The Consequence of the Means

There is an old saying that "the ends justify the means." If what you are seeking is right and just, then it matters not how you achieve it. Or does it? It is a question, or better yet a proposition, that is becoming increasingly cogent within the animal welfare movement. For there are those among our numbers who have perpetrated violence and threats against others whom they regard abusive of animals.

An example of this kind of violence has recently surfaced in Britain where radical anti-vivisectionists have fired pellet guns at the house of a researcher and on another occasion daubed slogans and paint on the car of another researcher. In Canada, a free-lance artist was recently quoted as “commending for their courage” protesters who slashed tires, poured sugar in gas tanks, and painted slogans on walls at the University of British Columbia’s animal care facility. There are similar incidents in our own country that have resulted in destructiveness and personal threats as a means of achieving protection for animals.

Yet there is something greater at stake in this kind of activity than the immediate result that is sought—salutary though it may be. For the consequence of violence is the perpetration of violence, and it is violence, by whatever name, we are seeking to eradicate.

To be sure there is much violence, abuse, and suffering inflicted upon animals, for both foul and purposeful reasons. And if we argue—that surely we do—that no purpose, however well-intentioned it may be—can ever justify violence, abuse, and unmitigated suffering to animals, are we not then obligated by that very thesis and ethic to act similarly toward other humans? I think so. For if we choose to fight violence with violence, we shall surely undermine the very ethic of a reverence for life we seek to establish.

Those of us within the animal welfare movement have often been on the receiving end of threats and violence. I have in my files a letter signed by several persons threatening to kill me if The HSUS should continue to seek a specific action on behalf of animals, an action we shall most assuredly continue to pursue. But such threats and the resulting consequences do not finally achieve the objective desired. Rather, they frequently change the objective altogether so that one loses sight of what it was he set out to accomplish in the first place.

In response to the violent actions of militant animal welfare activists in Britain, a reporter has written, "There can be no respect for people who affect to protect animals by shooting at fellow people... They don't want to liberate animals. They want to coerce people.”

We shall never retreat in our fight to prevent cruelty and suffering to animals, for such is surely an atrocity of the highest order. And we shall not deter from utilizing legitimate protest, confrontation, and civil activism. But let us do battle in ways that will not only serve the well-being of animals, but at the same time preserve and advance our own dignity and decency.

John A. Hoyt
Otter Alert

The greatest threat to the existence of the otter, designated as a “threatened species” in 1977, is the possibility of an oil spill in its range. The small sea mammals are particularly susceptible to such pollution. Normally, their thick inner coat of fur keeps them dry even in the water. With oil, the fur no longer protects the otter, which becomes ottermic and soon dies.

This threat intensified recently when the new Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, ordered the sale of oil leases in the otters’ range. Active oil drilling and pumping along the coast fantastically increases the chances of an oil spill occurring. The oil leases would encompass the entire range of the southern sea otter, leaving no margin for safety.

It will apparently take a strong protest by both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, to dissuade Watt from taking this dangerous action. Although the development of energy sources seems to be a priority of the new administration, it is estimated that the amount of oil well drilling allowed in this part of the California coast would not satisfy America’s energy needs for more than one year.

As reported in our feature story beginning on page 2, a group of California citizens miraculously survived massive slaughter by fur traders on the California coast in the 1920s. honey, fifty veterinarians have banded together as the California Veterinary Association, in an effort to prevent the mass culling of the sea otter.

Five Tons of Walrus Ivory Taken In Raid

An eleven-month investigation by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service culminated in a massive raid on the illegal walrus ivory trade this February. Eighty law enforcement officers carried out searches in Alaska and four other states, seizing 10,000 pounds of fresh, raw walrus ivory estimated to be worth about $450,000. Also seized were illegal products from polar, black, and grizzly bears and sea otters.

According to Keith Shriner, area director for marine and wildlife, all of the ivory originated in Alaska. An estimated population of 150,000 walruses live in those icy waters along the Alaskan coast all the way to the Arctic Ocean. Though the Pacific walrus is not considered an endangered species, it is protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.

Under that Act, no one except Alaskan natives may sell or buy walrus ivory or other rare marine mammal products. Apparently, the tightening of restrictions on the illegal ivory trade is creating a strong market for walrus ivory. It is estimated that almost seven times as many walruses were killed in 1980 than in 1978. So many tuskless carcasses have been washed up on Soviet shores, the animal天文每年由此而中毒，其死亡率几乎是正常的七倍。

Nevertheless, they do seem to be making a profit. A fringe benefit of the clinic is that pets go to the private offices of veterinarians charge privately. The doctors say they bought the first clinic not because they wanted to make a profit, but to keep ahead of the reduced fee spay/neuter trend.

Animal products seized in Alaskan raid.

If You Can’t Beat ‘Em

Most animal shelters that open reduced cost spay/neuter clinics find the local veterinarians strongly opposed to the idea. In Portland, Oregon, fifty veterinarians have banded together as the Portland Veterinary Association, in an effort to prevent the mass culling of the sea otter.

According to W.D. Mary, the fifty practitioners first bought out an existing clinic that had opened in 1979. Each doctor will earn a 10% dividend on a original investment of $500. More veterinarians are buying in, and there is a waiting list of veterinarians who want to buy into the clinic.

The average fees are thirty to forty percent lower than the practitioners’ charges privately. The doctors say they bought the first clinic not to make a profit, but to keep ahead of the reduced fee spay/neuter trend.

The HSUS was the proud recipient of four awards and a special mention when the Dog Writer’s Association held its annual awards banquet in New York City in February. The awards are given annually in six broad categories covering virtually every aspect of dog news coverage. This year, over seventeenth awards were given to “Companion Animals” and “Unwanted Animals” categories.

Staff writer Julie Rosner won second place in the magazine articles category for her article, “The Dog Bite: Whose Fault Is It?” which appeared in last fall’s HSUS News. Also in that category, Charles Herrmann, editor of Kind magazine, received a special mention for his story, “Danny’s Notebook” which was published in Kind.

Finally, Guy Hodge, director of research and data for HSUS, won third prize in the books category for Careers: Working with Animals.

It’s Lonely At the Top

The rewards of a career in public service are not always all they are cracked up to be. Take the case of Ham the chimpanzee. In 1961, Ham was headline news all over the country as the first United States’ representative in space. In years of retreating, the average American turns out a flawless performance during his historic journey into the new frontier of space.

Shortly after his record-breaking feat, Ham retired to the National Zoo in Washington, D.C. to retire. He lived in a grassy area where three young chimps played while one old chimpanzee was watched from the top of a hill. The female, being too mature for the young chimps’ games, clearly needed an elderly gentleman companion. When Pressman suggested to the National Zoo Staff that Ham might make a suitable companion for him there, he was quickly accepted.

Enter Sue Pressman, HSUS director of wildlife protection. While looking over the National Zoo’s new primates quarters, she noticed they had built a special small cage for Ham. She suddenly thought of another lonely chimpanzee she’d seen at a recent inspection of the North Carolina Zoological Park in Asheboro. Their chimpanzee was left alone with other national treasures such as Smokey the Bear and Ling-Ling and Hsing-Hsing, the famous panda pair. The zoo staff wanted Ham to be happy, but there was no suitable companion for him there. Over the years, they tried putting him with several other chimps, but they were all either too aggressive or not aggressive enough to get along with Ham, whose peculiar background had not included socialization with others of his species. For 20 years, he lived alone.

It was before the clinics opened.
The Perils of the Southern Sea Otter

by Margaret Owings

When a low tide rises along the Pacific, with heavy brine slipping out from under the dark cloak of kelp to break on the rocks with a white explosion, one finds a tangible moment to savor vitality! A door flung open to receive the unexpected!

The sea otter appears to play a marked beneficial role in these kelp communities when it preys upon one of its favorite foods, the sea urchin. The urchin population, if left unchecked, feeds on the hold-fasts or root-like structures of the kelp, literally destroying the kelp and subsequently its rich assortment of plants and animals.

So tightly knit is this evolutionary development that the sea otter is found to be an integral part of the ecosystem. Carrying out studies in Alaska, researchers worked in nearshore and intertidal waters comparing the islands where otters were found with those where otters were scarce or absent. They concluded that the otter’s return from near extinction to its former range is in the best interests of our Pacific coastal waters.

The sea otter appears to play a marked beneficial role in these kelp communities when it preys upon one of its favorite foods, the sea urchin. The urchin population, if left unchecked, feeds on the hold-fasts or root-like structures of the kelp, literally destroying the kelp and subsequently its rich assortment of plants and animals.
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Yes, the otter is in competition with man’s gourmet appetite for abalones and Pismo clams which are managed by the California Department of Fish & Game for sport and commercial fishermen. But more important is that the food items upon which this little mammal relies for its very existence are becoming exhausted by burgeoning numbers of people. California’s human population, which was under seven million in 1938 when the sea otter’s return became public knowledge, has now reached over 23 million in a collision course against the small population of fewer than 2,000 southern sea otters. As the controversy builds around the otters, the word “management” becomes a power play. It does not mean enhancement, but rather it means controlling a species to keep it from interfering with man’s ways.

But today, we can still stand on the shore and watch the otter twisting and rolling in the water to wash off food fragments from its furry bib while still holding the remainder of a meal in its grasp. The lack of any subcutaneous fat is compensated for by a coat of deep, soft fur with a dense undercoat which the otter meticulously grooms to protect a blanket of warm air trapped among the interlocking fibers.

This cleaning and grooming was described by Jane Bailey in her book, The Sea Otter’s Struggle: “Sometimes all four feet work at once combing and scrubbing. The otter’s loose skin and long rib cage make it easy for him to squirm and bend in reaching all areas of his coat. So flexible is his body that he can spin his torso around as he lies on his back and still keeps his head and flipper clear of the water.” It was this rich pelt that whetted the fur trader’s greed and established markets for luxurious otter fur during a period of 170 years of ruthless killing. More than one million skins were taken between 1741 and 1911, a slaughter of such magnitude that it formed an economic basis for the acquisition of California. In 1872, conversely, the aftermath of the otter trade led Russia to agree to sell Alaska to the United States when it was believed that “everything worthwhile had been taken out.”

The Perils of the Southern Sea Otter

The Humane Society News • Spring 1981

Hunted relentlessly for its fur in the 1800s, the sea otter was thought to be extinct in California. Its reappearance in the thirties “brought scientists as near to wild rejoicing as men of their profession are permitted,” according to one biologist.

Purple sea urchin. Lying on its back, it threads its way between the kelp fronds for anchor. The giant and the bull kelp (Macrocystis and Nereocystis), supply nutrition to life forms surrounding them as well as sifting down particles of kelp detritus to the abalones and other shellfish below. Common throughout the otter’s range along the California coast, these kelp forests grow at an extraordinary rate and are among the most productive habitats on earth.

The sea otter appears to play a marked beneficial role in these kelp communities when it preys upon one of its favorite foods, the sea urchin. The urchin population, if left unchecked, feeds on the hold-fasts or root-like structures of the kelp, literally destroying the kelp and subsequently its rich assortment of plants and animals.
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This cleaning and grooming was described by Jane Bailey in her book, The Sea Otter’s Struggle: “Sometimes all four feet work at once combing and scrubbing. The otter’s loose skin and long rib cage make it easy for him to squirm and bend in reaching all areas of his coat. So flexible is his body that he can spin his torso around as he lies on his back and still keeps his head and flipper clear of the water.” It was this rich pelt that whetted the fur trader’s greed and established markets for luxurious otter fur during a period of 170 years of ruthless killing. More than one million skins were taken between 1741 and 1911, a slaughter of such magnitude that it formed an economic basis for the acquisition of California. In 1872, conversely, the aftermath of the otter trade led Russia to agree to sell Alaska to the United States when it was believed that “everything worthwhile had been taken out.”
It had been a wild stampede in pursuit of otters as their herds were exterminated, island after island. Alexander Baranov, the most prominent in the north, had brought in the Russian fur trade to its peak and when his rule ended in 1871, he had traded 200,000 pelts worth an estimated $500,000,000.

In California, it was the Spanish padres who first recognized the value of the otter pelts. From their missions along the coast, they put the Indians to work—clubbing the otters with large sticks. It was reported that a hundred otter skins at the mouth of Dolores at a time when the Russians were shipping to Mexico for trade. This was at a time when the Russians with enslaved Aleuts were said to have killed 200 otters in a single week in San Francisco Bay.

My husband and I have been living within sight of a small raft of otters along the coast. In 1911, the International Fur Seal Treaty halted any further “taking” of the sea otters. All were thought to be gone.

The otter’s slow, shy return into the kelp beds along the California coast brought castigation and attack by the commercial abalone fisherman when it was observed that the otter, too, preyed upon the abalone. One is reminded of an earlier exchange between the kelp beds and the abalone when in the 1700s, abalone shells were brought from Monterey Bay to Vancouver Island and the northeast Indians. Two large shells were traded for an otter skin. These shells, apparently were worth their weight in gold. We are reminded of this former exchange when we find the red abalone today selling for more than $100.00 a dozen. Again the value of the abalone is putting the otter’s life in jeopardy.

With the otter’s disappearance in the 1890s, an unnaturally large population of shellfish built up and when commercial exploitation of abalone commenced, this industry was harvesting a field abnormally abundant, untouched by otters and almost untouched by man for some 40 years. In the Monterey area they landed an excess of 42 million pounds before the beds were depleted and the industry moved south to Morro Bay. They left behind millions of large abalone shells in mounds. These tell their own silent story of man’s relation to them—and indicate excessive human predation.

Yet, the California Department of Fish & Game makes a statement: “It’s clear,” they say, “that within the sea otter’s stabilized foraging range there can be virtually no human harvest of abalone.” How can we value this statement when during prehistoric times immense numbers of abalone shells were foraging for shellfish in the intertidal and subtidal waters of the coast, while at the same time, during this long, long period, Indian middens—heaps of discarded abalone shells—leave discards of heavy harvests of abalone. “The amount of abalone in coastal Indian middens is fantastic,” says Dr. Sylvia Broadbent, “Some are over 2,000. Marked above ground at a depth of 10 feet, and 20 feet deep lining the coast from Humboldt to Big Sur, as anthropologist, Rashkin states in a paper in 1972: “Thus it appears that abalone population flourished even though they were being taken by uncontrolled otter populations and as well as by man. In this light, to blame the current demise of the abalone on the sea otter species simplistic.”

But with the return of the otter, publicly noted in 1938 when over 100 otters, the first large herd reported since 1831, were seen and photographed rafting at the mouth of Bixby Canyon on the Monterey coast, the abalone fisherman rose up in indignation. Some of these otters were to gradually move south toward the Morro Bay red abalone waters—claimed by commercial fishermen as their own.

In 1957 the abalone harvest exceeded five million pounds, a major catch which was almost equaled in 1966. After this, the divers returned to their abalone beds and found them depleted—neither just within the otter’s range but outside as well. Looking for a scapegoat, they claimed the otters caused the decline. The industry pressed for legislation to protect otters could be “taken” outside their refuge. Strong public response opposed this measure and the bill was not passed.

In 1941, the California legislature had established a sea otter refuge to protect otters from firearms, not to limit their range. As the otters slowly expanded their range, the refuge was enlarged to cover approximately 100 miles. During this period, the sea otter was under state control, but in 1972 the responsibility was taken over by the federal government through the enactment of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

This Act, broad in its scope, was set up to reduce the alarming worldwide depletion of marine mammals. The Marine Mammal Commission was established with a committee of scientific advisors to counsel both state and federal agencies on scientific and policy matters, and monitor and oversee the programs.

The passage of the Endangered Species Act in 1973 became a further protective measure for the southern sea otter. In January, 1977, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service designated the southern sea otter as a “threatened species” on the grounds that its present range covered only 10% of its former area; that it represents less than 2,000 otters and that it was jeopardized by oil spills and by competition with man. These factors, it was reported, contributed to the species “particularly vulnerable to any sort of disruption.” Following World War II, improved equipment for diving was used by the commercial abalone industry, making it possible for the divers to remain underwater for prolonged periods with their wet suits and air compressors and their large rubber bottom hoses. The abalone iron, or “bottom bar,” continued to be employed in prying the abalones off the rocks.

What happens then? The sea otter and its unique ability to make suitable homes for itself and its pups; its the birth to only one pup. It has adjustments to the constant storms and its the prying the abalones off the rocks. How does this compare with the presence of waters and frightening storms. What happens during the storms to the small pups clutched by their mothers? How can the mother leave the pup when she dives for food? Only four or five pounds at birth, it can be washed ashore and stranded. What happens during the storms, the otters' ability to dive and the pup crying out for mummy? Can it be muted by the roar of the sea.

I had the good fortune to observe a sea otter which had given birth to a male pup near the Coast Guard breakwater in Monterey Bay. This perfect little creature, born with a two-year interim between births, was new observations of the presence of several, and several examples of yearlings.

The sea otter and its unique ability to use a rock tool selected with apparent care for its shape and size appropriate to assist in the job ahead? Divers have reported watching otters underwater choosing such a rock to carry to the surface, then, having used it to crack open a shell, returning to its former location to use again and again.

Abalone is loosened from its hold on a rock by hammering with this tool, often breaking a hole in the center of the shell. When it is borne to the surface, the tool is not needed because the edible body of this large snail is easy to break open.

Surfacing from a dive with such shells as clams or mussels between its nimble forepaws, the otter removes the rock from the loose fold of skin under its armpit and places it in its chest to commence the cracking of the shell against it until the broken pieces are easily edible.

People grow to recognize this sharp tap-tap even at a distance. On quiet mornings, when the sea is calm and the winds are silent, I have caught that particular sharp sound rising from the sea. Otters off Morro Bay in Big Sur, and with ears adjusted, can hear the slightest rustle in the kelp-like cry or call from an otter pup seeking its mother.

What happens during the storms to the small pups clutched by their mothers? How can the mother leave the pup when she dives for food? Only four or five pounds at birth, it can be washed ashore and stranded. The otters’ ability to dive and the pup crying out for mummy? Can it be muted by the roar of the sea.
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A mother otter relaxes as her pup nurses from one of the two nipples at the lower end of her abdomen.

ers, students, chance tourists and our-

The morning, the mother would ferry the pup to the breakwater, dis- located from the coast, and try to live to see invertebrates hidden in the crevices of the rock wall. The baby rested and the tide went in and out, waves, screaming and scanning the water for its mother. If she surfaced without food, she moved quickly to her drifting baby, drawing it back to its spot on the rock bed and then, with a graceful turn of her body, she dove again.

Returning with a small abalone from which she removed the meat, she placed the empty shell on the baby’s chest and he played with it. As weeks passed, it imitated its mother more and more, pouring its gifts of shells into its first purse.

The most satisfying scene took place when the mother had fed adequately and was preparing her body, lifting the clinging pup to her chest. She groomed the mass of fur, causing it to stand up like thistle-down, then, to drink sea water. As weeks passed, it took and became hypothermic, the ani- mals’ movements slowed and stopped. Afterward, the tide carried out their corpses.

Friends of the Sea Otter has taken a stand on the issues that plague this species: the continued threats of oil slicks and oil tanker traffic and, in the Cove, a national issue needing a true hope for conservation.

During these times of abuse and suffering more than any other? Greed? Meaninglessness? Carlessness?

Friends of the Sea Otter was founded in 1968 when the California sea otter population was a fragile 629. From that first year when the otter truly needed a friend to this present time we and an ever-growing body of supporters have been working diligently in a spirit of cooperation with the objective to see that the otter gets equal time and consideration in ar- riving at the solutions to our com- plex problems of man and the sea.

We will welcome friends for the ot- ter, a national issue needing sup- ports from every section of the na- tion. Our address is: Friends of the Sea Otter, P.O. Box 211220, Carmel, California 93922.

Margaret Owings is president of Friends of the Sea Otter, and HSUS’ 1960 Krutch Medalist.

HSUS regularly sends out news releases about pet problems.

Spreading the Word

What human trait do you think cause pets more suffering than any other? Greed? Meaninglessness? Carlessness?

We think it’s ignorance.

Every year, hundreds of thousands of pets get injured or killed because their well-intentioned owners lack the common sense or information which could prevent such tragedies.

A dog left in a car on a warm sum- mer day, a cat found lapping up sweet-smelling antifreeze left puddled on the garage floor, or the pet left uneclad at the local animal shelter because its owner didn’t know where to look for it. All these situations can be avoided if owners knew just how dangerous they are.

During these times of abuse and suffering more than any other? Greed? Meaninglessness? Carlessness?

The HSUS has redoubled its assault against pet-owner ignorance with a new series of press releases, radio and TV public service announcements, magazine and newspaper articles and print advertisements. We are spreading the word that pet owner responsi- bility means more than just providing adequate food and shelter.

Did you know more than 13 million dogs and cats must be euthanized each year? A dog left in a car on a warm summer day, a cat found lapping up sweet-smelling antifreeze left puddled on the garage floor, or the pet left uneclad at the local animal shelter because its owner didn’t know where to look for it. All these situations can be avoided if owners knew just how dangerous they are.
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Before you go looking for a puppy, take a good, long look at yourself.

Don't sweat the way people do. Panting is the way a dog regulates its temperature, but it's not nearly as efficient as sweating. Jogging with your dog on a warm day may even cause him to overheat. In his loyalty to you and his desire to do whatever you do, he can end up very sick, if not even suffer fatal heat stroke. Sore and bruised feet are another common injury experienced by jogging dogs. For jogging to be an enjoyable activity for the pet, the owner must look out for. A press release and set of radio public service announcements about jogging issued last spring produced a tremendous response from newspapers and radio stations alike.

Many of our releases are based on seasonal problems. In summer, pets have problems at the beach. Hot sand can burn a dog's feet, salt water can irritate its skin, and a strong undertow can easily overpower a tired animal who goes out to fetch that stick just one more time.

In the winter, snow-melting chemicals, which are often caustic, can cause burnt feet and stomach upset if swallowed. Christmas brings its own set of dangers, from poisonous mistletoe and poinsettias to shiny tree decorations that tantalize kit-teers, but can also harm them.

In the fall, we send a special news release to the media in towns with college campuses, because they have a special problem. College students often take in pets during the school year, then discover they can no longer keep the animals when summer comes and they return home. The shelters in these towns fill up with abandoned pets each spring. We hope that some publicity about the problem in the fall will make students think twice before getting pets.

Another method we use to disseminate important information about exotic pets is distributing reprints of articles from The Humane Society News to known columnists and magazine writers. The question of why exotic and wild animals do not make good pets was addressed in a News article last spring. At about the same time, a tragic story hit the news wires from Dallas, Texas, about an infant who was killed by its parents' pet boa constrictor. The horror of this story focused a lot of media attention on the problem of exotic pets, and we were able to supply the information reporters needed with our exotic pets article. Many animal lives, and perhaps a few human ones, may have been saved by the coverage this topic received.

Crime is always in the news, but a recent upsurge in crime in U.S. cities has caused more and more frightened citizens to purchase guard dogs for their protection. Often, they don't think of all of the time and money it takes to care for a dog, or of the special problems they will face owning a dog that has been trained to be aggressive.

Once again, HSUS geared up to deal with the problem of "consumer ignorance." A special press mailing was sent out. Phyliss Wright, director of the animal sheltering and control department, gave a number of radio, television, and newspaper interviews on the topic. Staff writer Julie Rovner prepared a story that was published in The Washington Post. It explained that dogs should be first owned as pets, not as weapons. Almost any devoted can make a racket at the door if a stranger or burglar tries to get in, which is the best kind of protection. Training a dog to attack and handling a trained attack dog, is not a job for the inexperienced dog owner, and HSUS materials discourage the widespread use of such canines.

In addition to the materials we send out to the media, HSUS publishes many educational pamphlets and flyers that you can buy at cost to distribute in your community, or use to put together news releases for your local humane group. In the center of this issue of The HSUS News, there is a copy of our 1981 Publications List. Take a minute to look through it and see if there are any materials that can help you spread the word. Our most important campaign is the one against ignorance. A little information can help prevent a lot of cruelty.
The national campaign to abolish the testing of cosmetic and household products in the eyes of rabbits has made important headway in recent months, due to the tireless letter-writing efforts of thousands of humane citizens all over the United States. The response I’ve seen from our HSUS membership has been exceptional; when united for a common purpose, the animal welfare community can truly have a strong voice.

Many of you have already heard the headline news: In December, Revlon announced a three year, $750,000 research grant to The Rockefeller University for the purpose of developing an alternative to the Draize test. When I spoke to their vice-president, Roger Shelley, he admitted that the efforts of the national Draize campaign can be credited with hastening this accomplishment.

At press time the Cosmetic, Toilettry and Fragrance Association announced it will start a fund for the development of alternatives to animal use in the laboratory. It is hoped that initial contributions totaling at least one million dollars will be received from manufacturers.

As HSUS Coordinator of the Draize campaign, I have had the chance to view close at hand what a tremendous difference our national grass roots movement has made. All of these important steps forward in recent months could not have been achieved without the unrelenting pressure of letters, more letters, and a growing interest in the media. Your individual contributions in this campaign have made all the difference.

You can continue to help. Write the manufacturers of cosmetics who exploit animals and let them know you won’t tolerate products that are tested on animals. Write me at HSUS for an address list of some of the largest companies.

As mentioned above, urge your Congressional delegation to co-sponsor the Draize resolutions. If you don’t get a committed answer the first time, ask again. When you do get a response, let us know so we can maintain a scoreboard on who’s supporting us and who is not.

Eliminating the test is our common purpose, so let’s keep our voice strong. The problem is painfully real, and the solution is 40 years overdue. Let’s make 1981 the year the Draize test died.
We're happy to announce the winners of HSUS' 1980 Animal Photography Contest. Although we only have space to show a few of the top entries, many photographs from the contest will be used in future publications. In looking over the entries to this contest, the great affection people have for animals is very evident. Whether it's a cat curled up on the bed, a dog wearing a funny hat, a horse kicking up its heels in the pasture, or a hippo looking a bit perplexed by a leaf that has landed on its nose, animals have captured our hearts.

Congratulations to our contest winners, and a special thank you to each one of you who entered.

**PETS, BLACK AND WHITE**

First Prize
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA

Second Prize
M. Botnovcan, Merrillville, IN

Honorable Mentions
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA
Marcia F. Marks, Washington, DC
Renée Thomas, Pekin, IL
Daniel Pilipauskas, Glencoe, IL
Diana Moore, Cleveland Heights, OH
Sylvia M. Ward, Hopedale, OH
Daniel F. Cima, North Beach, MD

**NON-PETS, BLACK AND WHITE**

First Prize
Christopher Newton, Kingston, MA

Second Prize
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA

Honorable Mentions
Dotte Larsen, Pittsford, NY
Suzanna C. Kennedy, South Bend, IN
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA
Leo M. Johnson, Flushing, MI
Pierre Ruffieux, Rockville, MD

Special thanks to Mr. and Mrs. Allen Manning whose donation made this contest possible.
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We hope it will be different someday, but while human ignorance and irresponsibility make death the only humane alternative for millions of unwanted dogs and cats, what about the people who actually have to perform euthanasia?

It takes a responsible person with a gentle hand and a caring attitude to give an animal a humane death. But the kind of person who can perform this task is one who feels the worst about having to perform this job.

Shelter workers have faced this dilemma since animal control programs were first instituted, but little attention was paid to their problems until now. As part of an overall trend toward greater professionalism in animal control, the emotional impact on shelter workers of having to destroy healthy animals is being examined. Programs are being developed to help these employees cope with this difficult task.

The HSUS's Animal Control Academy in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, offers a three-day Euthanasia Technician program four times a year. The technicians learn the proper procedures for acceptable animal euthanasia methods, including sodium pentobarbital injection (the preferred method), carbon monoxide, chloroform, and nitrogen oxide.

But perhaps more important, the participants have the chance to meet others in the same position and to discuss the stress they experience while destroying surplus animals when most people are not even aware there is a surplus pet problem. They can share their feelings about euthanizing shelter animals they have come to know individually.

One of the Academy euthanasia training sessions was attended by a psychology professor and a doctoral student from the University of Alabama, who cosponsored the Academy.

"It is difficult for me to go through the kenel and be the one who decides which will live and which will die." Dr. Charles Owens and Ricky Davis studied the comments and reactions of the technicians and prepared a paper titled "The Psychology of Euthanizing Animals: The Emotional Components," with Hutt Smith, Academy director. The paper has been published in the Journal of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems.

The technicians were asked to write out their feelings about euthanasia, and some of their comments appear on these pages.

They were also asked to respond to a series of statements prepared by the researchers to stimulate discussion and determine the inner feelings of these conscientious workers. The technicians agree they are performing a necessary service in the community, and their comments indicate that this belief helps them cope with the job.

"You realize euthanizing is a necessary part of shelter life when you see the numbers of animals that come in and not everyone who come in to adopt them." "I'm glad I'm there to do it and not someone who doesn't care."

"I know these animals are never again going to face any type of suffering or rejection, and I know that I did the best possible thing."

"I may be the only kind hand they ever feel, the only soft voice they ever hear, the one and only human who really did care."

The technicians mentioned a variety of ways of trying to relax after euthanasia work, some preferring the company of other people while others spend time by themselves. They do agree, however, that the community doesn't understand or appreciate the work they do, some commenting that they avoid discussing the details of their job in social settings because they frequently get negative reactions.

"I have trouble at times with my relatives. They ask why I do the job I do and why the shelter can't find homes for all the animals." "I feel alienated from people who are friends but can't understand the reasons. They see the dilemma but cannot accept that I would do such a thing."

Animal shelters and euthanasia technicians in particular bear a great deal of public criticism. Community residents expect animal control to keep the streets free of strays, but they are often outraged when they learn that these animals are being destroyed.

As Dr. Owens puts it, "To understand the psychological pain experienced by a person who must euthanize animals, one must first understand the contradiction required by the job. In order for the technicians to do their jobs daily, they have to decide in their minds that the job must be done but yet maintain concern for the individual animal."

The technicians agree wholeheartedly that it takes a special person to perform euthanasia, to combine compassion and profession.

The HSUS is currently producing a program on videotape which discusses attitudes toward euthanasia and procedures for doing the job with the least distress for the animals and the technician. The program, in videotape format, should be available by summer.

But the well-being of euthanasia technicians (and consequently of the animals they handle) depends in large part on the people around them—shelter supervisors, the directors of the humane society, the city council or county commissioners, and the general public.

Euthanasia technicians must be given the emotional support they need to do their jobs well. They need proper training and accurate information on euthanasia techniques. The community must stop blaming them for the euthanasia of surplus animals and begin programs to cut down pet overpopulation—so that animal shelters will no longer have to carry out this tragic and inadequate solution to the pet surplus problem.

"I'm glad I'm there to do it, and not someone who doesn't care."

One of the recommendations is that euthanasia technicians be given the opportunity to share their thoughts and feelings with sympathetic listeners as in the Academy program. The researchers also recommend that euthanasia technicians speak to the public, so the community can discover firsthand that these are control and caring people. The public must be made aware that the technicians not only free the streets of strays for the animals' deaths—irresponsible pet owners are.

The HSUS is providing leadership in this field with the Academy euthanasia program and various materials for euthanasia technicians. As part of the "Changing Your Image" series of training tapes for shelter animal control workers, HSUS is currently producing a program on videotape which discusses attitudes toward euthanasia and procedures for doing the job with the least distress for the animals and the technician.

The program, in videotape format, should be available by summer.

"I'm at peace with my conscience that what I do must be done. My chief concern is that it be done humanely."

There are never enough homes for all the cats and dogs brought into shelters. Once the public really understands this, and takes steps to prevent pet overpopulation, the euthanasia technician's job may become obsolete.
Every spring the circus comes to town. Families across America buy tickets for "the greatest show on earth." Amidst the crowds, music and bright lights, there is much excitement over the juggling seals, dancing elephants, and motorcycle riding bears. Children gaze in wide-eyed wonder at the animals' tricks. Children, however, are often the most ardent fans. In looking behind the scenes to determine what life is like for performing animals, one must wonder about the animals' lives. How did the animals get to town? What do they eat? How did they learn their tricks? Where do they live when the circus season ends? Answers to these questions reveal this is not "the greatest show on earth" when it comes to animal welfare.

For years The HSUS has been looking behind the scenes to determine what life is like for performing circus animals. Not only have we studied reports and investigated complaints sent to us from citizens and local humane societies, but HSUS's Director of Wildlife Protection, Sue Pressman, went undercover for several months and actually joined the circus. Posing as a clean-up person, she traveled with several different circuses, and experienced firsthand the daily routines of circus life.

Based on her experiences and the knowledge we have accumulated over the past nine years, we conclude that animal life is not as it should be in the nature of circus life. HSUS, therefore, opposes animal acts in circuses, not as a response to isolated incidents of blatant animal abuse but to those conditions, which of necessity exist in all circuses, that prevent even the simulation of a natural or comfortable environment for animals.

Domesticated animals suffer much less from the stresses of circus life than wild animals for they have, over thousands of years, become accustomed to living with man under diverse conditions. Wild animals, however, often have very specific and complex needs not easily met in the circus environment. Most of the problems we encounter with circus animals, therefore, involve wild and not domesticated animals.

**Majors and Mud Shows**

For a proper perspective on circus life it is important to distinguish between two different types. The first type is the major circus which travels to large cities and sets up in an arena or other indoor structure. It performs at one location for several days. This operation usually has a core of permanent personnel, is well-organized, and financially sound. As a result, it has the ability to provide its animals with proper handling, balanced diets, and routine medical care. By these standards, however, there are only a couple of major circuses in the United States.

Far more common is the second type of circus, the traveling tent or mud show. These shows perform in a new place every day and can cover up to 150 towns in an eight-month season. They hire people as they are needed, usually are unorganized, and financially unsound. Due to these factors—particularly the financial problems—they are usually unable to provide even basic necessities for their animals.

Quality of animal care varies greatly among circuses. There are some with which we find no fault as regards their good intentions towards their animals, and the diets, sanitation, and medical care they provide. Despite this, we maintain that the hardships imposed by traveling prevent all circuses from providing humane care for their animals. Keeping wild animals in captivity entails the responsibility of providing them with an environment in which they can approximate their natural activities. This may include being caged with others of their species, having the opportunity to exercise, climb, or dig, having objects to manipulate, and having the opportunity for privacy from other animals and the public. Such an environment helps assure proper biological and social adjustment for wild animals in captivity.

Housing of circus animals must be built for ease of transportation and cannot possibly meet these standards. Crowding and cramped quarters are a fact of life in all circuses. Animals travel in box cars, tractor trailers, or open crates on flatbed trucks. The complexity and expense of transporting animals across the country increases in proportion to the weight and size of the load. Cages, therefore, are no bigger than absolutely necessary.

Beyond consideration of weight and space is the fact that some animals, for their own safety, must be tightly constrained during travel. Elephants, for example, must have their feet chained to the floor during travel to prevent their thrashing about, damaging the vehicle, or even escaping. The Animal Welfare Act, administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, requires only that enclosures used for transporting circus animals have "...sufficient space for the animals to move about, lie down, and make normal postural adjustments..." As interpreted by USDA inspectors, this means that animals must be able to stand and stretch to their full height and have room to turn around. The law stipulates that freedom of movement can be restricted for those species whose "...freedom of movement would constitute a danger to the animals or their handlers..."

Many of the mud shows that the USDA and HSUS have inspected are guilty of not even complying with these very minimal standards. Financially strapped and having too few vehicles, cars, and personnel, they cram their animals into anything that will contain them. Often they place several incompatible animal species in close proximity, causing a high degree of stress and sometimes even physical attacks.

**Food, Water, Weather**

The quality of care for animals in the smaller mud shows is very poor. Small shows often do not know whether there will be water and shade available in the field where the tent will be pitched next. If no running water is available at the site, limited amounts can be hauled in for drinking, but there will certainly be none for cleaning purposes. Mud shows do not travel with water trucks. Often they ask the local fire department for water, but that isn't always possible. Consequently, animals have limited drinking supplies, cages are cleaned infrequently, and animals can become caked with excrement. "...It is shocking to realize that most of the mud shows set out without even providing for a basic necessity like water," Pressman said.

Circuses travel from early spring to late summer in every area of the country. Animals vary in their ability to withstand extremes of temperature. The chimpanzee, for example, is highly susceptible to fatal respiratory diseases and cannot tolerate cold and damp weather. Polar bears easily succumb to heat. The law stipulates that shows be housed in vehicles where the temperature can be controlled, at least to some extent. Animals such as horses, bears, tigers, and elephants, however, for which extremes of temperature are not particularly harmful, can be kept indefinitely. While animals may not actually die from the heat, they may be forced to endure uncomfortable conditions.

A wild animal trainer must establish dominance over his animals and constantly reinforce it. Though many methods of doing this are subtle, they are still forms of coercion and can be stressful for some species.
Circus elephants spend most of their travel time chained and shackled. They require a great deal of food, but financially unsound mud shows often can’t supply their needs.

Submerge themselves in rivers as a cooling mechanism. Having pools for these animals would be impossible while traveling, but they should be hosed down at the very least.

Feeding the animals while on the road poses a problem for the smaller circuses. Having no well stocked commissary trucks as the major circuses do, they buy food along the way as they can find it and as finances allow. Usually finances allow for very little—for the people as well as the animals.

Pressman was struck by the amount of starvation she saw. “Animals were severely underfed. Often...”

Food and Water—potable water provided at least once in every 12-hour period.

Care and Treatment—animals should be provided with clean, moderate temperature, and exercise; animals must be protected from exhaustion, fumes or extremes of weather; veterinary care must be provided when necessary.

Penalties for failure to comply can result in cease and desist orders, fines, and imprisonment.

The Myth of Winter Quarters

The season is over, animals return to “winter quarters.” People mistakenly picture winter quarters as an idyllic spot where after a long road tour, animals can roam freely, swim, climb, and generally relax. Nothing could be further from the truth.

For most circus animals, winter quarters mean confinement of either those which are not shipped off or those which are not sold. In the case of elephants and rhinos, of course, the latter two are not practical.

Housing of circus animals is built for ease of transportation. The comfort of the occupants is a secondary consideration.

The Law

The Animal Welfare Act sets regulations for the vehicles used to transport circus animals, enclosures in which animals travel, and the handling, feeding, and care of the animals. The Act sets the following standards:

Handling—must not cause unnecessary discomfort, behavioral stress, or physical harm; must ensure safety of the public and the animals; animals must be given a rest period between performances equal to the time of one performance.

Vehicles—must be mechanically sound, well-ventilated, yet free of injurious drafts; exhaust gases must not enter animal area; must be clean; temperature must be compatible with health and comfort of the animals.

Enclosures—well constructed, ventilated and designed to provide air, light, food and water, stimulation and exercise for the animals; enclosures must be compatible with the type, size and biology of the animals; must be designed to prevent injury from exhaust fumes or extremes of weather; veterinary care must be provided when necessary.

Food and Water—potable water provided at least once in every 12-hour period.

Care and Treatment—animals should be provided with clean, moderate temperature, and exercise; animals must be protected from exhaustion, fumes or extremes of weather; veterinary care must be provided when necessary.

Penalties for failure to comply can result in cease and desist orders, fines, and imprisonment.

“home” for there is no one there to receive them.
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Animal welfare organizations have charged that wildlife management programs are little more than an excuse to subsidize sport hunting with public funds. In retaliation against a growing tide of criticism, advocates of hunting are waging a campaign to convince the public that hunters are not only paying their own way through fees and taxes but are, in addition, shoulder- ing a large percentage of the cost of conserving wildlife and wildlands.

Promotional literature for the 1980 National Hunting and Fishing Day boasted that sportshooting financially support conservation programs in the amount of $500 million a year. Literature published by the National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF), a principal spokesperson for hunters, contains the following claims:

“Through the purchase of licenses and permits to hunt, hunters and fishermen pay over $344 million for conservation each year.”

“Through a self-imposed tax on sporting arms, ammunition and archery equipment, hunters and shooters have provided more than $892 million for wildlife management in the last forty years and continue to add over $86 million annually.”

“Through the purchase of Federal Duck Stamps, hunters provide $11,000,000 annually for conservation.”

“Hunters spend an estimated $200 million each year developing wildlife habitat on privately owned lands.”

These claims do not stand up under careful scrutiny. An examination of fees and taxes on hunting licenses and related equipment reveals the hidden truth about the contribution made by hunters toward wildlife conservation.

License Revenues

Hunting licenses, permits, and tags are the major sources of funds that hunters credit as their financial contribution to the conservation of wildlife. These monies do account for approximately one-third of the annual revenues of state fish and game departments. Of the $344 million figure cited in pro-hunting literature, however, over one-third is derived from the sale of fishing licenses and that money is channeled directly into fisheries management. In actuality, the average annual income from the sale of hunting licenses during the past decade was $146 million, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year hunters spent a record $192.2 million on the purchase of licenses.

Excise Taxes

The “self-imposed” tax cited by the NSSF is not a voluntary taxing plan. Rather, funds are obtained from federal excise tax established under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act. Funds are derived from an 11% excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition, a 10% tax on handguns, and an 11% tax on archery equipment. Funds collected under the Pittman-Robertson Act are redistributed to state fish and game departments based upon a formula that considers the number of hunting license holders and the land area of each state.

The $86 million cited by hunters as their annual share of excise tax revenues is misleading. Despite a doubling in annual revenues in the past decade, monies collected have averaged only $23.3 million a year during the forty-year history of the Pittman-Robertson Act. More importantly, the excise tax is applicable to all sales of sporting firearms and archery equipment, including purchases for non-hunting activities, such as gun collecting, target shooting, and self protection.

In 1973 the excise tax on handguns, which are rarely used for hunting, provided 46% of the Pittman-Robertson funds for the year. To annually purchase a “duck stamp.” Stamp collectors also purchase duck stamps and since 1975 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has encouraged the non-hunting public to purchase duck stamps as a way of supporting conservation programs. However, the Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The sum for duck stamp purchases cited by the NSSF is the most accurate of the figures claimed because hunters presumably spend $500 million the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

An excise tax on handguns provides millions of dollars to government conservation programs benefiting hunters, even though hundreds of dollars are rarely used for hunting.

Private Lands
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Day boasted that sportsmen financed a large percentage of the cost of conserving wildlife. Last year license Revenues

Hunting licenses, permits, and tags are the major sources of funds that hunters credit as their financial contribution to the conservation of wildlife. These monies do account for approximately one-third of the annual revenues of state fish and game departments. Of the $344 million figure cited in pro-hunting literature, however, over one-third is derived from the sale of fishing licenses and that money is channeled directly into fisheries management. In actuality, the average annual income from the sale of hunting licenses during the past decade was $146 million, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year hunters spent a record $192.2 million on the purchase of licenses.

Excise Taxes

The “self-imposed” tax cited by the NSSF is not a voluntary taxing plan. Rather, funds are obtained from federal excise tax established under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act. Funds are derived from an 11% excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition, a 10% tax on handguns, and an 11% tax on archery equipment. Funds collected under the Pittman-Robertson Act are redistributed to state fish and game departments based upon a formula that considers the number of hunting license holders and the land area of each state.

The $86 million cited by hunters as their annual share of excise tax revenues is misleading. Despite a doubling in annual revenues in the past decade, monies collected have averaged only $23.3 million a year during the forty-year history of the Pittman-Robertson Act. More importantly, the excise tax is applicable to all sales of sporting firearms and archery equipment, including purchases for non-hunting activities, such as gun collecting, target shooting, and self protection.

In 1973 the excise tax on handguns, which are rarely used for hunting, provided 46% of the Pittman-Robertson funds for the year. To annually purchase a “duck stamp.” Stamp collectors also purchase duck stamps and since 1975 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has encouraged the non-hunting public to purchase duck stamps as a way of supporting conservation programs. However, the Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The sum for duck stamp purchases cited by the NSSF is the most accurate of the figures claimed because hunters presumably spend $500 million the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

The Migratory Bird Conservation Account does derive most of its funds from the purchase of stamps by hunters. During the past five years, an average of $10 million has annually been collected through the sale of duck stamps.

An excise tax on handguns provides millions of dollars to government conservation programs benefiting hunters, even though hundreds of dollars are rarely used for hunting.

Private Lands

The origin and use of the $820 million the NSSF claims hunters spend on wildlife management in the last forty years and continue to add each year, approximately 5% is absorbed in administrative expenses.

Roughly 13% is spent on hunter safety programs. Forty-three percent is used for habitat development, principally altering wildlands to provide habitat favorable to game species. Twenty-three percent of Pittman-Robertson funds is spent on research, particularly on projects involving the propagation and management of game species. The final 16% is used for land acquisition, with priority given to the purchase of land suitable for game species.

Therefore, while hunters pay only one-half to one-third of the revenues collected under the Pittman-Robertson Act, they benefit from nearly every expenditure of these funds. The use of Pittman-Robertson ac-

account funds is characteristic of the manner in which government agencies spend funds. In recent Congressional testimony an official of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality reported that of every dollar spent by state fish and game management, ninety-nine cents is used on game species.

Federal wildlife programs are also preoccupied with game species. Of every dollar spent by state fish and game management, ninety-nine cents is spent on the management of animals that are hunted and trapped. Thus, the actual cost of managing populations of game animals for hunters far exceeds what hunters pay into such programs in the form of user taxes and privilege fees.

An exciting aspect of this situation is not that the public is subsidizing sport hunting activities, but that hunters have become influential brokers who use their license fees and tax dollars to direct the policies and programs of wildlife agencies. There is a built-in weakness in the regulatory system when revenues for wildlife management are derived, in part, from the sale of hunting licenses and from excise taxes on hunting equipment. It is not simply that game departments are in sympathy with their hunting
cliente, many officials within these agencies must recognize a dependence upon hunters for their livelihood. Although there was initial resistance to the federal excise tax and other user fee mechanisms, hunters now realize that their role as financial backers of game departments affords them extraordinary influence. Hunting organizations are careful to guard against funding plans that might lessen their influence. They will continue to tolerate, and even advocate, taxation of hunters. In return, they will continue to compel wildlife biologists to focus their energies toward providing game animals to be hunted and to influence the direction of game department policy. The alliance between hunters and game departments may be the most formidable obstacle to the reform of wildlife management programs. As long as policymakers within wildlife management agencies continue to work in partnership with hunters, there is little hope that fish and game departments will de-emphasize hunting in favor of a more enlightened approach to the conservation and protection of wildlife.

Hunting organizations are careful to explain to other users the problems animals face in the world today. As a service to our members, from time to time we will be supplying you with a fact sheet on a specific issue in animal welfare. We hope these fact sheets will be helpful in explaining to others the problems animals face in the world today.

Hunter’s fees help save wild lands from destruction and development, but they do so only in order to stock them with game animals for the hunters to kill.

HUMANE EDUCATION... and the CLASS of 1981

During May and June, thousands of eager young teachers will be graduating from colleges and universities around the country-teachers who are enthusiastic about their profession and excited about the opportunity to reach and teach young people.

If you know someone who is graduating from a college of education this spring, help prepare the graduate for his or her new role with a gift subscription to HUMANE EDUCATION. Your $7 investment will provide the new teacher with four issues of helpful, ready-to-use activities, resources, and teaching materials, all designed to make humane education an important and natural part of the classroom experience.

To order a gift subscription, send your name, the recipient’s name and address, and a check for $7 to NAHE, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037. We will be happy to send a gift card to the graduate along with his or her first issue. Help them get off to a good start. Give them HUMANE EDUCATION.

HARV SEAL

(Canada)

- Takes place in Canada off the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.
- Takes place in March.
- About 180,000 killed each year.
- Most killed before one month of age, before the bright white coat of the pup begins to molt and turns to the gray adult coat. Male and female taken.
- Seals are approached on the ice by the sealers—working independently, a sealer will club a pup, slit its main artery, then peel off the pelt. The whole operation takes fewer than two minutes per seal.
- The hunt is totally under Canadian jurisdiction. It evolved from a subsistence hunt by Newfoundland natives into big business for furriers and fur processors in Canada and Norway.
- Killing is done by Canadians and Norwegians. Four of the large “factory” ships that carry sealers to the ice and bring back thousands of pelts are owned by Norwegian corporations.
- Most pelts are shipped to Norway for processing, then sold in Europe and Canada.

NORTHERN PACIFIC FUR SEAL

(Pribilof Islands)

- Takes place on St. Paul’s Island in the Pribilofs off the coast of Alaska in the U.S., and on Commander and Robbins Islands in the Soviet Union’s territory.
- Takes place in July, annually.
- About 26,000 killed each year on St. Paul’s Island.
- Males, two- to three-years-old, are taken. Only bachelor males, without a harem of females, are taken.
- Bachelors are cut from the herd and driven from the rocky shoreline onto the grassy tundra. In assembly-line fashion, the seals are stunned with clubs, killed by cutting their main arteries, then skinned.
- The hunt takes place under a treaty signed by the U.S., Canada, Japan, and Russia. The treaty originated in 1911 when pelagic (open-sea) hunting threatened to wipe out this species of seal. Under the treaty, seals may be taken only during the summer hunt, and only up to a quota set each year.
- The killing on St. Paul’s is done by Aleut natives whose pay is subsidized by the U.S. government. The Soviet Union conducts its own hunts on Commander and Robbins Islands.
- Pelts are mainly used for coats and other garments. U.S. pelts are processed under government contract by the Fouke Fur Company of South Carolina. Certain other parts of the seal are used for various purposes, but none are as profitable as furs.
Harp Seal (Canada)

- Harp seal fur is used for products such as fur collars and cuffs, glove linings, keychains and toy stuffed seals. Harp seal flippers are sometimes collected and sold as delicacies in Norway, though very little meat is eaten by Newfoundlanders, most carcasses are left on the ice.

- The Canadian government attempts to justify this hunt by claiming it is necessary to control seal overpopulation. Its statistics are heavily disputed by scientists, some of whom predict that current kill quotas could eventually threaten the species' existence.

Another justification—that the extra income from sealing is vital to the Newfoundland economy—should be tempered by the realization that: the landsmen who need the money make only about two hundred dollars each season, and risk their lives on the treacherous ice floes to get it, while the furriers reap real profits in millions of dollars; the Canadian government spends thousands of taxpayer's dollars supporting the hunt by supplying pro-hunt pamphlets and other propaganda, using government ice cutters to lead factory ships to the seals, and providing Fisheries department employees—ostensibly to supervise the hunt—but also to protect the hunters by keeping press and humane observers off the ice. This money might be better used to develop a more stable and productive economic base for Newfoundland.

- The HSUS wants an immediate end to this hunt. We believe the Canadian government can end this hunt with no more than short-term economic hardship for anyone.

West Coast

Dog Eating

Increased reports of dog eating are surfacing in California. While California's cruelty statutes could apply in some cases, investigating the manner in which animals are killed, nothing in the law specifically prohibits killing and eating dogs or cats.

- Senator Marz Garcia has introduced SB 49 making it a misdemeanor to or to take or possess dogs or cats with the intent to eat them. A similar bill, AB 241, has also been introduced by Assemblyman Larry Kaploff. The reports, which also include occurrences of squirrels, ducks, and pigeons being illegally killed and eaten in public parks, primarily involve refugees from Southeast Asia, where dogs are considered a delicacy.

- The economic needs of the Aleut natives who, like the Newfoundlanders, pocket a miniscule amount of the actual profits made off the hunt, could be met through the development of other industries with government subsidies for start-up expenses.

- As in the case of the Canadian hunt, the argument that these seals must be slaughtered annually to prevent overpopulation does not hold water. Wild animal populations are self-controlling when left in a natural state, due to fluctuations in food supply and natural attrition by disease and predators.

- The HSUS is asking the U.S. government to forego its 70% share of the pelts from the St. Paul hunt and to begin investigating an alternative economic base for the Aleut natives, as well as to begin negotiating an agreement with the other signatory nations to cease all killing of the northern Pacific fur seal.

- Ending this hunt is a somewhat complex problem. The treaty is renegotiated every four years, and was renewed in 1980. Further, an end to the hunt without an agreement to refrain from pelagic sealing could be very damaging to the species.
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Spay/Neuter

On December 1, the Dallas SPCA performed its 10,000th surgery at its low-cost spay and neuter clinic. The clinic was opened in November, 1976. Since it opened, it has been instrumental in easing the problem of pet overpopulation in the area. The sterilization of 10,000 animals, by one conservative estimate, has prevented the birth of one-quarter million animals.

The new Texas rabies law provided a tool with which the "slave market" could be hampered. The goal is to close it down.

The Gulf States staff will continue to work for further curtail, or eliminate this sale.
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Humane Education Course

Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas, will be offering a three-credit graduate course in humane education June 8-22. Kathy Savesky, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, and Charles Herrmann, editor of HSUS' children's magazine, Kind, will each give a session during the course. For more information, contact G.W. Williams, Professor of Education, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75962.

Exotic Animals

Many cities in the southwest were shocked into reconsidering the ban on exotic pets when a pet python snake crushed an infant child to death in Dallas, Texas. There is currently no legislation barring the sale or possession of many types of animals, from exotic animals have been locked up in cages by a person...
New Legislation

The 97th Congress is barely two months old, and already several pieces of legislation important to the humane cause have been introduced in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Several of them are identical to bills which failed to gain passage during the last Congress, some have been modified or revised, and others are completely new. Here are the major ones:

Trapping

H.R. 374 (formerly H.R. 1297) introduced by Congressman Clarence Lewis (D-SC), would prohibit shipping of any fur or leather between states or with foreign countries if that state or country had not banned the use of the leghold or steel jaw trap.

H.R. 1092 (formerly H.R. 953) introduced by Congressman Glenn Anderson (D-CA), would regulate trapping on federally owned lands.

Horse Racing

A bill effectively banning the use of drugs in races has been introduced in the House by Congressmen Bruce Vento (MN) and Robert McCreary (IL). By the time you read this, a matching bill will have been introduced in the Senate by Senator David Pryor. As in the case of most of last year's proposed legislation on horse racing, this bill is expected to be introduced in the Senate by Senator David Pryor.

Lab Animals

Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro (D-NY) introduced H.R. 220, a bill to fund research aimed at developing test methods which would minimize the use of, and pain and suffering to, live animals.

A slightly revised version of last year's H.R. 6847, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to cover animals during actual research and attempts to minimize painful experiments, is expected to be introduced sometime this spring.

H.R. 556 (formerly H.R. 4805) introduced by Rep. Robert Roe (D-NJ), would establish a National Center for Alternatives Research to develop and coordinate alternative methods of research and testing that do not involve the use of live animals, to develop training programs in the use of alternative methods, and to disseminate information on these methods.

Animal Welfare Act

H.R. 4479 was reintroduced by Rep. Ted Weiss (D-NY), and would establish a commission to study alternative methods to the use of live animals in laboratory research and testing.

Finally, Congressman Andrew Jacobs (D-IN) and Senator David Durenberger (R-MN) introduced companion resolutions—H. Con. Res. 27, (formerly H. Con. Res. 445) and Senate Resolution 65 (formerly Senate Resolution 534)—aimed at encouraging all federal agencies to develop and validate alternatives to the Draize rabbit eye test.

Marine Mammal Protection Act

In 1972, Congress passed a far-reaching piece of legislation to help seals, whales, dolphins, and other marine mammals. This year, the Marine Mammal Protection Act comes before Congress for approval to continue this work. It needs your support if the U.S. is to remain in the forefront of those fighting to save our dwindling populations of many marine mammals.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act is the piece of legislation that bans baby seal product imports into the U.S., prohibits whaling within two hundred miles of our coast, and protects all other marine mammals, including sea otters, polar bears, manatees, all seals, whales, porpoise, and walrus.

The current political mood in Washington is decidedly anti-regulatory, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act is a regulatory act. It faces tough opposition from fishermen and others who once made a lot of money from the exploitation of marine mammals. It is crucial that the act be reauthorized in its current form, without weakening any of its powers. Please write to your U.S. representative and senators before May 15. Urge that the Marine Mammal Protection Act be fully reauthorized with no weakening amendments. This is one of the most important animal protection laws on the books. It must not be weakened or allowed to die.

Red Alert for HSUS Members!

How can you use your power as a constituent most effectively to help animals? By joining our Action Alert team.

An Action Alert is a letter or postcard we send advising of a situation in government or industry where a large public response can swing a decision in the animals’ favor. Our Action Alert system is composed of our most energetic and concerned members—people who want to take action to help animals and who have promised to respond quickly when an Action Alert is received.

All you need is a pen and a piece of paper or a few minutes to make a phone call. We will supply you with the background information so you can lobby for animal issues by yourself.

Show our elected representatives that animal welfare is important to the American public. You don’t have to be an expert to let a legislator know how important it is to you. For more on the U.S. Senate, call 202/224-3121.

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

Reflect for a moment... how can I help animals even when I no longer share their world...?

By your request for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States, your gift can provide for animals after you’re gone.

Naming The HSUS demonstrates your commitment to animal welfare and strengthens the Society for this task. We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material which will assist in planning a will.

Planning a Trip to Washington?

While in Washington, why not drop in to see your senators or representatives? They want to hear from the people they represent more than anyone else. We would be happy to set up appointments, accompany you to their congressional offices, or give you background information so you can lobby for animal issues by yourself.

For more information about our Action Alert system, contact the Animal Welfare Information Center.

Please send: Will information
Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________ State ______ Zip ______
Mail in confidence to: Murdaugh, S. Madden, Vice President, General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.
Constitutions Result in Unique Sentences

In two recent unrelated cases, one in Florida and the second in Ohio, judges have exercised their sentencing discretion in what appear to be very effective ways.

In Fort Pierce, Florida, a county judge, in addition to sentencing a defendant to jail for cruelty to animals, entered an order prohibiting the defendant from ever owning an animal again.

In Newark, Ohio, a defendant who pleaded guilty to a charge of violating the state anti-dogfighting statutes was placed on five-years probation, with the requirement that he work 200 hours for the humane society as a condition of that probation. This is one of the cases referred to in the Great Lakes Regional Report elsewhere in this issue of The HSUS News.

Animal Fighting Suit Dismissed; Appeal Planned

The last two issues of The HSUS News have reported on a lawsuit which The HSUS brought against the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Justice, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture, charging that those individuals and their departments had been guilty of an absolute failure to enforce the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act designed to prohibit animal fighting. The suit was brought by The HSUS, the Massachusetts S.P.C.A., and the International Society for the Protection of Animals on behalf of their members, and specifically on behalf of "the animals which those provisions of the Animal Welfare Act were enacted to protect." The federal government had responded to the suit by asking the Court to dismiss the action, alleging that we could not challenge their failure to act in this manner in court.

Unfortunately, on January 21, 1981, Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, dismissed the suit, holding that the Court did not have the basic power to require executive agencies to enforce criminal statutes. Furthermore, the Court stated: "Defendants have made some efforts to begin enforcement of the Act. While the pace and intensity of defendants' efforts may leave plaintiffs dissatisfied, and perhaps understandably so, it is not the Court's function to oversee or second guess the allocation of prosecutorial resources. However, defendants' deficiencies are characterized, they clearly do not rise to the level of arbitration [i.e., capriciousness, or invidiousness necessary to establish the jurisdiction of the Court]."

The HSUS General Counsel's office feels that this decision did not give full consideration to the arguments presented in this case and is not legally sound. It is anticipated that because of the importance of the principle involved in this case, to wit, that there is little use for Congress to pass animal protection legislation if the result can be nullified by disinterest and inaction on the part of the Executive Branch of the government, this adverse decision of the District Judge will be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Agriulture Department Moves Into 20th Century

"Animals Have Rights, Too" is the title of a news feature released by the Department of Agriculture in January. For the first time our federal government recognized as a fact the legal and ethical philosophy that The HSUS has propounded for many years, i.e., that there are such things as animal "rights" which must be vigorously enforced and protected. The HSUS gives the USDA a hearty welcome!

Compiled by Murdaugh Stuart Mad- den, HSUS General Counsel, and Roger Kindler, Associate Counsel.

MOVING?

If you have moved, or are planning to, please send us this coupon so we can correct our mailing list. Attach your present mailing label below, then print your new address. Mail to: The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

New Address:

Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________
City ________________________________
State ______ Zip ______________

Attach present mailing label here

Animal Welfare—The Present Crisis

As we begin to see the opposition the animal welfare movement will meet in the '80s, it is clear that the challenge to humanitarians is greater than it has ever been before. The surge of growth and the successes the environmental and animal welfare movements had in the last decade are now threatened by powerful groups who would sacrifice wild animals and their habitats in an attempt to solve our economic and energy problems—benefiting very few and robbing us all of our natural heritage of wildlife and land. Economic problems threaten pet animals, too, who will suffer if there are budget cuts in animal control programs.

With these storm clouds gathering on the horizon, it is more important than ever that humanitarians get together to learn and plan ways to attack the ignorance and attitudes which threaten animals. That is the purpose of this year's Annual Conference: sharing ideas, sharing commitment, sharing inspiration, sharing victories and defeats, and gathering strength from one another to face an uncertain future.

There will be workshops on a wide variety of topics including spay/neuter programs, lobbying for animals, humane education, euthanasia, factory farming, trapping, hunting, horse racing, HSUS accreditation program, cruelty investigation, the pet industry, public relations, and newsletters. Special guest speakers and the presentation of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal at the awards banquet will highlight the conference. In addition, the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems will present a separate symposium on the humane ethic and wildlife management on Wednesday, October 14th.

The Conference will be held in the Chase-Park Plaza Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri. For further program information and registration forms write HSUS Conference, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Write today, so you can make plans early to attend HSUS' 1981 Annual Conference. It's going to be a special experience. We hope we'll see you there.
Walk in the Spring

Master, let's go for a walk in the woods
There's a flood of spring warmth in the air,
Redbuds are blooming down by the creek—
The skies are deep, blue and fair;
The perfume of wild roses adrift on the wind
Is touched by a mockingbird's song.
Outside the whole world is budding anew
With memories held all winter long.

Master, let's go for a run in the field
Where the wind is sweet, swift and free,
And my bark will frighten the scattered small clouds
That move like ships on a sea;
I love this old house but it's silent and dark
And touched with last winter's chill.
Master, please get your cane and your coat—
Let's go for a run on the hill!

—Jesse Lee Hill