, tens of thousands of non-target animals are killed every year under the guise of predator control.
Wildlife has little or no data to prove the amount of actual predation losses to the ranchers. In testimony before the Department of the Interior concerning a draft report on predator damage management in the west, HSUS General Counsel Murdbaugh Madden commented, “The one consistent cry in this controversy which has proceeded for so many years has been that there is a lack of data...data-gathering and state-to-state co­operation should be encouraged by Departmental officials, commencing with Assistant Secretary Beed in 1977, but such studies have been undertaken. We submit that the reason is simply the lack of the knowledge that a detailed socioeco­nomic study of cost benefit ratios would call for the elimination of this whole program, a risk those whose livelihood has depended upon it (i.e. the damage control personnel themselves) are unwilling to take.”

The little data that is available raises serious questions about the accuracy of the damage control program, a risk those personnel themselves are unwilling to take. For example, Nebraska showed that in 1974, 11% of the cattle were lost to predators, but in 1971, the loss was only 4%. The fact that Nebraska has greater weather extremes than Ohio, and that Ohio sheep are ordinary kept in smaller, forced areas makes it likely that coyote predation accounts for even less than 4% of the difference. This sort of statistic should prompt serious research into the physical loss to ranchers’ claims of high losses to predators.

There may be some cases where individual coyotes are causing serious loss to some ranchers. In these cases, if proper husbandry methods are employed, including use of shearers and dogs, and predation is still a problem, it would be acceptable to humane kill or relocate the particular animal causing the problem. But Fish and Wildlife Service’s wholesale slaughter of wildlife in response to misinformation and ma­licious pressure from ranchers is totally unacceptable. Federal lands belong to all United States’ citizens. Herds that graze on public land ac­tually benefit from the presence of coyotes which aid in the control of needs of wildlife and the majority of U.S. citizens who do not want public lands used solely to further the economic interests of any minority group.

The HSUS members can help in the fight against predator poisoning and trapping by writing to Senator John Culver, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Resource Protection, Dirksen Office Building, Washing­ton, DC 20510, and asking him to hold hearings on the animal damage control program. Members can also write their own Senators and Congressmen re­questing they support Senate Joint Resolution 8 and Senate Bill 536, introduced by Senator Bayh, which would prohibit certain kinds of trapping on federal lands. This bill is in more detail in the Federal Report on page 30 of this magazine.

Senator Bayh will also introduce a bill to ban the use on public lands of poisons that have secondary ef­fects on the environment. Both 1980 and cyanide are in this cate­gory, since they kill non-selectively any animal that takes the poisoned bait as well as any animal that eats the carcass, and they do not break down or wash away in the at­mosphere indefinitely, often ending up in the area’s water table. Society for the Prevention of Cruelty is supporting all such bills as well as calling on the Department of the Interior to study alternatives to predator manage­ment which would consider the economic interests of any rancher, the health of the majority of U.S. citizens who do not want public lands used solely to further the economic interests of any minority group.

The HSUS is supporting all three of these bills as well as calling on the Department of the Interior to study alternatives to predator erad­i­cation which would consider the needs of wildlife and the majority of U.S. citizens who do not want public lands used solely to further the economic interests of any minority group.

The HSUS members can help in the fight against predator poisoning and trapping by writing to Senator John Culver, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Resource Protection, Dirksen Office Building, Washing­ton, DC 20510, and asking him to hold hearings on the animal damage control program.

Members can also write their own Senators and Congressmen re­questing they support Senate Joint Resolution 8 and Senate Bill 536, introduced by Senator Bayh, which would prohibit certain kinds of trapping on federal lands.

The HSUS members can help in the fight against predator poisoning and trapping by writing to Senator John Culver, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Resource Protection, Dirksen Office Building, Washing­ton, DC 20510, and asking him to hold hearings on the animal damage control program. Members can also write their own Senators and Congressmen requesting they support Senate Joint Resolution 8 and Senate Bill 536, introduced by Senator Bayh, which would prohibit certain kinds of trapping on federal lands.

The HSUS members can help in the fight against predator poisoning and trapping by writing to Senator John Culver, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Resource Protection, Dirksen Office Building, Washing­ton, DC 20510, and asking him to hold hearings on the animal damage control program. Members can also write their own Senators and Congressmen requesting they support Senate Joint Resolution 8 and Senate Bill 536, introduced by Senator Bayh, which would prohibit certain kinds of trapping on federal lands.
Puppy Mills Are Major Source of Cruelty In Midwest

Cruel puppy mills are a continuing concern for Midwest Regional Director Ann Gonnerman. She recently inspected two such breeding facilities and found dogs living in filthy conditions and unprotected from the cold, winter weather. In one kennel, outside Des Moines, Iowa, she found the dogs living in wire runs with manure frozen and piled high around them. These dogs had the special problem of having to carefully negotiate every step they took in their cages, because the bottoms were made of wire with crossbeams. Although the animals appeared to be well fed, the water in their bowls was frozen.

A reporter from KAKE-TV in Wichita, Kansas, accompanied Gonnerman on an inspection of a kennel near that city. They saw dirty, cold dogs in wire runs and filthy wooden cages. One dog, with a large, open wound on its side, was running loose on the property. In order to sell animals wholesale, breeders such as these must be licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which requires them to meet minimum standards of humane care. Because of lack of compliance, both breeders had either given up their licenses or had them suspended by the USDA. Both are still operating, though, because these states do not have laws requiring minimum standards of care. As long as they only sell the pup retail, they are outside USDA jurisdiction, and not covered by state law.

“These are the conditions we are encountering throughout our territory,” said Gonnerman. “There are too many places like these that are falling between the cracks of the law, if there is a law.”

Gonnerman is working to solve this problem. Committees are being set up in Kansas and Missouri to obtain state legislation that would require kennels to maintain minimum standards of care.

West Coast Regional Office Steps Up Visits To Local Shelters

West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon, previously elected vice chairman of the Board of Examiners in Veterinary Medicine, was invited to speak to the veterinary students union at the University of California at Davis. Fifty veterinary students joined the lively discussion afterwards about such issues as course curriculum at the school; showing clients you care about their pets; posting fees and giving estimates to consumers; animal ethics; and the intrinsic value of animals.

The West Coast Regional Office has stepped up visits to local humane society animal shelters and animal control agencies. “Not all visits to shelters are because of complaints received by our office,” said Eric Sakach, Field Investigator for the West Coast Region. “During field assignments, we make every attempt to visit all shelters to observe their operation and become acquainted with the staff. We’d like to know what we can do, as well as where we can be of assistance or if they have a program they may be particularly proud of.” Sakach continued, “Our main concern is the quality of the care given to the animals.”

Sakach recently visited shelters and noted areas needing improvements in Merced, Salinas, Indio, Desert Hot Springs, and Blythe, California, and in Ely, Nevada where 23 of the pound’s 30 kennels were in such a state of disrepair they were unusable. Most recently the office was requested to conduct a detailed inspection of facilities for the Ventura County Department of Animal Regulation. Sakach’s findings and recommendations were sent to county officials. “We are happy to evaluate any facility,” said Sakach. “And even happier if the visit is requested by city or county officials. It shows that they’re concerned about the welfare of the animals.”

Solving Animal Problems In Your Community

Connecticut State Spay/Neuter Clinic To Open

Ms. Dorothy McCaffery, Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture for Connecticut, recently announced the planned opening of the first Connecticut State spay/neuter clinic. Contracts have been signed with a veterinarian, and a lease has been taken on a building, formerly the town hall in Bethany, Connecticut, which will be the site of the spay/neuter clinic.

Start-up funds for the clinic came from private contributions collected by humanitarians in the state. Ms. McCaffery stated that the clinic is expected to be self-sustaining from the revenues generated by fees charged to users of the clinic for the sterilization of dogs and cats. She pointed out that no state tax dollars are to be used in the operation of the facility.

Two special meetings are being planned for the New England Region this spring. The first is a Regional Membership Conference for HSUS members and friends in the six-state area. It will be held on Saturday, May 8 at the Sonesta Hotel in downtown Hartford, New England Regional Director John Inman, along with HSUS President John Hoyt, Vice President Patricia Forkan and ISAF Director Dr. Michael Fox, will meet with the group to discuss animal welfare issues.

On June 15 and 16, a HSUS Workshop, “Solving Animal Problems in Your Community,” will be held in Albany, New York. HSUS staff members will conduct the workshop which will cover subjects such as animal rescue, sheltering, and control, investigations, education, organization and program development. For more information on the Membership Conference or the workshop on animal problems, contact the New England Regional Office at 630 Oakwood Avenue, Suite 213, West Hartford, CT 06110.

Call for Animal Rights Goes To Congress

As we go to press, The HSUS News has learned that Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey has read into the Congressional Record the text of HSUS’ resolution on Animal Rights and Human Obligations passed at the 1978 annual conference. Reprinted with the resolution will be the article on Animal Rights: The Search for a Legal Definition, which appeared in the Winter, 1978 issue of the News.

The HSUS is grateful for this opportunity to place before Congress and others our declaration of man’s responsibility to acknowledge and protect the rights of animals.
How To: Shop For Pet Food

by Dr. Michael Fox
Director, Institute for the Study of Animal Problems

A government survey completed in 1976 on the dietary habits of the nation revealed that the average American does not eat a properly balanced diet. Since many people don't seem to be feeding themselves sensibly, is it any wonder their pets are not fed an adequate diet?

Pet owners may in fact be on a better diet than their own. This is because some (but not all) cat and dog foods are scientifically formulated to insure that your pet receives all the essential nutrients. Food companies spend billions of dollars in nutrition research and have conducted long-term studies on cats and dogs to insure that their products are not only safe, but nutritionally sound and acceptable to both pet and owner.

Facts About Pet Foods

Many pets are like children, in that they may get a taste for something that is not good for them. This is especially true of pets that are fed by the same person who also feeds the family. Pets that are allowed to eat table scraps are at risk of becoming overweight and may develop health problems such as diabetes or heart disease.

Wild animals seem to possess what is often referred to as an “instinct for balance.” Their instincts insure that they eat a “balanced” diet by switching between different foods to get all the essential nutrients. Domesticated pets, on the other hand, are fed a single type of food that may not provide all the necessary nutrients.

The major pet food companies have spent billions of dollars in nutrition research and have conducted long-term studies on cats and dogs to ensure that their products are not only safe, but nutritionally sound and acceptable to both pet and owner.

To begin with, it is a fact that “4-D” meat is used in many pet foods. This includes parts of animals that are dying, dead, diseased, or damaged (bruised) on arrival at the slaughterhouse. Some of these parts are used to provide the protein content of the food, while others are used to provide the flavor. These parts are not suitable for human consumption and should not be fed to pets.

Special Considerations

For ethical, economic, and ecological reasons, pet owners may want to consider feeding their pets a more natural diet. This means feeding them the same type of food that wild animals eat. This can be done by feeding them foods that are high in protein, such as meat, fish, or chicken. These foods are more nutritious than those that are low in protein, such as vegetables or grains.
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Cats fed a low fibre (roughage) diet, such as one that is a high grade all-meat formulation, may be more prone to develop furballs. Some nutritionists believe that natural roughage in the food may help hair in the cat’s stomach (which it swallows when grooming itself) pass on through the bowel.

One of the reasons why cats enjoy eating grass may be a reflection of their “nutritional wisdom” which makes them seek out natural roughage to clean out their systems, to speak, when their diet is too low in fibre-roughage.

I am frequently asked about the relationship between the ash content of dry cat foods and urinary calculi (blockage), so to speak, when their diet is too low in fibre-roughage.

The relationship between the ash content of dry food and urinary calculi is not a new one. Some veterinarians advise cat owners never to feed dry food to their animals. Such extreme precautions may not be justified for healthy cats, but may be advisable once a cat has had a bout of cystitis.

Chronic or recurrent bouts of constipation in cats may be due to lack of natural “bulk” in the diet. For both cats and dogs, lack of exercise may contribute to this problem. The opposite trouble—diarrhea—can be triggered by excessively rich food, a food allergy, or putting the pet on a new diet or brand of food. Always change diets or brands gradually by slowly giving proportionately more of the new food each day. Some dogs are particularly sensitive to horse-meat and may have an acute gastrointestinal reaction to such food. Persistent diarrhoea should be checked out by your veterinarian since factors other than the nature of the diet, such as bacterial and viral infections, can cause severe enteritis.

Some veterinarians advise cats owners never to feed dry food to their animals. Such extreme precautions may not be justified for healthy cats, but may be advisable once a cat has had a bout of cystitis.

Portions of this article previously appeared in McCull’s Magazine, and are reprinted here by special permission.

“YOU CANNOT DO A KINDNESS TOO SOON, BECAUSE YOU NEVER KNOW HOW SOON IT WILL BE TOO LATE”
—Ralph Waldo Emerson

You can do a lasting kindness for the animals through The HSUS Annuity Plan. You can increase the assets of The Humane Society and provide for a continuing income for yourself, with substantial tax benefits to you, through our Annuity Plan. In return for a capital gift, The HSUS will contract to pay you for life a guaranteed annual income while the remainder of your investment will help assure the work: and purposes of The HSUS in the future. For more information, write in confidence to: Paul G. Irwin, Vice President-Treasurer, HSUS, 2100 1 Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037.

Marine Mammals, edited by Delphine Haley (Pacific Search Press, $26.60)

There are in excess of 120 species and subspecies of sea mammals including whales, which are the largest creatures to have ever lived on earth. Although biologically linked to other warm blooded, air-breathing animals, cetaceans, pinnipeds and their brethren are segregated from other mammals by the marine environment.

Efforts to penetrate the world of marine mammals have proven among the most difficult undertakings in all of field biology. Scientists have discovered that whales and dolphins are possessed of remarkably developed brains, complex social orders, and sophisticated systems of communication. These findings have prompted intensified scientific inquiries and have stimulated the interest and empathy of the public.

Marine Mammals is a scholarly but non-technical book comprised of 28 articles contributed by distinguished authorities such as Victor Scheffer, Willman Marquette, Stephen Leatherwood, and Randall Reeves. Chapters are devoted to individual species of sea mammals. Each passage contains detailed information on physiology, diet, behavior, distribution, habitat, classification, exploitation, preservation, and life history.

Marine Mammals neatly capsulizes current knowledge and past history into a set of informative, data-filled profiles. The book also includes photographs, illustrations, maps, and a bibliography.

Pacific Search Press is offering a 10% discount to HSUS members on Marine Mammals as well as other natural science titles. Write to Pacific Search Press at 715 Harrison St., Seattle, WA, 98109, for a copy of their catalog, specifying that you are responding to the offer in The HSUS News.
Budget Cuts Threaten Animal Programs

Federal protection for pet and wild animals will be severely jeopardized if Congress does not restore appropriations which would be cut, in reality, a reduction. In the spiraling inflation, even maintenance of federal programs plagued by the leghold trap and no other forms of trapping.

Among the provisions of the proposed new congressional bill are:

1. Making trapping illegal in the state of Maryland.
2. Requiring the use of decompression chambers in that state.
3. requiring the use of curare, a form of drugs to kill animals. The bill does not prohibit the use of decompression chambers.

Trapping Bills Before Congress

Trapping is one of the most emotional and difficult to solve by federal legislation because federal authority is limited in this regard. Congress could ban the interstate commerce of traps and products from states which do not ban traps, and/or regulate trapping practices on federal lands.

There have been several bills introduced in the new Congress on the subject of trapping. They take two different approaches. One bans the sale of wildlife products taken in states or countries which do not prohibit the use of decompression chambers. The other prohibits the use of any trap on federal lands that was cruel and inhuman.

A similar bill, H.R. 1297, has been introduced in the House by Rep. Clarence Long of Maryland. As a result of hearings held in the House in 1975 on the subject of trapping, a second approach was devised that would strictly regulate trapping on federal land. This is potentially less controversial since it would not raise the states’ rights issue.

Since one of the biggest single users of traps in the country is the Department of the Interior, with its predator control programs, stiff regulations would be a good start toward ending cruel trapping.

Several bills that would limit the use of the steel jaw leghold trap have been introduced in congress.

The Humane Approach

In recognition of the important role pets can play in the lives of elderly and handicapped persons, Congressman Mario Biaggi of New York has introduced H.R. 1111 which would prohibit federal assistance to rental housing projects if such projects did not allow those persons to have pets.

Last year, Biaggi attempted to pass a law allowing anyone living in a public housing project to own a pet. That was widely opposed, so this year he has narrowed the bill to those projects primarily for the elderly and handicapped.

Several studies have shown that pets can fulfill important psychological needs for elderly people as well as combating loneliness. For instance, one study showed that pet owners seem to have a better survival rate after heart attacks than those who do not own pets. Handicapped adults and children also benefit enormously from interaction with pet animals.

A similar approach to the use of these animals if their conduct or condition is only justified to constitute a threat to the health or safety of the other occupants. HSUS will propose that provisions must be made to ensure that proper and adequate care is being given to the pets as well.

States Take Action on Euthanasia

Four states have recently taken steps toward making euthanasia of cats and dogs more humane. Arkansas, Ohio, Pennsylvania and California have all proposed measures in their state legislatures to end cruel trapping. The Maryland House of Delegates and the Senate will vote on the bill in 1980.

Adequate funding has constantly hampered the enforcement of federal animal laws, and it now appears that this may be even more the case in the future. The administration is proposing a reduction for Animal Welfare Act funding from $4 million (the 1979 figure) to $1.5 million for 1980. This is a ridiculously low figure. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, which administers the Act, already cites inadequate funding as one reason why the Act is not being properly enforced. It has been estimated that at least $8 million will be necessary to adequately monitor and enforce the Animal Welfare Act. Without these badly needed funds, dogs, cats, and many wild animals will continue to suffer in the proposed short-sighted projects, zoos, research laboratories and other places regulated by the Act.

Rare and endangered animals will not fare much better under the proposed budget for the Interior Department’s enforcement of the Endangered Species Act. Although the requested amount for 1980 is not a reduction from the 1979 figure, the Fish and Wildlife Service is already under-funded for the job it was mandated by Congress to perform. Thousands of species are waiting to be added to the endangered or threatened species list and given federal protection. It is believed unlikely that more than ten of these species a year will be afforded this protection since the resources of the Endangered Species Office are too limited to review and study the status of all the species proposed for listing. In addition, illegal trade in endangered and threatened species continues because the Interior Department does not have sufficient numbers of agents to enforce the Act.

The most effective voice for marine mammals within the federal government is the Marine Mammal Commission. That Commission was instrumental in many actions to protect marine mammals, including fighting for strict proposal regulations to stop the killing of hundreds of thousands of porpoises in the tuna industry.

Funds for the Marine Mammal Commission to do its work have been whittled down from $640,000 proposed for 1980. One federal program slated with inadequate funding include the Wild, Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act, the program which administers the Humane Slaughter Act. We urge you to write to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to ask them to increase funds for the proper and adequate enforcement and administration of these animal welfare programs:

Representative Jamie Whitten, Chairman House Appropriations Committee, 216 H Capitol, Washington, DC 20515.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman Senate Appropriations Committee, 1235 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

Several bills that would limit the use of the steel jaw leghold trap have been introduced in congress.
Cruelty Conviction in Tennessee

In January, 1979, a walking horse trainer in Overton County, Tennessee, was convicted of cruelty to animals, based largely on the investigation and resultant court testimony of HSUS investigator, Marc Paulhus. A number of horses in the trainer’s care were found to be suffering from serious neglect, malnutrition and lack of veterinary care during Mr. Paulhus’ investigation in May, 1978. Warrants were issued against the trainer for cruelty involving a large number of dogs and cats. The sentence was not resolved since two of the defendants pleaded guilty, but the case resulted in some very thorough briefing of this question by the humane society lawyers which might be of interest to some of our constituents with potentially the same problem.

Grand Canyon Burros Threatened Again

In January, 1979, the National Park Service issued a management plan and draft environmental statement directed at severely reducing the feral burros in Grand Canyon National Park. In February, 1977, HSUS successfully used the Park Service to stop its first campaign to exterminate the burros and force the government to more carefully evaluate the problem. (See HSUS News Spring, 1977.) This new management plan is the product of that two-year evaluation.

The plan proposes shooting most of the 300 burros in the park and confining the remainder to a fenced area. The Park Service claims that the program is necessary because of damage the burros have allegedly wreaked upon the park habitat and archeological sites. HSUS will again submit its own analysis of the problem to the Park Service and will consider legal action to stop or modify the plan.

Elk Farm Opposed

The HSUS has joined with the County of Marin and the Marin County Humane Society in a suit in California designed to prohibit the establishment of an elk farm in Marin County. The purpose of the farm allegedly is to make the antlers available for removal while in velvet, the antlers to be exported to the Far East for use as an aphrodisiac.

This plan to bring Rocky Mountain elk into Marin County in order to create a new “farming operation” is being strongly opposed. The Superior Court there has been asked to bar the project by issuing a writ of mandamus commanding the California Fish and Game Commission not to issue the permits necessary in order for these elk to be imported into California.

Fake Dog Catcher Spotted

There have been reports in Virginia of a man posing as a dog catcher who is believed to have been responsible for the disappearance of a number of large dogs in the past few months. The impostor apparently wears a uniform and drives an official-looking truck. The technique has been for him to approach dog owners, demand to see their dog license, and then “confiscate” the dog from the rattled and confused owner.

The HSUS General Counsel would like to make it clear that if your dog is properly leashed and in your custody, no one has the right to “confiscate” it, even the legitimate authorities, except in some rare instance—for example, the suspicion of rabies. They may well give you a citation or ticket for failing to have your dog properly licensed, but a demand or request to do anything more than that should immediately raise your suspicions.

Legal Issue Raised in Cruelty Case

Another recent significant cruelty prosecution in Tennessee resulted in two of four defendants found guilty, where the evidence produced by the Humane Society in Oak Ridge spelled out clear neglect and cruelty involving a large number of dogs and cats. The prosecution was made more difficult by a legal issue raised by the defendant to the effect that as a humane society employee, the prosecution witness was bound by the same Fourth Amendment protections as though she had been an arm of government, such as a police officer.

The defense attorneys argued that the humane society employee had entered the premises where the animals were kept without a valid search warrant, and therefore any evidence she found was inadmissible under the Fourth Amendment, which proscribes search and seizure without a warrant. The prosecution prepared a brief replying that by precedent, the Fourth Amendment applies only to those operating under authority of the government. They argued that the humane society employee conducted the investigation as a private citizen, not as an agent of the government, and therefore the evidence she obtained should be admissible in court.

This issue was not resolved since two of the defendants pleading guilty, but the case resulted in some very thorough briefing of this question by the humane society lawyers which might be of interest to some of our constituents with potentially the same problem.

Do You Eat Meat?

One of the favorite questions put to animal welfare advocates by hunters, trappers, and others whose activities are often challenged by the humane movement is “Do you eat meat?” The point of the question seems to be that if one eats meat he has no ground on which to challenge those who inflict suffering, generally unjustifiably, upon animals. It is a defense mechanism, pure and simple, but one that often results in embarrassment and withdrawal by the person being queried.

It is undoubtedly true that one might feel more secure in his position when challenged if, indeed, he participated in no utilization of animals that caused suffering or injury. But to suggest that one has no right to challenge those who inflict suffering on animals in other forms because he eats meat is as absurd as to suggest that one has no right to object to murder because he has fought in a war.

There is surely a difference between killing an animal for food purposes (as some hunters do) and abusing and injuring animals for pleasure, sport, or other non-essential reasons. The motive of one’s actions and the consequence of pursuing an activity quite clearly must be considered in assessing the ethical appropriateness of using animals for whatever purpose. And while few, if any of us, are free from some degree of complicity in animal suffering, we need not feel intimidated by those who wish to excuse their own guilt by pointing to ours.

There are, I accept, legitimate uses of animals in a society where people and animals are very much interdependent. There are also many uses to which animals are put that are in no way defensible on ethical or moral grounds. Therefore, not only do we have a right to make such judgments, we have a responsibility to do so, not only for ourselves as individuals, but for the betterment of the society that serves both people and animals alike.

Those who object to the eating of meat have a right to challenge my decision and action when it is their conviction that eating meat is wrong. But when one uses such a challenge as a cover for his own activities or imagines it disqualifies me from seeking the further prevention of cruelty and suffering to animals, he is surely to be pitied, for either he is intellectually ignorant or morally undernourished.
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