Grand Prize Winner
1981 HSUS Annual Photo Contest
Within the animal-welfare movement there is a great temptation to view one's own understanding of animal-welfare issues as the only view worthy of serious consideration. As so often with religion, there is a certainty born of personal convictions and beliefs that allows for no other view or opinions. Even when compared with those held by groups of similar persuasion, we are loathe to concede that someone else may possess insight and understanding we have missed.

All too often, it has been this kind of exclusivity and pride that has prevented cooperative endeavor among animal-welfare groups. A recent example of that kind of intractability is the position currently being taken by Friends of Animals as regards H.R. 556, one of several bills which would provide further protection for laboratory animals and accelerated development of alternatives to live-animal research. H.R. 556 is most assuredly a bill with considerable merit, and one for which The HSUS has indicated its support. But because we did not support this bill exclusively, The HSUS is being blamed because this bill has not been favorably reported out of the Congressional Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology.

Unfortunately, FOA would have us believe this subcommittee would have approved H.R. 556 in its entirety except for the influence of The HSUS. The fact of the matter is that The HSUS and FOA are but a small portion of the various interest groups petitioning this subcommittee with their particular views and concerns. To pin one's hope for favorable response on a single bill, as FOA is advocating, is to tread on very thin ice. To refuse to support any other bill, as FOA is counseling, is to refuse to help laboratory animals unless it is done "my" way. Such a position is not only naive; it is also irresponsible.

It is indeed regrettable that Friends of Animals has chosen to conduct a public campaign falsely condemning The HSUS because it may not get precisely what it wants. What Friends of Animals is getting is precisely what our common adversaries want—a public confrontation within the animal-welfare community which, as another animal-welfare leader has stated, further confuses and confounds the Congress and frightens it at the deep disunity within the humane movement.

The HSUS has continuously indicated and demonstrated its willingness to work in concert with our sister animal-welfare groups on various animal-welfare issues. Indeed, the outstanding success of the Draize campaign is largely attributable to the cooperative endeavors of both national, regional, and local animal-welfare groups. So, also, is the work of The Council for Livestock Protection, Monitor, and various other formal as well as ad hoc cooperative efforts. Yet a willingness to work in concert with others must be reciprocated in a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation. It is only through this kind of unified effort that we can in the future proceed to even greater successes in securing protection from suffering and abuse for animals.
Another Spring

With the warm weather come car, boat, and RV shows; and with car, boat, and RV shows come Victor the Wrestling Bear, Willard the Boiling Kangaroo, the nameless Diving Mule and a number of other wild animals forced into service as promotional gimmicks and novelty acts. These shows pose unusual problems for humane societies because they blatantly exploit the animals used as skills and are a serious public safety problem. People working in the shows may be confined to their traveling cages—often just big enough to accommodate them and offering neither room to exercise nor contact with other animals—for most of their lives. Brought out of these cages for their performances, they are subjected to the raucous environment of crowded, noisy, public places. It is not surprising that injuries to the gullible public by animals goaded into aggressiveness during “contests” have occurred. You would think anyone foolish enough to wrestle a full-grown bear to the ground for something more than a potential broken arm would deserve whatever he got, but unqualified trainers with no business handling wild animals in the close quarters of shopping malls and boat shows must share the blame. One recent case of injury caused by a performing animal resulted in a suit brought against the animal’s owner and the host of the show where the act appeared.

Unfortunately, the USDA doesn’t ban these acts, although The HSUS believes the Animal Welfare Act regulations would allow it to do so. Humane societies should continue to monitor these exhibitions and enforce anti-cruelty statutes when it’s possible. If their local statutes do not specifically prohibit contact between the public and performing wild animals, they may find allies in the public health officials or members of civic organizations who will join in protesting wild animal acts.

Silver Spring Update

The monkeys seized from the Institute for Behavior Research last September (see The HSUS News, Winter, 1982), remain at the National Institutes of Health’s Poolesville (Maryland) facility. Permanent disposition will likely be decided when Dr. Edward Taub’s appeal is heard in circuit court the week of June 14, 1982. The HSUS is working with the State’s Attorney’s office in preparation for the hearing and will cover the travel expenses of out-of-town witnesses for the prosecution. Dr. Michael Fox, HSUS Scientific Director, is expected to testify on the lack of necessary veterinary care for the monkeys, the charge of which Taub was found guilty in October, 1981. The monkeys’ fate has not been decided. We urge HSUS members to write to NIH and request that Taub’s grant (paid for by tax dollars) not be reinstated and that the monkeys not be returned to his custody (Acting Director, NIH, 9000 Rockville Pike, Office Building #1, Room #124, Bethesda, MD 20892).

Canine Kudos

For the second straight year, The HSUS was honored by the Dog Writer’s Association of America at its annual awards banquet in New York. The HSUS this year shared DWA’s National Public Service Award with the American Animal Hospital Association. In presenting The HSUS’s award to staff writer Julie Rovner, DWA spokesman Maxwell Riddle cited The HSUS’s outstanding work towards ending dogfighting and exposing inhumane conditions in the nation’s puppy mills. The HSUS News and two articles (“Fighting the Flea,” Summer 1981, and “Puppy-Mill Misery,” Fall 1981) were chosen as finalists in the writing categories.

Typo Revealed

A spokeswoman for the Men­nen Company has written to set the record straight on the cos­metic manufacturer’s position on alternatives to the Draize test (see “Tracks,” Fall 1981 HSUS News). In response to a reader’s letter of concern, Men­nen had said the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association had form­ed a committee to develop techni­ques “to maximize the comfort to the animals involved in cos­metic testing.” The Men­nen representa­tive tells us this was a typo­graphical error; maximize should have been minicrime. In fact, Men­nen has pledged $15,000 to the CFA’s fund for developing alter­ natives to the Draize test. The fund has already been tapped to set up a Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing within Johns Hopkins University.
The HSUS public-awareness campaign draws nationwide attention to the plight of milk-fed veal calves.

"Before you choose veal...think twice," read the headline on a half-page ad in the New York Times last December 17. That ad, describing the miserable existence of the more than one million calves raised in confinement every year to produce expensive milk-fed veal, kicked off one of The HSUS’s biggest campaigns. Response to the campaign—from the farm industry, the press, the general public, and animal-welfare supporters—has been overwhelming.

“The public needs to be made aware of how its food animals are being produced, and the veal industry needs to know the extent to which the public values humaneness in animal production. These are the goals of our campaign,” wrote HSUS President John Hoyt in a letter to the editor of Feedstuffs, a leading agricultural newspaper. “We find this industry’s continuing efforts to foster public demand for pale or ‘white’ veal inexplicable, particularly as industry leaders have acknowledged that the color of veal has no effect on taste. To subject calves to the current regimen partly to perpetuate what is, in essence, a marketing device suggests an insensitivity to animals and disregard for the sensibilities of consumers.”

The HSUS launched its campaign in a carefully thought-out effort to make sure the public knew how the “best” veal served in the most exclusive restaurants was produced. Quite probably, their tempting, high-priced entree was once an animal that had spent all but a few days of its 16-week life in a unbedded, narrow, wooden stall too small for the animal to take more than a single step forward or back.

The HSUS veal campaign was the result of an intensive, year-long study of the veal industry conducted by HSUS staff. While, in recent years, concern has been growing about the plight of all food animals raised in intensive-confinement systems—systems known as factory farming—milk-fed veal-raising practices have probably drawn the most attention. In order to produce an animal with the palest flesh possible, male dairy calves are confined to crates and fed twice a day on a milk substitute purposely low in iron so the flesh does not develop its natural pinkish color.

The HSUS study, which included a survey of all the major U.S. milk-fed veal companies, concluded methods of veal-raising in the U.S. produce the most deprivation for the least justifiable reasons—to produce an exclusively luxury food. Even more galling is that economical alternatives—including the so-called group-pen system now gaining popularity in England—are available. Only public pressure on veal producers can provide an impetus for
change. Without public awareness, there can be no public pressure, thus, the campaign began by bringing the facts to consumers.

The first salvo consisted not only of the New York Times ad, but also smaller ads placed in city magazines in New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago where consumption of milk-fed veal is high. Respondents to the ad received a fact sheet detailing the veal campaign was sent to...
Now we know what many of you have been doing all year long: taking pictures of pets, wildlife, farm animals, and fish with enthusiasm, skill, and obvious affection.

Cats were this year's overwhelming favorites: of the 25 photographs winning prizes in the two pet categories (color and black-and-white), 12 had cats as subjects. Even our grand prize winner included a dog and a cat. Some of our winners are pictured here. Other entries appear in the article beginning on page 20.

All of us were struck by the good-natured cooperation you were given by your photogenic models, whether dressed in funny clothes or caught unawares during their daily trips through your backyard.

Congratulations to all winners and thank you for entering.

First prize, Pets, B&W: Marta
Second prize, Pets, B&W: Margie Bell
Grand Prize and First Prize, Pets, Color: Tom Virtue, Denver, CO
Second Prize (tie): Milford Waldroup, Orinda, CA
Honorable Mention: George C. Kip Hilton, Lakewood, CO
Franz Peterson, Orange Park, FL
Linda Held, Redwood City, CA
Irving Schlaifer, Washington, DC
Terrie Jacks, Ridgecrest, CA
Carol Garr, Tucson, AZ
Sandra Kirshbaum, Lawrence, NY
Carol Thomson, Denver, CO
Jeannette Maurer, San Antonio, TX

Non-Pets, Color
First Prize: Mr. and Mrs. Brian Pendergraft, Riverview, MI
Second Prize: Peggy Bristol, Bishop, CA
Honorable Mention: Jim Elder, Evergreen, CO
Kyle Binning, St. Petersburg, FL
Marla Turek, Naperville, IL (2)
Robyn Michaels, Chicago, IL
Sam H. Gould, Sun City, AZ
Penny Marciel, Gallup, CA
Cindy Bidagain, Tucson, AZ
Marla Turek, Orono, CA
Sterling Vinson, Tucson, AZ
Cindy Bidagain, Tucson, AZ
Debra Thoren-Roth, Denver, CO

Pets, Black and White
First Prize: Marta, New Orleans, LA
Second Prize: Margie Bell, Arlington, VA
Honorable Mention: Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA (2)
Stephanie Rodgers, Pennington, NJ (2)
Amber Francis, Oroville, CA
Sterling Vinson, Tucson, AZ
Cindy Bidagain, Tucson, AZ
Shirley Levine, Phoenix, AZ
Debra Thoren-Roth, Denver, CO

Non-Pets, Black and White
First Prize: Diane Trumbull, St. Petersburg, FL
Second Prize: Mike Roy, St. Petersburg, FL
Honorable Mention: Will and Angie Rumph, Pacifica, CA
Shirley Levine, Phoenix, AZ
Robert M. Pridy, Felton, CA
Valerie Matthews, Canyon Lake, TX
Pamela Pitanish, Detroit, MI
Elizabeth Stallard, Lancaster, OH (2)
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA (3)
Eleven years after passage of the act designed to protect them, wild horses face a government threat to trim their numbers and send thousands to an uncertain fate.

Anyone involved in animal protection ten years ago will remember the elation and satisfaction that followed passage of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971. Tremendously popular legislation designed to protect a vanishing part of America’s heritage, the Act was a milestone in the history of species preservation. The twenty-year-long fight to save dwindling herds of wild horses holed up in the canyons of the Western states was legendary. It created its own heroines—people like Hope Ryden and "Wild Horse Annie" Velma Johnston—and its own villains—the mustangers and pet food suppliers who herded horses from airplanes, ran them to death over cliffs, and wired their nostrils shut after capture to make them more tractable during their trip to the slaughterhouse.

Unfortunately, the initial euphoria quickly turned to disappointment. The Bureau of Land Management, the government agency responsible for administering the Act, proceeded to bungle its job in an all-too-often illegal, callous, and unprofessional series of bureaucratic misdeeds. The HSUS and other organizations that fought so hard for the Act’s passage have been rewarded by ten years of court battles, scientific controversies, and legislative maneuvers threatening to undo whatever good the Act has brought about.

Now, a new threat looms: weakening amendments to the Act, proposed by BLM Director Robert Burford, are winning support not only from pro-ranching interests but also from some conservation groups that historically have opposed protection of wild horses bound for the pet food processors. By 1971, she had gathered enough support from sympathetic representatives. By 1971, she had gathered enough support from sympathetic individuals and organizations like the HSUS to the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act signed into law. The Act prohibited:

- • acquisition of wild horses or burros by private individuals without government permission;  
- • malicious death or harassment of such animals;  
- • processing or permitting the processing of an animal or its remains into commercial products;  
- • sale of an animal or its remains; and  
- • violation of regulations issued to carry out the Act.

A crucial stipulation was that excess horses were to be relocated only to those areas where wild horses existed at the time of the Act’s passage; be humanely destroyed; or placed in private custody. The BLM and the Forest Service were to administer the Act. At the time, no one defined what constituted an "excess" horse—the BLM was allowed to use its own judgment. This would prove to be a critical omission, the basis of bitter controversy in subsequent years.

BLM Management Breaks Down
Within months of the Act’s passage, the BLM proved itself a poor steward. In 1973, Idaho ranchers using snowmobiles and aircraft rounded up horses with BLM approval. The Act provided little protection for these animals—between 7 and 10 of the original 20 were run over by clifs to their deaths, according to HSUS Chief Investigator Franz Danteler’s eyewitness account. The "Howe Massacre" prompted an outraged HSUS and American Horse Protection Association to file suit against the Department of the Interior for failure to enforce the 1971 Act by allowing illegal round-ups to take place. (This suit was eventually settled by having the surviving horses placed in AHPA custody, then in adoptive homes.) In 1976, a hard-fought battle by those organizations resulted in a permanent injunction against the BLM’s round-
up was even necessary. The court agreed. (Although the injunction had been modified over the years, it basically still stands.) In 1978, Dantzler inspected the BLM holding facility at Palomino Valley, Nevada, and was profoundly disturbed by what he saw: at least 300 of 2000 wild horses being held for possible adoption had died in the facility in the preceding 14 months. It wasn’t hard to see why: sick horses mingled freely with healthy animals for months on end in filthy, mud-choked, overcrowded pens. The horses had to eat hay thrown on the ground and develop sand colic; many were destroyed as a result. Once again, The HSUS sued Interior for mismanagement and cruelty in its Nevada wild horse operation. (The courts found against us in this suit, but it remains on appeal.)

In 1971, an organization called WHOA! (Wild Horse Organized Advocates) had received BLM permission to care for starving foals born in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge and, in spring of 1972, had placed the foals in carefully selected foster homes. This was the beginning of the Adopt-A-Horse program, a plan the BLM took over officially in 1975 and turned into its primary means of placing “excess” wild horses in private hands. Adopt-A-Horse program ran into trouble as well. It fell prey to bureaucratic snarl-ups and mismanagement once the BLM took over. Horses adopted—sometimes by the hundreds—by supposedly well-screened individuals mysteriously ended up in slaughterhouses or disappeared completely. Costs skyrocketed. Horses held for months awaiting adoption ran up substantial feed bills before being placed or destroyed. In January of 1979, the BLM was confronted with the biological impossibility of such an increase given the 9,500 horses estimated to need protection in 1971; it estimated that the 1971 figure must have been far lower than the 9,500.* Apparently, the BLM wanted as few protected wild horses as possible, through one argument or the other. It became clear that the BLM could not find enough adopters for all the animals it considered “excess.” The agency wanted the option of outright slaughter, anathema to The HSUS, which had fought so hard to get slaughter for profit out of wild horse management originally.

Legislative Onslaught

Two important legislative developments changed the original Act. In 1976, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act provided the BLM with the authority to use helicopters for capturing animals, supposedly because there were not enough experienced hands to round up horses in rough terrain. The HSUS opposed this change, remembering the Howe Massacre. In 1978, the Public Rangeland Improvement Act was passed. It:

• allowed adopters to receive final title to their adopted horses after one year of humane care and management by The HSUS, fearing horses would eventually end up in slaughterhouses once they were no longer owned by the government;
• allowed the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether an overpopulation existed, then required the Secretary to “immediately re-

*... The 1971 count of such animals [wild horses and burros] on public lands was too low.” George L. Yarbrough, Acting Director, BLM, Denver, Colorado, February, 1979, p. 55.
feared this admirable gesture towards fiscal responsibility was a thinly disguised attempt to legitimize commercial slaughter of wild horses and counseled waiting for the results of the NAS study.

The BLM didn’t give up. In October of 1981, Director Burford recommended amendments to the Act that would virtually gut it. At the same time, officials in the Department of the Interior, the BLM’s parent agency, convinced Senator Ted Stevens to propose an amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill seeking to repeal the Wild Horse Act outright! Only quick action by Senator Henry Jackson saved the horses that day.

Ironically, despite all the rhetoric about Easterners meddling in western affairs the fact is that only 4 percent of all cattle and 28 percent of all sheep raised for consumption in this country ever graze on public lands.* Western ranchers enjoy incredibly low public-grazing-land fees for their livestock—a luxury not afforded the vast majority of producers without access to public lands. That seems to be lost on Westerners who are busy complaining about the rest of the country’s meddling in the management of America’s public lands.

By attempting to link the wild horse issue to regional conflicts, ranchers with grazing permits have actually prompted greater outside scrutiny. Their claims that wild horses and burros are a major cause of range deterioration can easily be disproved. Government biologists state that 135 million acres of public grazing lands are in fair condition or worse.** But wild horses and burros inhabit only a small fraction of this total acreage, making their impact insignificant when compared to the rangeland destruction caused by 7 million domestic cattle and sheep. Nor can the ranchers credibly object even if the wild horse program is not cost-effective. Livestock grazing on public lands is heavily subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer, under the Taylor Grazing Act. Ranchers in 1982 will pay a paltry $1.86 per month for grazing one adult cow or five sheep—less than one-third of the total cost for soil and water development, predator control, fencing.

*According to the BLM’s own study, Managing the Nation’s Public Lands, January 31, 1982, p. 2.

**(ibid, p. 40)

and other grazing programs! Finally, thousands of trespass animals owned by ranchers and turned loose illegally on public lands easily outnumber all protected wild horses; strict enforcement of the Taylor Grazing Act could limit rangeland damage being done by these animals.

The Present Crisis

Despite opposition from environmental and animal welfare groups, the Administration will likely continue to pressure Congress to amend the Wild Horse and Burro Act. The BLM’s Robert Burford, himself a cattle rancher, threatens us with an unpalatable choice either accept his inadmissible amendments to the Act or the BLM will eliminate excess horses by shooting them on the range. The HSUS will continue to fight rather than acquiesce. The proposed amendments offer us no reasonable choice. The BLM wants Congress to authorize the direct sale of unadopted wild horses to slaughterhouses. This would contradict the original purpose of the Act and put the government in the pet food business. To increase revenues, the BLM has recently raised the fee for adopting a wild horse to $200.00, and $75.00 for a burro. When veterinary and transportation fees are added, many potential adopters will be priced out of the market.

In other ways, the BLM amendments would hamper our ability to assess BLM performance or restrain its excesses through the courts. They would, for example, eliminate the need for the Interior Secretary to report program information directly to the Congress. The BLM’s past record presents a compelling argument for the continuation of this accountability to Congress.

The BLM seems desperate for these changes to be made; perhaps it fears the NAS study will not report favorably on past and current BLM wild horse-management schemes. Now, the BLM wants Congress to amend the Act and delay the NAS study until 1985. It favors a cruel and wasteful approach to horse management over use of objective, scientific data. It should not be given the chance to have its way.

What You Can Do

The fate of wild horses and burros has never been more uncertain. You can assist us in protecting these magnificent animals by writing to your congressman and senators urging them to oppose any changes in the Act until the National Academy of Sciences study is completed.

Below are the names of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate committees likely to consider any changes in the Act. Write them as well.

Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

James A. McClure, Chairman

Henry M. Jackson

House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Morris K. Udall, Chairman

Manuel Lujan, Jr.
MMFA Given New Life

After almost a year of battling and negotiations, the Marine Mammal Protection Act was reauthorized for an additional three years when President Ronald Reagan signed Public Law 97-58 last autumn. The HSUS worked with a coalition of groups to obtain renewal of this vital conservation law. Although amendments were adopted that will still allow unnecessary and often needlessly provided for marine mammals in the act, happily, many more meaningful amendment were not.

The legislation retains the act's original goal: reducing the accidental deaths of porpoises caught during yellowfin tuna fishing operations to levels approaching a zero-mortality rate. However, a new amendment added language specifying that this goal can be satisfied through the use of "the best marine-mammal safety techniques and equipment that are economically and technologically practicable." Thus, the current allowable kill of 20,500 porpoises per year will not have to be reduced any further unless there is a technological breakthrough making it "practicable." Responding to animal welfare counter-demands on this issue, Congress provided financial assistance for research into new methods of catching tuna without the unnecessary and often needlessly killing of marine mammals.

Another major change simplified procedures for returning management of marine mammals to the states, Alaska, in particular, lobbied to make state management more expedient by eliminating certain hearings, a move which the HSUS strongly opposed. Other animal-welfare groups had previously participated. Although these changes will make it much more difficult for us to monitor protection of marine mammals, because quanity of deci-

1080 Update

The Reagan administration continues to pump for reauthoriza-
tion of the Endangered Species Act which it had been forced to poison coyotes. On January 29, Reagan reversed President Nixon's 1972 order banning 1080 because it posed extreme dangers to human health and caused the deaths of hundreds of thousands of nontarget animals, including eagles, hawks, owls, and badgers. White mice and 20,500 porpoises were not immediately clear the way for the poisonings to resume, it did mark the first time Reagan had actually gone on record supporting the anti-wildlife policies of his Secretary of the Interior. An additional worry: although 1080 is cur-
rently banned under a separate ac-
tion by the Environmental Pro-
tection Agency, there were signs that the EPA might be going the way of the administration. EPA hearings on the ban, first step in the complicated process necessa-
ry to lift it, were scheduled for late March. HSUS Vice President for Wildlife and Environment John Grandy testified: "The most unrealistic is to kill coyotes."

Grandy Testifies for ESA

On February 22, 1982, HSUS Vice President for Wildlife and the Environment, John W. Grandy, presented testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Convention on International Trade in Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) (see ar-
ticle on the ESA on page 30). In response to criticism of the expense to protect such species as the bobcat from international ex-

AWA Budget Axed

However much we complain about the inadequacies of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) and its enforcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it remains one of the most important animal programs administered by the fed-
eral government. If the Reagan budget for 1983 is accepted by Congress, however, AWA enforcement as we know it will cease completely. The Animal Welfare Assurance Health Inspection Service (APHIS), responsible for enforcement of the AWA, would have its $70 million budget reduced by 70 percent from fiscal 1982 levels.

Setting the Agenda

Now that the 97th Congress has returned from its mid-term recess, we hope its members will devote more time and effort to enacting legislation on crucial animal-welfare issues affecting racing animals, dogs in horse racing, humane transportation of horses, and factory farming. While this Congress has made some progress in the fight to help animals (by en-
acting the AWA Amendments to increase penalties for the illegal taking of wildlife and reauthorizing

Four Cheers ✼✼✼✼

While most members of Congress spent the early part of this year trying to sort out budget pro-

Lab Changes Sought

In February, The HSUS filed a petition seeking changes in regula-
tions authorized by the USDA on the animals they use in painful experiments. The 30-page document, the result of over a year of HSUS staff labor, suggests ways in which to improve the quality of information given by the USDA without spending any more of the taxpayers' money. The peti-
tion, programmatically seeks to define the "pain" and "distress" in USDA regulations and guidelines and asks that USDA require research facilities to provide more complete information on why pain-re-

For complete discussions of other crucial bills facing Congress and for information on to whom to write to protest potential legisla-
tive changes, see the article on the District of Columbia Senate Horse and Burro Act on page 10 and the ar-
Capitol rally headlines second Day of the Seal

The HSUS's rally on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, featuring musician Paul Winter and members of his Winter Consort, highlighted the second annual International Day of the Seal on March 1. While more than 200 spectators braved Washington, D.C.'s chilly winds, thousands of people across the country helped celebrate the results of efforts by the West Coast Regional Office, a resolution was introduced to that effect in the California state legislature.

Other protests, rallies, and candlelight vigils were scheduled throughout the country to increase the general public’s awareness of the plight of the harbor seal pups and the value of the world’s 33 species of seals.

For centuries, man has preyed upon the seal for its prized fur, for its meat, or because he believed it competes with him for the fish it needs to live." Vermont Congressman Jim Jeffords had said last December while introducing H. Res. 266, to declare March 1 National Day of the Seal. "In a few cases, this plundering of seal populations is driving some species toward the brink of extinction... We cannot allow this trend to continue; not only for the future of the seals, but for the future of ourselves as a species."

Although the resolution was not considered by the full U.S. House of Representatives in time for Seal Day, it did attract more than 100 co-sponsors. Bureaucratic tie-ups prevented a companion resolution, S. Res. 266, introduced by Connecticut Senator Lowell Weicker, from reaching the floor in time for this year. However, on March 4, the full Senate amended the resolution and, without objection, declared March 1, 1983, National Day of the Seal.

Patients in the Capitol Hill rally were treated to helium-filled balloons imprinted with harp seal insignia while they listened to the music of Paul Winter and members of the Winter Consort. The HSUS was represented by President John A. Hoyt, who acted as master-of-ceremonies, and Vice President for Program and Communications Patricia Forkan, among others. "We are here to celebrate seals, not club them," Forkan told the crowd. "Certainly these animals have committed no crime to deserve such treatment. Their only sin is being beautiful.

"Should these animals be reduced to mere things with no value beyond the price of a pelt?" she asked. "For, in all the seal hunts, the principal products are luxuries rather than necessities...with cruelty as a by-product."

Also speaking at the rally were Congressman Jeffords and Rhode Island Congresswoman Claudine Schneider. Jeffords movingly described his trip to the Canadian seal hunt as a member of a congressional delegation in the early 1970s. "As I stood there in the pristine arctic beauty, I was shocked at the brutal killing to obtain seal skins," he said. "Even though Seal Day is over for another year, The HSUS will continue to protest seal hunts taking place not only in Canada, but also in South Africa and Alaska, where some 25,000 North Pacific fur seals are to be clubbed in late June."

Public rejection of the cruelty in these unnecessary "harvests," which produce such products as key fobs and glove linings for the European market, is still our best hope for ending seal hunts all over the world. Events such as Seal Day can mobilize public sentiment against all hunts.
by Julie Rovner

A rash of anti-cat books prompts an emotional response from cat lovers and feline-phobes alike.

Sally Quinn hates cats. “I never met a cat I liked,” she says. “They smell and you can’t get the smell out of anything. They’re not honest or outgoing. They’re also hypocritical and sneaky.”

Untrue, says Sue Warner, who has owned many cats over the years. “They’re not hypocritical, they’re merely discriminating. And when they choose you, it makes you feel special. I like cats because they’re small, quiet, and under control. They can make their own entertainment, and, unlike dogs, they don’t whine when you leave them and gyrate when you come home.”

There are two types of people in the world—cat lovers and cat haters.

Few folks feel neutral about America’s second-favorite house pet. In the past year, though, the American public has been littered with kitty books, most of them anti-cat. The debate about cats has taken on the proportion of, well, a catfight. It really began as a joke, claims cartoonist Skip Morrow, author of The Official I Hate Cats Book. “I was at a friend’s house one day, and his cat was sitting in his lap. Suddenly, for no apparent reason, the cat reached out and scratched him. My friend grabbed the cat by the neck with both hands, held it up at eye level with its eyes bugging out, and said ‘Don’t you ever do that again.’”

Little did Morrow realize the cartoon version of that scene would inspire a series of books and novelties that would earn him the hatred of all animal lovers all over the country. His two “I Hate Cats” books and “I Hate Cats” calendar, each depicting imaginative ways to torture felines, became instant best-sellers. They, in turn, inspired 101 Uses for a Dead Cat (also a best-seller) and The Cat-Hater’s Calendar.

The latter, the most that they use the bubbling pot of anti-cat hysteria, While Morrow and the “101 Uses” author used cartoon images, the origins of The Cat-Hater’s Calendar took photographs of cats supposedly being barbecued on a grill, dropped into a pot of boiling water, and used as the bull’s-eye on a dart board. The resulting furor (which included protests from The HSUS and its members) was so intense that the calendar was soon pulled from the market.

“I think, with cartoons, people know ‘it’s not really happening,’” explains Morrow. “If you throw someone against a brick wall in a cartoon, he’s going to be fine in the next scene. But when you start using photographs…”

All of these books concern those in the animal-welfare community: they believe impressionable people, especially children, will be encouraged to torture cats.

Wrote HSUS President John Hoyt in a letter to the publisher of The Official I Hate Cats Book, “I’m sure you would have readily rejected a manuscript that fostered the abuse of children. Yet, surprisingly enough, you have published one which fosters the abuse of animals.”

Since publication of The Official I Hate Cats Book in early 1981, The HSUS has received dozens of letters protesting cat-hating paraphernalia.

“I hope something can be done to prevent vilification of this sort,” wrote one outraged member about The Cat-Hater’s Calendar. “For the Jackasses who created this vile thing to be such cretins that they feel they are dealing in humor is dumbfounding.”

What is it about cats that makes them the object of such intense emotion—both positive and negative—from people?

“The cat is a symbol of the paradox of love and hate,” says HSUS scientific director and animal behaviorist Dr. Michael Fox. “Cats give love, but they’re independent. Many people don’t like cats because they’re unpredictable, inscrutable, and subtle. Some people appreciate their independence and envy their self-reliance. Others interpret their independence as aloofness.”

Fox also thinks people may hate cats because they can’t be controlled. “Dogs are less dualistic than cats. They’re loyal, obedient, trustworthy, and predictable. Many people only love those they can control or who need them. Cats are neither.”

“Cats frustrate people a whole lot,” says Morrow (who admits to owning two cats of his own and actually liking them). “The cat is one of those domestic animals that...”
doesn’t speak the same language we do. Can you imagine having a full-fledged conversation with your cat? I can’t.”

Morrow didn’t realize how sensitive was the nerve he was hitting when he first began to circulate his drawings where he worked as a musician. After all, he admits, the book was almost called I Hate French Poodles. People always identified most strongly with the doodle of his friend nearly strangling his cat. “They’d take one look and say ‘I’ve always wanted to do that to a cat.’”

Cats have only been kept by humans since about 1,000 B.C. Scientists aren’t exactly sure how cats became domesticated, but it may be correct that, as novelist Rudyard Kipling theorized, they domesticated themselves. According to Kipling, woman domesticated man, dogs, horses, and cows, but not cats. While the other animals offered loyalty in exchange for food and shelter, the cat killed mice and amused children in exchange for the right to sit by the fire but refused to give up its freedom.

However domestication came about, it’s clear the early Egyptians other animals offered loyalty in different ways. They killed mice and amused children for change for the right to sit by the fire. They were more likely to have very controlling relationships with their precious pets.
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A third triumph was the scheduling of Congressional hearings on the subject of laboratory animals in general. These were held by the Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee. We had, for years, pressed for such hearings, knowing full well that no legislation of any kind in either house could ever be passed without them. The hearings which took place last October, although tied directly to neither H.R. 556 nor H.R. 4406, were welcomed by The HSUS. Our staff presented extensive testimony (as described in Federal Report, Winter 1982 HSUS News).

That these hearings took place at all is a great victory in the long, often discouraging fight to help the laboratory animals in this country. No hearings of any kind had been held since 1970—almost 12 years ago—and much has changed in laboratory research in that time. However, in the two days of hearings, we know that they were only the first step in a long, difficult, and, all too frequently, disappointing legislative process. We had been through a similar struggle on the trapping issue.

Working on national legislation is only for the stout-hearted and truly devoted. It is rare—if not impossible—to push any bill, no matter how worthy or carefully constructed, through a legislative body unmodified. That is how the legislative process in this country works. Following the October lab-animal hearings, therefore, we were not surprised to learn that some bill on the subject of lab animals might be possible, but not either of the two bills as then structured. Even though H.R. 556 and H.R. 4406 would most probably disappear as we knew them, the subcommittee would write a whole new bill.

The task before us was to make sure the subcommittee’s version was both as strong and as meaningful as possible. We took encouragement from the fact that a number of legislators, Subcommittee Chairman Doug Walgren, Rep. George Brown, and Rep. Tom Lantos among them, very much want to help laboratory animals. The HSUS is giving high priority to sitting down with congressional staffers, the congressmen themselves, and other humane groups to provide input on the new bill. We have been working, virtually on a daily basis, with no fewer than seven major, national, animal-welfare groups toward this end.

What Next?

The HSUS will not give up the fight to help lab animals simply because the bills we originally supported may not win committee approval. Even the President of the United States has to make changes in the bills he submits to Congress. We cannot expect no different treatment! Our next task is to get as strong a bill as possible supported by the House Committee on Science and Technology, which held the October hearings. That bill will then go to the full committee, where we have another chance to have it strengthened further. Once it has passed the full committee, it will then go to a vote by the entire House of Representatives, where additional amendments can be added before passage. Simultaneously, we will work to find a Senate sponsor for the bill and begin the entire process again there. At all of these junctures, support from you, our members, will be needed.

Is the Effort Worth It?

The legislative process is complicated, and one that offers no guarantee of a perfect bill at its end. There will always be the temptation to take a non-negotiable position, to say to the legislature, “Take this bill in our form or not at all.” To do that is to risk the possibility that our next chance to help lab animals will not come along for another 10 years.

We believe you, our members, want us to get the most effective legislation possible so we can move on to promoting alternatives to live-animal research more widely and improving the desperate state of animals now in labs.

The 556 and 4406 Legacy

We are fighting to keep the heart of both of these early bills in the subcommittee’s version. We are anxious to see a coordination center for alternatives established; provide training in alternatives to researchers; fund the development of alternatives; disseminate information and end duplication in research; establish a strong animal-care committee within laboratories, and create a mechanism by which research projects can be evaluated in terms of the potential animal suffering involved before they are undertaken.

We know your commitment to this important work is there. The outpouring of letters in support of H.R. 556 and H.R. 4406 provided a great deal of the impetus behind Congress’s decision to hold the 1981 hearings. We shall continue to persevere and see the process through to what we hope will be ultimate success.

There will always be the temptation to take a non-negotiable position, to say to the legislature, “Take this bill in our form or not at all.”
Great Lakes

The HSUS Cleans Up at the Dogfights

November 28, 1981, was a typical late-fall day in Freedom Township, Michigan, a rural community 15 miles outside of Ann Arbor. Cold, windy—a good day to catch a college football game or put up the storm windows. But for the 23 people who gathered at noon in the basement at 3944 Rentz Road to watch pit bull terriers mauel one another, it turned out to be a bad day at the dogfights.

By four o’clock, 19 men, 3 women, and 1 teenage boy were in police custody. Six were charged with a felony—dogfighting—the other 17 with attending a dogfight, a misdemeanor.

The result of months of effort by Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan law enforcement officers and humane societies, the raid and related activities in those states yielded 60 dogs, an additional 32 misdemeanor charges, and 14 felony indictments. For the first time, organizations in three states combined their resources and coordinated their efforts to make local dogfighters, so complacent that they thought nothing of staging matches in broad daylight, think twice about having their fun so close to home in the future. The HSUS’s Great Lakes Regional Office, The Humane Society of Huron Valley, and the Wisconsin Humane Society can share the credit for this very successful effort. Agents under contract to The Humane Society of Huron Valley infiltrated the closed, secretive world of dogfighters in Michigan, actually renting the house where the November 28 raid took place. Agents working for Wisconsin Humane tracked down participants in the Milwaukee area; and Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland and Investigator Tim Greyhavens spearheaded the investigations in the Toledo area. Police in all three states were involved as well.

A few hours after the Michigan raid, search-and-seizure warrants issued for five Toledo houses yielded a gold mine of evidence. Police found treadmills, a dogfighting pit, 12 pit bull terriers, and other dogfighting paraphernalia at all locations. Despite felony laws on the books in Michigan and Ohio, dogfighters in the Great Lakes region previously had been little troubled by local prosecution. Humane societies, sharing information and coordinating their activities with law enforcement officers, are changing all that. “Now, dogfighters realize that they have no safe place to go in the whole area,” said Greyhavens.

“One of the greatest benefits of a raid such as this is the response of neighboring states,” added Frantz Dantaler, Director of Investigations for The HSUS, who was involved in the Michigan sweep.

“State legislatures that previously thought there were no dogfighting problems in their area seek to enact statutes making dogfighting a felony in their jurisdictions.” Only eight states at present hold dogfighting a felony.

Although a provision in the Animal Welfare Act makes dogfighting a felony nationwide, lack of enforcement by federal agencies has forced The HSUS to seek time-consuming state-by-state legislative action and prosecution instead. These efforts seem to be paying off. As of early winter, four of the misdemeanor cases had gone to trial, with all four defendants found guilty. All felony charges remained to be tried.

Sportmen in the Great Lakes region can’t seem to have any fun these days—hot on the heels of the dogfight raid reported on the facing page was a cockfight raid carried out in January by the Lenawee County Sheriff’s Department and the Great Lakes Regional Office. Thirty-three men and women were arrested right in the midst of a fight taking place about 15 miles outside of Adrian, Michigan. Seventeen dead and 20 live cocks were confiscated along with the usual fighting paraphernalia (including carrying cages for fowl, above, right). Since it is a felony under Michigan law not only to own or maintain animals and birds for fighting purposes but also to own, maintain, or rent the premises where fights take place, authorities dismantled the cockpit itself and surrounding concession stands to use as evidence. Twenty-five felony charges have been filed against participants.

The HSUS’s Frantz Dantaler, Sandy Rowland, and Tim Greyhavens took part in this unannounced visit to another of Michigan’s exclusive nightspots.

Bunching Decision Upheld

On another day in what proved to be a banner autumn for the Great Lakes Regional Office, the Champaign County Common Pleas Court ruled that the pro-HSUS decision handed down against Kiser Lake Kennels last summer should stand (see Around the Regions, Fall 1981 HSUS News).

Kiser, found to be bunching (collecting dogs or other animals at one location for sale to research facilities) under these restrictions, was in violation of the Ohio Revised Code. Section 955.16 prohibits the release of dogs from animal shelters or pounds for research unless they are released to Ohio nonprofit organizations or institutions that are certified by the Ohio Health Council as being engaged in teaching or research concerning the prevention and treatment of diseases of human beings or animals. Kiser Lake did not qualify under these restrictions.

Commented Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland, “This favorable ruling serves as notice to all county commissioners as well as to other officials that The HSUS is determined to use every means possible to see that animals are cared for according to the law. HSUS members can be proud that this decision will benefit thousands of animals in pounds in Ohio and elsewhere.”
Spring Assault

The Gulf States Regional Office is gearing up for a major assault on rodeo cruelty. Documenting all facets of rodeo abuse, including animal training and transportation, in larger and smaller, ‘bush league’ events will be the goal.

The Regional Humane Education meeting and workshop in Shreveport-Bossier City, Louisiana, was held in March. The two-day program attracted an enthusiastic crowd.

Regional Calendar

West Coast

The Northwest Humane Educators will sponsor a NAATHEHSUS Humane Education meeting at the Airtel Hotel in Portland, Oregon, on May 14-15, 1982. Pre-registration, including two lunches, is $30, $35 at the door. Space is limited; reservations should be made through the West Coast Regional Office, 1713 J Street, Suite 305, Sacramento, CA 95814.

New England

HSUS staff members Michael F. T. Hunt, Kate Snow, and John Dommers will be among the speakers at the New England Federation of Humane Societies annual conference to be held in Boston, May 21-23, 1982, at the Framingham Motor Inn in Framingham, Massachusetts. Conference topics include intensive livestock farming practices and the newly-published national curriculum guide prepared by The HSUS. Contact the New England Federation of Humane Societies, P.O. Box 255, Boston, MA 02117.

The New England Regional Office will sponsor a Whale Watch on June 12, 1982, to depart from Plymouth, MA. HSUS President John Hoyt and other staff members will be on board the ‘Cape Cod Princess’ along with expert marine mammal and seabird biologists to identify species seen on the trip. Contact the New England Regional Office, P.O. Box 362, East Hadam, CT 06423, for more information.

Great Lakes

The Michigan Federation of Humane Societies will sponsor a workshop for humanitarians on April 23-25, 1982, in Lansing. Guest participants include HSUS President John Hoyt and staff members Phyllis Wright, Sandy Rowland, and Tim Greyhavens. Topics will include Michigan’s anti-cruelty laws, lobbying for animal welfare legislation, shelter management, dogfighting, humane education, and membership development. Contact Margaret Sarnia, 1661 Caliper, Troy, MI 48094.

The HSUS and the Humane Society of Huron Valley will sponsor a session of The HSUS’s Animal Control Training Conference at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on May 10-21, 1982. Contact Phyllis Wright, HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Trap Ban Sought

Assemblyman Sam Farr introduced AB 2600, based on The HSUS’s model bill to outlaw use of steel-jaw traps in California. The West Coast Regional Office began the campaign to get this bill passed by forming a steering committee comprised of humane societies long known for their opposition to the trap. It seeks the support of all concerned citizens and has materials available to educate the public and press about the suffering caused by this device.

Californians should contact legislators from their own districts and urge them to pass this much needed legislation. Any organization may join the coalition by contacting the West Coast Regional Office.

Pound-Seizure End

California State Senator David R. Bonta, along with co-authors, has introduced SB 1348 to prohibit animal shelters from releasing dogs and cats to laboratories and animal shelters from releasing them to laboratories. It also prohibits the use of pound seizure as a method of disposing of the rabies strain in dogs and cats.

The campaign, headed by the Committee for State Prohibition of Pound Seizure, includes the support of over 100 humane organizations. A document signed by almost 20 California physicians, veterinarians, and scientists states, “Pound seizure perpetuates inferior research and is damaging to the good name of the animal welfare movement.”

Robert T. A. Bonta said, “By authorizing this bill, California statesmen are burning the bridge behind them and opening their laboratories to an ever-widening source of biomedical-research animals.”

The West Coast Regional Office provided Sen. Roberts with background materials and sent an alert to every HSUS member in California urging action to help to pass this legislation.

West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon said, “We know from experience people dump animals rather than take them to shelters which turn them over to research. For years, The HSUS has done everything it can to help upgrade the care and handling of animals in shelters. Pound seizure destroys the public’s confidence in the credibility of animal control.”

In 1981, Los Angeles City, and San Diego City, in California passed by forming a steering committee to outlaw use of steel-jaw traps in California. The West Coast Regional Office will sponsor a workshop for humanitarians on April 23-25, 1982, in Lansing. Guest participants include HSUS President John Hoyt and staff members Phyllis Wright, Sandy Rowland, and Tim Greyhavens. Topics will include Michigan’s anti-cruelty laws, lobbying for animal welfare legislation, shelter management, dogfighting, humane education, and membership development. Contact Margaret Sarnia, 1661 Caliper, Troy, MI 48094.

The HSUS and the Humane Society of Huron Valley will sponsor a session of The HSUS’s Animal Control Training Conference at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on May 10-21, 1982. Contact Phyllis Wright, HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Medical Association opposes SB 1348.
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Bunny Bop Blows Up

In response to plans by farmers in Mud Lake, Idaho, to stage a series of rabbit drives and club-hunts, the West Coast Regional Office called the killing nothing short of cruel blood sport.

Blaming five million dollars in crop damage on an overpopulation of jack rabbits, farmers conducted mass killings, resulting in the slaughter of over 100,000 rabbits, in December and January. Virtually anyone who wanted to could get in on the kill, using his choice of baseball bats, tire irons, axe handles, and golf clubs as weapons. News sources reported rabbits being crushed beneath the wheels of round-up vehicles and others skinned alive. “It is particularly disturbing,” said HSUS field investigator Eric Sakach, “that so many of those participating in the carnage take obvious delight in such a brutal act, even allowing children to participate.”

The “bunny bops” aroused and angered citizens and humane groups from coast to coast. HSUS President John A. Hoyt called upon Idaho Governor John V. Evans to intercede and HSE farmers to seek alternative methods of controlling rabbit overpopulation and cruelty prevention. The HSUS recommended fencing rabbits out of potential damage areas, allowing natural predators to grow, and finding a humane method of disposing of the rabbits if necessary. The HSUS believes it is a cruel and expensive lesson in what can happen when natural predators are constantly gunned, trapped, poisoned, and denuded of an area.

Until they start respecting the role each animal plays in nature, people will continue to have crop losses in Idaho, and the animals and environment suffer the consequences of it.” Sakach said. The HSUS urges its members to write to Governor John V. Evans, 100 West State Street, Boise, ID 83720.

New England

Dommers Named Director

John Dommers, HSUS Coordinator of Multi-Media Materials and Production, has been named Director of the New England Regional Office serving Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and Maine. Dommers, who has been with The HSUS since 1972, will continue to head the multi-media activities of the society.

Mid-Atlantic

In what has become a yearly tradition, protesters, including representatives of The HSUS, demonstrated against the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge deer hunt held in December in Morris County, New Jersey. According to wildlife officials, approximately 250 of the refuge’s 500 to 600 deer had to die either through the hunt or other means to thin out the herd and avoid starvation among the deer population. Regional Director Nina Austenberg, rejecting this logic, told a national television audience, “The Fish and Wildlife Service is manipulating habitat to create a surplus.”

Southwest

The Great Swamp deer hunt by amateur sports hunters has proved ineffective in controlling the deer population. There are more deer than ever at the Great Swamp after seven years of hunting there.”
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Appearances can be deceiving. No where does this aphorism hold more truth than in the attitude of state fish and wildlife agencies toward the Endangered Species Act (ESA), one of this country’s most important and influential wildlife-protection laws.

State fish and wildlife agencies are those organizations in individual states charged with the responsibility of protecting, preserving, and managing wildlife and wildlife habitat. Because they have been funded, in most states, from hunting and trapping licenses and fees and not from general tax revenues, these agencies have received little attention from governors and other elected officials. The agencies have tended to act like independent fiefdoms, taking political actions and positions of which elected state officials and citizens (whom state governments are supposed to serve) are unaware. These actions have often been influenced by the pro-hunting, pro-exploration attitudes of the state fish and wildlife professionals themselves and not by the opinions of citizens state-wide.

This tendency is made more pronounced at times by the existence of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The International Association is a loose association of the fish and wildlife agencies of individual states in the U.S. and similar agencies in Canadian provinces and Mexican territories. It is also the group which normally and nominally represents individual state fish and game agencies in lobbying efforts before the Congress.

The positions taken by this group, presumably on behalf of individual citizens in the fifty states, are very likely to be dictated by those same pro-hunting, pro-exploration attitudes of the state fish and wildlife officials who make up its membership. These positions carry a fair amount of weight in the halls of Congress and with the administration and are taken, in many cases, without the knowledge of the governors and citizens wildlife officials represent.

A timely example is the question of bobcat protection and this nation’s international commitments under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna, known as CITES. The United States fulfills its commitments under CITES through the ESA. The American bobcat receives protection under CITES, thus, it receives certain protections under the ESA. During the past few years, lawsuits have been filed in U.S. courts on behalf of bobcat protection under the CITES/ESA agreements. These lawsuits have resulted in the courts sharply restricting exports of bobcat pelts to fur markets in Europe. This restriction was not some arbitrary judicial ruling; rather, it was the consequence of the complete failure of the federal government and most state fish and wildlife agencies to prove unlimited mass export of bobcat skins permitted by most states would not be detrimental to the very survival of bobcats in this country. The courts further ruled that, in allowing export, "any doubt whether the killing of a particular number of bobcats will adversely affect the survival of the species must be resolved in favor of protecting the animals and not in favor of approving the export of their pelts." Obviously, the court imposed reasonable requirements to protect a beautiful native American cat which has been extirpated from a number of states already and has been subjected to virtually unlimited destruction for its skin.

Enter the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The International Association has as its major goal during the ESA reauthorization process (taking place this year) the addition of language that would, in effect, overturn previous court decisions made under CITES, so that unlimited killing and export of bobcats may once again occur!

The state fish and wildlife agencies which oversee wildlife in your state is taking a position, through its membership and support of the International Association, that would allow unlimited killing of bobcats and would cripple CITES! Did you know that? The state fish and wildlife agency in your state supposedly represents you and the governor, but is taking this position without determining your wishes or even informing you of its position. Is this any way to run a democracy?

You almost certainly do not support unlimited killing of bobcats for the European fur market, and you most probably support this nation’s commitments to protect bobcats and other wildlife through CITES and the ESA. Yet your own state fish and wildlife agency (through the International Association) supports exactly the opposite position! If you want your state’s position (and that of your fish and wildlife agency) on the ESA changed, you will have to write, call, or mailgram the governor. (Sadly, the governor probably does not realize his state fish and wildlife agency has taken such a position!)

Your letter should:
• Tell the governor the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies which pursues representation of the state fish and wildlife agency is taking a position that would weaken bobcat protection under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna and would weaken U.S. implementation of CITES.
• Tell him/her you do not support the positions of the fish and wildlife agency.
• Tell him/her you strongly support protection for the bobcat and other wildlife under CITES and urge his/her administration to support the bobcat and the CITES treaty.
• Ask him/her to direct the state wildlife officials to go on record supporting (1) a stronger Endangered Species Act and (2) the CITES agreement as interpreted by the courts; and (3) bobcat protection under CITES.

The state fish and wildlife agencies, and the governor, are supposed to represent you and your desires. The only way for the governor to know what you want is for you to tell him or her, as specifically as you can, what your position on CITES and the ESA is and what you want done about it. Remember, the Endangered Species Act must be reauthorized this year. Time’s awasting.

by John W. Grady
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Tax Deductions and Non-Itemizers

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 makes deductions for charitable contributions available to individuals who do not itemize deductions on their tax returns. They now can directly deduct a percentage of their charitable contributions in calculating their taxable income.

In 1982, the non-itemizer can deduct 25 percent of his contributions up to $250.00. For example, if a taxpayer contributes $80.00 to a charitable organization, he can deduct $20.00 on his return, even though he does not itemize other deductions. The new law does provide for a yearly increase in the percentage of the contribution deducted, until 1987. Then, a taxpayer will be able to deduct the full amount of the contribution within the limit of 50 percent of his adjusted gross income. At every stage, however, the taxpayer must be able to document the contributions for which he is claiming a deduction. The HSUS provides receipts for all contributions over $10.00.

Watt and BLM Sued

On February 26, 1982, The HSUS and the American Horse Protection Association (AHPA) filed a lawsuit against the Secretary of the Interior, James Watt and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to stop the illegal policy, adopted by the BLM in January, 1982, of killing excess wild horses and burros removed from the public lands in spite of the existence of a large demand to adopt the horses. (See major article on page 10 of this issue.)

The Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971 allows the BLM to remove wild horses and burros from public lands when an overpopulation exists in a given area, and to offer excess horses for adoption to qualified individuals who can provide them with humane care and treatment. The BLM is further granted the authority to destroy humanely horses removed from the range when an adoption demand by qualified individuals does not exist.

Prior to January, 1982, the BLM regularly made efforts to find adopters for rounded-up horses and usually destroyed only old, sick, or temperamentally unsuitable animals. Under the new policy, the BLM destroys all horses held for more than 45 days without being adopted. The suit alleges a large adoption demand exists but that the BLM has stopped making good-faith efforts to match animals with interested individuals willing to adopt them. It also alleges that the BLM has shipped horses to private zoos where they are slaughtered and fed to the zoo's great cats. The HSUS and AHPA contend such a practice is contrary to the BLM's own regulations forbidding commercial exploitation of wild horses and burros.

IRS Clinic Ruling

In late 1981, the Internal Revenue Service ruled the operation of a full-service veterinary clinic by a humane society was not an activity promoting the society's exempt purpose but rather an unrelated business activity whose income was fully taxable. The ruling was specifically directed at a local humane society in Michigan but has legal implications for any society operating a veterinary clinic offering a full range of veterinary services to the general public. (Organizations operating clinics offering only spaying/neutering operations are unaffected by the ruling, although any organizations considering expanding their services beyond spaying/neutering should take heed of this restriction.)

The IRS memorandum, noting the veterinary clinic is a "very substantial part" of the organization's activities, concluded that "providing veterinary services for a fee to owners of pets is an ordinary commercial service which has no causal relationship to the prevention of cruelty to animals. The services for which the services are provided are neither unwanted nor the victims of any cruel or inhumane treatment." The IRS rejected the society's argument that profits from the veterinary clinic supported the animal shelter and other clearly exempt activities, saying the organization's need for funds or its use makes it of the profits from the trade or business does not convert the income from unrelated business to tax-exempt income.

HSUS Opposes USDA Move

The Winter issue of The HSUS News reported on the lawsuit The HSUS brought against the United States Department of Agriculture for its failure to enforce the humane-care requirements of the Animal Welfare Act at the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR) and at other research labs across the country. The USDA has moved to dismiss the suit, arguing The HSUS is merely a "concerned bystander" which has sustained only "abstract injury" because of the USDA's actions at IBR.

The HSUS is opposing USDA's dismissal motion, arguing the efforts of HSUS members and employees and its expenditures in providing for the IBR monkeys and in supporting the prosecution of IBR scientists give The HSUS a direct stake in the outcome of the suit. The HSUS also argues it suffered an "organizational injury" its efforts are diverted to protecting animals the USDA has a statutory obligation to protect and away from other animal-welfare matters not covered by a federal program. The HSUS contends its suit is brought on behalf of the IBR monkeys, which have a statutory right to humane care under the Animal Welfare Act but cannot sue in their own behalf. The HSUS is attempting to persuade the Court its status as an animal-welfare organization gives it an "advocacy relationship" with animals that should allow it to represent and promote animal rights in the courts.

The events of the past several months have confirmed that the challenge to animal welfarists is greater than ever before. The abuse and suffering being inflicted on animals in almost every segment of society is unparalleled in modern history. Both locally, and nationally, the protection of animals in today's world demands an informed, dedicated, and concerted response. We invite you to join with fellow HSUS members, directors, and staff to explore these issues in depth and formulate ways in which to ensure the protection of animals more effectively.

Program moderator for the conference will be Roger Caras, noted author, lecturer, and television commentator. The keynote address will be presented by Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, artist, educator, and preeminent Animal Rights author.

Special conference events will be two "dilemma" forums discussing laboratory animal and intensive farming issues; a mock trial; and an opinion strip to historic Boston and the New England animal community. The annual awards banquet on Saturday evening will conclude the conference events.

Workshops will be presented on a wide variety of topics of interest to animal-welfare activists, including sessions for persons working in specialized areas.

Make plans now to visit beautiful New England and attend this year's stimulating and informative conference on November 3-6, 1982.

1982 HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE

"Protecting Animals in Today's World"

Danvers (Boston)
Massachusetts
November 3-6, 1982

Compiled by Murdaugh Stuart Mad- den, HSUS General Counsel, and Roger Kindler, Associate Counsel.
As a child you learned it from the important people in your life—your parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters, teachers, clergy...

These people provided humane examples for you to follow. They helped mold your value system. They made you what you are today—a humane person!

Now it's your turn....

And *Kind* magazine is here to help you. *Kind* can be a wholesome extension of all the big and little things you do to pass your values on to the young people in your life. That's why we publish *Kind*. It's a unique investment for a humane future.

Subscribe for a young person today. *Kind* is only $6 a year for six issues. You'll feel good and the young person will be overjoyed.

*Kind* includes career features, puzzles, fiction, cartoon, projects, pull-out posters and more....

Use the envelope bound into this issue of *The HSUS News* to let us know who is to receive your *Kind* gift. Give us the child's name and address and indicate if you would like us to send a gift card.

*Kind* is the only truly humane national children's magazine! And we're proud of it. You will be, too.

*Kind*
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

---

National Headquarters
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037