n a complaint filed February 23, 2003, in the Superior Court of California, Humboldt County, District Attorney (DA) Paul Gallegos and his legal team have charged The Pacific Lumber Company (PL) with “Deceptive Concealment,” “Fraudulent Representation,” and “Fraudulent Suppression” under California’s Unfair Competition Law. The suit “seeks civil penalties and injunctive relief for harm to property rights and harm to ancient redwoods inflicted on the people of Humboldt County” by Pacific Lumber’s alleged “unfair and fraudulent business practices.”

The complaint contends that PL falsified data regarding landslide risks from timber harvesting on unstable slopes. Based on this alleged false landslide data and suppression of additional information PL was granted approval for its preferred cutting plan. According to the DA, the approved plan thereby allowed the company “to cut down some 100,000 trees on unstable slopes so as to earn an additional $40 million per year.” As a result of PL’s actions, the DA claims, for instance, that over the past three years, the company was “free to cut down trees on unstable slopes based on it deception… [resulting in] major landslides causing destruction to ancient redwoods, serious harm to Humboldt Bay, and serious harm to streams, bridges, roads, homes, and property rights for the people of Humboldt County.”

It must be difficult to battle one of the county’s largest employers, Assistant DA Timothy Stoen notes that when outside attorneys with a strong concern for the public interest offered to assist the prosecution team, getting paid only a percentage of any financial penalties recovered, the County Board of Supervisors voted 4-1 against such action—in a room purposely packed full of loggers. According to Stoen, the powerful company has threatened to sue his office, the county, and him personally.
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The Truth Is a Hammer
Humboldt DA Takes on Pacific Lumber

Animal advocates still fight to keep dolphins safe from the nets of tuna fisherman (page 7), while dolphins are hunted across the globe, from Peru to Japan (pages 8–9).
Howling Praise for AWI’s Founder

A former U.S. Ambassador William McC. Blair, Jr. waxed poetic about the outwardly calm Mrs. Stevens in the midst of the “controlled chaos” that is the AWI office: “In the center of it all—Christine—seemingly serene—but as usual full of indignation over the latest obstacle to be overcome in her never ending battle to protect animals from inhumane treatment.” Mr. Blair, in a speech worthy of a statesman, continued: “Christine was a force in her own right—never hesitating to speak about what troubled her—and what troubled her most was the dreadful things done to animals by humans—the widespread and too often needless torture done to them in the name of science, agriculture and sport. She was so passionate about the welfare of animals that she almost literally shared their pain.”

Surely, the tough-minded and strong-willed Mrs. Stevens would have been proud to hear Mr. Blair’s comment on the world’s animal abusers: “There were a few who called her an extremist. She was not. The extremists are those corporations, organizations, and their lobbyists who profit from the cruelty inflicted unnecessarily on animals.”

Grammy award winner, Paul Winter, a long-time colleague and friend of Mrs. Stevens, whom she greatly admired, shared two songs on his soprano saxophone to allow the whales and the wolves to pay dutiful tribute to their fiercest defender. The sound of waves crashing on the shore ushered in his piercingly melodic song, “The lullaby from the great mother whale for the baby seal pups,” using sounds off the coast of Bermuda. His piece, “Wolf Eyes,” reflects an effort to show “the gentle side of those creatures who have been for so long misunderstood and mistreated by us.” At the end of the haunting song, Winter led the gathering in what he called a “Howleuhah chorus for Christine,” eliciting realistic animal wails from the dignified audience.

Naturally, howling like wolves led smoothly into Dr. Jane Goodall’s reminiscences of Mrs. Stevens, replete with her own chimpanzee hoots (as if “to greet Christine…in joyous proclamation of the day,” she said). Dr. Goodall described Christine as her first shepherd through the labyrinth of Congress and the legislative process. She recounted further Mrs. Stevens’ even demeanor: “She always seemed to be the same. Although she would get very angry about things, she never lost her temper…. There was a strength within her, this steel, this determination…this woman who would never give up.” Animals everywhere are better off, said Dr. Goodall, “because of the indomitable spirit of one woman.” Christine exemplified the spirit that “tackles a seemingly impossible task and simply won’t give up. And these amazing spirits inspire those around them to carry on with the task even if they haven’t quite fulfilled it.”

Everyone who knew Mrs. Stevens and her work, who is aware of her legacy, is sure to have been inspired by her efforts and, yes, her spirit. As noted during the service, Albert Schweitzer called Mrs. Stevens his “companion in battle.” If this holds true, she was also our great general in war. And in her honor and instilled with her sensitive spirit and fierce determination, we must carry on her imminently humane crusade to eliminate animal suffering everywhere it occurs.

The Christine Stevens Memorial Fund

The Board of Directors of the Animal Welfare Institute is pleased to announce that it has established the Christine Stevens Memorial Fund to ensure the long-term viability of AWI’s essential campaigns. We have taken great pride in our historically high ratings with non-profit watchdogs for our extremely low administrative costs (the American Institute of Philanthropy consistently gives us an “A” rating). Through the Christine Stevens Memorial Fund, you can further guarantee that contributions to AWI’s ongoing animal protection work will be made directly to our essential funds to ensure the long-term viability of AWI’s essential campaigns.

If you have any questions, please call us at our new telephone number (703) 836-4300 or send a fax to (703) 836-0400.
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Orcas are incredibly social animals, living in closely-bonded family groups. Pod members tend to travel, socialize, and forage as a unit.

By Erich Hoyt, co-director, Far Eastern Russia Orca Project, and Vanessa Williams, conservation manager, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society

With support from the Animal Welfare Institute, the Far Eastern Russia Orca Project (FEROP) of the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (WDCS) has recently completed another successful field season. For the past three summer seasons, following a short pilot project in 1999, our largely Russian field team—aided by two Orca experts: Japanese biologist, Hal Sato; and Canadian ecologist, Erich Hoyt—has been studying the Orcas (a first for this species).

The project truly is pioneering. Erich and Hal were particularly eager to discover whether the Russian Orcas, too, are a largely “resident” population. So far, the answer to that question is a definite yes!

Last year, for the first time, the researchers also conducted a sightings survey along the entire east coast of Kamchatka. They found many more Orcas (more than 250 in all), photo-identified many of them, and made interesting sightings of humpback, gray, and fin whales. Plans for the 2003 field season include expanding both sea and land-based surveys and observations. Work has already begun on creating a digital photo-identification catalogue for the study Orcas (a first for this species).

The team has been busy presenting its findings-to-date at several important conferences in Russia, Canada, and last autumn’s Orca Symposium in France. It is vital to reach as many people as possible—the international scientific community, the Russian authorities, and the general public both in Russia and internationally—as until recently, very few people had heard about these Orcas.

Yet, they attracted the attention of one sector—the captive industry, which believed that Orcas living in such remote waters would make easy pickings. Orcas are big business: wild-caught Orcas can net their captors a cool $1 million apiece. In the summer of 2001 and again last summer, the Russian authorities gave permission for up to ten Orcas to be captured for marine zoos and aquariums. Several capture attempts—thankfully, unsuccessful—have been made by captors working for aquariums in Japan and elsewhere.

Sadly, the threat of capture looms large this summer, with news that the Russian authorities have once more set quotas for the capture of ten Orcas. The new quota, issued in November 2002, also expands the potential capture areas to include eastern Kamchatka and the northern Sea of Okhotsk.

WDCS is spearheading an urgent campaign, supported by many of the world’s most prominent Orca scientists, to keep these Orcas where they belong, in the wild. At present, the main scientific arguments against capturing Orcas off Russia are that these are almost unexploited populations, and we still know little about them. This is a substantial argument from the conservation perspective—but not to those who seek to capture and exploit Orcas.

It is essential, therefore, that our field researchers continue to amass detailed information on these Orcas, so that we may help counter any moves to capture the species in Russian waters.

The Russian government has set a quota for the capture of up to ten Orcas from its waters for 2003. Any Orcas captured are likely to be exported abroad for display in marine parks or aquariums. Please help our efforts to stop captures of Orcas in Russian waters by writing a polite letter to: Vitaly G. Artyuhiyov, Minister of Natural Resources, Bolshaya Grustinskaya Street, 4-6, 123812 Moscow, Russian Federation.

YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

The courts seem to agree with the good Senator from California. On April 10, 2003, San Francisco Judge Thelton Henderson issued a preliminary injunction preventing the weakening of the dolphin-safe label, responding to a suit brought by Earth Island Institute, Animal Welfare Institute, the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, and others. Judge Henderson concluded that we “have raised a serious question as to the integrity of the Secretary’s decision-making process.”

The final judgment of the court is still pending, but in issuing the injunction, Judge Henderson asserted that we are likely to prevail in our claim that the Secretary’s finding did not use the best available science, an action he called “an abuse of discretion.” Current evidence strongly supports the long-held belief that dolphin populations continue to decline in the Eastern Tropical Pacific and that the culprit is the continuing targeting of these dolphins for tuna. In fact, he notes that if “indirect effects of the purse seine fishery constitute “significant adverse impact.”" Senator Boxer countered, “This flies in the face of all available scientific information.” If upheld in court, Secretary Evans’ finding would pave the way for tuna caught by enclosing dolphins in nets to be fraudulently sold as “dolphin-safe.”
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Ending the Dolphin Hunts in Japan

**By Hardy Jones**

Executive Director, BlueVoice.org

I founded BlueVoice.org (www.bluevoice.org) to use the power of visual images as a means to help protect the ocean and its inhabitants. We utilize a combination of streaming video, internet Action Alerts with embedded protest links, and on-the-scene coverage to put pressure on our adversaries to end their barbaric practices. What follows is a success story—how we managed to turn dolphin killers into their protectors.

For decades fishermen in Futo, Japan have hunted dolphins—killing thousands of them. In 1999 we took video footage of the slaughter of a pod of 80 bottlenose dolphins at Futo. When the footage was shown on television, horrified viewers around the world responded with an avalanche of international outrage at the carnage.

As the footage was aired, a reporter who happened to be in Futo called into the station to report on the killings. The caller stated: “While the.speciale coverage to put pressure on our adversaries to end their barbaric practices. What follows is a success story—how we managed to turn dolphin killers into their protectors.
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Ocean-based ecotourism is now well established and helps to protect dolphins off the coast. The dolphin hunters cannot hunt while there are tourists dolphin watching. So, despite

having a government-issued permit to kill 600 dolphins per year, the villagers of Futo did not kill a single dolphin during the 2002-2003 season.

However, the local fisheries association is asserting that it will resume dolphin slaughter this September. Continued vigilance is vital.

Elsa Nature Conservancy of Japan helped with the effort in Futo. In addition, BlueVoice.org received contributions from several environmental groups, including AWI’s late and revered president, Christine Stevens. This success was truly the result of global cooperation.

Our next effort is to stop the killing at Taiji, the last village in Japan where fishermen regularly hunt dolphins. They are killing some 1,200 dolphins each season. Our presence on the scene in Taiji can make a difference as it did in Futo, and the Taiji fishermen can count on us being there to report their atrocities to the world.

A t least 1,000 dolphins per year are killed illegally by fishermen along the Peruvian coast, according to the Peruvian nongovernmental organization Mundo Azul (“Blue World”). Their meat is sold on a flourishing black market, and Mundo Azul has collected reports of dolphin meat being sold in various fish markets in cities along the coast as well as in restaurants in Lima.

The hunting and killing of dolphins, as well as the sale of dolphin meat and its consumption was prohibited under Peruvian law in 1995 as a result of a dramatic increase of dolphin hunting during the 1980s and early 90s in Peru, which led to an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 dolphins being killed each year.

For years the problem was thought to be solved, but in truth, it is not. Reports and photographs that we have collected from places

all along the 3,000 kilometer desert coast clearly show that illegal dolphin hunting continues to be a widespread practice. The fishermen encircle whole dolphin schools with nets, catch them with harpoons, lift them aboard and kill them by clubbing them to death— as happened this February in front of one of Lima’s most famous recreational beaches called Pulpos. Here ten dolphins were killed near the shoreline where hundreds of eyewitnesses stood.

One, Mrs. Serena, remembered, “It was barbwire. They harpooned the dolphins, one man jumped in the water and they lifted the dolphins aboard, then they clubbed them to death. It took them at least five minutes to kill the animals who suffered terribly. I was in despair and didn’t know what to do. We stood on the beach, screaming and yelling and they didn’t even bother about us.”

When the police patrol finally arrived, the fishermen were too far away to be identified. Capitan Juan Torres Diaz, Chief of Investigation of Crimes for the Police of Lima, noted: “We don’t have boats, not even a binocular. We stood on the beach switching on our sirens and yelling at the boats and couldn’t do anything.” An anonymous person, who was called from a nearby port, tried to reach the fishermen by jet-ski but had to give up.

This case is not the only one. In one beach in the northern limits of the coastal area of Lambayeque, members of Mundo Azul found more than 20 dolphins killed for human consumption in a single day. On another beach, the remains of three more dolphins washed up last Christmas. In the harbor city of Pucusana, a slaughtered dolphin washed up on the shore about 50 meters away from the office of the harbor police, who did nothing until Mundo Azul members pressed them to start an investigation.

In order to fight illegal dolphin killing, we have started a national awareness campaign for the conservation of dolphins. Mundo Azul also set up local environmental education programs in schools and are in the process of establishing a volunteer-based vigilance system to catch fishermen illegally killing dolphins. Presently, with the ecological police of Peru, we are investigating the illegal trade in dolphin meat in an under-cover operation, for the purpose of intimidating illegal hunters and traders and bringing them to justice. For the second half of 2003, Mundo Azul plans to organize 21 educational seminars for local leaders, such as journalists, representatives of local fishermen associations, local police, and coastguard personnel in the seven most important coastal cities along the Peruvian coast, to inform them about the existing laws and raise their environmental awareness.

Dolphins are naturally curious and friendly to humans and approach us in places where we do not harm them. Izumi Ishii (right), former dolphin hunter, now leader of the dolphin watches.

Peru’s Illegal Dolphin Hunting Kills 1,000 Dolphins or More
Exotic birds are beautiful animals, kept by millions of people as captive companions. Sadly, the global trade in wild birds has a drastically negative impact on their ability to survive in their natural habitats. Mortality of wild-caught parrots prior to export has been documented to range from 45-70%, as a result of poor nutrition, stress, and overcrowding.

The complex international web of bird smuggling and illicit trade reveals the breadth of the problem today: Indonesian smugglers sell parrots into Singapore, Italians smuggle illegal parrots into France, and Egyptians smuggle them into Europe. In 1997, 125,000 wild-caught birds were smuggled into the United States, totaling $1 million in profits for the smugglers. Figures on the trade impacts far more wild birds than the numbers which end up for sale in Europe and Asia.

Send the European Union the message that you, like thousands of other people around the world, feel that it’s time to stop the cruel practice of capturing birds from the wild for international commerce. The wild bird trade is an unacceptable exploitation of the natural resources of developing countries. The E.U. has become the largest importer of wild-caught birds to a virtual non-importer of wild-caught parrots. The Wright study importantly concludes: “Poaching rates were significantly lower in the years after enactment of the WBCA… [suggesting] that importation bans reduce poaching in exporting countries.”

Legal and illegal imports have been reduced to a trickle, though it surely still exists, and captive bred parrots are now more available and less expensive than ever for pet owners, breeders, and collectors. Restricting or eliminating the legal trade will reduce the illegal trade, rather than drive it underground as is often suggested. But not all countries have gotten the message.

Between 1997 and 2000, the European Union officially imported approximately 169,602 wild-caught birds of 111 species. Wild-caught birds are generally unsuitable as pets when they arrive in European homes, and thousands of these birds end up unwanted and ill-cared for. By importing wild-caught parrots, developed European nations are, in fact, unconscionably exploiting the resources of developing nations by creating a harvest that is neither biologically nor economically sustainable.

Therefore, WPT is spearheading a campaign to immediately cease the importation of wild-caught birds into the European Union, following America’s wise lead from a decade before. According to Dr. James Gilardi of the WPT, “The U.S. trade ban is cruel and inhumane to tens of thousands of highly intelligent and social parrots. Figures on the unacceptably high mortality that occurs during the trapping, shipping, and quarantine of these birds demonstrate that the trade impacts far more wild birds than the numbers which end up for sale in Europe and Asia.”

The spectacle of wild parrots is now an enormously popular ecotourism attraction and generates millions of dollars annually for tropical nations. Tourism creates solid employment for indigenous people as guides and lodge operators, and, if implemented well, ecotourism facilitates nature conservation. In contrast, harvesting parrots for the pet trade provides small numbers of temporary jobs, and the financial benefits fall primarily in the hands of unscrupulous dealers in large cities rather than indigenous people.
In Memoriam
John Kullberg, President of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation

Dr. Kullberg wrote, “the violence and destruction of abuses have meant for those species, now extinct, with whom we once shared the Earth.”

—John F. Kullberg

Great Apes Are the World’s Heritage

Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, however, the Project could secure an international declaration for the security of great apes and a specific convention designating great apes as a World Heritage Species. In more than 20 African countries from Angola to Uganda and three countries in Asia, great apes are under constant assault from habitat destruction, bushmeat poaching, insufferable civil wars, and capture for the pet trade. Globally, great apes also languish in captivity—any declaration or convention establishing their inherent value and adding safeguards must equally apply to them. Due recognition for the great apes’ plight and considerable international cooperation are vital if they are to survive this decade.

Corporate Profits at Animals’ Expense

Despite widespread international efforts by humane organizations and an embarrassingly small number of scientists to reduce the number of animals utilized for research, their use continues to grow exponentially. Selling rodents for experimentation is a highly lucrative business, and Charles River Laboratories (CRL) is outflanking other breeders of laboratory rats and mice, bringing in four times the revenue of its closest competitor. This past year the company earned $55.8 million. CRL is pleased to report that “2002 represented the first year in over a decade that the worldwide sales of animals increased at double-digit levels.”

NIH on Congressional Hotseat

For years, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) lavished millions of taxpayers’ dollars on the Coulson Foundation (TCF) though it was cited for nearly 300 violations of the Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) regulations by the Food and Drug Administration, and it had four separate sets of formal charges of violating the Animal Welfare Act brought against him by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Instead of holding TCF accountable for its apparent widespread violation of laws and regulations, NIH defended and persistently funded the facility. NIH finally may be held accountable as it appears that the House of Representatives is examining the agency’s negligence in providing grants. In March, Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Billy Tauzin, and Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman James Greenwood, sent a stern letter to NIH Director Elias Zerbouni. The letter described the titanic support Congress has given to NIH over the past five years, increasing its appropriations by $9.5 billion to $23.1 billion. The letter went on to express the Committee’s interest in “conducting an examination of NIH management and oversight of its federally funded research.” The letter requested specific information of NIH including the following:

“During one of the Committee’s investigations last year, the Committee became aware that NIH was providing grants to the Coulson Foundation (TCF), a registered animal research facility in damalugam, New Mexico that has recently declared bankruptcy. In addition to TCF’s poor financial health, the Food and Drug Administration and United States Department of Agriculture had cited TCF for violations of various regulations. Please provide a copy of all files relating to TCF maintained by the grants management and program officers who have overseen NIH grants to TCF. Include documentation of all notifications NIH received about TCF’s violations of regulations or statutes by federal or state agencies.”

There likely will be an oversight hearing held after the Committee reviews the material supplied by NIH. The investigation should address NIH’s failure to withhold financial support to institutions that flout the law. Coulston is not the only facility to have distinguished itself in this manner.

John Kullberg and canine star Sandy celebrate the stage production of Annie, co-produced by former AW Treasurer Roger Stevens. Far right is Sandy’s trainer Bill Berton.

A young gorilla rides “piggy back” in a National Park in the Republic of Congo.

“Like a nation calling upon its best defenders to prepare for the most formidable war imaginable, our suffering Earth is crying out for truly compassionate and able people to defend it and its inhabitants from the increasingly destructive consequences of abusive actions by those whose fundamental interests lie in myopically satisfying their own needs and pleasures, regardless of the harm their decisions cause others. Tolerance of complacency about the increasingly destructive impact abuse is having on sentient life everywhere, but especially in Third World countries, is no longer an option if we truly care about our planet and the pain and suffering our past toleration of abuse has meant for these species, now extinct, with whom we once shared the Earth.”

—John F. Kullberg
Browns' bear (Ursus arctos) in Eastern Europe may be imperiled by a dramatically increased annual kill in the Republic of Slovenia, a relatively new nation that declared independence from Yugoslavia in 1991. On October 10, 2002, Slovenia's Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food (MAFF) issued a permit allowing an extra 34 brown bears to be killed in the 2002/2003 hunt season—this, in addition to the previously approved 70 bears.

The total legal kill of 104 bears represents approximately 25% of the nationwide population of about 450 animals. The new cull numbers signify a considerable jump from previous years, where half as many animals were allowed to be hunted. According to Dr. Boris Kryštufek of the Slovenian Museum of Natural History, Slovenia "boasts one of the most important populations of brown bears in Europe….it is doubtful that the population size is large enough to cope" with the expanded slaughter. Opposition to the expanded kill has come from animal protection organizations including the Animal Welfare Institute, as well as authorities including the International Association for Bear Research and Management, and the Bear Specialist Group (IUCN) of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature's Species Survival Commission. In a letter to the MAFF Minister, International Union for the Conservation of Nature's Species Survival Commission. In a letter to the MAFF Minister, Franc But, the IUCN notes, "The long term status of bear populations in nations such as Austria, Italy, and Croatia are all significantly influenced by actions in your country." The Chairman of the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe warns that the European brown bear’s current range "is grouped in areas of brown bear territory. The head of Slovenia’s Department for Wildlife in the Slovenia Forest Service has acknowledged that officials there will consider other plans for dealing with bear management issues including habitat improvement, regulating the breeding of small livestock, and cracking down on bear-attracting illegal refuse dumps, but they are unwilling to reduce the cull numbers.

Brown bears in Slovenia are considered a "protected" species and have been as early as 1935 when an ordinance prevented the shooting, killing, buying, and selling of bears in certain districts in the country. However, they are also listed as "game" animals, meaning there can be a regulated hunt. Slovenia, one of the first European countries to protect its brown bears, now threatens to decimate its own population.

Many of us toil by day with focused determination, dreaming at night of a better life—perhaps one that is easier, richer, or more fulfilling. For the imprisoned brown bear in Elizabeth Stanley’s The Deliverance of Dancing Bears, the dream is simply to be a bear. Freed from her cage and shackles and the controlling iron ring forcibly pierced through her nose she would be able to enjoy the warm sun, the crisp mountain water, and the enlivening forests to which her kind is best suited.

Sadly, these hopeful visions of freedom, leisure, and companionship are quashed each day by her tormentor, Halik, who forces her to "dance" for unenlightened humans in order to gain a few coins for himself. The Deliverance of Dancing Bears, which confronts the cruelty of caging bears and forcing them to dance for fun, was published in Australia in 1994, and is now being brought to the U.S. for the first time. Even if it were devoid of text, one could interpret this tale by leafing through the book’s vibrant pastel drawings. The text is carefully crafted, however, and Stanley describes the brutality in keeping dancing bears, without graphic detail that might be disturbing for the five to nine year old readers for whom the book is intended. She writes of the bear’s claws being “blunted” and her powerful teeth “sawed.” The bear “succumbed fearfully to the heavy chain latched to her ringed nose.” The Deliverance of Dancing Bears presents the immorality of forcing bears to dance. But how do we liberate enslaved animals? Is it just and wise to purchase a captive bear (or other creature) from his or her captor in order to free the beleaguered beast? I have experienced this dilemma across the globe; seeing poor, wretched animals for sale in public markets in South America and Asia. Like many others, I struggled with the desire to free the animals, cognizant that doing so would put money in the hands of despicable merchants who would then replace the animal I just saved with another.

Stanley answers the conundrum affirmatively through an old, compassionate village, Yusuf, who buys the bear. “...How often have I watched you, poor beast, dancing humiliated in the market square on this loathsome chain,” he said. “...I feel too ashamed to have you dancing another day. I have no way of returning you to your home and your loved ones, but come with me, and I will restore to you a little happiness.” Initially, one can make a positive impact by freeing an individual animal. Then one can change the minds of the community in general. In this story, after selling the bear to Yusuf, Halik surfaces with a new young dancing cub, and Yusuf steps in once more. This time, though, as the new bear is bought, the gathered local crowd begins to understand the depths of Halik’s wickedness and publicly shuns him. Ultimately, two bears are rescued, free to live out their lives in the garden at Yusuf’s cottage in the woods; but perhaps more importantly, the community has been educated to the plight of these animals, reducing the likelihood that a similar situation would arise in the future.

Indeed, bear dancing is slowly being banned across the globe. As Stanley notes in her Postscript to the book, Greece and Turkey (the setting for the story) have outlawed bear dancing. There are still serious problems in other countries, however, including India and Bulgaria. What is the cost of freedom? What price must be paid to make dreams come true? For Elizabeth Stanley, for Yusuf, for me, no price is too great.

—Adam M. Roberts

Bequests to AWI

If you would like to help assure the Animal Welfare Institute’s future through a provision in your will, this general form of bequest is suggested:

I give, devise and bequeath to the Animal Welfare Institute, now located in Virginia, formally located in Washington, D.C., the sum of $____ or (specifically described property).

Donations to AWI, a not-for-profit corporation exempt under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), are tax deductible. We welcome any inquiries you may have. In cases where you have wishes concerning the disposition of your bequest, we suggest you discuss such provisions with your attorney.
Every year in the United States, over nine billion farm animals are raised, transported, and slaughtered for food. The vast majority of these animals must endure months, or even years, of intensive confinement and grossly inhumane conditions. Federal and state anti-cruelty laws inadequately protect farm animals and, in some cases, specifically exclude them. Furthermore, husbandry standards that are not truly humane are emerging from industry groups and agricultural organizations that are less concerned about animal welfare than they are about capturing the higher prices customers will pay for products marketed as humanely raised. Therefore, in a continuing effort to reduce unnecessary pain and fear inflicted on farm animals, the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) is expanding its husbandry program by developing humane criteria for all farm animals.

The impetus to expand the husbandry program is not only AWI’s successful pig program but also the growing number of requests AWI receives from farmers and retailers for humane criteria. This presents AWI with an unprecedented opportunity to influence how farm animals are treated. In addition to humane criteria for pigs, AWI has already completed standards for rabbits.

The interest in rabbits came about when a regional meat manager for a national grocery chain contacted AWI for such guidelines. When none were found, AWI developed them. Among other provisions, AWI rabbit standards require that the animals are weaned at a natural age, have bedding, and are allowed to run and burrow.

In America, over six million rabbits are raised for meat. The majority, if not all, of these animals are confined in barren, elevated wire-mesh cages frighteningly similar to the way in which laying hens are kept in factories. As is common in animal factories, does (female breeding rabbits) are forced to reproduce at many times their natural rate, and young rabbits are prematurely weaned causing additional stress to the doe and her young. Does and bucks (male breeding rabbits), in confinement operations, are isolated in solitary cages while the young are often overcrowded. In developing husbandry standards for rabbits, AWI seeks to provide a humane alternative to the inhumane practices commonly used when rabbits are raised for meat.

All AWI standards are developed in conjunction with farmers and scientists; address all stages of life; and delineate on-farm, transport, and slaughter requirements. Two distinguishing characteristics of all AWI criteria are that the animals are allowed to behave naturally, and that each farm is a family farm on which the family or a family member owns the animals, depends upon the farm for livelihood and participates in the daily physical labor to manage the animals and the farm. Furthermore, AWI is calling attention to and will not endorse dual production systems—operations that raise some animals humanely and subject other animals to cruel factory conditions. By the end of the year, humane criteria will be available for dairy cows, laying hens, chickens, turkeys, ducks, and beef cattle.

Poland In Peril

By Tom Garrett

mong the world’s “decision makers,” palms open to receive what the great corporations provide, few have proven more susceptible than the former Communist aparatchiks of eastern and central Europe. There is, at the same time, no greatercorruptor of politicians and government officials than corporate agribusiness. In Poland, the convergence of a politically Virulent Ameri- can corporation, Smithfield Foods, and a government made up of former Communists threatens the destruction of Europe’s last oasis of traditional peasant agriculture.

Two years ago, Andrzej Lepper, head of Samoobrona (“Self-Defense”) union received AWI’s Albert Schweitzer Medal for his role in stalling Smithfield’s initial effort to take over Polish pig production. However, in September 2001, Polish voters swept the shaming AWS (Solidarity Action) government from office and returned the post-communist SLD (Democratic Left Alliance), dominated by figures from the ancient regime, to power. With the change in government, Smithfield’s operations gained key government positions, and administrative barriers to corporate agribusiness were swept away.

Bolstered by a $100 million loan organized by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Smithfield began a massive offensive in the Polish countryside. By the end of 2002, operating behind front com- panies so as to evade laws forbidding foreigners from owning Polish agri-cultural land, Smithfield had gained control of over 30 large, former state farms and had already converted many of them into hog factories.

During the first months of 2003 Marek Kwida and I (accompanied sometimes by British organic farmer Tracy Worcester) toured the chief areas of infestation and met with local activ- ists. We were stunned by the impunity with which Smithfield is operating, ignoring federal and local laws alike and overriding intense, often desper- ate, local opposition. The company’s prison-like compounds contain packs of savagely barking police dogs. On at least two occasions we encountered English-speaking Poles who had been taken to North Carolina for training in Smithfield facilities. Every Smithfield hog factory building is flanked by iden- tical feed silos that dispense feed auto- matically. In the area around Gdansk in Northeast Poland, the number of workers on three state farms where Smithfield has set up hog factories was reduced from 120, before the company took over, to seven. As in the U.S., dead pigs are a ubiquitous, almost sym- bolic feature, of company operations. When dumpsters overflow, the victims are left in piles inside the buildings, as Kwida found in penetrating the appel- lating interior of a hog factory at Wronki Wilkie, or are dumped outside.

While five provinces have been visited, the most intense hog factory develop- ment is in former German areas seized by Poland after the war. The large farms (including Otto Von Bismarck’s) were converted into state farms. In Warminski-Mazurskie (former East Prussia) in the northeast, Smithfield operates on state farms pre- viously leased by its Animex subsidi- ary. In Zohodniki Pomorskie (Western Pomerania) in the northwest, where the takeover has gained great tier momentum, Smithfield uses a front called Prima. Here, the situation is so out of control that on one occasion we found a hog factory, operating without licenses or permits, after noticing that this hog manure was being disposed of alongside the road. Everywhere we heard the same story: Attempts by local officials to enforce the law are overrid- den by the governors or by ministries in Warsaw. Protests by villagers driven half mad by the stench are disregarded. Press exposés have no effect.

However, Smithfield’s “fix” is swelling in a larger vortex. Unemployment has reached 20%; much of Poland is locked in a situation reminiscent of the great depression of the 1930s. The top down corruption of the post-com- munist government was revealed when a secretly recorded conversation, solic- iting a bribe of $17.5 million to SLD in a secretly recorded conversation, solic- iting a bribe of $17.5 million to SLD in return for passage of a radio and tele- vision bill favorable to commercial inter- ests, was published in Poland’s largest daily newspaper. Public support for the government has plummeted to 12% in the polls. A vote of confidence has been put off until after the June referendum on E.U. accession.

Once this is over, the government will probably fall, new elections will be called, and opposi- tion parties (including Samoobrona, now polling far ahead of SLD) will dominate the Sejm. Opposition parties decry corruption and promise Polish for Poles. The question upon which Poland’s future depends is whether they can put words to practice.

Activists Stop Construction of Massive Hog Factory

By Gail Eisenitz

In November 1998, a coalition con- sisting of Concerned Rosebud Area Citizens, Human Farming Association, South Dakota Peace and Justice Center, and Prairie Hills Audubon Soci- ety took on an unprecedented legal bat- tle against what was scheduled to be the third largest hog factory in the world. The factory was to be sited on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in southern South Dakota, the second poorest reser- vation in the United States. In addition to the cruelty on an almost incalculable scale, it would have generated roughly three times the amount of raw sewage of the entire human population of the state of South Dakota.

Because Indian lands are exempt from state environmental laws, Bell Farms, a major hog factory corpora- tion, entered into a joint venture with the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council to operate its proposed factory producing nearly one million pigs a year on reserva- tion lands. However, the hog factory was subject to federal law, so the citi- zens’ coalition, with Human Farming Association’s financial support, sued the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), challenging it for not first preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The coalition’s first legal battle was successful, and the BIA was forced to halt construction of the project until such time as an EIS was prepared. In response, Bell Farms sued the BIA in federal court in South Dakota, and the citizens’ coalition intervened on behalf of the BIA. Bell Farms ultimately won that round and construction was al- lowed to proceed without preparation of an EIS.

Contrary to federal laws requiring public input, most tribal members had been kept in the dark about the venture and about the horrors of factory farm- ing. As the coalition continued with its legal battles, it also spread the word on the reservation about the horrendous cruelty, environmental hazards, and terrible working conditions associated with hog factories. When tribal mem- bers became aware of the appalling conditions that had been invited into their community, they promptly ousted their existing Tribal Council and voted in a new Council that opposed the fac- tory farm.

In an amazing turn, in June 2000, after a complex and tortuous two-year legal battle, the Tribe, formerly a partner in the enterprise with Bell Farms, filed a motion with the court changing its legal posture in the case, realigning itself with the citizens’ coalition and the federal government—against Bell Farms. As the litigation progressed, construction on the hog factory stopped after only two of the thirteen sites were built.

The citizens’ coalition, the BIA, and the Tribe appealed the South Dakota judge’s ruling in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. In April 2002, in an astounding victory, the Circuit Court reversed the judge’s deci- sion and ruled in the coalition’s favor and refused to rehear Bell’s case. Ear- lier this year, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the winning appeal by declining to review Bell’s appeal. This means that Bell Farms has no right to operate on Rosebud lands.

On March 6th, 2003, the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council voted unanimously to give back the two sites that had been built and remove them from tribal land. The Tribe then formally asked the BIA to provide assistance in initiating legal proceedings to evict Bell from the reservation. The BIA has yet to decide whether it will help the Tribe or not.
Fewer than 45 elephants reside in The Kingdom of Swaziland, a small country wedged between South Africa and Mozambique. If California’s San Diego Zoo and Florida’s Lowry Park Zoo have their way, Swaziland’s elephant population would be cut by about 25%.

These zoos received permits from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to import 11 elephants from Swaziland, marking the first zoo import of wild African elephants since the 1980s. This importation sends the erroneous message that America should subsidize its dwindling numbers of captive elephants at the expense of an already diminished wild population. Swaziland has been replenishing its elephants since they were wiped out by poaching five decades ago, while U.S. zoos have been experimenting with captive breeding programs with deadly consequences.

The zoos claim that without their beneficent intervention, the elephants would be killed to manage the remaining resident population, despite the fact that Swaziland’s Hlane National Park and Mhkaya Game Reserve, in which the elephants currently reside, have not even reached their carrying capacity. There are more humane alternatives to address elephant conservation in Swaziland than slaughtering these magnificent creatures. Elephants can be translocated to other protected areas (at least three have been identified in southern Africa), additional land could be acquired adjacent to Hlane and Mhkaya to expand the available habitat in these protected areas, and long-term immunoocontraception programs could be employed, similar to those that have been tested effectively in South Africa’s Kruger National Park.

A coalition including the Animal Welfare Institute brought suit against FWS, challenging the legality of the import permits. Our complaint alleges that, contrary to international rules under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, there is no proof that this import will not be detrimental to the species in the wild. Outrageously, there isn’t even clear confirmation that the animals identified on the import permits are the same elephants that have been rounded up by the zoos. The Mkhaya Game Reserve’s 18 elephants were to be the pool from which the 11 for import were selected. But reports from Swaziland indicate that on the week of March 10, 2003, approximately 24 elephants were rounded up—necessarily indicating that some were taken from outside Mkhaya, apparently in contravention of the information in the permit applications.

Wild elephants should be left to wander freely with their families and friends through their native savannahs playing in watering holes and mud pits, and interacting with one another as they choose.

Above: Young elephants are more attractive to visitors, so San Diego zoo is shipping its resident elephants to Chicago to make room for the desired new youngsters.