A Dim But Certain Light

One of the most tragic and awesome responsibilities accepted by the vast majority of animal-sheltering facilities throughout the length and breadth of this country is that of euthanasia. Unlike those few “no kill” facilities that are motivated by a concern and compassion for homeless animals, those who endure the burdensome and thankless task of euthanasia go the second mile in extending mercy to those animals no one wants or will accept. Except for their forbearance during the past many years, the enormous suffering of these victims of human irresponsibility and greed would have been much greater, and the number of unwanted animals roaming country lanes and city streets or permanently confined in sheltering cells would have been overwhelming.

But euthanasia has never been the answer to the enormous overpopulation of unwanted animals—not will or should it ever be. Rather, it has been at best a remedial stopgap while a permanent cure was being developed and administered, a cure which is slowly but surely beginning to take effect.

During the past several years, The HSUS has aggressively promoted the three-fold concept of legislation, education, and sterilization (LES) as the most effective means available for eradicating the unwanted animal problem and has vigorously insisted that any animal-welfare organization worthy of the name must make this emphasis a number one priority.

Elsewhere in this edition of The Humane Society News you will read the very positive and encouraging statistics resulting from a conscientious commitment to this program in numerous cities and counties throughout the United States. And, though the final numbers are not yet compiled and analyzed, it is clear that a major step has been taken toward reducing the pain and suffering that otherwise would have been experienced and that the light at the end of the tunnel, though still dim, is nonetheless certain.

While these results are surely cause for rejoicing, they are not cause for complacency, for not enough animal-welfare societies have made LES a major priority; not enough veterinarians have joined wholeheartedly in this endeavor; not enough communities have embraced effective animal-control programs; not enough “puppy mills” have been eliminated; and not enough pet owners have become responsible pet owners. When all of these shall have changed for the better, then the dim but certain light shall surely become a beacon.
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The top ten cat names were Sam/Samantha, Kitty, Tiger, Boots, Princess, Patches, Muffin/Muffy, Smokey, Fluffy, and Tom. While 1982’s top cat name, Kitty, only slipped to number two, the top dog name, Max, dropped to fourteenth.

Other more creative names reported among the animals given up for adoption were Foggy Bottom, Taj Mahal, February 14, Piffle, Mallet, and Danger Red River. Now, if only their former owners had used some of that creativity to come up with ways to keep their pets rather than unloading them at the animal shelter....

We consulted with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and provided help and assistance to defray the cost of feeding. The HSUS does not always think artificial feeding is the best way to handle wildlife problems. Feeding maintains numbers of animals at a higher level than the habitat can support, and wild animals often have trouble recognizing and digesting foods other than their natural ones. However, we believe each situation should be evaluated individually and, in some cases, such as these, feeding is clearly appropriate. We’re happy that many animals made it through the winter due in part to our contribution.

Feeding Starving Animals

This winter has not been an easy one for wildlife. In December, pronghorn antelope in Wyoming following their usual migration path to their winter feeding grounds were stopped by a thirty-two-mile fence erected by a local rancher. Millions of television viewers saw news footage of confused and frightened antelope running back and forth in front of the fence, trying unsuccessfully to jump over it. The HSUS as an organization demanded that the fence be taken down, as did many of our members individually. Wyoming Governor Ed Herschler and a host of federal officials responded to public pressure and finally convinced the rancher to let the state take down sections of the fence so the pronghorns could get through.

In Florida, endangered brown pelicans were starving because the unusually cold weather made their food hard to find. The HSUS sent funds to a group in Florida that fed the animals to get them through the critical period.

In Utah, the unusually cold winter and deep snow were taking their toll on deer and elk. Many of you saw a national news report on this situation in early January.

Help come too late for this starving antelope. Many other animals have been helped through HSUS assistance to local groups feeding wildlife hit hard by this winter’s extreme weather.

Pet Win

Results are in for the 1983 Dog Writers’ Association of America annual writing awards and, once again, The HSUS News has received a top award. Former staff writer Julie Rovner’s Spring 1983 article “Do Tenants Feed a Petless Future?” won first place in the category of best single article in a special-interest magazine. This is the second year in a row a News article has received this award.

Meat-Eating Danger?

On January 23, while the meat industry was launching its “National Meat Week,” The HSUS held a press conference of our own to discuss the connection between the treatment of farm animals and consumer health.

Dr. Michael Fox, The HSUS’s scientific director, was the main speaker and attracted a standing-room-only crowd of reporters to Washington, D.C.’s venerable National Press Building. Using a slide show which, in contrast to the meat industry’s happy media hype, showed how grim “life on the farm” really is, Fox presented persuasive evidence of how unhealthy environments in factory farms produce unhealthy animals. These animals are injected with and fed antibiotics, arsenic, and other toxic chemicals that ultimately could be ingested by humans.

“Consumers are at risk when they purchase meat and poultry products found in most supermarkets,” said Dr. Fox. “Behind the clean and wholesome-looking packaging lies the reality of food animal production: a treadmill of animal stress and disease, confinement conditions, and biological manipulation.”

Dr. Fox pointed out that The HSUS sees the increasingly inhumane treatment of animals as the core “of a serious problem in our nation’s agricultural system.”

The costs of this cruel treatment to farm animals will be passed on to the consumers. The currency will be the quality of our health. Dr. Fox also distributed to his audience copies of his new book, Farm Animals: Husbandry, Behavior, and Veterinary Practice, the first scientific approach to farm animal welfare. This book is available to HSUS members at a special discount price of $19.96.
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One-third fewer animals are currently being handled in surveyed U.S. animal shelters as compared to late 1971 and early 1972, according to a recent HSUS survey. This fact appears to confirm the significance of increased animal legislation, education, and sterilization as a means of reducing the number of unwanted animals.

The survey, the most comprehensive national polling of community animal programs ever undertaken, has revealed this heartening after returns stop trickling in. That the number of animals, particularly dogs and cats, handled by shelters decreased by 32 percent in a little more than ten years is the best evidence so far that comprehensive animal legislation combined with concerted human education and sterilization efforts—termed LES by The HSUS—can affect the chain of events that has led to nationwide pet overpopulation.

The HSUS mailed 3,225 surveys in July of 1983 to societies and animal-control agencies on its mailing list and to agencies in selected cities with a population of 25,000 or more. Out of 684 surveys returned, 51 groups provided data that could be compared with responses to a similar but less comprehensive 1972 HSUS survey. Of the 51, groups handling over 1,000 animals annually (The HSUS estimates that there are approximately 1,800 in the U.S.) provided the most complete information about local human and animal populations, sterilization programs, number and age groups of sheltered animals, euthanasia methods, budgets, and licensing programs. Smaller shelters, while no less important to communities, were excluded from the analysis for this reason.

Several factors besides LES also may have influenced the decline in the number of animals handled by shelters. Survey returns suggest that the number of shelters in the U.S. has increased since 1972. This has, perhaps, spread among more organizations the animals being handled in any one community. An unrelated study shows that the total number of households owning dogs or cats has declined (the demand for pet dogs decreasing and demand for pet cats increasing) over the past decade. Perhaps, too, as the public has learned more about the fates of sheltered animals—some must be euthanatized; others may be sold for research—pet owners have declined to relinquish their animals to shelters. Nonetheless, the hard data points to the conclusion that shelters are more successful than ever before in coping with pet overpopulation and irresponsible pet owners with the help of the LES plan.

Positive as these findings are, one grim reality remains for many sheltered animals: there has been little positive change in the percent of animals that must be euthanatized because responsible, loving, lasting homes cannot be found for them within an acceptable time period. In fact, 34 of the 51 shelters responding to the HSUS survey indicated that, overall, in late 1971 and early 1972, these organizations euthanatized 63.57 percent of the dogs handled. By 1982, that figure had risen to 68.02 percent, more than a 4 percent increase. Thirty-six shelters responded that, in 1972, 59.83 percent of cats handled were humanely euthanatized; the figure grew to 62.35 percent in 1982. Much has been accomplished, but there is an even greater need for The HSUS’s LES blueprint for reducing pet overpopulation.

Our experience has shown that only a small percentage of animals in shelters can be placed in responsible, loving homes. Therefore, The HSUS does not advocate high adoption rates but, rather, high adoption standards. Lax adoption procedures cause further animal suffering when new but unfit pet owners abuse, abandon, or give away pets. According to the 28 groups reporting adoption data for both the 1972 and 1983 surveys, the number of dogs adopted from shelters decreased by 1.74 percent during the decade. Cat adoptions increased by 0.91 percent during the same period—a slim gain. More dogs than ever were reclaimed by their owners between late 1971 and 1982. There was no detectable change in the number of reclaimed cats. With fewer dogs now handled by shelters, more of them euthanatized, fewer adopted out, and more than ever reclaimed, it seems there are fewer unwanted, stray dogs. This is good news, but there are still too many homeless dogs. Cats suffer even more by comparison, and according to HSUS Director of Accredita-
Improving Things in Paradise

Strict leash laws, recently en­acted in the Hawaiian Humane Society, have noted improved animal control and welfare, with less wasted money and, certainly, less wasted life, she observes.

One well-known example of an or­ganization that is emphasizing LES is the Animal Control Division of the City of Charlotte (2700 Toomey Ave., Charlotte, NC 28203). Accord­ingly, Lisa Morris, greater public awareness and, certainly, less wasted life, she observes.
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Fewer animals are adopted in Charlotte. There were 780 dogs adopted in 1982, for example, as opposed to 3,086 in 1972. Careful screening of potential adopters means adopted animals are less likely to bounce back to a shelter later, or worse, be abandoned or abused.

"Stray and unwanted animals create a costly control problem that continues to escalate at an enormous rate," says Ms. Quisenberry. "Although sterilization is available today, not enough pet owners choose to have their animals spayed or neutered because of the cost of the surgery and the lack of education regarding the results of animal overpopulation. The need for reduction in growth of the animal population and the escalating cost of animal control activities warrant the involvement of local government."

The Calhoun Humane Society (64 S. Edison, Battle Creek, MI 49017) oversees animal problems in a predominantly rural area that includes the city of Battle Creek. The area’s population has grown by over 41,000 over the past ten years. Although the animal population is difficult to estimate because of the area’s rural nature, former director Shirley D. Hilk provided impressive humane society statistics for 1982 compared to those in 1972: the number of sheltered dogs has decreased by nearly 4,000 in ten years, the number of sheltered cats nearly halved.

One is doing something right in Calhoun County. Shelter Manager Mike Pearson said the society enjoys its best results from educating shelter visitors about the need for spay/neuter surgeries before they leave the premises. He said the society operates the only shelter in the entire county, and the group assists low-income pet owners with spay/neuter fees on a case-by-case basis, sometimes paying for the entire operation.

The group’s volunteers handle an educational program. Once a cat or dog has been adopted, the society requires that a new owner have it spayed in over sixty days. Thereafter, the new owner must have the animal altered by six months after it is six months old.

Mr. Seales, director of the department for the past six years, says six paid employees promote ongoing humane education throughout the community of 35,000. Mr. Seales hosts a one-hour radio show, "Top Dog," every Monday through Friday plus a Saturday morning show, "Responsible Pet Ownership." Beginning soon will be a five-minute weekly television show, "Dog Gone," which will feature dogs and cats improving their week plus a "pet of the week."

"You never know who you will reach over the radio," says Mr. Seales, "and our one-on-one relationships with shelter visitors have really increased responsible pet ownership. We visit schools, too. Four years ago, I had to ask community and business groups to let me speak to them about animals. Now, they’re asking me to speak, and my schedule is full."

In 1971/1972, only female animals were spayed at the shelter, but an October 1983 ordinance requires that all male and female cats and dogs be altered within thirty days after adoption. This has likely helped reduce the number of sheltered dogs, says Mr. Seales. Actually, the number of cats entering the shelter increased from 87 during 1971/1972 to 1,684 in 1982. Cats were not regulated by ordinance in 1972; therefore, they weren’t routinely impounded. In 1980, the animal ordinance was revised, and now cats must wear a rabies tag at all times or else be impounded. Although cats can still be unlicensed, Mr. Seales and co-workers are improving them under the new law, as the figures indicate, and he is optimistic about a future cat-licensing requirement. "We’re taking the cat-restraint issue one step at a time," he said. "Cat licensing is not a popular subject. It brings people ‘out of the woodwork,’ but I believe we will see a reduction in the number of cats entering our shelter, combined with improved cat control, over the next five years."

The Calhoun Humane Society concentrates on long-range planning, and the board of directors is steering more progressive. The shelter will soon be remodeled.

A complete summary and analysis of the HSUS surveys will be available in several months. Questions or concerns can be answered by the Companion Animals Department, The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037; telephone, (202) 452-1100.

Deborah Reed is editor of Shelter Sense, published by The HSUS.
Cats—catty pensive, placid, perpetual, stoic, striped, spotted, and calicoed—crowd the world of painter Thaddeus (“Uncle Tad”) Krumeich. And, to the delight of all of us at The HSUS, we are able to introduce our members and friends to his work through a set of note cards now available (see the front cover and inside back cover of this issue). Mr. Krumeich’s cats flourish not only in his note cards and paintings but also on collector’s plates, prints, and greeting cards. Their is a glorious, slightly old-fashioned world where every window and china cabinet is filled with antique toys, blooming Giant poppies, topiary, and a moonlit lookout for authentic touches that appeal. He prowls antique shops and flea markets for additions to his collection of antique trains, boats, and wind-up toys, and once brought home a perfect bit of lace he found on a doily in an Indiana restaurant. (It later surfaced in one of his paintings.) “My paintings are like memories—or the distilled essence of an experience,” the artist explains. Even the cats seem other worldly—“There is always the lookout for authentic touches that make his artistic conceptions so appealing. He prowls antique shops and flea markets for additions to his collection of antique trains, boats, and wind-up toys, and once brought home a perfect bit of lace he found on a doily in an Indiana restaurant. (It later surfaced in one of his paintings.) “My paintings are like memories—or the distilled essence of an experience,” the artist explains. Even the cats seem other worldly.”

Mr. Krumeich, who paints from life (and only rarely from photographs) twelve hours a day, seven days a week, has definite ideas about why a particular cat appeals—or so it seems,” the artist laughs, “The last one arrived with the cat wearing a hat—what patience it has!”

“Uncle Tad” takes inspiration from one of his neighbors.

Born in New York City, Mr. Krumeich spent his early years summing in Southampton, New York, where he now makes his home. He started drawing at an early age and helped to design his high school newspaper. After stints at New York University and in the Navy, he returned to civilian life working at a New York advertising agency. He then returned to NYU and taught art courses to help with his college expenses. (He later earned a masters degree at Columbia University.)

Teaching art turned into practicing art; he undertook commissions for commercial publications such as The Reader’s Digest, Family Circle, and Women’s Day and, then, went to work for the children’s textbook publisher Silver Burdett in Morningside, New York. There he discovered his talent for portraying dogs, cats, and other animals. He saw the demand for his trompe l’oeil (or “eye-fooling”) primitive style in—since they look as though they could disappear from their creator’s carefully constructed scene at any moment, perhaps to reappear in another one.

His passion for electric trains and an interest in gardening and travel aside, Mr. Krumeich donates his talents to his local humane society, UNICEF, and now, to The HSUS.

His future holds plans for an art show in Carmel, California, next year, a series of jungle paintings, and a set of figurines, in addition to the musical cat plates. Although the audiences for his plates and his paintings differ, believes Mr. Krumeich, they share in common a desire to enter the small, brilliantly colored, self-contained world captured by the artist’s eye.

We are sure that The HSUS’s members will want to join them.

“Peaches and Cream” were on one of the first collector’s plates done for the Anna Perenna company.

“Uncle Tad” takes inspiration from one of his neighbors.

MR. KRUMEICH'S CATS

‘The Krumeich’s Cats by Deborah Salem

Giant poppies, topiary, and a moonlit night surround a table in one of Thaddeus Krumeich’s “trompe l’oeil” paintings.
Twentieth Century Cruelty

Nineteenth Century Custom Leads to Twentieth Century Cruelty

In the 1860s, when the first humane societies were founded in the United States, the pathetic spectacle of cart and carriage horses dying in their traces on city streets was a common one. One hundred and twenty years later, horses are still dying in city streets, victims of the “picturesque” carriage trade in American cities as far-flung as Chicago, New York, New Orleans, and San Antonio. In these and other cities, as few as 3 and as many as 120 horses pull carriages filled with visitors from tourist attraction to attraction. Every day, they must compete with urban noise, traffic congestion, fumes, and driver recklessness. They are, on occasion, overloaded, struck by cars, starved,Denial in hot and humid weather. There were no heat-related incidents in 1983, even though the summer was a hot one in New York. The ASPCA’s Elinor Molbegott attributes the good record in part to that organization’s enforcement of the hot weather ban: “Our inspectors would keep track of the temperature and tell the drivers when to come in.” The HSUS board member and New York City resident Regina Bauer Frankenberger is supporting a bill to limit carriage horse work only during cool months, more rest periods, drinking fountains, and horse inspections were added. Accounts of horses bolting, carriages being overturned and drivers trampled sounded comic at first, but they were followed by reports of one horse dying from azoturia (a condition causing muscle paralysis, common in work horses) and of another with an open wound, poor coat and poor muscle tone.” This luckless beast had been hit by a car while pulling a carriage only a few months before. Such incidents caused Gulf States Regional Director William Meade to speak out against carriage horse businesses in the crowded cities in his region. The problems he articulated were many.

• Insufficient water and sanitation facilities
• Carriage horse businesses in urban environments everywhere. Even setting minimum standards, such as those in New Orleans, cannot eliminate all potential dangers to horses that must struggle day after day in bumper-to-bumper traffic.

When the city of Corpus Christi, Texas, was considering adding carriage horse permits to its tourist attractions, Mr. Meade sent a letter outlining the problems to city officials. In a second letter, he reiterated HSUS opposition to all carriage horse operations but did offer a list of minimum standards that should be adopted as legal requirements should the city insist on allowing them. Among them: 4 hours of work a day per horse;

- a maximum of four hours of work a day per horse;
- properly fitted rubber shoes on every horse;
- drivers experienced in livestock handling and driving;
- sufficient drinking water available to horses at their passenger pick-up point and the midpoint of their route; and
- an ordinance of emergency veterinary treatment.

In Chicago, where 60 carriage horses operate in a five-square-mile area near the “Gold Coast,” Executive Director of Animal Care and Control Peter Poholik has been trying to formulate an ordinance specifically addressing the carriage horse trade for all potential dangers to horses. The ordinance, which is supported by The HSUS, contains specific requirements, such as maximum hours worked in a day, minimum standards for stable facilities, use only of horses in good health and at a proper body weight.
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When the city of Corpus Christi, Texas, was considering adding carriage horse permits to its tourist attractions, Mr. Meade sent a letter outlining the problems to city officials. In a second letter, he reiterated HSUS opposition to all carriage horse operations but did offer a list of minimum standards that should be adopted as legal requirements should the city insist on allowing them. Among them: 4 hours of work a day per horse from 12 noon to 7 p.m., when the temperature exceeds 90°; a maximum of four hours during peak rush hours of 7 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.; a week of recuperation for every two weeks worked for each horse.
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Genetic Engineering: Cornucopia or Pandora’s Box?

by Dr. M.W. Fox and Linda Mickley

Introduction

Genetic engineering, to those familiar with Aldous Huxley’s ominous futuristic novel Brave New World, evokes images of society’s改革委ins with the genetic potential of humans to create a strict caste system. Currently, however, genetic engineering technologies promise to open new vistas of diverse and splendid research in a variety of fields.

Medical scientists are rapidly perfecting methods of producing scarce or expensive hormones and vaccines from genetically modified cells. For example, insulin needed by diabetics can now be manufactured by bacteria purifying it from stomachs of slaughtered calves. Technological development coincided with the finding of vaccines using modified tissue cultures rather than live animals is well under way. The experiments that led to the perfection of these techniques took place in well-monitored laboratories dealing with microorganisms that are genetically changed.

Agricultural and animal scientists are also riding the crest of the wave of genetic research. Many of them view this research as a bonafide means of significantly improving the world food supply by developing drought-resistant crops, plants that grow in salty soil, and animals that grow faster and yield greater quantities of milk and meat. The social good, a very noble and of immense potential benefit to modern society. Several darker, negative aspects of genetic engineering do exist, however, and these must be examined and understood.

One is the issue of care and welfare of genetically manipulated farm animals. A second is that of the cost-effectiveness of maintaining such animals. A third is the possibly dire consequences of accidental or deliberate release of genetically modified organisms into the environment. Lastly is the recent ruling by the Supreme Court that allows for altered life-forms to be patented, raising serious ethical questions as to how the public should allocate financial and consumer support for genetic engineering.

We must begin to address these issues now in order to prevent much potential animal suffering at the hands of over-zealous scientists and producers, as well as to avoid the probably irreversible damage to our environment. We must reach humane, ethical conclusions in order to act responsibly.

Traditional Methods of Manipulation

The practice of genetic engineering, per se, is not limited exclusively to recent laboratory breakthroughs. Mankind has been exerting a calculated, external pressure on the genetic material of plants and animals since the dawn of domestication by selectively breeding for desired characteristics. Nowhere is man’s long-time influence more evident than in the astonishing diversity in form and function of our breeds of domestic dogs. To realize that human intervention alone is responsible for the myriad breeds that have been produced from one common canine ancestor is truly amazing. The flip side of this bright coin is that much of the over-specialized selective breeding of dogs has resulted in the perpetuation of inborn defects and the expression of chronic degenerative diseases, such as hip dysplasia. Such disorders, defects in the genetic blueprint of the animal, do not change. A calf from one or two young.

Producers could conceivably induce the development of fetters in animals which normally bear only one or two young.

and, unfortunately, commonly accepted. This is especially true in the case of farm animals. Genetic manipulation via selective breeding has created many, if not all, of our modern farm breeds in the U.S. For instance, we have extremely high-producing dairy cows that must be managed expertly in order to avoid several severe metabolic disorders which cut short their milking careers and their lives; genetically selected broiler chickens that become lame because their joints are damaged by too-rapidly-growing muscle mass; laying hens that are genetically programmed to lay more eggs in less time at the cost of becoming “burned out”; and hogs, selected for long back, leanness, and rapid growth, that are more susceptible to stress.

Inter-breed hybridization (such as the creation of mules from the breeding of a donkey with a horse; artificial insemination (which allows for the impregnation of females without having the male actually on the farm); super-ovulation (in which a high-producing female is hormonally stimulated to produce more ova than normally); and fertilized-ova or embryo transfer (a technique whereby fertilized eggs can be removed from the mother and grown in an incubator until a second female are also entrenched in modern animal-production science. All, with the exception of inter-breed hybridization, respect genetic boundaries: no matter how the egg was produced or fertilized, the species itself does not change. A calf will always result from artificial insemination with bull semen of a cow; whether the ova was the product of super-ovulation or normal cycling. Inter-breed hybridization, which does cross species lines, is a relatively new phenomenon, and although a live baby mule will result from a horse/donkey cross, nature does exact a price. All mules are sterile.

The Search for “Perfection”

Modern animal scientists and producers seem determined to create the farm animal that produces the most in the shortest time span and on the least feed and tolerates the human-made, controlled environments of the intensive system. This search for the “perfect” cow, chicken, or pig can be sidetracked by the unpredictability of the inheritance of de-
The "perfect" farm animal is now more likely to be produced in the laboratory than in the barn.

**Some Experiments of Note**

While these newest methods of genetic manipulation involve intricately detailed laboratory techniques, the basic principles behind them are reasonably straightforward once a few concepts are clarified. Simply put, the chemical of inherited traits for all living things is packaged in DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid). The strands of DNA (the actual genes) from the strand in one cell and transferring them to another cell. With the right encouragement, this alien gene will insert itself into the DNA strand of the second, or "host," cell. This "recombinant DNA" (so called because it has recombined with the host's gene) will be copied right along with that genetic material when the cell divides. In this way, introduced genetic material and the traits for which it codes, can be made transmissible to future generations. When such a procedure is performed between cells from unlike species of organisms, it is known as "transgenic." A recent transgenics experiment has captured the interest and imagination of animal-production scientists. A fertilized mouse embryo was inserted with a gene from a rat. The inserted gene was the one responsible for the production of the hormone that dictates growth. The embryo was then transplanted into a female mouse and allowed to develop and be born. The young mouse that received the rat gene grew to twice the size of a normal mouse. Transgenics has opened up a whole new frontier in animal production because it allows scientists to cross species boundaries. In this way, genetic engineers can "add" desirable traits from one species to a different species. The gene believed to be responsible for the twinning phenomenon is an example. Twinning is common among Australian Merino sheep, and its positive identification and isolation from these animals is well within the realm of the possible. Using these genes, producers could conceivably induce the development of litters in animals which normally bear only one or two young. Additional research is being directed at genetically modifying the microorganisms that live in the digestive tracts of ruminants (cud-chewers such as cows, sheep, goats, and deer). The naturally occurring microbes assist the animal in breaking down and utilizing foods high in fiber, such as grass and leaves. Modification of the microbes to be able to digest substances not usually digested by the animals would be almost anything they do as long as the microbes can be transmitted in a way they can survive and be recycled in a way the animal will be fed almost anything thing so long as the microbes can be transplanted at the proper time and in the proper medium. K. Proctor already feeding cattle waste cardboard and chicken feed; what else would these altered organisms be capable of eating and using?

**Humane Considerations**

The fervor with which genetic engineers and animal-production specialists are approaching genetic modification of our farm animals must be tempered not only with humaneness and regard for animals' welfare but also by consideration of several important, timely questions. What guarantees exist that such tampering with genetic material will not create mutations or monsters? How many of these unfortunate creatures must be produced and discarded in the search for the "perfect animal—production plant"? Can we really say with any amount of certainty or peace of mind that the development of the ultimate cow, pig, or chicken is worth the cost in terms of the probable loss and suffering of many experimental animals? Let us assume for the moment that experiments can give rise to cows as big as elephants (as one social philosopher has already postulated) or pigs as large as beef cattle. Certainly, common sense alone tells us that such animals will produce more meat and milk, but at what cost to them, us, and our environment? It is conceivable that they will require more feed, different housing conditions, and cause increased manure disposal problems. The genetically engineered farm animals of tomorrow may present the same problems as do the selectively bred factory—farmed animals of to-day: the economies of scale will force the farmers to raise more animals than they can realistically humanely care for. The vicious circle of treating production diseases with drugs will begin anew, and the consumers will again be taking the risk of eating animal products that have harmful residues.

Will these animals be capable of being genetically adapted to adjust psychologically to their larger sizes and increased production and growth demands? Will these animals be capable of being genetically adapted to adjust psychologically to their larger sizes and increased production and growth demands? What of the more aggressive strains or breeds of animals to make them larger would be foolhardy. The basic alteration of an animal's genetic make-up does not automatically preclude its response to stressful or unhealthy conditions. Such animals may become even more dependent on drugs just to meet the demands placed on them by their new internal constitutions.

As a result of the development of the few farm animal breed types "best suited" to human needs, scientists would, in essence, be practicing the genetic equivalent of putting all of one's eggs in one basket. The world has lost genetic diversity at an alarming rate just through the extinction of farm breeds. In the British Isles alone, twenty—three breeds of livestock have become extinct this century. The Lincolnshire Curly Cut Pig, now extinct, was a robust, outdoor—type hog with an unusual coat of long white hair. No one will ever know what contributions this breed might have made to the modern swine industry in developing hogs that can live comfortably in colder climates. The Suffolk Ram was a Hardy breed of cow capable of producing quality yields of milk even when kept on poor pastures and given the commonest of feeds. Had it survived, this animal might have made significant contributions to a modern dairy industry always looking for ways to increase production while minimizing feed intake and expense.

The loss of genetic diversity through extinction is not the worst of all possible scenarios. The prac-
were not ominous enough, the genetically engineered mice used in some labs seem to have developed entirely new types of hereditary maladies. Large herds of genetically altered farm animals may also be prone to new hereditary diseases that would show up in the population only after several generations or lack the ability to cope with infectious diseases.

Long-term Considerations

All of these humane and animal-welfare arguments for the prudent use of genetic engineering are important to any discussion of the issue. No discussion of this type, however, would be complete without mention of the possible ecological consequences of the accidental or deliberate introduction of altered lifeforms into the biosphere.

Granted, short-term commercial benefits may be garnered from the release of certain bacteria into the soil or of the planting of specifically altered crops. One example is the bacteria that lowers the temperature at which fruit will form, effectively protecting plants from damage during cold weather. Another is a strain of food crop which could be made to grow in dry or salty soil, allowing utilization of certain arid areas. These organisms sound wonderful on paper and could conceivably help grow more food, but the interrelationships between plants, their pests, the soil, and the effects they have on the ecology of the area are so complex that the true ramifications of such actions might not be comprehended until irreversible damage has been done.

An ever-widening circle of organisms is now afforded protection under patents. The patenting of organisms is not, in itself, a recent development. Asexually reproduced plants (those not grown from seeds) have been patentable since 1920, but the inclusion of certain seed-propagated plants just ten years ago has added another dimension. Such protection has been criticized widely by many breeders, small farmers, and environmentalists who claim that the patenting of genetic material has great potential for abuse. The HSUS has decided that industry can exercise exclusive control and private ownership over any genetically engineered lifeform it creates. This ruling has not only reduced the definition of life to an assortment of its physical and chemical components but also managed to give private enterprise exactly what it needs to charge ahead with its misused and selfish notion that living things and their constituents are nothing more than raw materials to be manipulated, reengineered, and capitalized on. From here, it is only a short step for industry to begin regarding animals and their own exclusive creations without inherent rights or worth, not unlike other manufactured goods.

The potential for abuse is an extremely ominous aspect of the ability to patent lifeforms. Genetic engineering, by dint of its power to tamper with the very blueprint of life, the gene, may well give to the few the power to decide which are "good" genes and which are "bad" genes. How can you preserve and perpetuate the "good" genes while the "bad" ones possibly phased out, to be lost to the gene pool forever.

Conclusions

Genetic engineering technology can be regarded as either the ultimate tool with which to produce new species or a dangerous Pandora's box. The same sort of two-pronged problem occurs 20 years ago with the advent of powerful pesticides, herbicides, and other petrochemical derivatives. The potential social and economic impacts were the same as those today; venture capital has always found new technologies areas ripe for investment and exploitation.

In response to the growing body of the public and those persons in government and private industry involved in genetic engineering to act to prevent animal suffering and negative ecological consequences.

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director and Linda Mickley is research assistant for The HSUS.

The Fourth Annual Day of the Seal was celebrated on March 1 throughout the nation. March 1 is traditionally the first day of the birthing season for harp seals. To The HSUS and other animal-welfare groups and individuals, this day also symbolizes the rebirth of hope for all the world's seals.

In Washington, D.C., The HSUS gave an evening reception for representatives, their aides, and other figures key to the issue of protecting seals. Over 300 guests gathered in the Senate Caucus Room to celebrate the day and to discuss strategies for protecting the North Pacific fur seals which have been clubbed, at taxpayers' expense, throughout the twentieth century.

"In addition to our continuing concerns about the humanness and esprit de the United States conducting an annual seal harvest, there is now serious concern about the very survival of the seal population," said HSUS President John A. Hoyt to the gathering of legislators and animal-protection groups. "The North Pacific fur seal population has drastically declined and continues to decline at a rate of eight to ten percent per year. Progressive action is needed to reverse the decline and restore the seal population.

In his speech to the guests, Sen. Carl M. Levin pointed out the irony of the Interim Convention on the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals. The treaty which calls for the annual slaughter of the seals, "You don't save seals by killing them, you save seals by stopping their slaughter," he said.

Musician Paul Winter performed for the guests between the speeches. As the house lights dimmed and a seal slide show was projected on a large screen behind him, he played moving musical interpretations of the marine world and the songs of seals on his soprano saxophone.

The HSUS's fight to protect the North Pacific fur seals has several elements. First, we are demanding (continued on page 28)
Psychological Experimentation on Animals: Not Necessary, Not Valid
by Dr. John Mc Ardle

The concept of an animal model can no longer be fully defined by the traditional meaning of a model; now, however, we have humane alternatives in the study of such diseases. In those instances where a case may be made for the scientific validity of using an animal species as a substitute for human beings, a prerequisite is that the animal and human examples of disease must share similar symptoms, causes and mechanisms, and responses to treatment. The concept of an animal model cannot be generally applied to situations in which a specific problem originates within a specific animal itself. Such problems are unique to each type of animal and include all aspects of behavior, both normal and abnormal. Animal models will always be directly relevant to understanding the complexities of human behavior since behavior results from a complicated interaction between the human brain and its genetic heritage and the complex society in which that brain functions. These factors are all unique to human beings.

In theory, if a laboratory animal was exposed to an infectious agent, developed the disease, and was cured by some experimental treatment, there was a high probability that a similar approach would also cure humans afflicted with the same problems. (At the time, this was a valid use of the concept of an animal model; now, however, we have humane alternatives in the study of such diseases.)

W hatever's dictionary defines torture as "the infliction of pain (as from burning, crushing, or wounding) to punish or coerce." Although it would be inappropriate to apply this concept to all areas of biomedical research, it is the founding principle and fundamental characteristic of one area of scientific investigation, experimental psychology. By this we mean the use of laboratory methods to study animal behavior as a model of human behavior. Animals used in experimental psychology are routinely exposed to severe pain, physical and behavioral stress, heat, cold, electric shock, starvation, and mutilation. Scientists condone and routinely expose to severe pain, physical and behavioral stress, heat, cold, electric shock, starvation, and mutilation. Scientists condone and describe the complex functions of the human mind and to create animal "models" of human mental disorders.

Laboratory animals have been used as models of human diseases since the mid-nineteenth century. Their use in experimental psychology, however, only dates from the work of the Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov in the early part of this century. Scientists initially hit upon the idea of substituting animals for humans in the study of infectious diseases. In theory, if a laboratory animal was exposed to an infectious agent, developed the disease, and was cured by some experimental treatment, there was a high probability that a similar approach would also cure humans afflicted with the same problems. (At the time, this was a valid use of the concept of an animal model; now, however, we have humane alternatives in the study of such diseases.)
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and appear unaware that it is, to quote Dr. Heim, "crassly unscientif-
ical, to make a point with data which are rel-
vant but do not lend themselves to this quantitative approach." This de-
sire to ennoble science (biology, chemistry, physics) may explain experimental psychologists' preferences for working with the stan-
dard laboratory animals of the biol-
ogical sciences, the rat and the mouse.

Experimental psychologists des-
pairately want to be thought of as biomedical researchers. For one rea-
son, they do all the status, trap-
ings, paraphernalia, attitudes, and activities of "typical" classical scien-
tists such as biologists. It is interest-
ing to note that when researchers in the natur-
atory animal veterinarians, and tech-
nicians are asked to identify the one field of all science which involves the greatest abuses, has the least scientific foundation, and offers, at best, minimal relevancy to human medi-
ical problems, they often identify experi-
mental psychology.

In a recent, extensive published
literature in experimental psy-
chology, it quickly becomes obvious
that nearly all research falls into
basic categories: (1) observations that, from our own collective experience, are intuitively obvious, (2) observa-
tions that could be derived from hu-
man clinical studies, (3) information available from observations of natu-
ral, free-ranging populations of the same animal; and (4) studies simply not worth doing, either because they are not science or involve an unac-
ceptably high moral cost.

Some of the most abusive and ethically questionable studies in ex-
perimental psychology purport to
examine aggression and stress. Roger Ulrich, who was one of the principal in-
vestigators in that field, having, in his studies, repeatedly forced two animals to fight one another. He now admits to conducting studies that were essentially redundant and useless. He finally decided that to help stop human aggression, he would first have to cease his "torturous experiments." Not only has he stopped his experiments but he has also repudiated them as irrele-
ant to the study of human aggres-
sion. Dr. Ulrich summarized his own
discipline by noting that "behavior-
al science and its applied technology have evolved into another religion in which animals are used as sacrificial objects. Like the faithful of ancient times, we kneel at an altar of a
deviation rationalization, where the high priests of laboratory research are paid to perform painful rituals on other life forms so that hu-
man suffering will be driven away.

Many of the typical experiments in experimental psychology can be re-
placed with comprehensive studies on human patients suffering from various psychological disorders, on normal individuals in various social and ethnic groups, or by observing animals in natural habi-
thats.

Psychological experimentation on animals has one unique characteris-
tic of interest to animal welfare. It among all scientific dis-
ciplines is the ideal candidate for complete elimination! No major sci-
entific endeavor would suffer by such an act.

As long as the general public re-
ains unaware of the suffering and tempt iduced upon animals used in experi-
mental psychology, and we continue to allow experimental psy-
chologists to play at being scientists
without the rigorous intellectual foundations we expect from the basic biomedical sciences, even the increase in knowledge of psy-
chological testing, an organization of psy-
chologists has been working to change the way their colleagues view their lab-
oratory animal research. Over 250 psychologists have joined Psycholo-
gists for the Ethical Treatment of
Animals (PsyETA) to encourage the
American Psychological Association (APA) to address ethical issues in
animal experimentation.

PsyETA was formed, according to Dr. Kenneth Shapiro, its presi-
dent, as a response to the growing criticism of psychological testing on ethical grounds. Shapiro points to the work of Dr. Harry Har-
low and others at the Primate Lab-
oratory of the University of Wisconsin as some of the most famous, influ-
ential, and, to many minds, diabolical experiments perpetrated by the
scientific community. Repeated stud-
ies of maternal deprivation and "in-
duced psychological death" forced in-
fant monkeys to live for months at a
time in isolation with only a surro-
gate "monster mother" as solace. These ingeniously designed wire and cloth monoliths were "blasted [their] babies with compressed air...tried to shake the infant off their chests...posses-
sed an embedded catapult which peri-
odically sent the infant flying [or]
carried concealed brass spikes which
would emerge upon schedule or de-
mend," according to Dr. Harlow. Total social isolation, another Har-
low-created condition, created mon-
key infants so emotionally disturbed that they died of self-induced starva-
tion. Such experiments are, according to Dr. Shapiro, "unconscionable" and "an affront to scientific integrity." Dr. Joan Field, former presi-
dent of the Maryland Psychological Association, has joined PsyETA. She be-
lieves that "there have always been some scientists and psychologists uncomfortable with Harlow-type re-
search."

Although not successful in its ef-
forts to convince APA to establish a
separate ethics committee to deal with animal-welfare issues at the APA meeting last summer, PsyETA has made a number of positive moves to influence psychologists to review their concept of animal research.

"Many scientists have not consid-
ered other, non-animal scientific op-
tions," says Dr. Joan Field. "It is possible to conduct human research and human research, and it is bet-
ter research."

New Scientific Group Has Humane Focus

While the case of Dr. Edward Tanb, the psychologist convicted of cru-
elty to monkeys in his Silver Spring, Maryland, laboratory (and whose con-
version was overturned on a techni-
cality) has riveted animal welfarists' attention on animal abuse in psycho-
ological testing, an organization of psy-
chologists has been working to change the way their colleagues view their lab-
oratory animal research. Over 250 psychologists have joined Psycholo-
gists for the Ethical Treatment of
Animals (PsyETA) to encourage the
American Psychological Association (APA) to address ethical issues in
animal experimentation.

PsyETA was formed, according to Dr. Kenneth Shapiro, its presi-
dent, as a response to the growing criticism of psychological testing on ethical grounds. Shapiro points to the work of Dr. Harry Har-
low and others at the Primate Lab-
oratory of the University of Wisconsin as some of the most famous, influ-
ential, and, to many minds, diabolical experiments perpetrated by the
scientific community. Repeated stud-
ies of maternal deprivation and "in-
duced psychological death" forced in-
fant monkeys to live for months at a
time in isolation with only a surro-
gate "monster mother" as solace. These ingeniously designed wire and cloth monoliths were "blasted [their] babies with compressed air...tried to shake the infant off their chests...posses-
sed an embedded catapult which peri-
odically sent the infant flying [or]
carried concealed brass spikes which
would emerge upon schedule or de-
mend," according to Dr. Harlow. Total social isolation, another Har-
low-created condition, created mon-
key infants so emotionally disturbed that they died of self-induced starva-
tion. Such experiments are, according to Dr. Shapiro, "unconscionable" and "an affront to scientific integrity." Dr. Joan Field, former presi-
dent of the Maryland Psychological Association, has joined PsyETA. She be-
lieves that "there have always been some scientists and psychologists uncomfortable with Harlow-type re-
search."

Although not successful in its ef-
forts to convince APA to establish a
separate ethics committee to deal with animal-welfare issues at the APA meeting last summer, PsyETA has made a number of positive moves to influence psychologists to review their concept of animal research.

"Many scientists have not consid-
ered other, non-animal scientific op-
tions," says Dr. Joan Field. "It is possible to conduct human research and human research, and it is bet-
ter research."

Mobilization Against Psychology Experiments

On August 24, 25, and 26, the Mobilization for Animals, of which The HSUS is a major spon-
so, will going to the American Psychological As-
ociation's annual meeting in To-
ronto, Canada.

On Friday, August 24, the Mo-
bilization will sponsor an indoor concert in the Toronto area. On Saturday, August 25, participants will gather in a park to prepare for a massive demonstration going to the downtown hotel serving as head-
quarters for the APA meeting. At 1 p.m., all participants will be fea-
turing celebrities and speakers from national humane organizations, will begin.

In the near future, we will be speaking out more specifically, both to our members and to the public, on how the "scientific" abuses in psychological testing can be fought and, eventually, halted completely.

This infant rhesus monkey raised with a cloth-covered surrogate mother was one of the subjects studied by Dr. Harlow and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin Primate Laboratory.

Infant rhesus monkeys in social depriva-
tion studies conducted by Dr. Har-
low and his colleagues at the Univer-
sity of Wisconsin Primate Laboratory during the 1960's.
After years of struggle, a law to ban all uses of the steel-jawed, leg-hold trap has been passed in the state of New Jersey. Under the bill’s provisions, the traps cannot be used by their yellow HSUS decals announcing that ‘EVERY FUR COAT Costs a Life.’ When the day came for the state to pass the bill and send it to the governor for signing, Mrs. Austenberg was in the chamber with her own child and several others.

They had been working for this ban and were delighted to be present when it finally passed the legislature. The trappers, knowing, finally, that passage of the trapping ban was inevitable, had only a handful of professional lobbyists present at their last hurrah.

The trappers fought us hard all the way. They claimed that trapping was a useful industry; provided necessary extra cash for thousands of low-income individuals; aided in the control of rabies and wildlife populations; and was not cruel to the animals. Very recently, they had claimed that a trap manufacturer had invented a “new,” humane, steel-jawed leg-hold trap (see the Winter 1984 HSUS News).

But our arguments proved to be more persuasive. All along, we have contended that nothing could justify subjecting animals to the intense pain and suffering that trapping’s victims must endure. Studies have repeatedly shown that trapping does not prevent rabies, and, in fact, may help to promote it. The padded trap was not a humane trap—just a last-ditch effort in the trap ban.

Assemblyman D. Bennett Mazur, sponsor of the ban in the assembly, was uniring in his efforts to have the ban passed. Although we were glad to have the ban take effect immediately, the final bill provided that the law becomes effective no later than sixteen months after the governor signs it. All of the animal-welfare groups strenuously objected to this compromise. This means the trappers will have one more season to suffer and kill before the trap. During that eighteen months, Rutgers University scientists will perform a study to determine whether alternatives to the steel-jawed trap are available. If there are reports that alternatives exist, the ban on the steel-jawed trap will go into effect immediately. Since a seven-year battle by animal activists in New Jersey and Massachusetts has already identified sixteen alternatives to the steel-jawed trap, Rutgers will agree with this comprehensive study. (Of course, the HSUS is not in favor of all trapping programs and species, however, our first priority has been to ban this particular trap.)

As the ban comes into effect, we started a campaign to ban the trap statewide. The HSUS news that alternatives to the steel-jawed trap are available.

The ban on the steel-jawed trap has been resoundingly defeated because of erroneous and misleading information circulated by the trapping industry, animal-welfare advocates have had to work hard to regain their momentum. Rhode Island and Massachusetts have recently passed very progressive bills that limit use of steel-jawed traps, but the success in New Jersey clearly illustrates that the steel-jawed, leg-hold trap is on the way to oblivion.

The HSUS continues to protest the increased use of national wildlife refuges.

In December 1982, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) proposed major developments at the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge near Newburyport, Massachusetts. The situation is similar to that which existed at Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Barrogat National Wildlife Refuge, both of which are on the New Jersey coast. The HSUS strenuously objected to these developments as harmful to wildlife and the wilderness character of the refuge. The FWS proposed a storm of protest from Massachusetts citizens and conservation groups and from national animal-welfare and wildlife groups.

In November of 1983, the HSUS bowed to public pressure by promising to find an off-refuge site for the new buildings and to withdraw the proposed sport hunting and trapping programs. They still plan to pave part of the main road, but they will institute several measures to control traffic. As those of you who live in New Jersey may know, the FWS has proposed a controversial plan to extend the amount of hunting allowed at Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge and the amount of trapping at Barrogat National Wildlife Refuge, both of which are on the New Jersey coast. The HSUS has worked hard to combat these programs.
Institute Explores Publishing Plans

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems is developing plans to print and distribute an annual book, now planned as Advances in Animal Welfare Science and Philosophy, which will replace the quarterly International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems. The Institute currently has a full complement of excellent manuscripts submitted by academicians, and this new publication should do much to help advance this growing field of interest. (See page 3 for obtaining back issues of the Journal.)

Three new tape-cassette slide lectures, Cat Behavior and Psychology, Dog Behavior and Psychology; and Animal Control: Psychology, Ethical and Social Issues are now completed and will soon be available for distribution to schools, humane societies, and cat and dog clubs.

Before the famous Cruft's international dog show in London, Institute director Dr. Michael Fox spoke at an educational seminar for veterinarians on animal behavior, welfare, and rights philosophy. Research associate Linda Mickley attended the International Pig Trade Show and the International Poultry Trade Show in Atlanta, Georgia. At both of these shows was a strong promotional emphasis on capital-intensive "factory" farming systems. The most disturbing feature was an absence of exhibits dealing with improved systems that might enhance animals' welfare. One speaker, a public relations expert, advised producers to avoid using the term "confinement" systems and instead use the euphemism "environmentally controlled housing" systems, since this sounds better to the public, and to tell the public that hogs are genetically adapted to such housing—both of which statements are false and misleading!

Ms. Mickley is compiling a list of humane alternative farming systems. If any of our members knows of such farms, the Institute would appreciate hearing of them. Farmers may write to Ms. Mickley directly at 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

Full Schedule for NAAHE

During the spring months, the staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) is offering presentations and workshop sessions as part of regional animal-welfare meetings in Louisiana, Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Indiana. In addition, NAAHE director Kathy Savesky will conduct two sessions on humane education at the annual meeting of the National Animal-Control Association, held in Arkansas in May, and will teach a three-day segment of the annual humane education seminar at Stephen F. Austin State University in Texas this June. (For more information on these meetings, you can write to NAAHE at Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.)

NAAHE's membership magazine, Humane Education, acquired a new editor this past winter. Wil­low Soltow, a free-lance writer and former editor for an educational publishing firm, joined the staff in December to write and edit the quarterly magazine for educators. In addition to her work with the magazine, Ms. Soltow will be responsible for assisting in the development of new humane education teaching materials. She will also work with Kind News Editor Vicki Parker to coordinate the content and focus of the teacher's and children's compo­nents of NAAHE's education program.

Bill DeRosa, who had been interning with NAAHE since August, joined the staff in November as NAAHE Research Associate, replacing Vanessa Malcarne who left the organization to pursue full-time graduate work. During the past several months, he has worked in cooperation with the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation coordinating the east coast activities for NAAHE's two-year humane education evaluation project.

1984 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Animals and Society: Critical Times, Crucial Choices

San Diego, California

October 24-27, 1984

The urgency and importance of the multitude of animal problems facing us today are underscored by the theme of this year's HSUS annual conference. Speakers with varied backgrounds and extensive experience in animal welfare will grapple with these vital issues in a carefully chosen program of workshops, formal addresses, and informal sharing sessions. Invited speakers include Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, who will deliver the keynote address, Roger Caras, nationally known author, lecturer, and television commentator, who will act as program moderator, and Dr. Blaine Worten, professor and head of the psychology department at Utah State University and director of the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation. On Wednesday, October 24, 1984, the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education will sponsor an all-day workshop featuring members of the Western Humane Educators Association. We hope to see you in San Diego for this valuable four-day gathering of animal-welfare advocates.

LISTEN...

LEARN...

EXCHANGE IDEAS...

AT THE HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Humane Society News • Spring 1984

The HSUS offers discounts on travel to and from San Diego. Special arrangements have been made with United Airlines to offer HSUS conferences a forty-five percent discount off coach fare for travel to and from San Diego from anywhere in the forty-eight contiguous states between October 18 and November 3, 1984. To make your reservation, call toll-free 800-521-4041 and tell the agent you are attending the HSUS annual conference or give the agent the special HSUS Conference Number: 420. Further details will be provided upon request and in the next issue of The Humane Society News.
that this summer’s hunt be called off. We are working with senators and representatives to secure that message to Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige. Second, we want a new treaty which would outlaw the commercial slaughter on land and the killing of seals on the seas to replace the expired one in October. Third, since the Senate will ratify any new treaty, we are asking our members to tell their senators to push for—and vote only for—a protective treaty, not one that continues to allow seal killing. Over the past four months, we have asked HSUS members to circulate petitions requesting this protective treaty and send them to their senators’ local offices. The original is to be sent to us for presentation to their offices on Capitol Hill. Hundreds of these petitions have arrived so far. We urge our members to continue collecting signatures and sending us their petitions throughout the summer.

The HSUS is also trying to invoke the Endangered Species Act—a means of protecting the North Pacific fur seals. Because the seal population is declining so drastically, we have prepared and filed a significant document petitioning the Commerce Department to place the North Pacific fur seal on the threatened list under the Endangered Species Act. If Commerce agrees to this, we believe the annual slaughter of as many as 28,000 seals would have to be stopped, and the federal government would be obligated to study all possible causes of mortality.

While the HSUS Washington staff was busily arranging the reception and organizing the petitions sent in by members, Seal Day was being celebrated in other parts of the country. In Tallahassee, Florida, the HSUS Southeast Regional Office collected almost 700 signatures and presented the petitions to aides in the office of Sen. Lawson Chiles and to Gov. Robert Graham. HSUS New England regional office staff gathered in front of Sen. Dodd’s office in Hartford, Connecticut, to circulate petitions and listen to speakers.

Delay Is Desirable

The pages of the U.S. Senate’s 1984 calendar may hold the fate of this country’s wild horses and burros. This spring, Tennessee Senator James McClure, plans to introduce a bill that would weaken the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. The earlier in the legislative session the Commerce Department to place the North Pacific fur seal on the threatened list under the Endangered Species Act, the better the chances are that it will be passed without much debate. The sponsor of S. 457, Idaho Senator James McClure, plans to ask Sen. Baker to bring this HSUS-sponsored bill up for an up-or-down vote.

At the end of the first session of this Congress, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed S. 457 by a vote of ten to nine. That version of S. 457 would allow the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to round up and remove 3,500 wild horses and burros annually from the open range. The BLM would transport to humane organizations, at taxpayers’ expense, all horses and burros they are unable to find homes for. Any animals the humane organizations are able to accept would be sold at auction, most likely to slaughterhouses for pet food.

Sen. McClure has been trying to convince the Senate that S. 457 is a noncontroversial bill that should be passed quickly. The HSUS has sent an Action Alert to Tennessee members asking them to call Sen. Baker in opposition to the bill. As a result of the large volume of mail, it appears that Sen. McClure will not be given the early calendar date he has requested.

It is critical that your two senators continue to hear your opposition to the controversial S. 457. Do not think that no matter when S. 457 comes up for a vote in the Senate, the HSUS, such as inhumane laboratory animal care, unsanitary puppy mills, and miserable roadside zoos, are due to lack of funding or some other internal problem at APhIS, that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is responsible for funding the annual budget for carrying out the purposes of the AWA, including inspections. The Reagan administration has tried to slash the APhIS budget for Agriculture Appropriations by seventy percent two years in a row, but by working with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the HSUS has assisted in having the funds restored each time. The HSUS welcomes this official look into enforcement of this major piece of animal protective legislation.

Alternatives Study Begins

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a scientific research service for Congress, has begun an eighteen-month study of alternatives to laboratory animals in experimentation, testing, and education. While OTA is ultimately responsible for producing an extensive report on this study, which was ordered by Utah Senator Orrin G. Hatch, the project will be monitored by a nineteen-member advisory panel. The panel will meet four times over the eighteen months, review drafts, and provide further direction for the final report.

Representatives of the cosmetic industry and the biomedical re-
The following sponsors of the Fourth Annual Day of the Seal, which was celebrated at a reception in the Senate (see page 19):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Claiborne Pell (RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Bob Packwood (OR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Lowell P. Weicker (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Carl N. Levin (MI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Charlie Stenholm (FL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. James M. Jeffords (VT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Don Bonker (WA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Barbara Boxer (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You!

The HSUS enjoys the friendship and support of many senators and representatives on Capitol Hill. Without them we would not be able to effect changes that benefit animals nationwide. In this issue we would like to thank:

North Dakota Senator Quentin N. Burdick for requesting and obtaining a study of how effectively APHIS enforces the Animal Welfare Act.

Focus on FY 85 Budget

Congress is currently studying President Reagan's proposed budget for fiscal year 1985 (effective October 1, 1984, through September 30, 1985). Although President Reagan has requested budget cuts in several programs important to The HSUS, the house and senate committees on appropriations hold the federal purse strings and make the final decisions on how the programs are funded.

The appropriations committees are composed of subcommittees which specialize in the funding of each department in the federal government. The HSUS is particularly interested in the following subcommittees, because their work—and the budgets they approve for federal departments—can directly affect the welfare of this nation's animals, including wildlife, livestock, and companion animals.

Agriculture Subcommittee—The proposed budget includes a cut of $1.2 million from the funds designated for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. This would reduce the already pathetic and inadequate 1984 budget of $4.8 million to $3.6 million for 1985. The HSUS is not only fighting to get the budget restored but also seeking to see it increased so there will be sufficient funds to conduct meticulous inspections of every animal facility in this country, from zoos to laboratories.

Agrcultural Subcommittee—The proposal for a ban on illegal trapping in the U.S. National Park System (see the Fall 1984 HSUS News), the National Park Service has postponed the effective date of regulations prohibiting such illegal trapping from October 5, 1983, to January 15, 1985. In its public notice on the decision, the National Park Service cited the prevention of "economic对企业 harmful" for trappers and the need "to allow Congress to consider legislation addressing the issue" as reasons for the delay. The notice was signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior G. Ray Arneson, who is blantly buying time to push through Congress legislation that would supersede trapping to parks where it is currently illegal.

In response to the National Park Service action, The HSUS and several other organizations sent out Action Alerts asking members to object to the proposed delay. As of this writing, the Park Service has received approximately 2000 letters on this issue, the vast majority of them in favor of our position. It expects to make the decision on when to put the ban into effect in March.

This public response in support of our position gives us a good chance to have the ban instituted on schedule some time this spring.

The following sponsors of the Fourth Annual Day of the Seal, which was celebrated at a reception in the Senate (see page 19):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Claiborne Pell (RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Bob Packwood (OR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Lowell P. Weicker (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Carl N. Levin (MI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Charlie Stenholm (FL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. James M. Jeffords (VT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Don Bonker (WA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Barbara Boxer (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our "Pet Action Line" television series is ready for airing.

We've alerted every Public Broadcasting System station in the country, but we need you to call your local PBS station and tell its programmers to include our series in its schedule.

Don't delay—every call helps!
West Coast

Condor Death Outrage

A coalition of environmental, wildlife, and humane organizations has requested the immediate removal of all M-44 sodium cyanide devices from the range of the endangered California condor. According to laboratory tests performed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, a young female California condor found dead on a Kern County (California) ranch last November appears to have been poisoned by a device federal trappers use to kill coyotes. A "coyote getter" is a pipe containing sodium cyanide and a spring-loaded mechanism half buried in the ground and baited with a sex scent or meat. When an animal bites the top, the device is activated and the animal's mouth is filled with poisonous cyanide.

The dead condor was found at a ranch where M-44s are still in use and not far from a tripped M-44. Despite the evidence that the condor died from exposure to such a device, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service continues to use M-44s within the condor range as part of the Animal Damage Control Program. The coalition believes the continued use of M-44 is illegal under the federal Endangered Species Act and an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) use restriction on sodium cyanide.

Unfortunately, the EPA has approved the limited use of sodium cyanide in M-44 devices. Despite restrictions intended to protect endangered species, says West Coast director Char Drennon, "present federal and state administrations are disastrous for protecting wildlife."

Hectic April

A coalition of animal-welfare groups will participate in a busy week of activities in April to bring attention to the plight of laboratory animals.

On April 23, the Mobilization For Animals will sponsor a march and all-night candlelight vigil at the University of California at Davis near the primate center.

There will be a benefit showing of "The Animals Film," a feature-length film about animal abuse, at a Sacramento area theater on April 25. The public is invited to attend this award-winning documentary narrated by Julie Christie.

On April 28, there will be a demonstration at the U.C. Davis campus. Numerous animal-welfare and celebrity speakers are scheduled as speakers.

Members who wish more information on these activities should contact the West Coast Regional Office at 1713 J Street, #305, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Close Call for CA

Active opposition by The HSUS and other organizations to the appointment of Howard Don Carper as director of the California Department of Fish and Game was rewarded when the senate committee withheld its confirmation of the former gun shop owner and sport hunting advocate. Mr. Carper’s complete lack of experience in wildlife management, wildlife biology, and government service—and his representation of various arms and ammunition companies—made him totally unacceptable to us as head of the state’s wildlife conservation agency. Mr. Carper had favored former Interior Secretary James Watt’s plans for massive drilling off the California coast and opposed virtually all new wilderness designations in California.

No new candidate for Mr. Carper’s position has as yet been named.

Pound Seizure Decision

The fate of Sen. David Robert’s bill to end the practice of pound seizure in California (S.B. 883) should be known by the time this issue of The HSUS News reaches our members.

The West Coast Regional Office wishes to thank all the dedicated humanitarians who responded by writing or calling their assemblymen on this important issue.

Great Lakes

Keeping Rodeo Away

Field Investigator Steve Putman presented testimony before the Fort Wayne (Indiana) City Council asking the city to continue its ban on rodeos.

Mr. Putman explained that The HSUS opposes rodeos because they are conducted in ways that inevitably result in injury, pain, terror, fear, and harassment for participating animals.

The Great Lakes office also worked with the Humane Society of Greater Akron (Ohio) in planning to issue warrants against cowboys in a recent rodeo there. Ohio law forbids the use of bucking straps, prodding rods, and other devices commonly used on rodeo animals.

Exotics Restricted?

A bill is pending in Ohio which, if passed, would outlaw or seriously restrict the ownership of dangerous or exotic pets.

In Akron, where a child was killed by his father’s pet tiger, a regional director Sandy Rowland testified before the city and county officials against exotic pet ownership.

Pound Protest

In December, The HSUS organized a protest as part of our effort to repeal pound seizure in the city of Chicago (see the Winter 1984 HSUS News). Nearly 100 people braved the cold weather to demonstrate against releasing pets from Chicago’s animal-control facility to research institutions. Staff members Dr. John McArdle, Frantz Dantzler, Sandy Rowland, and Steve Putman represented The HSUS.

The rally was held in front of the Chicago Sun Times Building, which houses the office of nationally syndicated columnist Ann Landers. She has publicly supported the practice of pound seizure. In another pound seizure battle, Dr. McArdle testified in Jackson County, Michigan, in January in support of placing the pound seizure issue on the ballot.

Pound Seizure Triumph

There was jubilation in Massachusetts on December 17, 1983, when Gov. Michael Dukakis signed the long-awaited bill to prohibit pound seizure.

The new law is important because it includes inspections of facilities and will eventually prohibit not only the sale but also the transportation of pound animals. Among other provisions, it repeals and prohibits the selling of impounded animals to research facilities as of October 1, 1984; prohibits the importation of pound animals as of October 1, 1986; and provides for yearly licensing of all institutions by the state health commission. Inspection of research facilities will be undertaken by special agents of animal-welfare organizations.

Passage of this law in the home state of such prestigious research institutions as the Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, the Massachusetts General Hospital, and the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital should prove that, contrary to the claims of pound seizure supporters in other states, human health facilities will not shut their doors if pound seizure prohibition passes.

The New England Regional Office outlines the efforts of HSUS members who, with other individuals and organizations throughout Massachusetts and New England, contributed a great deal of time and energy in support of this bill.

The HSUS supports Vermont’s bill to prohibit pound seizure, H 191, which was reported favorably out of committee as of our press deadline. Vermont members are encouraged to contact their legislators to enlist their support for this measure.

And, final good news—the governor of Maine signed into law a bill repealing pound seizure in that state on February 23, 1984.
Signs Do the Trick

Last year, the New Hampshire Fish and Wildlife Department decided to authorize mourning dove hunting, and many Granite State landowners responded in protest by prohibiting any hunting on their land. At that time, the New England office heard from a number of people who wanted to know where they could purchase durable “no hunting” signs for their use. The regional office now has available a lightweight, polyethylene sign at a substantial discount. The sign has been legal in the state unless pending legislation would also specifically banned by county ordinance. The regional office now has a number of people who wanted to know where they could purchase durable “no hunting” signs for their use. The regional office now has available a lightweight, polyethylene sign at a substantial discount.

Deer Hunt Canceled

In October of 1983, The HSUS was alerted by two local citizens to the fact that The Trustees of Reservations, a Massachusetts land preservation group, was planning to hold a public deer hunt on one of its preserves, the Richard T. Crane, Jr. Memorial Reservation in Ipswich, Massa.-chusetts. We immediately investigated the planned hunt and contacted the trustees. Once our investigation was completed, we sent a well-documented report opposing the hunt to The Trustees of Reservations, urging them to cancel it. Many local citizens and several other animal-welfare groups also expressed their opposition to the hunt by writing letters and holding a demonstration in Ipswich.

As a result of these protests, The Trustees canceled the hunt one day before it was scheduled to begin. They have now hired a wildlife biologist as an independent consultant to study the deer. The HSUS will be acting as an advisor to the study as will several other animal-welfare groups including the Massachusetts SCCA and Friends of Animals.

Southeast (continued)

Stiffer Fighting Penalties

State Sen. Edgar M. Dunn, Jr., and Rep. Richard Crotty have introduced bills in the Florida legislature to increase the penalties for animal fighting. Under current law, it is a first degree misdemeanor to cause the fighting or baiting of bulls, bears, or dogs and a lesser offense to attend such fights as a spectator. The proposed bills would make it a felony offense for any individual convicted of promoting, staging, or attending an animal fight. The pending legislation would also prohibit cockfighting which, until now, has been legal in the state unless specifically banned by county ordinance.

Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus helped to draft the bills and enlisted the support of the Florida Sheriffs Association to lobby for their passage. Thanks are due to the sheriffs association and the Orlando Humane Society for arranging the bills’ sponsorship. Florida residents should contact their own state legislators requesting their support for this important legislation.

Farms Animals Neglected

Complaints of neglected farm animals in rural Cotitonda, Florida, were referred to the Southeast Regional Office because the community does not have its own local humane society. Director Paulhus found several horses in need of immediate care and a number of dead dairy cattle. Reports from witnesses revealed that the cattle had died over an extended period of time, presumably from lack of sufficient available pasture.

Six horses were seized as evidence pending the outcome of a civil hearing and criminal trial.

Pound Seizure Hearings

Hillsborough County, Florida, and Gwinnett County, Georgia, are considering whether to continue the sale of shelter animals for research. The county commissioners in both communities have responded to outcries from animal activists opposed to the re-

Tenth Swamp Protest

Despite torrential rainfalls, HSUS staff and members of other animal-welfare associations were on hand to protest the hunting of deer at the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in December. Protesters refuted the claim of refuge officials that the hunt is necessary to control the deer population. Although it seems that the deer hunt will continue, HSUS regional director Nina Austenberg believes that the protest brings the issue to public attention and has been effective in preventing, or at least delaying, the hunt.

New York Support Needed

New Yorkers are requested to write to their own state representatives and to The Hon. Stanley Fink, Speaker of the Assembly, for arranging the bills’ sponsorship. Florida residents should contact their own state legislators requesting their support for this important legislation.

Decompression Ban

HSUS Director of Accreditation Lisa Morris testified before the Pennsylvania Senate Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee in support of legislation banning the decompression chamber in that state. The October meeting, which attracted animal-welfare representatives from throughout the state, was the culmination of many years of effort to prohibit this method of euthanasia. Ms. Morris testified, “The HSUS is strongly opposed to the use of the decompression chamber and, for the past two decades, has been a leader in the movement to outlaw its use. Twenty states, including all of the states surrounding Pennsylvania, have banned the use of decompression chambers for euthanasia.”

Since that meeting, Pennsylvania has joined those twenty states. The legislation banning decompression chambers allows for the use of carbon monoxide if certain conditions are met and also allows humane societies direct access to the purchase of sodium pentobarbital.
Wolf Suit Won
In January, The HSUS and fourteen other groups achieved a victory for Minnesota wolves—and for all endangered species—when they won a lawsuit against the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). FWS had issued new regulations that allowed a sport-trapping season on and increased killing of gray wolves in Minnesota. Judge Myles Lord declared that the regulations were illegal and the government's interpretation of the law incorrect. He said both the Endangered Species Act and its legislative history (which reflects the intentions of Congress in passing the act) clearly show that, for endangered and threatened species, the government's responsibility is to bring the species to a point at which they are no longer considered in danger of, or threatened with, extinction. He found that, while the Secretary of the Interior may allow the controlled killing of some species of a threatened species, he may do so only in "the extraordinary case where population pressures in an ecosystem cannot be otherwise relieved."

This decision is a great victory for wolves and for any other threatened species for which FWS might have proposed similar regulations.

Reflections on a Tragedy
In late January, television audiences nationwide were exposed to the grim spectacle of hundreds of horses dying from starvation and disease in Falls County, Texas. There, reportedly up to 20,000 horses had been assembled from various parts of the country by two entrepreneurial horse traders and sold temporarily to a dozen local farmers and ranchers to be fattened. The horse traders were supposed to re-purchase the horses and ship them to slaughterhouses for the European market, but the plan went awry. In early January, the horse traders faced bankruptcy and claimed to be unable to honor the re-purchase contracts. Some of the harshest weather of the century had descended upon Texas and the horses. Pastures were being grazed bare. The farmers and ranchers ended up the legal owners of livestock in which they had only a temporary, tentative stake and upon which they were reluctant to spend money for feed or veterinary care. The horses, to them, were nothing more than unwanted inventory and overhead costs. The county grand jury and district attorney balked at pressing cruelty charges, even though it was never clear whether those immediately responsible for the horses' care did not have the money or simply were just reluctant to spend it. The situation was finally somewhat improved by a combination of better weather, voluntary contributions of money to feed the horses, and the efforts of The HSUS and several other animal-welfare organizations.

The Falls County nightmare is ample proof that artificial concentrations of large numbers of animals created by poorly planned, fast-quick financial schemes are animal-welfare disasters waiting to happen. The underlying economics are too delicately balanced, the normal incentives for taking care of the animals are weak or nonexistent, and the sheer numbers of animals make adequate care difficult to provide should any adverse circumstances arise.

This case is evidence that state cruelty laws generally are not designed to protect livestock to the same extent as other animals. Many state statutes, including that of Texas, punish only "unreasonable" failures to provide essential food and care to these animals. Many prosecutors simply do not see the necessary criminal intent in a situation when those responsible for the livestock, in fact, have the money to spend but choose not to spend it. The disappearance of the economic incentive to feed horses becomes "reasonable"—and therefore excusable—neglect, according to this reasoning.

The HSUS believes that adequate care must be provided to livestock whether it is profitable to do so or not; animals cannot be treated like mere stock—trade inventory.

Lab Raided in Florida
On February 17, Tallahassee police, accompanied by HSUS Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus, officials from the Leon County Humane Society, two local veterinarians, and Dr. Michael W. Fox, served search warrants upon Florida State University. The warrants were based on authorized searches of a laboratory in the experimental psychology department where several cats were reportedly being deliberately deprived of water as part of an ongoing experiment. The search party entered the laboratory, examined the cats, and seized a large quantity of documents. As this issue of the News was going to press, evidence was being considered to determine whether or not prosecution was warranted under a Florida statute which makes failure to provide sufficient water to confined animals a crime, as well as under the general anti-cruelty statute that outlaws unjustifiable torture or torment.

Assuming that the evidence shows that the cats were being deprived of essential water, the case would present a situation where a scientific procedure is apparently in direct violation of the criminal laws protecting animals. The resulting litigation could be a first step in defining the boundaries between experimental license in the name of science and the right of animals to be free of unnecessary torment.

An HSUS Exclusive: Note Cards from Thaddeus Krumeich

Noted artist Thaddeus Krumeich ("Uncle Ted") has created four unique, colorful cat portraits we have reproduced as note cards for our members and friends. Every package of twelve cards and envelopes includes three each of "Bachi's Cabinet," "Chauncey's Toys," "Oliver's Chrysanthemums" (reproduced here in color), and "Walter's Other Window" (reproduced on the front cover of this issue of The HSUS News). All are part of Mr. Krumeich's "Little Favorites" series. The note cards are 4½" x 6½". Mr. Krumeich generously donated to The HSUS the right to offer these cards in full color—the originals are already collector's items. Order yours now. Each package of twelve cards and envelopes is $5.00.

HSUS Note Card Order Form

Please send me __ __ boxes of HSUS note cards at $5 per box (three or more boxes are $4.50 each). I enclose $ __ __

Send the cards to:
Name ________________________
Address ________________________
City ___________ State ___________ Zip ___________

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to: HSUS Note Cards, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037

Orders will be sent by UPS and must be delivered to a street address.
The ultimate joy of life, after all, is most permanently expressed in relationship. A most meaningful and lasting relationship with animal welfare can be expressed through The HSUS Deferred Giving Program. You can provide assets for The Humane Society, receive continuing income, realize substantial tax benefits, and also realize your goal—help for animals.

In return for a capital investment through our Pooled Income Fund or Annuity Plan, The HSUS will contract to pay you a life income, and the remainder of your gift will then be used for the direct benefit of animals through our programs. For more information (and a fact-filled brochure), write in confidence to:

Paul G. Irwin, Vice President/Treasurer
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037