World Congress for the Protection of Animals

In May of 1984, citizens of the United States will have the unique opportunity of attending an international gathering of animal-welfare professionals being convened in this country for the first time. Sponsored and arranged by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), this congress is expected to attract delegates and participants from numerous countries throughout the world who will discuss many critical issues affecting animals and seek to develop effective programs to ensure their protection from abuse and suffering.

Papers will be presented in general sessions in these subject areas: Transportation of Animals; Animal Husbands—Intensive Systems; Animals in Research; Early Childhood Abuse of Animals and Later Criminal Behavior; Animals in the Motion Picture Industry; Animal Spectacular—Rabies—A Worldwide Problem—Sealing; and The Fur Controversy. All papers and subsequent discussions will be presented with simultaneous translations. Written proceedings will be available in Spanish, French, German, and English.

Because such an international gathering will likely not be held in the United States again during the 1980s, you are urged to take advantage of this rare opportunity. The congress will be held from May 27 to June 1 at the Boston Park Plaza Hotel. Registration for the entire congress, including banquet, is $50.00 for WSPA members; $60.00 for non-members. Hotel reservations should be made directly with the Boston Park Plaza Hotel, 50 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02117. Specify that you are attending the WSPA-sponsored World Congress. Rates are single $58.00 (plus tax); double $72.00 (plus tax) per night. Whether or not you plan to attend this world congress, you are invited to become a member of the World Society for the Protection of Animals for just ten dollars per year. Through your membership in this outstanding international animal-welfare organization, you will be assisting in protecting animals worldwide.

Send your membership dues to WSPA, P.O. Box 190, 29 Perkins Street, Boston, MA 02130. Also, if you desire to attend the world congress, write to the same address for a registration form and further congress information.
Sea World Wins Its Way

In November, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a permit to Sea World to capture ten orcas (killer whales) over the next five years for display and breeding purposes (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). Many as ninety applications that can be caught and held briefly to be measured, blood-sampled, photographed, and, possibly, marked.

Although the NMFS did not reduce the large number of animals originally requested by Sea World as we had hoped, we were pleased to see that the final permit issued in much more restrictive than that which Sea World requested. It has taken into account our opposition to painful procedures such as liver biopsies, tooth extractions, and stomach samplings as we had hoped, we were pleased to see that the final permit issued to the capture to ensure that the animals are handled as humanely as possible.

The larger question, however, is whether these animals should be in captivity at all. Federal legislation has been introduced by Rep. Rod Chandler of Washington State to prohibit the taking and importation of killer whales for public display purposes. The granting of the permit is only the first step down a long road for Sea World. Much could happen before ten orcas are ensconced in the attraction’s multi-million-dollar facilities being built in Florida and California.

Trap Seeks Foot-hold

Woodstream Corporation of Lillitza, Pennsylvania, the largest steel-jawed trap manufacturer in the world, is introducing a modified version of the steel-jawed, leghold trap to the Connecticut legislature (see “Around the Regions”). The manufacturer, Harald Thomas, states that this new model, which is equipped with padded jaws, has been tested by his company and causes none of the cuts and broken bones which result from the steel-jawed, leghold variety. But the HSUS believes this trap is neither new nor humane.

Over the past several years, different modifications of the cruel steel-jawed trap have been developed; some used various materials wrapped around their jaws as padding, while others had an offset ground into the jaws which left a gap when the trap was closed, lessening the pressure on the trapped limb. But none of the modifications proved popular with the trappers. HSUS staff have met with officials at Woodstream to discuss the reasons behind the failure of these modified traps, particularly the ones using padded jaws. At that time, Woodstream presented a sound argument against manufacturing such a trap: the rubberized material used to wrap the steel jaws would retain human scent; the material itself would not be durable (since the trapped animal would tear through it in an effort to get free); and trappers would not use the new trap because of the expense and effort involved in its maintenance.

Now, Woodstream is touting the padded-jaw modification in Connecticut as a compromise to cruel trapping methods. In reality, the trap is no compromise at all. It inflicts stress and pain on the trapped animal; it costs twice as much to manufacture as the steel-jawed trap, and trappers have shown in the past that they just don’t like using it. Why, then, is Woodstream promoting a trap that it once refuted so justly? It wants the public to believe this trap is new and popular. And, if any whale dies during capture, it will count toward the quota of ten and all activity will have to be suspended and reviewed.

Before Sea World can even begin to remove the two animals licensed for capture in 1984, it must conduct a population survey and show it to the NMFS for approval. There are a number of steps during the procedure at which HSUS, along with others, has requested a chance for input and review. Now that the permit has been granted, the public must scrutinize every aspect of the capture to ensure that the animals are handled as humanely as possible.

The Humane Society of the United States

Television Series Announced

The HSUS will launch a weekly television series about the world of animals early this year. The program, called “Pet Action Line,” will offer practical advice ranging from companion animal training to preventative and emergency pet health care and will feature controversial topics such as the use of drugs in horse racing, laboratory animal experimentation, and dogfighting.

The HSUS has joined forces with the Action Alert Team, nationally syndicated television producers, to produce the series. The show will be hosted by broadcast journalist H.I. “Sonny” Bloch and produced by Gail Nemec. “Pet Action Line” is currently being released to more than 900 communities through cable systems and will be made available to public broadcasting, cable, and commercial stations nationwide.

A weekly television program addressing the importance of animals in our lives and the ways in which The HSUS is working to eliminate the suffering and abuse they endure has been one of our major goals for several years,” said HSUS President Hoyt. “We are tremendously excited at the possibilities this medium provides for advancing the rights and welfare of animals.”

Reaction to the Alert

The early response to our first Animal Activist Alert, published in October, indicated it was a success. Readers were excited and eager to help remove fur coats as grand prizes. We asked our readers to locate sweepstakes that offer fur coats as grand prizes. We asked our readers to write to the sweepstakes companies in protest. The Alert Team received responses from the companies and sent copies of them to The HSUS.

In conjunction with our campaign against Norwegian fish products, we asked readers to locate local Norwegian sardines and salmon at their markets and send us the mail received. “We aren’t really surprised by the success of the Alert Team,” says editor Martha Finney. “We weren’t really surprised by the response to the Alert Team. We have a history of writing many effective letters when The HSUS asks them to speak up on an issue. ‘We’ve really plugged a great source of dedicated energy,’ says editor Martha Finney.

Sonny Bloch (left) and producer Gail Nemec of the “Pet Action Line” join HSUS President John A. Hoyt in announcing a new television venture for 1984.
**FARM ANIMAL WELFARE: NEW DIRECTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS**

**Introduction**

From the time of its founding almost thirty years ago, The HSUS has attempted to improve the conditions under which food animals are transported and slaughtered. In the late 1970s, however, it became imperative to address the cruelty and deprivation endured by animals raised in intensive confinement. Factory farming—the highly automated, capital-intensive system of raising animals for food—was causing millions of animals unnecessary stress, distress, and increased susceptibility to disease.

Through our publication Factory Farming, we alerted our members to the deprivation caused veal calves by confinement in stalls too small for them to stand up, turn around, or groom, and by diets inadequate in iron. We described hog confinement systems in which sows were kept tethered in small, concrete stalls for months at a time; laying hens were kept in unshaded feedlots. The unsheltered, sordid conditions of beef cattle were not entirely a whitewash. Farm animal scientists whose research is supported mainly by agribusiness and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) published a report for the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) entitled “Scientific Aspects of the Welfare of Food Animals” in 1981. It, unfortunately, recognized few of the welfare concerns that HSUS Scientific Director Dr. Michael Fox (who was a contributor) and The HSUS had raised. But it was not entirely a whitewash. Farms animal scientists, for the first time, were beginning to look at animals not simply in order to enhance their productivity and efficiency, but also to determine animals’ wants and needs and to accept the challenge of developing scientific methods objectively to determine animals’ well-being.

The CAST report helped open farm animal welfare as a legitimate field of scientific inquiry in the U.S., and scientists quickly became more appreciative of the kinds of research that had been going on in Europe for some years. In response to public concern that the farm animal welfare movement had generated, the USDA awarded a grant of $830,000 to several universities to research various aspects of stress in farm animals. Although this relatively small grant was a welcome first step, scientists such as Dr. Fox remained concerned about whether all important aspects of farm animal welfare would be adequately explored through such research. In some areas, such as the raising of milk-fed veal calves, enough preliminary data exists to undertake a successful national public awareness campaign (see the Spring 1982 HSUS News). However, in other areas, we saw that more data would have to be analyzed and interpreted.

**New Publications, New Ideas**

Dr. Fox has now completed a new book which underscores the importance of animal-behavior studies in observing humane husbandry systems. Farm Animals: Husbandry, Behavior, and Veterinary Practice is a major reference text for students, researchers, veterinarians, agricultural engineers, farm animal scientists, and interested laypersons.

Farm Animals should provide the information needed by experts to formulate humane husbandry systems, codes of practice, farm animal welfare legislation, and guidelines. It established farm animal welfare as a scientific discipline in its own right, a discipline which needs to be incorporated into the teaching curricula of veterinary and agricultural schools for the benefit of not only the animals, but also all those involved in farming enterprises.

Farm Animals shows very clearly that most factory farming systems for livestock and poultry are stressful to the animal, cause unnecessary distress and suffering, and increase the animals’ susceptibility to infections and metabolic diseases. While much of the material in Farm Animals draws upon the decades of research done by European scientists, considerable supporting evidence from U.S. animal scientists and veterinarians is included as well. The data show clearly that, without extensive reliance upon drugs (a known consumer health risk), factory-farmed animals will have reduced productivity, profitability, and increased incidence of stress-related diseases. It is ironic that American researchers have ignored the implications of their own findings. To challenge factory farming could mean a loss of their jobs and research grants. It is understandable, even if it is ethically reprehensible, therefore, that the American Veterinary Medical Association’s Animal Welfare Committee gave a virtual carte blanche approval of factory farming in its first report to the membership. When serious animal health and welfare problems are denied and rationalized in this way, we must question the ties between organized veterinary medicine, the pharmaceutical industry, and agribusiness. It is difficult for veterinarians, like animal scientists, to be truly objective about the toll factory farming takes in animal suffering since their perceptions of intensive livestock and poultry farming are colored by their professional vested interests. So important do we consider Farm Animals that we are making the book an integral part of our public awareness campaign on farm animals. An HSUS press conference announcing publication of the book will be held in February in conjunction with Rep. James Howard’s office in the House of Representatives office building. Rep. Howard is the sponsor of H.R. 3170, the farm animal welfare bill under consideration in the House (see “Federal Report”). Representatives of the general-interest media, agribusiness trade publications, and appropriate congressional staff people will be invited to learn about this influential new book.

Dr. Fox has also prepared for The HSUS an informational monograph entitled Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet, which will strengthen the humane and ethical principles shared by those who feel a responsibility for the animals we use and exploit.

According to this publication, factory farming, in the long run, benefits no one—not the banks that hope to profit from a farmer’s two-million-dollar mortgage on a new pig “factory”; not farmers, consumers and taxpayers; not the animals. A big “factory” that relies heavily on drugs to boost animal production...
and prevent diseases that local farmers use, and generates food products that raise people's health. Its inherent problems create more jobs for research scientists and state and federal regulatory bureaucracies—mainly at taxpayers’ expense.

How all of us can “eat with conscience” to improve animal welfare, improve family farmers’ welfare, improve personal and family health; and, by eating less of all farm animal produce, contribute to the nation’s best interest and alleviate worldwide starvation is the important concern of Farm Animal Welfare and the Humane Diet.

While the picture is complicated, there is much that concerned humanitarians can do to help transform agriculture and improve the welfare of farm animals. If you buy meat first, to ensure that your diet does not in directly support the inhumane rearing of farm animals, buy only products from animals that have been raised under more humane conditions and received good care during the their lives, or during their productive lives on the farm. And, we have no direct way of knowing the in the grocery store which products satisfy these criteria. But, until livestock and poultry producer associations establish and enforce their own humane codes and humane labeling on all products, the conscientious consumer can, to some degree of accuracy, select produce on a somewhat arbitrary humane scale (on the opposite page). If you wish to include meat and other animal produce in your diet, this grading system will be helpful as a start.

In grading some husbandry systems as being more inhumane than others, there is no intention to suggest that farmers are deliberately cruel to their animals. Rather, many farmers have been obliged for financial reasons and co- ined to use less expensive and more easily industrialized factory methods of animal production. The good farmer should be either to go out of business and give up generations of traditional culture, wisdom, and methods that many would soon not use for obvi- ous humane reasons. There is a third alternative for a factory system: Build a factory that will serve taxpayers’ needs, and forge an alliance to be formed between con- sumers and all farmers who care for the welfare of their own land and livestock, be they owner-operators or cor- porate contract managers.

The humaneness of any husband- ry system is also influenced by the attitude of persons tending the ani- mals and the quality of care and at- tense given to each animal. While an intrinsically inhumane, restricting, depriving, or overcrowded and stress- ful environment for the animals can only be worsened by indifferent hu- man attention and barely improved by careful attention, the quality of human husbandry skill and high quality human attention, vastly different from the management techniques needed to operate a highly automated factory system.

Once you get used to the idea of being and eating with conscience, becoming more selective and conscientious comes easily and brings many other useful benefits. Better health and the certain knowledge that by changing your consumer habits you are making a personal contribution to improving the wel- fare of farm animals and actually helping to create a world of political and ethical entropy through self-imposed frugality. In the final analysis, this is enlight- ened self-interest.

Other Positive Signs of Change

Humane groups are not alone in their concern for the inhumane ab- solute existence of factory farm ani- mals can be improved. The drafting of humane standards for any number of agribusiness and their adverses on any adverse effect on human health and to examine the economic, scien- tific, and ethical consequences of animals’ welfare is a promising sign.

For the first time in the history of the U.S. Congress, there is a strong intention to look at intensive methods of livestock and poultry husbandry.

Some agriculture businesses, agricultural companies, and indi- vidual farmers are also making posi- tive contributions to enhancing farm animal welfare. The Quacker Corporation of the U.K. has established its “welfare” veal system in Amer- ica, and one major veal producer in New Jersey, American Feeds and Lib- orce and Lamb. Cotton, and bacon. Eggs. Veal.

A Scale of Husbandry Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>INHUMANE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products (milk, butter, cheese, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, duck, and chicken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditions**

- Dairy cattle are the least intensively raised and confined of all farm animals, although there are some large-scale dairy “factories” especially on the west coast.

- Animals have some freedom in deep-litter sheds and have a relatively short life, but conditions are often not conducive to animal welfare.

- Even though cattle are raised on grass/land (where over-grazing and impact on wildlife habitats are problems), most are “finished” on corn and legumes in feedlots, a questionable use of natural resources and plant resources.

- Beef cattle are subjected to hot-iron branding and are castrated and dehorned without anesthesia.

- While the majority of animals are not subjected to intensive confinement rearing, indiscriminate predator control in western states raises serious ethical and ecological concerns.

- Many (but not all) are raised and “finished” in total confinement, and breeding cows are often subjected to unnecessary privation, confined in stalls, or tethered to the ground by a short chain.

- Most eggs come from battery-caged hens, the birds usually being extremely overcrowded to maximize profits.

- “Fancy” or milk-fed veal is usually from calves raised alone in narrow crates that severely restrict their freedom of movement.

**A Scale of Husbandry Practices**

- *No system of animal production (including transportation and slaughter) can be considered absolutely humane. In essence, some methods and systems are less inhumane than others, rather than being humane per se.*
animal welfare is the issue of the nineteen eighties, and it won’t go away.”

The American Farm Bureau Federation objected to The HSUS’s Humane Education Curriculum Guide developed by The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education for use in schools. The Farm Bureau attempted to have this guide for teachers censored and blocked in Utah schools.

The Problems of Agribusiness

The over-reaction to this guide and to our farm animal welfare program has given us more beneficial publicity than we could have ever hoped for. It reflects the paranoia of capital-intensive agriculture that is creating its own nemeses (which we have termed “agricide”). The industry rationalizes and denies that it is inhumane to animals or responsible for increased consumer health risks from antibiotics and other drugs given to animals to boost productivity and to prevent diseases, diseases that are the direct result of the stresses of intensive confinement husbandry practices. Agribusiness continues to deny that it is responsible for pesticide, herbicide, and other agrichemical contaminants in our food and water and in our own bodies as well as responsibility for a decline in the quality of rural life, and the demise of the family farm, with thousands being forced into bankruptcy as larger factory farms take over and reap short-term economic advantages.

Future Directions

There are an estimated 700,000 small farms and part-time farmers in the U.S. now who do not follow agribusiness practices of chemically producing crops and raising animals in factories. These farmers are combating more and more regulatory and political pressure to comply and demand, while agribusiness is focusing more and more on raising crops and animals for export, and setting up colonies of U.S. agribusiness technology, genetic stock, and chemical and drug dependence abroad. Many states, such as New Hampshire, Vermont, and Michigan, are actively supporting the formation of marketing, distribution, and information networks for farmers who wish to sell their produce locally, by farmers’ markets. A cautiously optimistic rejuvenation of the small farm is occurring nationwide. These farms are concentrating on supplying local goods to suburban and urban areas within their regions. Agricultural college and USDA farm extension advisors are looking for information resources to help small farm operators. These resources are in great demand but short supply since most research and development has been focused on agribusiness’ factory-scale farming operations.

Consumers still have a choice between local and “health” foods, and processed foods, “convenience,” fast, and imported foods. But the choice is shrinking, as it is for finding animal produce from animals raised, transported, and slaughtered humanely. We should, therefore, support local farmers and “organic producers’ markets” and, at the same time, work toward humane and ecologically sound reforms in agribusiness.

However, in spite of the significant way that the farm animal welfare and agricultural reform movements have made, we should heed the Battelle Memorial Institute’s study entitled “Agriculture 2000—A Look At The Future.” But our forecasts also predict that there will be more and larger confinement systems of livestock and poultry production. Several studies have shown that these systems, requiring considerable capital to erect, are also costly to maintain and require considerable energy to run, in contrast with less intensive systems. Thus there are serious problems of, namely disposal, water pollution and air pollution with odors which prohibit confinement systems from populated areas. In less populated farming areas, they will contribute to the bankruptcy of local farmers, and since they are highly automated, they will contribute also to local unemployment. Manufacturers of swine confinement buildings have been strongly opposed by the Center for Rural Affairs in Nebraska, and local communities and the Michigan Federation of Humane Societies are actively opposing one company seeking over one million dollars in public funds to set up swine factories in Michigan. These systems benefit only the manufacturers, the power, pharmaceutical, and drug companies. The Battelle Institute predicts that genetic engineering will be an integral part of agribusiness enterprises. Genetically engineered animals may be even more dependent upon antibiotics and hormones to maintain health and productivity.

Conclusion

Our agricultural base is our life-support system, not simply the cornerstone of the industrial system. The social, ecological, and political ramifications linked with our concern for the welfare of farm animals have drawn The HSUS into a wide-ranging and complex arena. It is clear that we will have to continue our efforts to inform the general public, educate, encourage the small and medium-scale, humane farmer, support important legislation, and promote the long-term welfare throughout the eighties, and beyond: otherwise, the suffering of farm animals will become even greater and “agricide” may be irreversible.

HSUS Farm Animal Materials

Factory Farming (1980) describes in detail how farm animals are raised and what humane reforms are needed. $1.00.

Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet (1983), by Dr. Michael Fox, reviews the connections between how farm animals are raised and the hazards to human health that are the result. This report also gives details as to how one can “eat with conscience” to help reduce animal suffering, loss of natural resources, and improve one’s health. $2.25.

Humane Concerns of Factory Farming (1981), a slide show with cassette tape commentary on modern farming methods. (Script booklet included) $85.00.

Fact Sheets on Factory Farming (1983) Separate fact sheets on dairy cattle, veal, beef, laying hens, broiler chickens, and hogs describe how the animals are raised, what humane reforms are needed, and what you can do to help. $1.00 per set of six.

Farm Animals: Husbandry, Behavior, and Veterinary Practice (1984) A 288-page scientific book by Dr. Michael Fox, with an analysis of various intensive farm animal husbandry systems currently in operation in the U.S. and Europe and what reforms are needed. $19.95 (price includes a 20% discount for HSUS members).

and newspapers, have ranged from outright denial that factory farming can be inhumane to stating that our concerns were misinformed, sentimental, and anthropomorphic. One university professor and department chairman, in defense of the status quo, stated in an agribusiness magazine that “farm animals do not have emotions,” implying that they cannot suffer from the extreme dep­rivation, frustration, and crowding stress that are inherent aspects of factory farming.

Agribusiness, defensive because of consumer health concerns over nitrites, and hormone and antibiotic residues in farm animal produce, has been under pressure from organic farming advocates and farmers’ organizations that see agribusiness as a threat to the livelihood of the independent mid-sized family farm.

With the considerable media attention that the agribusiness establishment generated between 1980 and 1982 by their opposition to and denial of our concerns, fueled further by The HSUS’s nationwide “No Veal This Meal” campaign, the smoke screen began to lift. Agribusiness spokespersons proclaimed that “farm
Dealing With A Change In Your Pet's Behavior

by Martha I. Finney

Illustrations by Dianne Engleke

When a well-behaved animal suddenly starts to bark, spray, or chew the sofa, a change in your lifestyle may be the cause.

Susan and her husband waited a long time to have a baby. When Jeremy finally came along, they never dreamed that their gentle six-year-old, mixed-breed dog, Scarlet, would cause trouble. At first, Scarlet ignored the baby, but by the time Jeremy had started crawling, the dog had begun to growl and bare its teeth at the baby. The problem became so severe that the new parents realized they had to act or give up their beloved Scarlet for Jeremy's sake. They decided to consult an animal behaviorist.

This professional spent forty-five minutes in their home, observed the baby-pet interaction, and suggested a behavior modification strategy that has successfully preserved Scarlet's place in the family. The behaviorist noted that the smiling, barking baby was inadvertently inviting the dog to fight. Jeremy, in his crawling position, made eye-to-eye contact with Scarlet, and, in smiling, bared his teeth. These two factors spelled confrontation to Scarlet, and it returned the gesture by baring its teeth and growling—its way of saying "I was here first—beat it!"

Scarlet's unacceptable behavior was a symptom of its insecurity. The behaviorist told the worried parents that they had behaved to the dog what its place was in the family and show it that it wasn't lost its affection. Every time Scarlet threatened Jeremy, the behaviorist told them, they should clap their hands and shout, "Scarlet, no!" then offer the dog a toy as a distraction. The behaviorist also urged them to give Scarlet its own time with them by taking the dog for regular walks.

After three weeks of this consistent treatment, the parents noticed that Scarlet and Jeremy had become playmates.

"Now Scarlet really wants to be Jeremy's friend," Susan notes, "we had a success story and I'm glad of it."

Whenever pets suddenly change their behavior, the pet owner's anxiety, guilt, and grief can be just as stressful as the behavior itself. Instead, it is crucial for every member of the household to have a mental health or physical problem. In dealing with a troubled animal, the pet owner does not have the luxury of a shared verbal language with which to ask, "What's the matter with you?" The best people can do is try to avoid problems before they start, study the behavior problem to find the solution, and turn to a veterinarian, animal behaviorist, or humane society for advice.

For many of us, the final consideration is "How long can I tolerate this new behavior and what will I do once I can't?"

There is, of course, no such thing as a dog or cat guaranteed not to bark, chew, spray, scratch, dig, or soil the house. However, no pet is guaranteed the most stable, constant, and ideal conditions in which to live, either. Today, many pet-owning households break up in divorce; families and single people move from large houses to small apartments; and a home can change its cast of characters as family members move away, move in, get married, or die. Even in the most stable of households, someone is bound to go away to college and leave the devoted pet behind. The troubled pet might react to these changes by barking, destroying the furniture, spraying the room potted palm, or repeatedly jumping the backyard fence to wander the streets. The educated pet owner will try to keep a beloved animal safe and well-behaved by compensating for the unpleasant change, whatever it may be, and helping the animal cope. Although many changes in lifestyle are beyond the control of the pet owner, with insight and empathy, that person can control the pet's reaction to the changes.

Conversely, the careless or insensitive pet owner can also make matters worse. One woman, for instance, shared a spacious home with two very large, purebred dogs, three cats, and a basset hound. Everything was ideal: there was plenty of space, and the roommates worked at home so there was also companionship for the animals. Suddenly, however, the roommate had to move away and the set-up crumbled. The woman was left with one large dog, one cat, and a small efficiency apartment in which to live. When the dog, alone, missed the strange roommate, it took out its frustration on the small apartment. First, it attacked a pillow, but each day cost the woman one more item in the apartment, including the kitchen floor's peeling tiles. The dog chewed everything. Finally, after the apartment was virtually destroyed, the woman came home to bits of foam rubber, all that was left of the sofa. She had reached the end of her rope. She gave the dog up for adoption. Had she considered the changes from which the dog was suffering—losing home, daytime companion, and room to roam—she might have chosen to remain in the house and advertise for a new roommate. Or, she could have moved the group to a more affordable house. Because of her thoughtlessness, she, the dog, and her savings account suffered.

"Destruction," says Maryland-based animal behaviorist Ginger Hamilton, "is usually caused by stress. The owner can prevent it by recognizing that each home, human, and pet is different, Dr. Michel For, scientific director of The HSUS, defines a behavior problem in two ways: the behavior must cause the person stress and/or be indicative of stress in the animal.

The source of the animal's stress is not always immediately apparent. Scarlet, for example, was not stressed by the introduction of the new baby into the household; it was only when the baby was old enough to exhibit a threatening action that the dog reacted. If the behaviorist had simply jumped to the obvious conclusion that Scarlet resented the baby, the dog could not have remained in that house. It was only through understanding canine behavior that this counselor was able to pinpoint the exact problem and foresee that it could be solved.

Another young couple with a well-behaved, four-year-old dog moved from a cramped, one-bedroom apartment into a house with a large, fenced yard. To the casual eye, this was an ideal change. No longer could the dog or cat guaranteed the most stable, constant, and ideal conditions in which to live. The problem?
Is there a new baby?

The dog felt it had been banished to the back yard. It missed its regular evening rounds with the folks. "You'd think he would love the backyard as an outdoor haven with trees and squirrels and room to run," said the woman, "but the high point of his day was that regular 8:00 p.m. jog around the block with us." The couple, with their long experience of successful pet ownership, had to exercise a little extra insight in order to realize that the dog had been given an enlarged world, it still thrived on the daily, personal attention of its human companions. Once the evening ritual was returned to the dog's routine, the problem disappeared.

When a well-behaved pet starts showing troubling behavior, it's important not to react with anger. It's time to look around its environment to see what major element in its life might have changed, says Dr. Fox. Has its routine been modified? Has a beloved family member left home? Has the pet owner gotten married? Has the new spouse brought along a pet that was the favorite in the old household? If so, the dog may feel displaced. At best, a new pet owner going off to college, for example, will give the first pet companionship, diversion, and a thread of continuity. Don't, however, try to remedy an already bad situation by bringing in a second pet. "By the time people have the misbehavior problem," says Dr. Hamilton, "it's too late for a second pet." She also warns against having more than two cats in a household. Cats, however socially they may be, are not pack animals. Although a multitude of happy, multi-cat households exists, the situation can cause problems. One woman had five cats living in her home, and she inadvertently encouraged more visitors by installing a cat door. "I had a boundary dispute eventually became a screaming cat in hopes that, since the competition is eliminated, the spraying has finally stopped."

"Sometimes when we try to be kind and take in too many pets, we cause suffering and more problems," says Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals. "This example illustrates the suffering that can occur when you don't understand the species' normal behavior."

In worrying about a disruptive animal, it's important for the pet owner to keep a cool head and trace the cause of the problem as quickly as possible. As changeable as modern society is, there are few guarantees that pet owners can offer their pets regarding living arrangements and roommates. Although these may change throughout the pet's life, the responsible pet owner's love, care, sensitivity, and devotion will last.

Cocker spaniels tend to bark more than the average dog.

We've sold thousands of this best-seller over the past few years. Order yours now.

1. Shirts are royal blue with white print. The front reads: CLUB SANDWICHES, NOT SEALS! The back is a picture of a harp seal. Order HSUS T-shirts in honor of Seal Day. Shirts are available in MEN'S sizes S, M, L, XL (Small fits a small woman or large child). Shirts are $6 each ($5.50 each for 4-9 shirts and $5 each for 10 or more). Please send me _____ shirts at each.
2. I need _____ small _____ medium _____ large _____ extra large.
3. My check (made payable to The HSUS) for $_____ is enclosed.
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6. CITY __________ STATE ZIP
7. Please return this coupon with full payment, to SEAL SHIRTS, HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. Please allow 3 weeks for delivery.
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A recently concluded, year-long probe by The HSUS into accusations of animal cruelty on sets of movies and television programs has resulted in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) charging agricultural and animal abuse. For once, it looks as if a case of abuse of animals used by the entertainment industry may be investigated. In September of 1982, the HSUS received its first report that a tiger died as a result of cruel treatment. Ralph Helfer, directing business as “Gentle Jungle” for an amusement park in Moorpark, California, had died as a result of cruel treatment. Our initial investigation came from a young woman who had been a Gentle Jungle trainer assigned to that film. She told a terrifying tale of an animal that had been tranquilized so it could be dyed black for a movie. She had been fired after it was too late to save it. One of them corroborated the young woman’s account.

Through our original contact, we were put in touch with other former Gentle Jungle employees who told of equal or worse mistreatment of animals, including the beating and resulting death of an orangutan. Its crime? During a “soft” (i.e., not shocking) performance, it had fallen from the wire. One person after another emerged to relate their experiences at this facility, including the beating and resulting death of an orangutan’s crime? During a “soft” (i.e., not shocking) performance, it had fallen from the wire. One person after another emerged to relate their experiences at this facility, including the beating and resulting death of an orangutan. This mistreatment of animals is a continuing practice by Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.

Our West Coast Regional Office and the San Bernardino Valley Humane Society conducted a raid on a private sanctuary in California where they discovered a number of animals, including a bear owned by an animal trainer, in extremely poor condition. One of the animals, a kangaroo died during the filming of “The Thorn Birds.” The HSUS has been investigating the facility since 1981. The HSUS learned that one of the animals developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.

A movie like “The Barbarian” is not only used for wirestripping, but it also called for the hero to punch a camel and knock it to the ground. To guarantee that the camel fell, it was placed on a wheeled platform that was yanked out from under it. In another incident, a tiger, unable to say, the director got the animal to fall by tying a rope around the animal’s neck and pulling it. A kangaroo died during the filming of “The Thorn Birds.” The HSUS has been investigating the facility since 1981. The HSUS learned that one of the animals developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.

In reviewing permits relating to the seals used in the movie “The Golden Seal,” The HSUS learned that one of the animals had developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.

Our Department of Agriculture; kept it apprised of all developments; and continuously pressed it to initiate its own investigation. Rumors of pending legal action against Gentle Jungle circulated for months. At last, in November, 1983, we learned that USDA had charged Gentle Jungle with repeated violations of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). According to the USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service officials had cited Gentle Jungle for “abusing animals in violation of the Act on at least 30 occasions resulting in the death of various animals.” We had also kept the U.S. Department of Interior informed of our progress. It assured us that, as soon as it knew USDA had begun proceedings against Gentle Jungle, it would revoke the permits to deal with trainers who abuse animals, including a bear owned by an animal trainer, in extremely poor condition. One of the animals, a kangaroo died during the filming of “The Thorn Birds.” The HSUS has been investigating the facility since 1981. The HSUS learned that one of the animals developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.

The HSUS has been investigating the facility since 1981. The HSUS learned that one of the animals developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in exotic animal training.
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HSUS Periodicals: Many Ways to Stay Informed About Animal Welfare

We're glad we can count you as part of The HSUS, but we find many people aren't aware of the variety of periodicals we publish to serve the many different—and important—interests of those in animal welfare. All of these publications are prepared by The HSUS's nationally experienced professional staff. Shouldn't you order one today?

The HSUS News Quarterly membership magazine of The Humane Society of the U.S., with up-to-date reports on HSUS activities in national, international, and regional animal–welfare issues. $10 minimum membership contribution.

Shelter Sense A lively, unique, informative newsletter for animal-sheltering and -control personnel that offers answers to community animal problems. Ten times a year. $5 per subscription.

Humane Education A practical, colorful publication of The HSUS's National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, filled with activities and suggestions for classroom teachers and educators in animal-welfare organizations, animal-control agencies, nature centers, and zoos. Quarterly. $7 per year.

Animal Activist Alert A four-page, quarterly newsletter with the latest information on state and federal legislation and special activist campaigns. Free to HSUS members on our Action Alert Team.


I would like to receive these periodicals of The HSUS:

The HSUS News. Enroll me as a voting member of The HSUS ($10 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose

Shelter Sense. Enter a subscription to Shelter Sense ($5 for one year) and send me ten issues. I enclose

Animal Activist Alert. I am a voting member ($10 per year) of The HSUS. Please add me to the HSUS Action Alert Team.

Kind News I. Enter a subscription to Kind News I ($10 for 1 year) and send me 35 copies of each of 4 quarterly issues. I enclose

Kind News II. Enter a subscription to Kind News II ($10 for 1 year) and send me 35 copies of each of 4 quarterly issues. I enclose

Humane Education. Enter a subscription to Humane Education ($7 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose

Make checks payable to The HSUS. Please return this coupon to The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, along with your payment.

HSUS Loxahatchee Suit All But Stymies Hunt

The hunt that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) planned to hold in Florida's Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge took place in November, but, as a result of an HSUS lawsuit, it was quite different from what the agency had had in mind (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). In September, the FWS published final regulations for the hunt, a clear sign it was going ahead with its plans to kill up to twenty-seven deer out of a population of only 180 to 400. The HSUS immediately sued the FWS just before the hunt's scheduled beginning, asking for both a temporary restraining order and a permanent injunction against killing animals on land designated for their protection. We were joined in our suit by the Florida Federation for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and one of our Florida members, Defenders of Wildlife and the Florida Audubon Society sued on the hunt at the same time, and the cases were combined.

On October 28, Judge Louis Oberdorfer in Washington, D.C., granted our request for a temporary restraining order and transferred the case to Florida federal court. The next day, the government's attorneys tried to get the Florida court to hold an emergency hearing on their request to allow the hunt. The court refused, and the hunt was canceled for the first two of its three scheduled weekends. Then, a hearing was held in the Florida court to determine whether Interior Secretary James Watt had acted properly in approving a hunt for Loxahatchee. The judge decided that Secretary Watt had followed all the established procedures for holding a hunt, and that it could proceed. He lifted the restraining order and dismissed the cases, allowing the hunt, finally, to take place on the third and weekend originally scheduled. Twenty-nine hunters killed two deer during this abbreviated slaughter.

While we feel the judge's decision was not the right one, we are happy that our action resulted in canceling two out of the three hunt weekends, especially since the first weekend's hunters would have been allowed to use bows and arrows and muzzle-loading guns. (Secretary Watt had, earlier, decided to cancel a potentially damaging airboat hunt.)

This is not the end of the fight. Because the judge dismissed the cases without a full hearing "on the merits," and without a chance to present witnesses and additional evidence, we can and will sue the FWS again next year if it attempts to hold another hunt. Our public protest, in concert with other animal-welfare groups, at the refuge on November 12 was covered by national, state and local television and newspaper reporters and successfully made our point that a wildlife refuge is no place for hunting. This added public awareness may very well help us next year if we must make this fight once again.

***

In September, the FWS proposed allowing or expanding hunting on eight national wildlife refuges. This brings to over forty the number of refuges on which hunting has been allowed to encroach in just two years. The HSUS protested this irresponsible decision to the FWS in early October. We continue to oppose vehemently every one of these proposals as they come up, while demanding an end to sport and recreational killing of refuge wildlife.
The kinship of all living things served as the theme of the 1983 HSUS annual conference.

For the first time in seven years, the HSUS annual conference came to the southwest in October. No matter that three hundred animal-welfare supporters were venturing into the heart of rodeo country (although our anti-rodeo stand brought front-page headlines in one Ft. Worth newspaper)—our welcome in Ft. Worth was warm, nonetheless.

Wednesday's symposium, "Can Love Be Taught?: Empathy, Animals, and Education," co-sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education and the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, brought behavioral experts from across the country to The HSUS's forum. Drs. Michael Fox, Carolyn Zahn Waxler of the National Institutes of Health, Nancy Eisenberg of Arizona State University, and Stephen Kellogg of Yale presented papers during the morning session. Two panel discussions completed the afternoon.

One Thursday and Friday mornings, addresses by President John Hoyt, Dr. Richard Morgan of the Mobilization for Animals, Dr. Michael Fox, and Ms. Marilyn Wilhelm of the Wilhelm Schole in Houston gave conference participants different insights into and interpretations of the "All One Family" theme.

Both afternoons were filled with workshops—ten each day—to challenge and inform members, animal-welfare professionals, and humane society volunteers alike. What energy participants had left over fueled exploration of the colorful Texas countryside, attendance at the humane educators' sharing session, and touring the nearby Waterfall Ranch (see the Fall 1982 HSUS News) where endangered species are raised for eventual return to the wild.

Texan Charlotte Baker Montgomery, an educator instrumental in decades in bringing humane ethics into the classroom, received The HSUS's Joseph Wood Krutch Medal at Friday's banquet.

Each conference develops a unique personality and Ft. Worth's was no exception. The tightly-packed program, extremely comfortable accommodations, and unusually articulate, involved group of participants combined to make this conference among our most valuable and enjoyable.

California Bound
The HSUS will hold its 1984 annual conference in San Diego, California, from October 24 through October 27. What better way to fend off winter's icy blasts than to make plans now to join us in sunny southern California this autumn? Remember, our west coast conferences are always among our best attended. Don't miss this one. Program details will appear in the spring and summer issues of The News.
From Consciousness
To Conscience
Excerpts from
President Hoyt’s
Address

I recently received a letter from a gentleman in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, expressing dismay and concern over the theme of this conference, All One Family, coupled with the logo depicting a man and woman with the animals. He writes: “From this it is my impression that the author’s position (and in turn that of The HSUS) is that mankind and animals should be considered as one... While I am not a theologian nor a philosopher, permit me to quote such a man of world renown as Dr. Francis Schaeffer: Human life stands at a critical place because there is an unbreakable link between the existence of the infinite personal God and the intrinsic dignity of people. If God does not exist and has not made people in His own image, there is no basis for an intrinsic, unique dignity of human life... Consequently, to allow the devaluation of human life is wrong in principle. And if this is not enough for you, then pragmatically you must realize that it is your life that is being devalued.

“In summary,” wrote my correspondent, “I believe a theme such as that being used by The HSUS is indicative of the devaluation of human life that is rapidly growing in our society.”

Not unkindly, I replied to this gentleman: “We are certainly not suggesting by this theme that animals are in every respect equal to mankind, though we are most assuredly seeking to establish a much greater degree of respect, consideration, and compassion for animals. Why is it that you and others choose to conclude that in seeking to elevate the dignity and value of life in general, we are thereby devaluing human life? “I can only affirm that I believe human life takes on a greater degree of dignity and purposefulness when our compassion and care are extended to all creatures. In closing, let me quote the great author and philosopher Joseph Wood Krutch who wrote, ‘To be truly human has always meant to be compassionate.’

We are aware of the many cures from disease that have resulted from animal research; the many advances in human well-being and prosperity that otherwise would have lain dormant; of the possibilities for extended life and prolonged death research has made possible.

But what of the animals made to suffer in the process? What of the ethics that should control and circumscribe such uses, ethics born of a consciousness we believe capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, between dignity and obscenity, between compassion and cruelty? Are we native to believe such an ethic exists?

It is very difficult, indeed, to believe the research community is genuinely concerned about the quality of its research or the conditions under which the animals being used are housed, cared for, and frequently mutilated... If, as these ambassadors of human benevolence would have us believe, this is all for our own good, why so secretive? Why so unwilling to let persons—responsible persons—outside their own profession participate in these momentous decisions affecting our destinies? Why the unwillingness to support even the “more moderate” legislative proposals? Why? Because, if they did, they fear that much of what is now being done would no longer be tolerated or permitted. And they have long since decided that they, and only they, are capable of determining what’s good for us in this arena of life. We are not asked to participate; we are not wanted to participate; we are not permitted to participate.

The poet, artist, philosopher, and theologian are becoming conspicuously non-functional in our society. Their voices are but a whisper in a world gone mad with indebtedness which must indeed be redeemed with unstrained mercy and compassion... Yet herein lies the irony. For one would suppose, or at least hope, that out of consciousness grows conscience; that out of understanding grows feeling; that out of awareness grows sensitivity; and out of wisdom grows compassion. Can we hope that it will ever be so?

Truly, we who are the exploiters of animals, even when such can be judged either necessary or appropriate, are under a burden of indebtedness which must indeed be redeemed with unstrained mercy and compassion, the giving of which benefits not only the animal recipients but us, the givers, as well, making us ever more humane and, consequently, ever more human.

Richard Morgan, international coordinator for the Mobilization for Animals, chats with an HSUS conference participant at the coffee break after his Thursday address to the conference.

John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, and Ann Church, coordinator for state legislation, discuss pound seizure during their Friday workshop.

Director of Captive Wildlife Protection Sue Pressman fields questions on roadside menageries, one of Thursday’s workshop topics.

The “Pet Action Line” and Marty Stouffer Productions, Ltd., receive certificates of appreciation for their work on behalf of animals during Friday’s banquet. Flanking President John Hoyt are Sonny Black (left) of the “Pet Action Line” and Marshall Stouffer of Marty Stouffer Productions.
Each year, those who attend the HSUS annual conference offer and vote upon resolutions proposed for adoption. These resolutions set forth a course of action The HSUS strives to follow during that and subsequent years. Resolutions from previous years remain valid so long as they are appropriate.

National Wildlife Refuges
Whereas National Wildlife Refuges were established primarily as natural sanctuaries to protect, serve, and benefit wildlife; and Whereas most municipalities have no provision for the control of stray or even injured cats; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS actively pursue with the appropriate government agencies a moratorium on hunting in Grand Teton National Park.

Nutrition Studies in Schools
Whereas thousands of so-called nutritional experiments have already been conducted by secondary school students in which one animal is fed a healthy diet and another is fed junk food; and Whereas such experiments are often conducted in a haphazard manner, using animals that are unwanted, ill, and injured; and Whereas most municipalities have less effective control of dogs, but many have no provisions for control of stray or even injured cats; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS vigorously campaign to encourage municipalities, as well as humane societies, to provide for the control and protection of stray and injured cats.

School Science Fairs
Whereas students from primary grades through high school throughout the United States are encouraged and even encouraged to conduct experiments that cause pain and stress to animals; and Whereas many of these experiments are procedure-oriented, allowing students to give injections, perform crude surgery, or provide euthanasia, often with inadequate training; and Whereas there is often not enough supervision to assure that students provide adequate care, feeding, and

Hunting in Grand Teton National Park
Whereas national parks are areas to be preserved unimpaired for future generations; and Whereas it is a fundamental precept of national parks that the wildlife they contain be permitted to live a natural existence within the park; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS work to eliminate such cruelties at auctions, and in this endeavor enlist the aid of local humane societies and appropriate government agencies.

Livestock Auctions
Whereas livestock sold at public auctions are often subjected to cruel and unhumane treatment during loading, dragging, beating, whipping, and other harassment, and are frequently deprived of food, water, and proper veterinary care; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS encourage its members and the public to ask that schools not to allow these experiments.

Kosher Slaughter
Whereas shackling and hoisting of livestock before ritual slaughter is still practiced; and Whereas such method of pre-slaughter handling is inhumane and not part of ritual requirement; and Whereas products of such slaughter are being consumed by people of many faiths; and Whereas humane organizations and people of the civilized world are opposed to such methods of shackling and hoisting of live animals in the process of slaughter; and Whereas years of hard work and financial expenditure by various humane organizations have succeeded in developing a restraining pen where the animal can be slaughtered the ritual way, making the shackling and hoisting unnecessary; and Whereas the adoption and operation of this pen need the moral and financial support of the Jewish community; therefore be it
RESOLVED that this conference give its recorded thanks to The HSUS for its work toward the abolition of this cruel method of animal handling and replacing it with the restraining pen.

Transportation of Food Animals
Whereas food animals often suffer from inadequate food and water, severe climatic changes, shipping fever, injuries, and sometimes death during transportation; and Whereas the absence of adequate laws, lack of regulation of transportation, and poor handling practices contribute directly to the injury and suffering of food animals; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS work towards reducing the suffering of food animals during transportation by educating the public to the cruelty involved, enlisting the aid of local humane societies and working with government for the passage of legislation to establish humane standards for the transportation of these animals.

Whereas the National Dairy Council and its local offices donate white rats to schools for educational purposes; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS fight to ensure that the National Dairy Council stop its practice of donating white rats to schools and be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS work to eliminate such cruelties at auctions, and in this endeavor enlist the aid of local humane societies and appropriate government agencies.

FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS encourage its members and the public to ask that schools not to allow these experiments.
Fox Speaks Before Varied Groups

In September of 1983, the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems (ISAP)’s director, Dr. Michael W. Fox, addressed members of the Pet Food Institute at their annual conference in Washington, D.C., on the need for better public education (especially via television pet food commercials), responsible pet ownership, and understanding cats’ and dogs’ behavior and needs.

That month, Dr. Fox also attended the International Cat Show in Amsterdam, Holland, and gave an address to the European press on cat behavior, welfare, and animals’ rights. Upon his return, he gave the keynote address to the New York State Humane Association’s annual conference in Nyack, New York, emphasizing the connections between humane and environmental ethics and global survival.

In October, he spoke to the freshmen class at Tufts’ University School of Veterinary Medicine in Boston on applied animal ethology, animal awareness, rights, and the scientific assessment of animal welfare. He also gave a public talk at Old College, Reno, Nevada, as part of a lecture series on animals and attitudes, entitled “Duty and the Beast: Treatment, Empathy, and Survival.”

In December, Dr. Fox gave a public address sponsored by the Monroe County Humane Society in Bloomington, Indiana, and spoke to the Theological Society in Baltimore, Maryland, introducing the society to the concerns of the humane and animal rights movement. He also published papers on empathy presented at the joint ISAP/NAHA symposium during the HSUS annual conference will be published, along with other review articles dealing with a variety of topics from animal rights to abnormal behavior in captive and farm animals, in a new, annual review series. This will be published in book format, provisionally entitled Advances in Animal Welfare Science and Philosophy, being published in late 1984.

Well-orchestrated raids in two separate parts of the country have proved that long-term HSUS efforts to spur local officials to enforce dogfighting statutes are beginning to succeed. Our investigations department and regional offices have invested countless hours and logged countless miles to educate local law enforcement officials about dogfighting in their jurisdictions. The federal prohibition against dogfighting (part of the Animal Welfare Act) has been, to our disappointment, virtually unenforced by the Justice Department, and it has become all too clear that committed, well-planned action by local officials in our best hope to infiltrate dogfighters’ secretive, violent world.

This past summer, a raid on a fight in progress in Greenville, Illinois, carried out by state police and Bond County (Illinois) sheriff’s deputies, was termed “the smoothest we’ve seen,” by HSUS Vice President Pat Dickert (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). Seventy-five officers, many of whom were hidden in an opencovered cattle truck and surreptitiously driven to the fight location, stormed an isolated farm where sixty-five people from nine states were watching a dogfight in progress. HSUS investigators Franz Damlzer and Bob Baker and Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland accompanied the police to取证and assist with confiscating fighting dogs and equipment.

The HSUS offered a dogfighting reward of $2,500 for anyone who supplied information leading to the arrest of any of the people involved in the dogfight. Four of the people arrested were charged with attending a dogfight, a misdemeanor under Illinois law. Thirteen still await trial; the others either have pled guilty or forfeited their bonds (ranging from three hundred to five hundred dollars). Forty-seven dogs were seized.

**LONG-TERM EFFORTS REAP REWARDS IN DOGFIGHT RAIDS**
The Greenville action was a perfect example of HSUS and local police teamwork. According to newspaper accounts, surveillance of the farm had begun three months before the raid. In January of 1983, HSUS informants had told us that the owner of the farm, a known dog-fighter, had moved into Bond County. We, in turn, passed this information on to the police. Once the location and timing of the fight had been nailed down, the actual raid, involving helicopters and SWAT teams, took place without a hitch.

In October, yet another large-scale operation in rural Mitchell County, Georgia, netted fifty people attending an early morning dogfight. These were the first arrests made under a tough, new felony dogfight law in that state. This raid was organized by the Georgia Bureau of Investigations, with The HSUS, the Georgia State Patrol, and the Mitchell County sheriff’s department providing back-up assistance. This time, the tip came directly to law enforcement authorities; once they had an idea of where the fight was to be held, aerial and ground surveillance crews were able, eventually, to pinpoint the exact site in a wooded area. Then, the raiding party moved in. Two bloody dogs, too injured and weak to fight any longer, remained unattended in the pit as participants and spectators scattered into the woods. HSUS investigators and Regional Director Marc Paulhus aided the injured dogs as police, directed by a spotter plane overhead, concentrated on rounding up the fleeing sportmen.

In a tree near the pit, HSUS investigators found scales, used to weigh the dogs scheduled to fight, and nearby, bloodstained breaking sticks, used for prying open the dogs’ mouths. Two training treadmills, commonly used to build up a dog’s endurance through forced road work, and a water tank, in which dogs would have been forced to swim for long periods of time, were also identified. All evidence was photographed for later use in court.

Local assistance was provided by the Atlanta Humane Society and Fulton County Animal Control. All those arrested were taken to the Mitchell County jail for processing. On October 17, Mr. Paulhus appeared before a grand jury in Camilla, Georgia, where indictments were returned against all individuals for felony dogfighting and misdemeanor gambling. Three individuals—Harry Hargrove, the property owner, Robert Earnest Swetman, whose dog was reportedly in the pit at the time of the raid, and John Joseph Kelly, publisher of the underground dogfighting magazine The Sporting Dog Journal—were charged with commercial gambling.

The majority of those arrested pled guilty or nolo contendere (“no contest”) to the charges rather than face jury trial. A Mitchell County judge ordered these defendants to pay a $3,000 fine and gave them each a six-year suspended sentence. Others elected to take their chances before a jury.

Mr. Hargrove, Mr. Swetman, and Mr. Kelly were tried on October 24. The following day, the jury returned a guilty verdict on all three counts against Mr. Hargrove and Mr. Swetman. They were sentenced to cumulative jail terms of seven years and assessed $16,000 in fines. The third defendant, Jack Kelly, was found guilty of two counts. He received a four-year jail term and a $6,000 fine. These penalties were the highest on record anywhere in the country for a dogfighting offense.

This case demonstrated the tremendous benefits of cooperative law enforcement efforts. All of the involved organizations shared a commitment to eradicating dogfighting from their jurisdictions. We hope that stiff felony laws for malicious animal abuse, such as the one now in effect in Georgia, will provide a more realistic deterrent to future violators. It would be hard to believe that even dedicated dogfighters will again risk these kinds of heavy fines and long jail terms to conduct their business in Georgia.
A Poisonous Policy Reversal

On October 31, 1983, the Environ­
mental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a decision reauthor­
izing the indiscriminate and destruc­
tive poison 1080 for use against coyotes on western sheep ranch­
eries (see the Winter 1983 HSUS News). The poison will be distrib­
uted in small, single-lethal-dose (SLD) baits and in collars worn
around the necks of live lambs staked out to attract coyotes. The
only good news is that the EPA did not authorize the use of 1080
in carcass baits (dead sheep in­
jected with the poison and left out for coyotes—and any other ani­
mal—to eat). A highly toxic poi­
son, 1080 was originally banned by
then-President Nixon in 1972 be­
cause of its extreme hazards to human health and to hundreds of
thousands of non-target animals,
including birds and other wild
abies, and badgers. Then-EPA Adminis­
trator Anne Gorsuch had been
expected to make a decision on 1080
reauthorization in late 1982, but the upheaval at EPA put the poi­
san on the back burner for months. Despite our efforts to pre­
vent 1080’s return to the west­
ern ranges, the new team at EPA succumbed to ranchers’ demands
for 1080 in their arsenal.

The SLD baits are particularly
damaging because they can be con­
sumed by any animal that hap­

tons upon them, including pets. The
toxic collars, designed to kill
only the coyotes that actually at­
tack sheep, will be ineffective on
the many coyotes smart enough
to learn to bite elsewhere on their
prey’s bodies.

The HSUS believes that the
1080 collars and all uses of 1080
counterproductive to the live­
stock industry—since the use of
this and other poisons has never
given it any real relief—and in­
tolerably costly in terms of the
inhumane destruction of wildlife.
With its reauthorization of 1080,
the EPA only offers ranchers dead
wildlife, at best, a false solution
for an industry struggling with its
real problems of labor and hus­
bandry.

The HSUS and other environ­
mental and animal-welfare organi­
izations were deeply concerned
about the EPA action and appealed
the EPA action to the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Another Loss

Despite the best efforts of The
HSUS and our attorneys, we have
lost our appeal of the 1982 black
duck hunting season (see the Spring
1983 HSUS News). This was an
important suit, since it could have
aided our efforts to halt subse­
guent hunts. The 1983 season was
open as usual. The FWS did issue
regulations designed to reduce the
kill of black ducks by twenty­
five percent in the U.S. While we are
pleased that some ducks will be
saved, this action falls short of
our objectives for black duck pre­
servation, and we will continue
our efforts this year.

A Dangerous Amendment

While we were pleased with the
Senate’s action on Capitol Hill, we
were alarmed by the way the House
amendment prohibited 1080 from
buying animals or “other­
wise” saving them. The
language did not authorize DOD to use 1080, but our
amendment prohibited DOD from buying animals or “other­
wise” saving them. The
language did not authorize DOD to use 1080, but our
language did not have to grind to a halt
because it could have
had no enforcement at all.

The destruction of ani­
mal flesh by weapons in mil­
itary firing ranges is much more
extensive than human wounds. If
1080 firing ranges were banned,
the medical student might not
would not gain appropriate exper­
ience on animals and, in the case of
surgical procedures, might not

The HSUS language was also
included in the senate legislation
until Sen. Inouye weakened it at
the full-committee level. Sen. In­
ouye, a respected World War II

Pups Welcome Here

As the ninety-eighth Congress
finished its business for 1983, it passed a bill called the
Pets Protection Act, which will stop the widespread practice of
denying elderly and handicap­
pet owners the opportunity to keep their pets in federally sub­
sidized housing. H.R. 3539 states that no one will be denied an
opportunity to rent just because he
or she owns a pet.

Confusingly enough, H.R. 3539
was primarily a money bill having
little to do with housing regula­
tions of any sort. It became the
final stop for the pets-in-housing
provisions, originally introduced
by Rep. Leonard Lance of New
Jersey and Rep. Mario Biaggi of New
York, after several detours along the
legislative path. The
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and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) will write the regulations necessary to implement this new law. The HSUS will be working both inside and outside Congress to make sure that pets and pet owners will be well served.

Please write to Sen. Proxmire and Rep. Biaggi in thanks for their dedication to this issue.

**Best Bet in the Senate**

Legislation introduced by Sen. Robert Dole to strengthen the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) is our best opportunity in the Senate to protect laboratory animals. Although hearings on S. 657 were held in July, the bill now languishes in the Senate Agriculture Committee. The full Senate cannot vote on it until it passes that committee.

The Dole bill is wider reaching than the Walgren amendments in the House. It would set stricter regulations to reduce pain and suffering during experimentation and discourage researchers from proposing painful experiments. It would require each research facility to have an animal-care committee whose members would include a veterinarian and another person responsible for animal-welfare concerns and not affiliated with the facility.

The only other legislation dealing with lab animals in the Senate is S. 964, introduced by Sens. Edward M. Kennedy and Orrin Hatch. The Kennedy/Hatch bill would effectively ban the use of nonhuman primates in federal research, organizations dedicated to the humane treatment of animals. Only be required to acclimate new, and place thousands of wild horses or burros to be sold to slaughterhouses.

The senators tacked an amendment to S. 457, a bill to remove “excess” wild horses and burros from public land, which would require the removal of 3,500 wild horses and burros from western ranges every year by an aircraft round-up. They would then be transported to local humane organizations which would either find shelter for these animals or allow them to be sold, mainly to slaughterhouses. The sponsoring senators are trying to force those of us who never wanted the animals removed from the ranges in the first place to bear the moral burden of condemning them to death.

S. 457 gives the Bureau of Land Management the power to list the names of “excess” wild horses and burros. The current BLM adoptions--a horse program would continue but, under S. 457, BLM would have new authority to sell the unsalvageable animals to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. This commission would set in place of congressional and animal-welfare history as the catalyst that forces agribusiness and the public to examine the cruel methods of intensive production of farm animals. Those opposing the Howard bill are already distributing printed material to congressional offices stating that “it is the animal's right to die in its own way.” The Dole bill, to pass H.R. 1797, would prohibit the use of steel-jawed, legholde traps in the United States. As a result, two of the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Howard of New Jersey and John Melcher of Montana, are voting to remove their names from the bill’s list of co-sponsors. Other representatives have reported an increased trapping pressure in their offices. Trapping lobbyists are swamping house offices with information denying the cruelty of all traps.

It is vital that your representatives on Capitol Hill know how strongly you feel about the cruelty of animal suffering in laboratories. By writing to your senator, you can make a difference.

Any member of the Senate may be reached c/o The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. Any representative may be reached c/o The House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.
ANIMALS
It’s their world, too. But you’d never know it.

Take a look around you at the animals sharing our planet. Newborn calves thrust into solitary confinement grow up without room even to turn around. Millions of kittens and puppies are condemned to death annually because their owners didn’t care enough. Seal pups are brutally clubbed in the first step toward becoming fashionable fur coats.

With your help, The Humane Society of the United States can give our animals the protection they deserve.

Already, we’re speaking out against senseless killing and cruelty toward animals, helping to improve conditions for laboratory animals; and end the brutality of clubbing seals, trapping with steel-jaw leghold traps, and harpooning whales.

I want to join The Humane Society of the United States and help protect animals.

Membership categories:

- Individual Membership—$10
- Sustaining—$100
- Family Membership—$18
- Sponsor—$50
- Donor—$25
- Patron—$100 or more
- Supporting—$50

I am enclosing an additional contribution of $_________ to assist The HSUS.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________ State ______ Zip ______

Membership includes a year’s subscription to The HSUS News and periodic Close-Up Reports.
Make checks payable to: The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037

Gifts to The HSUS are tax-deductible.

Southeast

Southern Seminars
The North Carolina Humane Federation held its annual conference on November 11 and 12. Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus conducted three workshops at that meeting, on dogfighting and cockfighting investigative techniques; exotic animals as pets; and investigation of roadside menageries. At the same conference, HSUS Director Anna Pessmire was honored for her many years of service to the North Carolina Humane Federation. The program attracted sixty participants.

Director Paulhus also led a one-day workshop on investigations at a two-week-long animal-control workshop in Panama City, Florida, in November. The Bay County Humane Society sponsored the session, which drew participants from as far away as Arizona and Puerto Rico.

Fall Round-up
The Great Lakes office has worked hard this autumn to repeal pound seizure in Chicago. Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, presented testimony on the proposal at a hearing in September; we are now waiting for a report from a subcommittee assigned to study the issue further. We urge Chicanos to contact the Great Lakes Regional Office (735 Haskins Street, Bowling Green, OH 43402) if they can help with our efforts to pass this measure.

No “Soft Jaws”
The New England Regional Office and state animal-welfare groups plan a campaign in Connecticut against a new, padded-leghold trap to be introduced by the Woodstream Corporation (see “Tracks”). The world’s largest trap manufacturer has proposed the new trap as an alternative to the inhumane, steel-jawed version opposed by humane groups for decades. Regional Director John Dommers wrote the Connecticut legislature’s environment committee, citing Woodstream’s previous resistance to such a trap as an indication that the manufacturer itself doesn’t believe its own product is a realistic option. Mr. Dommers is now working to organize a coalition to outlaw the steel-jawed, leghold trap in Connecticut.

Spring Workshop in Connecticut
A session of The HSUS’s popular workshop, “Solving Animal Problems in Your Community,” will be co-sponsored by the HSUS’s Connecticut offices in Mystic, Connecticut, from April 26 through 28. Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president, companion animals, Bill Smith, director of the HSUS’s Animal Control Academy, and other experts will lead informative and practical sessions to help participants increase their skills in dealing with community animal problems. Contact the HSUS New England Regional Office, P.O. Box 762, East Haddam, CT 06423 for details.
Into the Jaws

For the first time, supporters of a ban against the steel-jawed, leghold trap took their cause directly to the major manufacturer of traps in the U.S. In an action organized by Trans-Species Unlimited, approximately 500 demonstrators marched down Main Street in Lititz, Pennsylvania, to the headquarters of the Wood-Stream Company. Trappers jeered (see HSUS and the Environment John Gran­den in this issue).

New Pet Law
Part of New York

New York City Mayor Ed Koch has signed into law a bill which permits tenants to keep pets in apartments. The bill protects tenants from later, arbitrary enforcement of “no pets” clauses landlords haven’t enforced within a lease’s first three months. Under the new law, landlords can disallow any pet which causes damage, is dangerous to other tenants, or is a nuisance. Regional Director Nina Austenberg wrote Mayor Koch of HSUS about this bill, calling it a prototype of pet-owning tenant legislation for other communities.

North Central Office Opens

The HSUS has opened a new regional office in the Chicago, Illinois, area. The North Central Regional Office will serve the needs of the animal-welfare movement in Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and Missouri. It will extend HSUS programs for the prevention of cruelty to animals into communities where animals have little or no protection. It brings to eight the number of HSUS regional offices.

Frantz Dantzler, director of investigations from HSUS headquarters in Washington, D.C., has been named regional director. The office is at 1907 175th Street, Lansing, IL 60438.

Gulf States

Red-faced in Runge

In the midst of sweltering September heat, Gulf States investigator Bernie Weller led the Runge, Texas, sheriff’s department in an investigation of an unusual cattle starvation case. Approximately thirty of a herd of seventy-five animals on a local ranch had been allowed to die from starvation and thirst. Such cases of abuse are usually hushed up by cattlemen who don’t want to be embarrassed by the publicity surrounding livestock cruelty and have the political clout to make sure details don’t reach the public. However, in this case, the owner of the cattle decided to plead guilty to several counts of animal abuse. He received fines and expense payments totaling fifteen hundred dollars and one year’s probation. He agreed, in addition, to construct watering lines and provide proper food for his remaining animals. The publicity surrounding this incident should serve as an example to cattlemen of the consequences of neglecting livestock in their care.

“Mission of Mercy”

In what was called “a mission of mercy,” West Coast investigator Eric Sakach assisted the Humane Society of San Bernardino Valley (California) and other animal-welfare officials in removing more than fifty animals from a ten-acre compound that once served as a sanctuary for homeless creatures. The owner of the facility, an elderly woman, had been caring for unwanted dogs, cats, and other animals for over twenty-five years by herself. In recent years, it had become apparent that she could no longer do the job alone, and the humane society had been supplying food and labor to keep up the standard of care. Eventually, however, the woman refused this aid and conditions worsened considerably. Mr. Sakach, humane society staff members, veterinarians, animal-control officers, and fish and game wardens met to plan a course of action. Authorities obtained a search warrant and removed twenty dogs, twenty-seven cats, two pigs, a burro, a monkey, a tortoise, a bear (which reportedly had appeared on the “Beverly Hillbillies” television series some years ago), and a number of fowl. The bodies of thirty cats, discovered in pens and buildings on the property, were also removed.

The animals were released to a wildlife specialist for proper care and treatment; the dogs and cats were taken to a city shelter.

Animal-welfare agencies plan to seek a court order to restrict the owner from possessing animals other than personal pets in the future.

Idaho Update

The standard conditions found by investigator Eric Sakach in an Idaho animal shelter last year are now a thing of the past. The town had been using an airless, converted railroad boxcar as a shelter and disposing of its dead animals in an open pit (see the Spring 1983 HSUS News). Mr. Sakach suggested a number of urgently needed reforms to town officials, who now report the construction of a new, properly equipped city animal shelter, the hiring of a full-time animal-control officer to care for impounded dogs, and the retaining of a veterinarian to perform euthanasia as needed.

Western Academy

The HSUS Animal Control Academy will hold a two-week training session in Portland, Oregon, from February 27 to March 9, 1984, for animal-control and humane society personnel. Contact the West Coast Regional Office (1713 J Street, Suite 305, Sacramento, CA 95814) for details.
Adoption Dilemma

In 1981, at least two local societies operating shelters were sued or threatened with a lawsuit if they refused to take in any animal, even if brought to them by the household of a new owner. In both cases, the old owner demanded that the dog be returned, and the issue of whether to return the animal immediately was the crux of the case.

These cases have a great potential for disrupting the adoption process and the time and energies of society officers into defending suits. There are a few steps a shelter-operating society can take to protect itself in these cases, assuming that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

1. A shelter should review its internal procedures to ensure that it complies with the local law mandating that animals be held for a certain period before being adopted or euthanized. A record-keeping system which identifies individual animals and documents the length of time each animal was held is vital.

2. Establish a legal statute or ordinance under which you receive stray animals and for which you are liable if not adopted or otherwise disposed of them. The statute or ordinance should be written to confer legal title to the animal and to provide for a right of appeal to the holding period and other required procedures. The statute or ordinance should also provide that the society is not liable for damage to the animal or persons in its care.

3. Be sure that your adoption procedures do not encourage or create the impression that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

4. Be sure that your adoption procedures do not encourage or create the impression that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

5. Be sure that the policy is not interpreted by the courts as a contractual or implied promise of future care for the animal.

6. Be sure that the overall policy is in keeping with the legal requirements and the public interest.

7. Be sure that the policy is consistent with the law and the public interest.
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Make Your Plans for Seal Day 1984!

March 1 is the traditional beginning of the season when harp seals come in from the seas and give birth to their white pups. For the past three years, on March 1 The HSUS and dedicated individuals throughout the country have joined together in celebration of this new generation of seals and all seals suffering at the hands of man.

This year, March 1 is particularly important because we will be working on a very special project—promoting the development of a new international treaty that will protect rather than exploit the northern fur seal on the Pribilof Islands, off Alaska. Now is our chance to end the commercial and political exploitation of these seals, but we need your help.

Ever since 1911, the Soviet Union, Japan, Canada, and the United States have conducted commercial fur seal “harvesting” under the Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals. The U.S. government pays the Aleut Indians who live on the Pribilofs to kill the seals. The skins are then divided among the signatory countries. This original treaty was designed to prevent pelagic sealing as well as control the amount of seal clubbing on the Pribilofs. However, it has not worked.

The North Pacific fur seal population has been rapidly declining by eight to ten percent each year. This treaty expires October 1, 1984. It must be renegotiated this year. Now is our chance to pressure our senators to support a treaty which would protect seal interests, rather than commercial ones.

Here in Washington, D.C., The HSUS will host a special Seal Day reception in Congress for the senators and their aides. HSUS Krutch medalist Paul Winter will be our special musical guest, and we will distribute materials depicting the annual slaughter that occurs on the remote Pribilofs.

To publicize our need for a new treaty, ask your city officials to declare March 1 “Seal Day.” Hold candlelight vigils, bell-ringing events, and peaceful, friendly demonstrations at your senators’ offices. Ask your senators to work for and support a treaty to protect seals, not exploit them. And, be sure to distribute HSUS fact sheets on seals and our “Club Sandwiches Not Seals” T-shirts.

The HSUS is currently preparing an action packet which we will send you at no charge. It contains reproducible fact sheets and the successful HSUS 1981 resolution adopted by Congress making March 1 the official National Day of the Seal. Remember to contact HSUS regional offices to let them know you’re interested in taking part in whatever activities are already planned and to fill them in on your projects.

This can be our year to end the killing of Pribilof seals. With our coast-to-coast energy, that dream just might come true!