In June 1999, USDA launched yet another investigation as a result of the death of three other chimpanzees: Holly, Terrance and Muffin (see story below) and as the world becomes more and more aware of their pitiful plight (see story below) and as the world becomes more and more aware of their pitiful plight (see story below) and as the world becomes more and more aware of their pitiful plight (see book review on page 19).

Death Toll Mounts at TCF

Like casualty of war reports from the field of battle, news of chimpanzee deaths at the Coulston Foundation (TCF) surface regularly. TCF in Alamogordo, New Mexico, has the largest colony of research chimpanzees in the world. Frederick Coulston, who callously told the New York Times “You can raise [chimps] like you do cattle,” operates TCF, which has exhibited an indefensible and consistent pattern of non-compliance with the Animal Welfare Act.

Recently, Donna, a 36-year old chimpanzee, died a miserable death after carrying a dead fetus in her womb for anywhere between two weeks and two months. C. James Mahoney, DVM, Ph.D., a veterinarian with over 20 years experience working with chimpanzees, reviewed the case and concluded that Donna’s “death constitutes clear violations of the most basic precepts of accepted standards of veterinary medical practice.” He continued, “… it is clear to me that Donna must have suffered excruciating pain, for several, if not many days.”

Dr. Mahoney’s analysis states that Donna had a liter of puss in her peritoneal cavity and a ruptured uterus “with the partially decomposed fetus’s skull visible through the tear.” Donna was used for breeding and reportedly had 14 babies in 26 years – three times the natural birthrate for wild chimpanzees.

But TCF’s negligent chimpanzee homicide does not end there. USDA inspection reports from December 13-16, 1999, reveal 4 more chimp deaths. Between August and December 1999, Dean (age 34), Babu (age 27), Kimberly (age 9), and Albro (less than 1 year old), all died at TCF. One example of TCF’s veterinary carelessness involves Kimberly, who reportedly had diarrhea that “could have been caused by a potentially contagious organism that could affect other members of the colony.” A fifth chimp, Rosie (age 29), apparently also died during this same time period.

TCF commits these atrocities with millions of your tax dollars. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) continue to fund TCF despite its repeated violations of the Federal Animal Welfare Act and NIH’s own standards. NIH hands out billions of dollars of taxpayers’ money to laboratories for animal experimentation. Where does it draw the line? If a Coulston chimpanzee is forced to have 14 infants and denied the necessary surgery to remove a huge dead fetus, how can NIH be trusted? An internal NIH report from a site visit to TCF in April 1999 asserts, “Veterinary care is problematic… Three other veterinarians are very junior with no formal training in primate medicine…”

Incredibly, the latest six deaths came after a March 1998 complaint against TCF by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regarding the deaths of two chimps, Echo and Jello, was amended in February 1999 to include new charges that TCF’s failure to provide adequate veterinary care resulted in the unnecessary deaths of three other chimpanzees: Holly, Terrance and Muffin (see AWI Quarterly, Winter 1998, “New USDA Complaint Filed Against Coulston”). In June 1999, USDA launched yet another investigation as a result of the death...
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Crushing Bill Enacted!

On December 9, 1999, legislation was enacted to ban the creation, sale, or possession with intent to sell, of depictions of animal cruelty when the filmed acts violate existing state or federal animal protection laws. Congressman Elton Gallegly (R, CA) originally introduced the bill, H.R. 1887, in an effort to rid the country of pornographic animal crushing videos.

These films, which sell worldwide for as much as $100 or more, show high-heeled or barefoot women torturing defenseless animals who are helplessly bound to the floor beneath their feet. Numerous live creatures are subjected to this sadistic attack: fish, frogs, insects, guinea pigs, rats, mice, hamsters, kittens, puppies, and other species. Each animal is meticulously massacred, enduring the agony of bones being slowly crushed throughout the entire body. After death mercifully arrives, the stomping continues until unidentifiable remnants of the poor animal carpet the floor.

Filmmakers’ and “actresses’” faces are rarely shown which makes perpetrators difficult to identify; film location is almost impossible to figure out so prosecutors do not know under what jurisdiction to try the case; and the statute of limitations on state anticruelty laws likely would expire before charges could be brought. H.R. 1887 eliminates these loopholes, and hopefully will contribute to the elimination of one notably horrific type of animal cruelty.
Turtles Dance, WTO Stumbles
by Ben White

In the months leading up to the ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle my challenge as AWI’s international coordinator was to put animal issues on the map. Even though many of the most flagrant cases of WTO rules superseding national laws involve hormone treated beef, genetically modified organisms, dolphin-caught tuna and turtle-caught shrimp, there was a real danger of animal protection being lost amidst thousands of labor justice, human rights and environmental protection groups scrambling to be heard.

So, I latched on one crazy idea to make the animal message loud and clear: putting 240 people in sea turtle costumes on the streets. Without the foggiest idea what it would take to make that many costumes and fill them with volunteers, I began holding evening meetings to get the word out about the effect of the World Trade Organization on animal protection laws. Many didn’t believe that any international trade group could actually kill hard-fought domestic legislation designed to make the consequences of our trade kinder: on sea turtles, on dolphins, on furbearers, on the environment and on workers around the world. It was only when the details were explained — that the WTO forbids the restriction of any product based on how it’s obtained — that people came to grips with the organization’s deadly embrace of child labor, slave labor, unsafe food and cruel fishing practices.

From these meetings grew turtle making parties in Seattle and Lopez Island, Washington. Lisa Wathne of HSUS, grassroots organizer par excellence, did an amazing job coordinating Seattle volunteers, generating about twenty workers for each manufacturing party. All hands were needed.

Each turtle costume began its life as a sheet of scrounged appliance carton. Patterns were traced on the flattened cardboard and cut out, one for the plastron (belly), one for the back (carapace) and one for the head. Then pleats were cut, hot-glued, stapled and taped, giving the backs the convex curve of a green sea turtle. All edges were taped in hopes of keeping the omnipresent Seattle rain out a little longer. Then everything was given a thick coat of exterior latex paint, inside and out. With 240 plus costumes, that amounted to almost 1,000 sides painted, not including the heads. Then we brought in artists to paint the final designs. AWI associate Jen Rinick came out from Washington, DC to provide invaluable help in the last stages. We were still stapling and painting the turtle heads at 11:00 PM on the Sunday night before the first rally.

Until volunteers started showing up at the First United Methodist Church in Seattle that Monday morning, we were never sure we would actually have the bodies to fill the turtle suits. But they just kept coming. Everybody was issued a front, back, head and a flag. The flag was modeled on the early American Gadsden flag with a coiled rattlesnake and the slogan “Don’t Tread on Me”. In redrawing the design for silk-screening, I changed the motto slightly to Don’t Trade on Me, and added NO/WTO SEATTLE 1999, ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE. Soon we had over 240 people ranging in age from 13-80, suited...
up and in a festive mood. I gave a brief speech exacting the promise from all that we would behave in a manner that would honor sea turtles – the pacifists of the animal kingdom: we would march peacefully for our sovereign right to make national laws protecting sea turtles.

The turtles were an instant hit. Everywhere we went, people cheered us. The light-heartedness of our approach combined with the beautiful handmade costumes won us huge popular support. We marched with about 3-4,000 other supporters of animals and the environment to a rally right next to the WTO venue. There I briefly joined Congressman George Miller, Senator Paul Wellstone, Carl Pope of the Sierra Club, and Patti Forkan of HSUS on the speaker platform to rally the turtles in a rousing cheer.

On Monday, volunteers were given a choice of actions for Tuesday, the official opening day of the WTO. One group met at 6:00 AM to join a massive civil disobedience demonstration designed to shut down the WTO peacefully by blocking all of the major streets around the Washington Trade and Convention Center. Another group of turtles met at 9:00 AM and marched with a mammoth inflatable turtle into the big labor march organized by AFL-CIO, the Steelworkers and the Teamsters.

7:00 AM Tuesday saw about forty turtles walking arm in arm down the middle of Seventh Avenue in a light rain as the gray skies slowly lightened. Flags flapping, we marched directly to the intersection we had been assigned to obstruct. Soon, a line of turtles stretched across Eighth and Olive. Behind us, the entire block was beribboned with about four miles of yellow “crime scene” tape that said UNSEEN CRIMES. At about 8:30 we were met by over seven thousand people organized by the Ruckus Society, Art and Revolution and the Direct Action Network. The antithesis of an angry mob, it was truly the “pageant of resistance” it was meant to be: huge puppets, dancers, cheerleaders, jugglers, turtles and “trees” danced in the streets and celebrated the suspension of the WTO’s morning activities.

All morning, the direct action turtles moved to plug gaps in the protest lines that were keeping WTO delegates from the meetings. Even the police were glad to see us show up, throwing a peaceful line between themselves and other protesters. At one point I looked around and realized that at 48 years of age, as a veteran of dozens of often violent antiwar protests, I was one of the few people among either the police or protest lines who had been through this before. I spent most of my time trying to calm people down, telling them not to be afraid.

By early afternoon, the blocking of the entrances was an acknowledged success. A handful of very tired turtles, a little surprised not to have been arrested, waited alongside the parade route of the massive labor march. The feeling of joy and unity was unlike anything I have seen. Steelworkers marched with Filipino workers, native rights advocates with child labor activists, Teamsters with organic farmers, monster puppets from Art and Revolution walked alongside AFL-CIO officials. “Where are the turtles?” I kept asking. “Oh, there are a bunch of them coming,” I was reassured.

Finally, three blocks away I see an enormous green bubble coming towards me. As it came closer I saw dozens of absolutely ebullient turtles holding up the 20’ long inflatable mama turtle. They told me that when they had marched into Memorial Stadium, already packed with tens of thousands of organized labor supporters, an enormous cheer went up for the turtles.

As upwards of forty thousand people marched peacefully through downtown Seattle, a few dozen self-avowed Anarchists from Eugene, Oregon went on a rampage breaking store windows and

“We would march peacefully for our sovereign right to make national laws protecting sea turtles.”

– Ben White
spraying graffiti everywhere. They specifically targeted certain large corporations: Nike, Banana Republic, Starbucks, Nordstroms. Oddly, some police just watched it happen. When they finally responded it was against peaceful protesters. By Tuesday afternoon, the police were attacking with huge clouds of teargas and barrages of wooden and rubber bullets. Tuesday night saw a general curfew extended over all of downtown Seattle. Only those with WTO credentials were allowed on the streets.

Early the next morning seven volunteers showed up wanting to join ongoing protests in turtle suits. After they promised to stay together and stay peaceful, I handed out the suits. One hour later, watching news coverage as I waited for another wave of volunteers due at 9:00, I saw the volunteers cuffed in a circle with a pile of turtle costumes alongside. I decided then that organized peaceful protest had been foreclosed and that it was time to pack up. Some turtles remained, however, until the end of the conference on Friday. Not one ever engaged in any angry or violent behavior.

Writing this a few days after the conference closed, I can report on just the first fallout of the WTO protests in Seattle. On Saturday, the Seattle papers carried the banner headlines: WTO Talks Collapse. One of our major objectives, that there be no new round of talks to increase the power of the WTO over our lives, had been achieved. Delegates from small third world countries said they were emboldened by the protesters to refuse to accept decisions made by a few powerful countries meeting behind closed doors. Delegates now are at such a fundamental impasse it appears they will have difficulty getting back on track next year at their planned mini-meeting in Geneva.

By the time the smoke and gas cleared, over 600 protesters had been arrested. Almost all had been exercising their constitutional right to peaceful protest and freedom of speech. The Chief of Police has resigned and the Mayor may follow him, both very embarrassed by police overreaction and their blind welcome of the WTO in the first place.

The turtles were covered very favorably in the New York Times, The Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, USA Today and many other media. They have somehow become an icon for “flamboyant” protests of the nineties. We now are making plans to put them on the streets of Geneva if and when the WTO decides to raise its ugly head again.
The Polish Connection

Polish Delegation Investigates American Agribusiness Repudiates Factory Farming

by Tom Garrett

The New Breed and the Rise of Smithfield Foods

During the 1970s and 80s, U.S. meat packing was taken over by a “new breed” of ruthless entrepreneurs who broke the power of the unions, reduced real wages to a third of their previous level and replaced a stable, American-born workforce with a shifting population of Hispanic and Asian immigrants. Under this regime, workplace injuries have soared making meat packing the most dangerous industry in America. Deaths from food poisoning, with contaminated meat the primary culprit, have risen five fold to 9,000 annually. The Humane Slaughter Act because of the subjugation of the Food Safety and Inspection Service by the industry and a 2-300% increase in “line speed” - the speed of the conveyor on which animals are hung to be stunned and killed — is no longer enforced. Once unthinkable atrocities, such as dumping conscious hogs into “scalding tanks”, are now commonplace.

While the packing industry was being “reformed” a parallel trend gathered force in production of hogs.

In 1991, Smithfield Foods of Smithfield, Virginia opened the world’s largest slaughterhouse, 800 acres in extent, on the Cape Fear River in Bladen County, North Carolina. With the opening of the Tarheel plant, which is capable of killing in excess of 24,000 animals a day, hog factory development, no longer held back by a shortage of killing capacity, exploded. By 1996, one of every five hogs raised in the United States came from North Carolina and Smithfield Foods was propelled from the status of a regional pira-nha to that of a dominant player in the industry. As the North Carolina technology spread beyond the state, and Hog factories metastasized through the mid-west, Smithfield expanded with them, buying up dozens of competing slaughterhouses. In 1997, Smithfield edged out IBP as the world’s largest hog butcher.

At the same time Smithfield moved toward “vertical integration” (a system that eliminates competition by controlling the raising, slaughtering and marketing of pigs). Late in 1998, taking advantage of the unprecedented crash in the price of live hogs, Smithfield purchased North Carolina based Carroll’s Foods, America’s second-largest hog factory operator and a major turkey producer as well. In the fall of 1999, Smithfield announced the purchase of the world’s biggest hog production company, Murphy Farms. These acquisitions have left Smithfield as the owner of 675,000 sows, four times as many as its closest remaining competitor and enough to produce nearly 10 million pigs for slaughter each year. Around 23% of the pigs slaughtered in the U.S. in 1999 were killed in Smithfield plants. In the year 2000, Smithfield will raise six of every ten pigs killed in its slaughterhouses.

Smithfield’s multi-billion-dollar takeover in America has been matched by aggressive expansion overseas. In 1998, it gained control of Schneiders, Canada’s second largest packing company, bought two French meat processing firms, entered a joint venture with Mexican investors for a hog production complex in Hermisilo, Sonora and invested $100 million in hog factories in the Brazilian state of Matto Grosso.

The Polish Connection

Smithfield’s most ambitious initiative fueled by a $400 million line of credit with Chase Manhattan and a group of German, Dutch and Japanese banks, has been directed at Poland. In March 1999, Smithfield acquired 67% of the capitol stock in Animex S.A., Poland’s largest meat and poultry processing Company for only $43 million. Exulting over having acquired the company at “a fraction of the hundreds of millions that it would take to build that same infrastructure today,” Smithfield CEO Joseph W. Luter made no secret of his intention to take over pork production in Poland. “The pork industry in Poland is, in many ways, similar to the U.S. pork industry of 30 years ago,” Luter concluded. “We believe the strategies and practices we have followed in the U.S. will work equally well, perhaps even better in Poland and Europe.” In July, it was learned that Smithfield was planning as many as four large hog factory complexes in western Poland including one near Poznan with a rumored capacity of 900,000 animals.

Luter’s assessment of Poland as easy prey may, however, prove egregiously wrong. Poland’s sturdy peasants staved off attempts at collectivization and emerged from communism with 80% of farmland still in private hands. Poland has two million farms with an average size of only 21 acres. A quarter of Poland’s people still live on farms and an additional 15% live in rural villages and towns. Having survived communism, Polish peasants show no disposition to submit gently to the pressures of the global market. Last winter, in response to a flood of subsidized E.U. imports and the same ruinous crash in farm commodity prices that has driven tens of thousands more American farm families off the land, Polish farmers blockaded roads, highways, railroad bridges and border crossings all over Poland. With public opinion, even in the cities, favoring the farmers, the Polish government was forced to relieve the situation by buying commodities and raising tariffs against imports.
When trade journals reported in February 1999 that the spearpoint of Smithfield’s invasion of Europe was to be Poland, AWI worked to “get the word out” to Polish humane and environmental groups. In June, AWI President Christine Stevens gave the green light to my idea of bringing Polish activists to the United States to see for themselves exactly what Joe Luter meant in promising to “replicate” Smithfield’s American success in Poland. The project gained force when Agnes Van Volkenburgh, a brilliant third year veterinary student at the University of Illinois who had volunteered to translate, spoke directly on the phone with Andrzej Lepper, head of Poland’s Samoobrona (self-defense) farmers’ union. Lepper, catapulted into prominence by his leadership of the blockades and ranking high in the polls despite press efforts to demonize him, eventually accepted AWI’s invitation.

On September 7th, Agnes, AWI’s Farm Animal Specialist Diane Halverson and I went to Dulles Airport to greet a Polish delegation that included not only Lepper and his deputy Janusz Malewicz, but Roman Wierzbicki head of Rural Solidarity of Independent Farmers and co-leader of the blockades and Marek Kaczynski, chairman of Poland’s Parliamentary Commission on Agriculture. Arriving with them were humane activists Ewa Gebert and Zbigniew Jaskolski, ecologists Dr. Kazimierz Rasztyn and Małgorzata Jerma, Samoobrona deputy Janusz Malewicz, and two journalists Harald Kittel and Igor Parnas. At dinner hosted by AWI’s senior diplomat, John Gleiber, I sat between the two farm leaders. Courteous, well informed, insightful, they bore absolutely no resemblance to the crude demagogues portrayed by the Warsaw press.

September 8th began with breakfast for the Polish delegates at the Washington Headquarters of International Union for Food with officials from the Food Allied Service Trades (FAST) and Food and Commercial Workers Union at the table. The subject was Smithfield’s “union busting” activities with myriad instances of intimidation, bullying, bribery and other thuggish acts designed to keep company workers free of union influence. The Poles, from a nation liberated from communism by grass roots unionism and where trade unions are at the core of both major political blocs, seemed genuinely shocked.

The next stop was a meeting hall near the little town of Tillery, North Carolina that serves as the headquarters of the Black Farmers and Agriculturists Association (BFAA). Here we sat down for a lunch cooked by the black families who had come from miles around and awaited patiently for our arrival. Then BFAA President Gary Grant and his associates, with Agnes translating, recounted the stark fate of black farmers in America. In 1920, there were 926,000 black farmers in America; in 1992 fewer than 19,000 remained. Almost half of black operated farms are smaller than 50 acres. The black land base is evaporating week by week. For example, in 1950 black farmers owned 1.2 million acres of land in North Carolina; today they own 200,000 acres.

Why had the disaster engulfing family farmers descended with such particular vengeance on those who are black? One obvious reason is that black farmers have been systematically denied credit. And nowhere, as Gary Grant showed, has the bias been more extreme than in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1984-5, for example, of 16,000 farmers who received USDA loans only 209 were black. In 1998, USDA agreed to settle a lawsuit filed against USDA by BFAA by dispensing $1.2 billion to black farmers victimized by discriminatory policies. Thus far, however, not a dime has been dispensed.

Floyd Hawkins, one of the only remaining family hog farmers in the region, described how Smithfield has destroyed traditional hog farmers in North Carolina by forcing small slaughterhouses out of business and then refusing to buy small lots of hogs on the grounds that they “lack uniformity.”

The Poles, with a sense of injustice honed by decades of oppression and conflict, were clearly moved by what they heard. Driving southeast on secondary roads toward New Bern, on the central coast we passed hundreds of abandoned farmhouses and crumbling barns, depressing visual confirmation of Gary Grant’s statistics.

Arriving in New Bern at dusk, the delegation was welcomed, in fluent Polish, by John Dove, the 93-year-old Polish-American father of the Neuse Riverkeeper, retired Marine Corps Colonel Rick Dove. On September 9, Col. Dove, who is hired by the Neuse River Foundation to try to protect the river, opened a half-day seminar on the Neuse ecosystem. He began with an extraordinary video, assembled from years of patiently acquired footage that chronicled the decline of the beautiful and productive Neuse River during a period coinciding with the explosion of hog factories in its watershed. Much of the footage dealt with the toxic dinoflagellate _Pfiesteria piscicida_, the “cell from hell” which has killed billions of fish in North Carolina rivers and estuaries over the past decade. This appalling organism, with one of the most complex life cycles observed, can kill fish at a concentration of only 300 per milliliter. Dove filmed many thousands of dead, dying and suffering fish all displaying the ghastly, ulcerative lesions that are the mark of _Pfiesteria_.

The video then shifted to the sources of the nutrient overload that has stimulated blooms of algae and led to toxic concentrations of _Pfiesteria_ in North Carolina’s rivers and estuaries. Aerial footage showed sewage from open cesspools being sprayed on reclaimed marshland crossed with drainage ditches that lead directly to the Neuse and even sprayed on fields partially inundated from heavy rains. Close up shots showed the same effluent leaching — sometimes pouring — into the river. Viewers were then taken inside the hog factories where sows spend their entire lives, never smelling the earth or seeing the sky, in steel cages so small that they cannot even turn around.

"Viewers were then taken inside the hog factories where sows spend their entire lives, never smelling the earth or seeing the sky, in steel cages so small that they cannot even turn around."
The Heart of Darkness

On September 10 the delegation drove to Duplin County, the Pandora’s box where the spreading plague of hog factories finds its origin. In John and Becky Lancaster’s immaculate living room, the Poles listened to local residents explain how the hog industry had changed their lives. While the previous night’s rain had cleared the air said Mrs. Lancaster, many days the atmosphere around her house was, quite literally, nauseating. Visitors held their noses hurrying from their cars to the house; the children couldn’t go outside to play. An emaciated woman stood to greet us. “You should be around when they spray or when it settles in. There’s five cesspools — they call ‘em lagoons — in half a mile.”

We stopped at a sign proclaiming “Hog Hell,” and turned up a narrow dirt road to an open field. On every side were hog factories; in the center was a small house. The stench, although not overpowering, was pervasive. “This is a good day,” said Mr. Johnson, who had stayed home from work and stood waiting, among a small multitude of dogs, to greet us. “You should be around when they spray or when it settles in. There’s five cesspools — they call ‘em lagoons — in half a mile.” He explained that he owned only five acres and the right of way along the road. As for his twenty-six dogs: “They’re about all strays” he said. “They’re about all strays” he said. “They’re about all strays” he said. “They’re about all strays” he said.

Several of us walked down the road to a hog factory, a row of metal sheds and an open cesspool, that we had passed on the way in. Soon, the party followed arid the Poles began peering in the buildings. A feed truck approached and a young man got out, looking worried. “This ain’t good,” he said. “The Boss is comin’ and he ain’t gonna like this.” He had no sooner spoken than a pickup truck appeared, jouncing at high speed up the uneven road. The driver leaped out. “This here’s private property! Who the hell are them people?” he shouted. “You brought ‘em, did ya? Who the hell are you? Show me some identification.”

“Show me your badge and I’ll be glad to” I said. “I ain’t got a badge,” said he, “but I damn sure know somebody who has.” Then, apparently finding me menacing, he locked the doors of his pickup and began dialing a cell phone “He’s callin’ the Sheriff,” the young man advised, “you better git them people out real quick.”

“Welcome to Duplin County” said John Lancaster after the delegation was safely loaded. “We’ve got our own little police state right here.” He had another reminder when we reached a cafeteria for a farewell meal. “Take off that anti-hog button before we go in. Remember where you are.”

En route back to D.C., we reached the town of Smithfield, Virginia, and motored past the cavernous slaughterhouse from which Smithfield Foods earned a 12.6 million dollar fine, the largest ever imposed under the Clean Water Act, for over 6,900 illegal discharges into the Pagan River. Up river is Smithfield’s new corporate headquarters, with Joe Luter’s yacht anchored nearby.

described her research on the long-term impact of hog factories on the health of those who live nearby and are unable to escape the stench and disruption. One common response, said Dr. Okuni, is severe depression.

The seminar ended with presentations by two veterans of North Carolina’s hog wars, Tom Mattison and Don Webb. In 1996, Mattison, Riverkeeper of the smaller New River, faced what — to that time — had been the world’s largest hog spill, an estimated 20 million gallons of raw hog waste flowing directly into the river. For days, Mattison told us, state officials, rather than take measures to protect public health, tried to cover up the spill and deny that it existed. Ex-hog farmer Don Webb, a big man with a voice to match, described how Smithfield and the hog barons had driven traditional hog farmers (whose numbers in North Carolina plummeted from 27,000 to under 5,000 in barely over a decade) out of business and dwelled on the political corruption that facilitated the corporate takeover.

By this time, the Poles had heard enough to respond. Ewa Gebert reminded everyone that cruelty to animals and cruelty to children and other humans are part of the same syndrome. The leaders of the two powerful farm unions stated simply and bluntly that hog factories will have to do to stop them. “These are concentration camps for hogs,” said Andrzej Lepper. “We had concentration camps in Poland before. We will not allow them again.”

Lepper made a remark which was to prove prophetic: “Learning of this situation, I am reminded of a Polish proverb,” he said, “God forgives always. Man forgives sometimes. Nature never forgives.”

During the afternoon, Rick Dove mobilized his “airforce,” three light aircraft flown by ex-military pilots, and each of us had an opportunity to view the crop of hog factories, sown thickly across the Neuse floodplain, from the air. The installations look very much alike, a neat row of long metal sheds with one, and sometimes two open cesspools, bilious green in color, positioned nearby. Several units were often visible at the same time and even in a comparatively short flight we over flew dozens. A striking feature was the proximity of cesspools to watercourse, which could be easily identified by the lines of trees bordering them. It appeared that the designers had deliberately positioned cesspools on low ground.

“We set off with our friends, for a tour of a country that has abandoned itself land and soul, to industrial agriculture.”

“We are concentration camps for hogs,” said Andrzej Lepper. “We had concentration camps in Poland before. We will not allow them again.”

not be permitted in Poland. Asked by reporter Penny Round if the unions would employ “aggressive means” to prevent Smithfield from building hog factories in their country, Rural Solidarity head Roman Wierzbicki replied “We will do whatever we have to do to stop them.” “These are concentration camps for hogs,” said Andrzej Lepper. “We had concentration camps in Poland before. We will not allow them again.”
September 13 began with an early morning flight from National Airport to Kansas City. There, we boarded vans and drove to Unionville, Missouri for a rendezvous with Terry Spence, a leader in the struggle against Premium Standard Farms (PSF, now owned by Continental Grain) which is the second largest hog factory operator in the U.S. Northern Missouri is an area of rolling hills with numerous creeks and live oak thickets. The only disquieting feature of this bucolic landscape is the extraordinary number of derelict farmhouses; a mute commentary on the tragedy that has overtaken Rural America.

After meeting Spence, we entered an area absolutely dominated by hog factories. There are 22 “units” in this cluster of hog factories Spence told us, totaling 198 sheds in which 218,000 feeder pigs are confined. We stopped at one unit, consisting of nine metal sheds, each containing 1100 hogs. A pickup truck containing PSF security men, which had been tailing us, parked 100 yards away to keep the delegation under surveillance.

As we drove on (always with one or two “units” in sight) we noticed silo like structures built at the edge of low hills. These are repositories for dead pigs. The “dead truck”, which visits each shed daily, backs up to the top of the silo and disgorges its cargo. When the silo is full, a larger truck backs under the bottom of it, a trap door is opened and the carcasses cascade down and are hauled to the PSF rendering plant. There they are processed and fed to the surviving pigs.

Once safely off PSF land we drove to the Spence farm. The yard was already full of pickup trucks; 30 or so local farmers had come in to meet the Poles. It was a clear, warm evening amid the rolling Missouri hills. Fortunately, the wind was in the right direction to clear away the scent of hog factories.

After supper, the farmers stood up, with painful earnestness to tell about their trouble with Premium Standard Farms. We tried to work within the system, they said. But the system betrayed us. Even now, after purported legal victories, we are nowhere. They are still here and they are slowly destroying us. What can we do?

The two Polish farm leaders responded. Even across the language barrier they were eloquent and forceful, and the farmers, listening intently, broke into clapping again and again. The Poles described the tactics they had been forced to use when the government ignored their problems, how they had occupied buildings, sometimes local offices, sometimes entire ministries in Warsaw. They told how they set up roadblocks, turning back trucks but allowing ordinary traffic to go around and how they had resisted the police when attacked. In these cases they had often set fire to rows of old tires to deter the police charges. They also equipped themselves with numerous buckets of liquefied hog manure, which they mixed and sealed in their barnyards before setting out. The police, said Lepper, were very sensitive to being doused with liquid hog manure because it is almost impossible to get the smell out of their woolen uniforms.

When Kaczynski, taking exception to his colleagues, urged the Americans to operate strictly within the rules, Scott Dye, the deep voiced Sierra Club staffer whose mother lives downwind of PSF hog factories, had an answer. “Been there! Done that!” he said. “We went to our legislators. The company bought them. We went to our state officials. The company bought them. We went to the courts. It goes from appeal to appeal. The Feds are supposed to be on our side. So far that has meant nothing.” Terry Spence stood up to say that if he had known what he now knows, he would have taken direct action at the beginning and either stopped PSF or “gone down fighting.”

Wierzbicki had the last word. “My friends” he said, “Listen to me. If you take direct action, plan an action that you have a real chance of winning. If you undertake something you can’t win, the farmers may become discouraged and give up. Conversely, a win — even if it is a small win — will encourage them and they will continue to fight.”

On the 15th, we drove through the variegated southern Iowa landscape for a noon press conference in Des Moines, arranged by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. After lunch, we continued north to the town of Clear Lake. Northern Iowa is much flatter than the southern part of the state and has fewer streams and lakes. The farmland here is so valuable that instead of being left derelict, as in North Carolina and Missouri, abandoned farmsteads are bulldozed away. This has been the fate not only of countless farms in the region, but of churches, country schoolhouses and even villages. One sees fields of corn or soybeans stretching, almost without interruption, to the horizon.

That evening, the delegation attended another seminar, which included hog farmers down from Minnesota to tell how they had been victimized by the John Morrell Packing Company owned by Smithfield. The following morning, clear, windless and warm, with the first scents of autumn in the air, we visited farms raising hogs for Niman Ranch according to the humane husbandry protocol developed by AWI’s Diane Halverson.

Our first stops were at adjoining farms owned by the Menke brothers. We began at Paul Menke’s farm, walking through a cornfield to a couple of small — perhaps one acre — enclosures bordered by elm trees. Each contained three or four sows with thirty or so piglets a few weeks old. The piglets would approach curiously, with big eyes, then suddenly take fright and run to the other end of the pen. In a moment they would return, the bold ones leading, the timid ones hanging back, to repeat the process until some of us captured their interest by tossing out ears of corn from the adjoining field.”

The piglets would approach curiously, with big eyes, then suddenly take fright and run to the other end of the pen. In a moment they would return, the bold ones leading, the timid ones hanging back, to repeat the process until some of us captured their interest by tossing out ears of corn from the adjoining field.

The Poles described the tactics they had been forced to use when the government ignored their problems, how they had occupied buildings, sometimes local offices, sometimes entire ministries in Warsaw. They told how they set up roadblocks, turning back trucks but allowing ordinary traffic to go around and how they had resisted the police when attacked. In these cases they had often set fire to rows of old tires to deter the police charges. They also equipped themselves with numerous buckets of liquefied hog manure, which they mixed and sealed in their barnyards before setting out. The police, said Lepper, were very sensitive to being doused with liquid hog manure because it is almost impossible to get the smell out of their woolen uniforms.

When Kaczynski, taking exception to his colleagues, urged the Americans to operate strictly within the rules, Scott Dye, the deep voiced Sierra Club staffer whose mother lives downwind of PSF hog factories, had an answer. “Been there! Done that!” he said. “We went to our legislators. The company bought them. We went to our state officials. The company bought them. We went to the courts. It goes from appeal to appeal. The Feds are supposed to be on our side. So far that has meant nothing.” Terry Spence stood up to say that if he had known what he now knows, he would have taken direct action at the beginning and either stopped PSF or “gone down fighting.”

Wierzbicki had the last word. “My friends” he said, “Listen to me. If you take direct action, plan an action that you have a real chance of winning. If you undertake something you can’t win, the farmers may become discouraged and give up. Conversely, a win — even if it is a small win — will encourage them and they will continue to fight.”

On the 15th, we drove through the variegated southern Iowa landscape for a noon press conference in Des Moines, arranged by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. After lunch, we continued north to the town of Clear Lake. Northern Iowa is much flatter than the southern part of the state and has fewer streams and lakes. The farmland here is so valuable that instead of being left derelict, as in North Carolina and Missouri, abandoned farmsteads are bulldozed away. This has been the fate not only of countless farms in the region, but of churches, country schoolhouses and even villages. One sees fields of corn or soybeans stretching, almost without interruption, to the horizon.

That evening, the delegation attended another seminar, which included hog farmers down from Minnesota to tell how they had been victimized by the John Morrell Packing Company owned by Smithfield. The following morning, clear, windless and warm, with the first scents of autumn in the air, we visited farms raising hogs for Niman Ranch according to the humane husbandry protocol developed by AWI’s Diane Halverson.

Our first stops were at adjoining farms owned by the Menke brothers. We began at Paul Menke’s farm, walking through a cornfield to a couple of small — perhaps one acre — enclosures bordered by elm trees. Each contained three or four sows with thirty or so piglets a few weeks old. The piglets would approach curiously, with big eyes, then suddenly take fright and run to the other end of the pen. In a moment they would return, the bold ones leading, the timid ones hanging back, to repeat the process until some of us captured their interest by tossing out ears of corn from the adjoining field.
Then we skirted the cornfield to a much larger compound, a miniature pig city full of farrowing huts of every type and state of repair, watering troughs, feeding troughs, “creep feeders” (designed so piglets can enter but sows cannot) even an old school bus body for shade. Each sow had her hut, big enough to accommodate her and her piglets and provide shelter for them during rainy spells. Paul told us that all of the corn he raised on his farm was ground up and fed to pigs and that once he had harvested a field he turned the pigs on it to graze. “They glean every kernel,” he said.

Paul explained that the pigs have separate sum-mering and wintering quarters. In late spring, summer and early fall, the pigs live in field compounds; in late fall and winter they live in “hoop houses” piled deeply with straw or cornstalks. After each summer season, the entire hog city, school bus and all, is moved to another tract. Paul waits five years before returning with his pigs to the same piece of ground. “Hopefully five years is enough time for the soil to rid itself of pathogens,” he said. “So far, I’ve had almost no disease.”

Pat Menke’s operation is similar to his brother’s but with the refinement of a spray system rigged so pigs can stand under it in hot weather and get cooled down. Pat, who also follows a five-year cycle, stresses the soil building features of his system. “I had pigs on that piece of ground last year,” he said, pointing to a cornfield next to his compound. “I expect to get 200 bushels without a pound of fertilizer.”

Paul Willis’ operation is similar in principle to the others, but on a grander scale with a full 20 acres for the pigs to roam in. On the Willis property we had a look at some hoop houses which were opened up and used by the pigs for shade. The frames were covered with heavy, plasticized canvas, which, absent a severe hailstorm can be expected to last at least six years. I asked Willis about tail biting. “For the most part we are free of it,” he said. “But from time to time a female — always a female — starts to bite tails. There is nothing to do, once you identify her, but to segregate her from the others.”

We examined one more farm, where weaner pigs lived in barns on deep straw and exercised in adjacent lots. Then we said good-bye to our friends, including anti-corporate activists, Jim and Pamela Braun, and turned toward Chicago.

The last night, before a final press conference and reception in Polish Chicago, was spent at the Sinsinawa Visitor’s Center, a Catholic retreat across the Mississippi from Dubuque, Iowa. There we awoke to an extraordinary view: to the east the red sun rising through a caul of mist over the hill country of northern Illinois, to the south and west the great river hidden by a slowly ascending blanket of fog. The scene from the dining hall, fully glassed for 120 degrees, was especially panoramic. We sat at our own table among a couple of hundred sweetly smiling nuns, eating breakfast and gazing at a sight most of us are unlikely to see again.

Nature Never Forgives

E ven as the tour came to an end, the truth of the Polish saying “Nature never forgives” was borne out as floodwaters from Hurricane Floyd poured across North Carolina’s coastal plain. The flood waters inundated scores, probably hundreds, of hog factories in North Carolina and southeastern Virginia drowning — by USDA estimates — at least half a million pigs trapped in their stalls as well as millions of chickens and turkeys. Most of the installations the delegation viewed from the air were submerged.

Vast quantities perhaps, as much as a quarter billion gal-lons of liquefied hog waste, were released by the floods. Satel-lite images showed a brown plume of waste filling Albemarle and Pimlico Sounds and moving out to sea. Persons returning to flooded homes found their belongings coated with a fecal scum; tens of thousands of water wells were contaminated. Despite frantic efforts of North Carolina officials and the hog barons to cover up the magnitude of the disaster, its impact on fishing and tourism can be hardly short of calamitous. Beaches will eventually stop stinking, but no one knows how long it may take fragile coastal ecosystems to recover.

In the meantime, having been exposed to the realities of Ameri-can agribusiness, the heads of Poland’s powerful farm unions have stated publicly and unequivocally in Polish media that they will not allow Smithfield to build hog factories in Poland. Andrzej Lepper has addressed an ultimatum to Smithfield CEO Joe Luter telling him that Samoobrona cannot be bought and that “if Smithfield does not heed Samoobrona’s warning it will feel Samoobrona’s fists.”

Lepper has invited AWI to assemble a delegation of U.S. activ-ists for a tour of Poland at Samoobrona’s expense. Two other farm unions, Rural Solidarity and Farmer’s Circle have asked to co-host.

The unions and public interest groups are anxious to enter co-operative projects, such as setting up a model farm to demonstrate the humane husbandry techniques observed in Iowa. Lepper has asked for American help in applying the river keeper’s concept as a means of protecting Polish rivers.

One of the most gratifying effects of the Polish tour was seen in the U.S. During the tour, as though a fairy godmother had waved her wand, the words “cruelty” and “animal welfare” ceased to be taboo. Rick Dove set the tone by showing excerpts from the PETA video. The Poles, one and all, attacked hog factories for their cruelty. American speakers, as though it was no longer “sissy” to speak what had been in their minds all the time, picked up the theme.
These provocative ideas came to Mr. Lepper during the course of the AWI-sponsored invitational tour for Polish leaders designed to show them the enormous contrast between humane family farms and the appalling hog factories in the United States.

Ecological Farming and How To Interpret It

Ecology is an area of interest and activism in modern society which calls for preserving the natural environment: building new relations between humankind and nature: and determining a new role for mankind as “guardians” of the world. In other words, it is a philosophy of creating a new order, a new way of life in harmony with the laws of nature and socioeconomic progress, in which humankind and respect for all forms of life are the greatest values.

Ecology means order (logos) in our homes, in accord with the laws of nature, and by home I mean the family home, the country, the world and the cosmos.

A new style of life in harmony with nature, a new style of progress of civilization and respect for all life, not only human, wise and conscientious use of natural resources introducing harmony of life between humankind and nature - all of this constitutes ecological development.

“We have enslaved the earth and all its life; We have disturbed the natural order instead of accepting it...We should NOT create situations which may prove to be globally disastrous.”

We define humankind as the greatest player in this development and respecting laws of nature as its greatest value. In reaffirming and broadening the concept of “humaneness” we create a new philosophy for humankind as co-creators of evolution, as thoughtful caretakers who shape the environment, without abusing it, without devastating nature and inflicting suffering in the world on non-human animals.

No one is as entrenched in the issues of the environment as farmers. The country is their natural environment, a sanctuary from the pollution produced by large cities and industry. The majority of the public is not aware of these facts. The public does not acknowledge the arguments for maintaining a natural balance in the environment nor the need to clean up the environment at the cost of all of society-for all of society’s health.

Farmers and the rural community are not only the “guardians” of natural resources, they also must produce adequate amounts of healthy food. Ecologically appropriate technological methods need to be employed in raising crops as well as livestock.

Healthy food is most readily produced in conditions afforded by family farms.

The well being of all humankind is at stake. Healthy food consists in many kinds of products of plant and animal origin. The concept of healthy food does not include chemically contaminated products of animal factories, rather it necessitates natural farming and Polish farming is natural farming.

Along with the majority of Polish farmers, I am a Catholic, so here are my moral and religious impressions on this issue. I think humankind, the highest form of life, received (as the Bible tells us) a concession from God, to use nature and living beings for our benefit. But we have violated the planet; we have violated the biological balance; we have polluted the air and waters: not to keep alive, but for material gain, to amass riches, to live in luxury and beyond our needs. We have misunderstood the Bible’s directions. We have enslaved the earth and all its life; we have disturbed the natural order instead of accepting it. We have failed to be good stewards of the earth that God has given us. We should love the earth that sustains our life, and thoughtfully use her goods and resources. Today, as intelligent beings, we must be fully aware of our responsibility to use that...
intelligence. The fact that nature has allowed us to expand and harness its power doesn’t mean we should fulfill our unnatural whims at the price of the environment and the fundamental natural order. We should not create situations which may prove to be globally disastrous.

Farming must take on a new obligation: keeping the country ecologically safe. Accepting this obligation requires proper knowledge and training from the scientific community — we do not have that. This lack of training is not viewed as important by some politicians and economists who focus on financial gain.

Ecological humaneness requires the rural economy to adopt humane attitudes towards farm animals. These are living beings who have emotions, who feel and experience suffering, and have natural instincts which need to be expressed.

It is essential, therefore, to do everything to allow the animals on farms an opportunity to live happy lives, to treat them with respect and empathy. A broadened concept of humaneness and regard for all forms of life should motivate us to respect the natural laws of the animal world, in the same way we respect the human right to dignity. The right to live with dignity in the case of animals is a life without suffering and without taking away their natural environment. The life of any being is a great mystery and a natural phenomenon deserving of the greatest reverence and care.

Problems of ecologically preserving the environment and humaneness toward life of all species is becoming a global concern. Europeans still care what happens to the rain forests of the Amazon, the waters of the oceans, the ice of Antarctica. The inhabitants of the Americas care about the rivers and mountains of Eastern Europe. As well as International coordination of environmental activism even international jurisdiction over violations of nature and its devastation.

Society, just like the environment, is subject to damage by pathological factors, economical and political. This pollution is evident in Poland.

There is a need to introduce a new order and harmony into our lives and our society. It is a problem in human ecology, as mentioned by Pope John Paul II, the moral postulate of “love thy neighbor,” the practice of which is often so difficult. Let’s remember this when we take a stance on international issues, like the current topic of ecology.

Is Poland’s Private Farming In Danger?

During my visit to the U.S., sponsored by AWI (September 7 through 18), I saw industrial “hog factory” farms and poultry farms, much the same as the ones which existed in Poland during the communist times. Many of those are still in existence today.

Smithfield Foods Inc., with the permission from the U.S. Government, with no regard for animal welfare or the environment, built hundreds of farms which produce millions of hogs. Smithfield led to the destruction of countless private farms. If we idly stand by and watch the expansion of this company in our country, the same fate awaits our farmers. That is why we appeal to everyone, farmers and local governments —

Do not allow the construction of factory farms for hogs, poultry, or cattle, not only by Smithfield, but by any other company! By blockading the construction of factory farms we are saving our beautiful environment, we are protecting animals from being raised in inhumane conditions but most of all we are saving our family farms.

“The construction of factory farms must be stopped! Let us not allow Poland to be invaded by this cancer, which we already experienced during the communist times!”

American farmers were tricked, they woke up too late, let us not make the same mistake! Let’s act before it is too late, not after!

The President of Smithfield Foods, Inc., Joe Luter, has announced that he will conquer Poland, and has received permission to do so from anti-Polish, anti-farmer successive governments of Poland.

The construction of factory farms must be stopped! Let us not allow Poland to be invaded by this cancer, which we already experienced during the communist times! It is our duty! Future generations of Poles will not forgive us the sin of idly standing by.

North Carolina Flooding

September 28, 1999

Since the factory farms were destroyed by the flood and given the amount of destruction they have brought to the environment and to private farmers, it is clear that they should not be rebuilt.

There is a saying in Poland: “God forgives always, man sometimes, nature never.” Sooner or later, Nature avenge human interference with its laws. The North Carolina disaster is just one example of Nature’s “ecological payback bomb,” many of which have been exploding in different parts of the globe.

If the U.S. Government is considering giving money for the rebuilding of destroyed farms, that money should go to the thousands of private farmers whose farms were destroyed by the corporate factory farming system. Private family farms are the ones we need to rebuild!


Farming Humanely
by Dwight Ault

To introduce myself, I am a sixty-nine year old sustainable and organic farmer from southern Minnesota. I have farmed nearly forty years and am more excited about the art of farming than ever. Wendell Berry says that good farming is an art. He is right.

My strong suit, labor and income-wise, is raising pigs from birth to market. I, along with a dozen or so hog raisers, mostly from Iowa, came into the Washington D.C. area in early September as guests of Niman Ranch Pork. It is through Niman Ranch that we market our top-notch pork. Our first responsibility was to be farmer ambassadors in the Fresh Fields/Whole Food stores in the Washington area. All in all, it was a wonderful experience as we met many interested and supportive customers most who had never met a guaranteed, honest to goodness, hog farmer from the Midwest. When they viewed our many pictures of our farm, they were quite impressed with the care of the animals.

For you readers who are not “up to speed” in the Animal Welfare Institute’s efforts concerning what has gone on with our domestic critter friends, the pigs, let me tell you. In order to be eligible to sell to Niman Ranch Pork, one must not give any form of antibiotics to the pigs from birth to market, must not cut off tails, must always give the pigs deep straw in which to bed or have them on green pasture, must not use animal by-products in feed. Niman Ranch further requests its pork to be tested for tenderness, taste and color.

The reaction from customers was fun for us to hear. Two couples said, after hearing our explanation, that they were going to buy pork right then and there. They had not purchased pork for several years because of the reputation of the present factory-produced pork formerly sold in Fresh Fields/Whole Food stores. The meat counter employees were continually saying that they were pleased with the number of customers which we were sending to their counter. Many asked, “Can we find this meat brand in other stores also?” and we would, of course, tell them that no other stores presently carry it other than Fresh Fields. In short, they were very pleased to have access to this quality meat. I soon realized that I did not expect this reaction as we had been led to believe that, in general, the urban consumer did not much care where and in what conditions the pigs were raised. Not true at all! They very much cared regardless of whether or not they were consumers.

I think that they were impressed that we producers cared that much and that we could produce pork under the protocol set up by the Animal Welfare Institute. It was simply a wonderful experience for the consumer and producer. I, for one, must ever be thankful to the Animal Welfare Institute for its tireless efforts in establishing and promoting this decent movement. If I were to have to produce pork as I did a few years back, I would get out of the business. My son, Grant, who will carry on the farm and who now farms with me, agrees. I look back and realize that without the gentle persuasions of the Halverson sisters (Diane and Marlene), I no doubt would never have made the switch to a system based on caring and ethics. Well-cared-for pigs, in short, bring joy to their owners, and to my way of thinking allow pigs to know joy in return. Technical progress has brought terrible consequences to the main part of livestock production as far as animal care is concerned. There is a statement which says that “out of agony comes true beauty.” I hope this will be so in pork production.

I think AWI’s concern for the Polish farmer is terribly important. My wife and I had the opportunity to meet these people while in Washington and understand their dilemma. If they are not successful in protecting their farmers and pork production system, then we all end up being victims of large factory systems based on the “ethics of the dollar.”

May our Creator give the strength necessary to the Polish farmers to do what they must do in order to protect decency and their way of life. This is the obligation of us all.

Death and Disintegration of Truck Driver in Murphy Farms Hog Factory Cesspool

Excerpts from The Daily & Sunday Oklahoman, Copyright, 1999 Oklahoma Publishing Company

The body of the man still missing in a 25-foot-deep hog lagoon after two weeks, is “extremely, badly decomposed by this time,” Ray Blakeney, director of the state medical examiner’s office, said Tuesday.

Blakeney said if Murphy Farms, owner of the lagoon, is using a bacterial process to break down the hog manure, it would contribute even more to the decomposition of the body of Jack Plain, 58.

On the night of December 1, Plain was driving the bobtail truck that was backed into the lagoon when it missed wheel blocks, submerging the truck in the lagoon…

Calls to Murphy Farms spokeswoman Darra Johnson were not returned Tuesday.

Ellis County Sheriff Dewayne Miller returned a call to The Oklahoman. Miller said he has been at the site most of the time but did not want to talk about the incident over a cellular phone.

Members of the Plain’s family have continually questioned why the hog company doesn’t drain the lagoon, but Darra Johnson said Monday that there’s too much effluent to spread it anywhere…

Miller said if these recovery efforts don’t work, a next step would be to drain the lagoon. - Mick Hinton, dated December 15, 1999
AWI Welcomes its International Committee’s Newest Member

A
gnes Van Volkenburgh, whose translations appear on pages 12-13, has accepted an appointment to represent Poland on the AWI International Committee. A third-year veterinary student at the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine, she has directed her talents to improvement of life for animals in both the United States and Poland. As a tireless translator, Agnes made possible the dialogue, both official and informal, between the Polish-speaking delegates and their host Americans throughout our U.S. tour (a photograph of her appears on the opposite page [14]). General Stanislaw Maczek, Agnes’ great-great uncle, is recognized throughout Poland as a hero of his homeland. He commanded a motorized cavalry brigade in 1939 and later led the First Polish Armored Division in fighting in Belgium, Holland, France and Germany, from 1942-1945.

Agnes has written a scholarly paper reporting “Effectiveness of a Coordinated Veterinary and Public Education Program in Achieving Pet Sterilization in Poland.” The surveys that she conducted on veterinary attitudes before and after the veterinary education campaign were accompanied by a survey of public attitudes, followed by a public education and media campaign. As a result, almost three-quarters of veterinarians in Warsaw will recommend sterilization to their clients. Excerpts from conclusions reached on results of the study are reproduced below.

“This study is the first step in a long journey. It provides a successful model of effective public and veterinary education aimed at increasing the knowledge about and the acceptance of sterilization. Educational programs developed in this project need to be continued and expanded to reach other areas of Poland and audiences of different age groups… Further public and veterinary education is essential to get the culture to the point at which pet population control is a commonly accepted responsibility.

“The study was widely publicized in the United States. The Champaign News Gazette ran a feature story about my work in Poland. A Polish television station in Chicago invited me to speak about the problem of pet overpopulation in Poland and the United States on their program, in which they showed footage of the Early Sterilization Conference in Lublin. Alfa, a Polish language weekly in Chicago, and Polish Daily Zgoda, a Chicago Polish language daily, ran stories about my work in Poland. This widespread media coverage contributed to increasing the awareness of Polish-American audiences of pet overpopulation and will benefit the welfare of animals in the United States.

“The translated articles and educational brochures produced as a result of this project have been made available to veterinary colleges, animal shelters, and humane agencies throughout Poland. The literature will also be distributed to ‘Animals’ Foundation youth groups across the country and will thus contribute to creating a new generation of responsible pet owners. The results of this research will be published in a Polish veterinary journal, Magazyn Weterynaryjny, reaching veterinarians throughout Poland and providing a model for achieving increased sterilization rates in other communities.

“… My immediate objectives include the continuation of the public and veterinary education programs, a campaign for humane treatment of farm animals, and developing a mobile spay/neuter clinic for rural areas of Poland.

“… This project gave me the opportunity to explore ways by which I can help address international issues of animal welfare as a future Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.”

The project was supported by the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Ralston Purina Company, Hills Pet Nutrition, and major veterinary colleges in the United States and Poland.

The Day I Saw a Full-grown Pig Gambol in Frenzied Delight

This event was witnessed by Louise van der Merwe when a South African hog factory boar was allowed a brief interval of freedom. “We let these boars out for 10 minutes every day to keep them healthy,” the farmer told me.

“Really?” My face lightened. “Do they enjoy it?”

The farmer asked a nearby laborer to let one of the boars out while we went to wait outside. The boar’s big body emerged from the shed door and he trotted heavily on his short legs along a narrow cement passageway leading to an enclosed strip of sand that ran along the back of the shed. As his trotters reached the sand, he suddenly broke into a frenzy of excitement, maneuvering his big, bulky body back and forth and up and down like a bucking bronco. He stopped momentarily to dig his snout as deep as possible into the sand, and then began to frolic and gambol once more.

– Louise van der Merwe, Founder of Animal Voice

Bequests to AWI

To any who 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, located in Washington, DC, the sum of $___________ and/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 specific wishes about the disposition of your bequest, we suggest you discuss such provisions with your attorney.
Fighting the Tiger War in the Tiger State

by Debbie Banks

Even in the shade, the mid-April temperatures in Madhya Pradesh (MP), central India, can reach 42° and there we were, wandering across an exposed black desert in the searing heat. But what we were walking across was not a natural desert. Rather, it was what was left of a once healthy forest on the borders of Panna Tiger Reserve.

Panna, one of five Tiger Reserves in the self-declared "Tiger State" of Madhya Pradesh, has been turned into an island. The black waste from the National Mineral Development Corporation (NMDC) diamond mine has formed an expansive moonscape. Spanning miles, the mine's tailings have smothered the land and extinguished all life. And tigers are expected to cross this?

The indiscriminate destruction of tiger habitat in and around protected areas not only exacerbates the threat to tigers, but has disastrous affects on other wildlife, the forests, the water table and the people who depend on them. The loss of much of this habitat is due to industrial activities.

Tiger populations may thrive in core areas of Tiger Reserves, but they are often surrounded by mines, dams, roads, agriculture, plantations, human settlements and livestock. Fragmentation of habitat inevitably leads to increased conflict, and tigers are forced into isolated populations that are more vulnerable to local extinction.

This in turn impairs the probability of long-term survival as population size and reproductive success are reduced and dispersal patterns of subadults are impaired.

While conducting a five-week field investigation for the Environmental Investigation Agency's The State of the Tiger: India's Tiger Crisis, we were continually coming across examples of government negligence, indifference and even collusion with those who were out to destroy tiger forests for the financial gain of a few.

In the Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh, local tribal peoples have lost their land and the valuable trees on it to corrupt politicians, including the brother of the former State Forest Minister.

In Pench Tiger Reserve, commercial fishing is conducted by mafia-style businessmen in violation of the Indian Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. In the guise of agitating for the "traditional" rights of local communities, they have coerced the State government into issuing fishing permits for 305 people.

Yet most of these people have alternative means of subsistence, most live 25-100 km away from the Reserve, and since the Pench river is not perennial, the only water body is the Totladoh Reservoir completed in 1990, hardly a traditional source of fish!

Kenya Battles the Ivory Trade

by Adam M. Roberts

Just months after three Southern African countries auctioned off their stockpiled ivory to Japanese buyers, the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) has reported its biggest ivory seizure in the decade since the 1989 international ban on commercial ivory trade. According to the KWS statement, 45 pieces of ivory weighing over 350 kilograms were seized from three different sites in a town north of Nairobi. The tusks represent at least 23 dead elephants and there were bullet holes through two of the tusks. Two people have been arrested and will be prosecuted.

Acting KWS Director, Nehemiah Rotich, told the Associated Press "the poachers had probably been stockpiling the ivory in the field in anticipation of an increase in the price [of ivory]."

Kenya was one of over half a dozen African elephant range states that opposed the downlisting of elephants from Zimbabwe, Botswana and Mozambique at the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) in 1997. This opposition stemmed from the fear that any renewed international legal trade in elephant ivory would lead to poaching in other elephant ranges states. Rotich concluded in his AP interview: "We hope that it will not take the deaths of any more elephants for the world to recognize the threat that the ivory trade poses to our elephants."

As the year 2000 began, Reuters reported a shoot out between the KWS anti-poaching patrol and elephant poachers, four of whom were killed in Garissa in northeast Kenya. The story notes that "poachers had killed eight elephants in the Kora National Park but were challenged after burying the ivory which they planned to recover later. The poachers, armed with three automatic rifles, exchanged fire with the game wardens before they were killed."

All of this poaching activity looms ominously as the world prepares for the next Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES which is to be held in Kenya in April 2000. An interesting clash will take place there when South Africa follows the lead of Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia, and tries to downlist its elephant population from Appendix I to Appendix II to allow, among other things, trade in raw ivory. Meanwhile, to their credit, Kenya and India are submitting a proposal to put Zimbabwe’s, Botswana’s and Namibia’s elephant populations back on Appendix I for their long-term protection. AWI will be sending two delegates to the Kenya meeting, Ben White and Adam Roberts. When they return, Ben and Adam will provide a full report of the outcome of the meeting in the AWI Quarterly.
**U.S. Department of Commerce’s False “Dolphin-Safe” Label**

by Ben White

Thanks to the U.S. Department of Commerce, it is easy to tell which canned tuna one should not under any circumstances buy: the one with their “Dolphin-Safe” label! In an effort to dupe American consumers, the Agency has cooked up this new label to describe tuna caught under the “Dolphin Death Act” of 1997. Under pressure from a Mexican WTO challenge asserting that our embargo on tuna caught by chasing, encircling and netting dolphins is an unfair trade restriction of their dolphin-deadly tuna, the U.S. Government has changed the definition of dolphin safe. Under their label, dolphins can still be harassed, chased for hours by speed boats and helicopters, and caught in purse-seine nets so long as no dolphins are seen by the single observer to be killed or seriously injured.

Fortunately, you still have a choice. Canned tuna bearing the old label that says Dolphin Safe, without the Department of Commerce banner is still caught without setting nets on dolphins. Because the major tuna packers in the United States have heard your voice clearly, all of them are sticking with the old label and the old definition. Chicken of the Sea, Bumblebee, and Star Kist have all promised to refuse to buy dolphin-caught tuna or use the Department of Commerce’s lying label.

---

**Russian Beluga Slaughter Halted**

by Ben White

The power of the global whale protection movement kicked into high gear in September when Russia unexpectedly opened up a new commercial whaling operation on small whales. About 36 beluga whales were killed in the Sea of Okhotsk and shipped as meat and blubber to Japan. Within days of this brutal and dangerous precedent, the outcry was so loud and well organized that the Russian government pulled the plug on any continued slaughter. A permit to kill 2,100 of these lovely white whales was cancelled.

The deadly ramifications of a whole new front of commercial whaling galvanized opposition from the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, the State Department, the Marine Mammal Commission, Congressman William Delahunt (D, MA) and many non-governmental organizations. The enterprise was perceived as an end-run around the International Whaling Commission and an attempt to weaken current global prohibitions on commercial whaling. The hunt and transport was the first major international sale of small cetacean meat in modern times.

The sale between countries of meat obtained from the larger species of whales is illegal because of their listing on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). Unfortunately, small cetaceans are listed on Appendix II, allowing some limited trade if it can be done "without threatening the population." A Russian CITES export permit for the beluga meat was issued over the objections of many Russian officials and scientists who protested that not enough was known about the belugas being decimated.

The Animal Welfare Institute was one of the organizations clued in to the emergency. We responded by sending out an email alert that produced calls, letters and faxes to the Japanese Embassy and Consulates. We were investigating the possibility of traveling to Russia and filming the continuing slaughter when it was called off. Congratulations to all involved, especially Karen Steuer and the International Fund for Animal Welfare who had a film crew waiting for the ship when it delivered its grisly cargo to Hokkaido, Japan and was central to organizing the incredible, overwhelming, rapid response.

---

**NMFS Plays Politics with Beluga Extinction**

As expected and feared, the National Marine Fisheries Service has capitulated to Anchorage big business interests and declared the Cook Inlet population of beluga whales depleted (under the Marine Mammal Protection Act), instead of the far more protective endangered status (under the Endangered Species Act).

As described in the *AWI Quarterly* of Spring 1999, the beluga whales of Cook Inlet have been reduced from over a thousand to only about two hundred in a decade. The primary cause has been native hunting for commercial sales in Anchorage. But whereas most native hunters agree with listing the whales as endangered in hopes of bringing the population back to healthy levels, a huge outcry has come from the Anchorage business community. Anchorage dumps its sewage directly into Cook Inlet, with only primary treatment. And a string of oil rigs dotting the inlet enjoy a unique status among the fifteen hundred oil rigs on the continental shelf of the U.S.: they are permitted by the EPA to dribble poisons such as lead, mercury and arsenic into the water.

Whereas the endangered listing would open up scrutiny of these habitat influences on the whales, the depleted status does not. It is also unclear how the government will now move forward on a co-management scheme with native hunters. There is a temporary ban on hunting in place.

The Animal Welfare Institute is preparing to sue the National Marine Fisheries Service for dodging their legal responsibility to protect these whales. We urge members to comment directly to the agency on the proposed inadequate depleted listing:

Chief, Marine Mammal Division
Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20910
The Human Use of Animals: Case Studies in Ethical Choice
F. Barbara Orlans, Tom L. Beauchamp, Rebecca Dresser, David B. Morton, and John P. Gluck

Dr. F. Barbara Orlans, a long-standing and much valued member of the Animal Welfare Institute's Scientific Committee, has written many books seeking to improve conditions for animals used in research, testing and education, and to ensure that high school students do not harm animals under the rubric of a science fair project. The most recent book, of which she is the lead contributor, has been widely reviewed, with opinions from both sides of the perennial argument on use of experimental animals.

It was a pleasure to find that The Physiologist, the journal of the American Physiological Society, took a very sound view. "This book," wrote C. Terrance Hawk of Duke University, the reviewer, "will make you reflect on your own ethical outlook and does so in a surprisingly non-judgemental fashion."

Following is the full review, as published in Vol. 42, No. 3, 1999, of The Physiologist:

This book is primarily a set of case studies on animal use. To effectively analyze these case studies, the introductory chapter prepares the reader by providing broad background information. The introductory chapter contains discussions of morality and the moral community, animal minds, the moral implications of Darwin's theory of evolution, defining moral standing, and descriptions of moral philosophies (utilitarianism, Kantianism and rights theories). This introductory chapter also includes discussions of the justification of the human use of animals and a consideration of alternatives to the use of animals.

Subsequent chapters are individual case studies covering most major areas of animal use and each stands alone from all others. Four well-known case studies are presented in the section entitled Biomedical Research, including "Baboon-Human Liver Transplants: The Pittsburgh Case," "Head Injury Experiments on Primates at the University of Pennsylvania," "Patenting Animals: The Harvard 'Oncomouse',' and "What Does the Public Have a Right to Know," a case involving the Progressive Animal Welfare Society and the University of Washington, Seattle. Most case studies provide a historical description of the problem and also include a discussion of the ethical issues and welfare concerns.

Other sections include case studies in the use of animals in cosmetic safety testing, in behavioral research, in wildlife research, in education, in food and farming, as companion animals, and in religious rites.

I was most impressed with the short primer on reasoning through moral problems that is contained in the introductory chapter. It is noted by the authors that problems normally appear when "some evidence or reason indicates that an act is morally right, and some evidence indicates that the act is morally wrong, but the evidence on both sides is inconclusive." So how does a person reason through such dilemmas? Several methods are described that can be used to help understand and more objectively approach the problem, including specification of one's general moral commitments, balancing values, and the use of facts.

This book will make you reflect on your own ethical outlook and does so in a surprisingly non-judgemental fashion. If you are a member of your Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee; are a member of faculties in basic science, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, philosophy, or ethics; or have a general interest in the welfare of animals, then this easy-to-read book is certainly recommended.

Alternative Traps
Tom Garrett
Washington, DC: Animal Welfare Institute, 1999 revised edition, 51 pp., $8.00

A new edition of Alternative Traps by Tom Garrett has just been published by the Animal Welfare Institute. This is an update of Tom's comprehensive review of the many less cruel traps now available, in addition to full coverage of the worst traps and the terrible torture they inflict.

With a Foreword by Cathy Liss, AWI's Executive Director, the updated edition includes information on the continuing struggle against the steel jaw leghold trap and the strangling snares still widely used throughout the world from Alaska to Africa. Eighty-eight countries have banned steel traps, but the U.S. still lacks federal legislation against them.

When the European Union banned them in all its member states in 1991, we hoped that its import ban against fur from 13 species in the wild fur trade would force U.S. compliance. But instead, our Government threatened to challenge the E.U. under the World Trade Organization, asserting that this law for animal protection would create a barrier to free trade.

This is the third edition of this fully documented reference source. The first was issued in the form of three monographs in 1984. Tom Garrett's engineering expertise served him well as he traveled across the United States, Canada and the European Union to gather little-known facts; for example, interviewing trap-inventors who had succeeded in developing traps that rendered animals unconscious instantly instead of putting them through unimaginable pain and fear in steel jaw leghold traps or strangling snares. But these traps — the Gabry's and the Kania — have never been seriously encouraged by industry as alternatives in the remote areas for which they were designed.

Humanitarian organizations and law enforcement agencies will find this unique publication useful whenever they are called upon to rescue an animal from a trap or to make decisions that will help to prevent the enormous amount of unnecessary suffering inflicted by the steel jaw leghold trap and the often homemade strangling snares left for long periods in the bush.
In Nichols' first chapter, "In The Wild" we journey through the Tai Forest in Côte d'Ivoire where chimps share fruit unselfishly, use stones to open hard-shelled nuts and where a mother carried her dead infant around for days in mourning before "finally giving it a gentle touch and leaving it behind;" and into Tanzania where chimps carefully use twigs to dig for ants or termites and where Dr. Goodall has spent nearly 40 years studying their independent and interactive behavior. Chapter 2, an essay by Jane Goodall, recounts her historical experience at Gombe and the important findings of her in-depth research there. Goodall writes of her work to rescue a single chimp named Gregoire who lived alone in cage in the Brazzaville Zoo since 1945, to her efforts to keep the retired Air Force chimps out of the hands of The Coulston Foundation, and ultimately, on behalf of chimps in abusive situations everywhere. Goodall refers to a "strong sense of guilt, the guilt of my species" and what horrors humans inflict on animals such as chimps. Her chapter closes with a full two page photo of a former carnival chimp living in a cage behind his owner's bar in Ohio: in solitude he sits, hunched over behind the bars of his cage, as smoke rises near his right eye from the tip of the cigarette protruding from his dark lips.

Chapter 3, "Research and Captivity," shows the myriad abuses humans inflict on "our closest relatives in the animal kingdom." Whether it's in crowded zoos, medical testing laboratories, or performing animal acts, humans, with our supposedly greater intelligence and ability for compassion, have a remarkable capacity to inflict suffering on these unwitting victims of our brutality. Nichols' pictures of a bushmeat hunter in Liberia, a chained and abused adult chimp in Côte d'Ivoire, a chimp forced to ride atop an elephant and another forced to wear a tuxedo and pose for a photographer's camera in Florida, all vividly exemplify the magnitude of our inhumanity.

But some hope appears in the final chapter on "Sanctuaries" where chimpanzees may live out the remainder of their natural lives "in safety and comfort." One look at the book's final photo of two orphaned infant chimps looking at each other in a sensitive embrace is enough to make anyone want to do more to help chimps everywhere. Goodall notes that "not many people can look into the bewildered, traumatized eyes of an abandoned infant and turn away." By the time one closes Brutal Kinship, she or he will not only be incapable of turning away from the plight of chimps, but will be actively seeking ways to help them.

— Adam M. Roberts
Marshall Farms, a major U.S. breeder and supplier of beagles and ferrets to laboratories for experimentation and testing, struck unexpected resistance when it tried to establish itself in the Département of Allier in central France. Public opposition was enormous. The Mayor of Montbeugny announced that she would resign if Marshall Farms were allowed to construct its proposed facility.

A French animal protective group, Trente Millions Amis, used their television program and website to focus on mistreatment of laboratory beagles in the U.K., where a lengthy undercover videotape had been shown on television.

Dissemination of information about the proposed Marshall Farms facility resulted in a staggering number of petitions opposing it: 1,297,241. The petitions were signed by prominent French public figures, including former President of France, Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, Brigitte Bardot, Raymond Devos, 11 deputies, 5 Senators, and large numbers of scientists, doctors and veterinarians, hundreds of schools and colleges, and major corporations such as France Telecom, RTL, and TF1. Petitions were received from Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, England, Germany, Austria, Luxembourg, Brazil, Canada, Singapore, Senegal, Romania, Tunisia, the United States, Poland and Norway.

A Council of the Département of Allier presented Prefect Gregoire with an unfavorable report on Marshall Farms’ proposal to build a large breeding and supply facility to sell beagles to research laboratories. The company then withdrew its proposal, which ended the matter. Two other towns, Blyes, near Lyon, and Ledonjon, also refused to allow Marshall Farms to establish itself in their precincts.

Following is a glimpse of Marshall Farms’ record in the U.S.: A fire January 16, 1998 at Marshall Farms burned 449 puppies and 151 pregnant beagles to death. The fire was started by a heating pad which had been marked “Bad” in February 1995! The fire was investigated by the Wayne County Sheriff’s Department and Peter Vallas and Associate, Inc. which reported shocking irresponsibility on the part of Marshall Farms.

In 1995 a USDA inspection report stated, “All technicians performing spays, castrations and [ferret] descenting are operating without masks or head covers. Several have long hair which was hanging into the operating field. All survival surgeries… must be performed under aseptic conditions.” The inspectors also noted lack of a written program of veterinary care and methods of euthanasia which should follow the recommendations of the American Veterinary Medical Association Panel on Euthanasia. The inspectors further noted, inadequate space for animals. For example, eight puppies were squeezed into an enclosure only big enough for four.

In 1991, Marshall Farms attempted to export 74 beagle pups to an experimental laboratory in Switzerland. An Affidavit from the Supervisor of Cargo Operations for Swiss Air Transport Company stated the beagles were crated in wire mesh containers, which are not acceptable in international shipments. “The wire mesh had many sharp burrs on the metal which was dangerous for both the animals and the cargo handlers.” The dogs were able to put their paws through the wire mesh. Further, two dogs were fighting in one of the cages, and “The animals were only able to reach their food and water from the top half of the containers. They could not reach any further because of the size of the containers.” The ASPCA Animalport stopped shipment of the 74 beagles, citing New York State law.

Repeated use of improper sized wire mesh flooring has seriously injured both beagle pups and ferrets. Marshall Farms’ insistence on use of wire mesh cage floors has been their standard practice for many years. It allows an enormous number of animals to be housed using limited numbers of cleaners and caretakers. Such floors are sometimes called “self-cleaning.” An advertising brochure includes a large photograph of a beagle on the sort of wire mesh that led to the 1991 penalty.
CITES 2000
The Future of Wildlife In a New Millennium

The Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 11) to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) will take place in Nairobi, Kenya from April 10 – 20, 2000. Delegates from 150 nations will convene to decide the fate of myriad species across the globe, from American spotted turtles to Zimbabwean elephants. They will also examine ways in which the Treaty can best prevent overexploitation due to international trade by discussing issues such as the trade in bears, bushmeat, rhinos, seahorses and tigers.

Adam M. Roberts and Ben White will represent the Animal Welfare Institute at the meeting and will work on a variety of issues of importance to the Institute and its members. Pages 8–13 of this issue of the AWI Quarterly, written by Adam M. Roberts (unless noted otherwise), outline our perspectives on a few of the vital issues for consideration at the CITES meeting.
Japan and Norway continually try to use CITES to reopen international commercial trade in whale meat. See story page 11.

On December 1, 1999, an estimated 420 kg of worked ivory pieces were seized at Paris/ Roissy airport, apparently en route from Rwanda to Japan. See story page 8-9.
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Clockwise: Eclectus Parrots, Blue Eyed Cockatoos and a Blythe’s Hornbill — a few of the species of birds in Papua New Guinea’s remaining rain forest. See story page 4-5.
After graduating from the University of Papua New Guinea, Peter Gundu taught high school students in different parts of Papua New Guinea (PNG) for 15 years. He resigned in order to set up the Guiye Waiye Environment and Conservation Group (GWECG) where he wrote, “We saw there was a need for education of the local people on the importance of conservation. We saw lots of foreigners coming into Papua New Guinea, bribing our politicians, landowners, local chiefs and exploiting our natural resources particularly timber, minerals, and fish. Foreign companies exploit our resources at a very fast rate, leaving nothing behind but pollution. A large proportion of people in Papua New Guinea are illiterate so they really don’t understand and know what is going on.

“Our group’s awareness campaign is very important to inform the people of Papua New Guinea what the foreign firms are doing here with regard to foreign investments”

According to the PNG Post Courier, the Environment Minister called the country’s forests “green goldmines” and said “investment interest in our forests and trees is coming from big pharmaceutical companies which spend millions annually in drug research programs while other companies are seeking herbal medicine for natural health cures.”

Papua New Guinea Magazine did a feature story on Minnie Bate, “a qualified medical technologist from Milne Bay [who] has the unique distinction of being the first Papua New Guinean to make an attempt at promoting PNG herbal products on a commercial scale… ‘The jungle is my pharmacy,’ Minnie declared.”

Conservation of traditional medicinal plants in one of GWECG’s aims as is the conservation of traditional cultures. The majority of Papua New Guineans are subsistence farmers dependent on the land. The rapid increase in population puts pressure on the land. Land that used to be left alone to regain its nutrients, as practiced traditionally, is disappearing, according to Gundu. Topsoil erosion is causing soil degradation, and the clearing of virgin forest destroys water containment areas leading to dried up creeks and streams.
The environment awareness campaigns cover many of the nation’s provinces, traveling to high schools, landowner groups, developers, unions, NGOs, women’s groups, community leaders, and churches, stressing the consequences if they fail to look after the environment they’re living in and enjoying today. “We also pointed out,” writes Gundu, “the damage and destruction already done to our forest and the birds and other creatures that inhabit it, by foreigners namely, Singaporean Malaysians and companies from Taiwan, Japan and Korea who are cutting our forest rapidly without following the proper agreements set out by the landowners, provincial governments, and the national government.

“These Asians don’t even plant trees to replace the ones they have cut down; mining companies don’t even show respect for the landowners but dump chemical waste in rivers depriving those who depend on the river for food of their livelihood…. Most of the educational institutions we visited told us they’re worried that there will be nothing left for future generations. They said the Papua New Guinea government should try to control the flow of foreigners who only come to exploit our resources for their own benefit.

“In March 1999, we conducted our awareness campaign in three districts of Morobe Province; all have logging firms there cutting timber. These companies have recently gone over the boundary and have not paid the landowner’s royalties. Nearly everyone, including the village chiefs, landowners, councillors and some educated elites in the area supported our campaign and even talked about taking the Asian companies to court to get them deported from Papua New Guinea!”

Next GWECG went to Madang, a province known for its beautiful beach island, rivers and forest, but now the beach has been polluted, their forests cut down and their rivers polluted. The giant Japanese Wood Chin Mill generates unhealthy amounts of smoke and dust and pressures their workers to labor long hours for low wages, in bad conditions.

“We spent four weeks in Madang,” Gundu continues, “because the local land owners invited us to their villages to do campaigns for the rural villagers and give them advice on how to protect their environment before it’s used up by foreigners. We conducted our awareness campaign in Gogol where they’re doing a reforestation and nursery project, and at Sagalau Teachers’ College, Madang Market, Divine Word Institute, Tusbab High School, Sek Station, Fidelis College, Madang Paramedical College, Yumba Health Science College, Plantation Hotel, North Coast Madang and Bogia Station. The NGO’s in the area provided accommodation for our group during our stay.

“We would like to go back to Madang Province this year as soon as we get some funding for this program. We want to bring the attention of the Provincial Government, local level government, resource developers, landowners, and NGO’s to our campaign for protection of the environment.” In conclusion, Peter Gundu writes, “I have seen great damage done to Papua New Guinea’s rivers, wildlife, ocean, and forests with my own eyes, and I will still speak out against this destruction until the foreigners listen and do the right thing. Today they are aware of our environment group; the community is also with us so our efforts will have weight.”
The next morning, a more senior policeman, clearly in cahoots with the logging company, prevented their departure on a scheduled plane. The company unsuccessfully attempted to separate Ruwi from Faith and a hired mob of 50-80 men prevented their departure from the office. Intense action was going on behind the scenes. Telapak sought support in Jakarta through high-level government and military officials, and EIA kept in touch with UK Government officials and the White House. The press was asked to keep quiet during the siege because of fear of endangering Faith and Ruwi.

On Saturday January 22nd, following intense pressure from Jakarta and the personal intervention of the British Ambassador, both Ruwi and Faith were flown to the South Kalimantan city of Banjarmasin in a plane chartered by EIA and Telapak. They were warned that Tanjung Lingga thugs were on their way to Banjarmasin so another plane was chartered to fly them to Jakarta. A last minute attempt by Tanjung Lingga to “buy off” this plane to prevent their departure, failed.

The campaign presentation to the Government of Indonesia and international donors took place on January 26th. The problem of illegal logging under the control of timber barons has been emphasised by this incident. The area is out of control and until the central government can reinstate law and order there can be no hope for the forests, the people and the remarkable creatures so dependent on them.

By Dave Currey, Environmental Investigation Agency

“We’ve been badly beaten and now we’re with the police” was the opening line from Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) investigator Faith Doherty’s call from the town of Pangkalan Bun in Central Kalimantan on the Indonesian part of Borneo. This was the start of a three-day kidnap drama that involved logging company-hired thugs, corrupt senior police, helpful and supportive detectives, orangutans, diplomats and the destruction of one of the world’s most famous and important National Parks – Tanjung Puting.

EIA and Telapak Indonesia launched a campaign to stop the illegal logging in Tanjung Puting National Park last August. This swamp forest is home to wild and rehabilitated orangutans and has been made famous by the work of Biruté Galdikas. In the EIA/Telapak campaign report “The Final Cut” the names of companies and illegal sawmills were made public. At the top of the list came Tanjung Lingga, a company that EIA and Telapak had infiltrated undercover as businessmen in June 1999. This company is owned by a local timber baron, member of the Indonesian Parliament, Abdul Rasyid.

The campaign gained momentum with pressure building from the international community, disillusioned by Indonesia’s forestry sector. Our campaign message: “If you can’t stop illegal logging in Tanjung Puting, then Indonesia’s forests have no future.” A newly elected Government was sworn in at the end of October 1999, and the EIA/Telapak campaign was presented to some members of the Parliament.

The international donors to Indonesia are represented in the Consultative Group on Indonesia, bringing forestry issues to the fore. A seminar was organised by the Indonesian Co-ordinating Ministry of Finance and sponsored by the World Bank. The EIA/Telapak campaign video was to be presented by Ruwi, Telapak’s Executive Director. Faith and Ruwi were in Tanjung Puting to update the information before the seminar.

Lured to the offices of logging company Tanjung Lingga, Faith and Ruwi were viciously beaten. “They wanted to kill Ruwi” explained Faith. Ruwi was punched to the ground and kicked in the head while Faith’s finger was wrenched from its socket and finger ligaments and a tendon broken in a struggle with company officials. A gun was used to threaten them both. Police were called and Faith and Ruwi were taken to hospital, allowed a phone call, and then taken to the detectives’ office for statements. They were to stay there under the protection of the detectives for the next two days.

The next morning, a more senior policeman, clearly in cahoots with the logging company, prevented their departure on a scheduled plane. The company unsuccessfully attempted to separate Ruwi from Faith and a hired mob of 50-80 men prevented their departure from the office. Intense action was going on behind the scenes. Telapak sought support in Jakarta through high-level government and military officials, and EIA kept in touch with UK Government officials and the White House. The press was asked to keep quiet during the siege because of fear of endangering Faith and Ruwi.

On Saturday January 22nd, following intense pressure from Jakarta and the personal intervention of the British Ambassador, both Ruwi and Faith were flown to the South Kalimantan city of Banjarmasin in a plane chartered by EIA and Telapak. They were warned that Tanjung Lingga thugs were on their way to Banjarmasin so another plane was chartered to fly them to Jakarta. A last minute attempt by Tanjung Lingga to “buy off” this plane to prevent their departure, failed.

The campaign presentation to the Government of Indonesia and international donors took place on January 26th. The problem of illegal logging under the control of timber barons has been emphasised by this incident. The area is out of control and until the central government can reinstate law and order there can be no hope for the forests, the people and the remarkable creatures so dependent on them.
The Government of Indonesia has promised to deal with illegal logging, but so far the logging continues in Tanjung Puting. The Park headquarters have been destroyed and rangers have evacuated the Park. The latest report is that the Head and Deputy Head of the Park have resigned.

It is difficult for this democratically elected government at a time of economic crisis and civil unrest, but it is vital that they act courageously to defeat the powerful interests destroying Indonesia’s priceless forest heritage. This case in Tanjung Puting is complex and politically difficult, but it is clear what must be done. Efforts to investigate this timber baron’s fiefdom have so far failed following coercion. But the Government has to follow up while the world is watching.

Tanjung Puting National Park must be saved from the illegal loggers. Please urge His Excellency, the Ambassador of Indonesia, to do everything in his power to stop the destruction.

His address is:
2020 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

For more information on the campaign contact EIA,
1330 New Hampshire Avenue, Apt 507, Washington D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 452 8661 or visit EIA’s website at www.eia-international.org

“Thief Caught at Camp Leakey”

This charming account of orangutan intelligence and enterprise is excerpted from Pongo Quest (Fall/Winter 1999, magazine of Orangutan Foundation International). Orangutans never swim, but they love to eat flowers from big flowering trees. One of the orangutans in Biruté Galdikas’ sanctuary in Indonesia found a way to cross the river that bounds Camp Leakey so she and her young son could feast on such flowers.

“We had been told that there was a thief on the premises, but we thought the term too harsh. Perhaps ‘borrow’ is more accurate, for Princess never takes the canoe permanently, and only when it is urgently needed. Lured by the tempting white blossoms that cover a glossy-leafed tree across the Sekonyer Kanan River from the Camp, she borrowed the canoe again today…

“We saw her purposefully striding down the dock toward Camp, son Pan clut-ching the hair on her back as he struggled to keep up. Where the swamp becomes land she disappeared under the dock, to reappear with the canoe in tow. Lowering Pan inside, she moved the canoe to the river by pulling herself, hand over hand, along the dock. When she reached the river, she launched the canoe out into the current, paddling with her hands, one side and then the other around the tethered speedboat…

“My last glimpse was of her sitting in the front of the canoe, an arm on each side, paddling with determination to get to her next destination. Later, when the assistants inquired as to the location of their canoe, we silently pointed downriver…

“They swam out to the speedboat (since there was no canoe) and headed downriver, where in a mile or so they came upon Princess and Pan sampling blossoms from another tree. Knowing the jig was up, Princess took her son and climbed up into the canopy, and the assistants reclaimed the canoe. By the next morning Princess and Pan had made their way back to Camp, but on the wrong side of the river…” She had to be helped into the canoe.

“Princess lifted Pan onto her back and climbed in, settled herself right in the middle and with arms resting on the gunwales, calmly, patiently waited for Mr. Yatra to deliver them back to the dock. There Princess and Pan disembarked and went on their way, looking back only once to see where the canoe would be tethered the next time it was needed.”

Princess with her little son, Pan, “borrowing” the Camp Leakey canoe for a foraging expedition.
A Deadly Experiment Gone Wrong

“Thereafter, under experimental quotas for raw ivory not exceeding 25.3 tonnes (Botswana), 13.8 tonnes (Namibia) and 20 tonnes (Zimbabwe), raw ivory may be exported to Japan…”

— Annotation accompanying the 1997 downlisting of three African elephant populations

An “experiment” is generally defined as “any action or process undertaken to discover something not yet known.” When the CITES Parties voted to open an “experimental” ivory trade from Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe in 1997, the outcome was easily deduced. Before all African elephants were placed on CITES Appendix I and international commercial ivory trade was prohibited, the continent’s elephants were decimated, from approximately 1.3 million to about 600,000. With the 1989 ban, populations stabilized, poaching dropped dramatically, and ivory smuggling routes and the global market all but dried up. After this remarkable success, CITES Parties turned back the clock on elephant conservation and took a giant risk with the protection of these majestic creatures.

However, there is an opportunity at COP 11 for Parties to make amends for their grievous error by voting for Kenya’s and India’s proposal to put all elephants back on Appendix I. As Dr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, told the Associated Press (AP), “If there was a total ban, it (poaching) would be easier to control.”

In 1997, AWI and other organizations warned that reopening the ivory trade, even on limited basis, would cause barbaric elephant poaching to escalate. At a press conference in Washington, D.C., Nehemiah Rotich, Director of the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), warned that the elephant poaching “holocaust is coming back again” and that he hasn’t seen poaching of this magnitude in the last 10 years. A January 2000 KWS press release grimly notes: “In 1999, KWS seized over 2,000 kg of ivory from illegal dealers, this was four times the average for the previous 6 years.” In a letter to European Union nations urging support for the uplisting proposal, Director Rotich added: “Elephant poaching for ivory has also increased five fold in our elephant stronghold, the Tsavo National Park where thirty percent of our elephants occur.” New images of massacred elephants, brutally cut down by poachers’ bullets and their faces sawed off for the coveted ivory, bring back horrific images from decades past.

But Kenya is not alone in bearing the painful burdens of the renewed ivory trade. In October 1999, a consultative meeting among African elephant range states (including the Asian elephant range state of India) was held in Amboseli, Kenya. The meeting’s Proceedings note that most Parties reported “insignificant” elephant poaching in their countries when elephants were on Appendix I and that “there has been a notable increase in illegal hunting” since the 1997 downlisting. Congo, for instance, reported an “incredible upsurge in illegal killing of elephants,” and Cameroon reported “seizures of large quantities [of ivory] confiscated from diplomats.” In India, 222 poached elephant carcasses were discovered between 1997 and the 1999 consultative meeting. A majority of African elephant range states attending the consultative meeting supports the effort to put all elephants back on Appendix I.

Zimbabwe, which (with Namibia and Botswana) now proposes to expand its ivory exports further, has witnessed increased elephant poaching since the ban was relaxed. Panafrican News Agency reported on December 8, 1999 that “Zimbabwean wildlife officials” suspected that poachers from Zambia “had killed more than 80 elephants in the country’s game parks in 1999 alone.”

So what happens to the ivory from these poached elephants? It’s a worldwide free for all. In February 2000, Portuguese
Jumbo Thieves

A further concession of the 1997 elephant downlisting was facilitation of "export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations." The problem is that there is no clear definition of what an "appropriate and acceptable destination" really is. As a result, insidious animal dealers such as Riccardo Ghiazza can literally steal baby elephants from their mothers and transport them internationally for commercial gain.

According to the London Mail and Guardian, Ghiazza was recently arrested on charges of fraud and falsely obtaining South African citizenship when he allegedly failed to declare that he is wanted for a drug conviction in Italy. He is also the culprit in the Tuli elephant fiasco in which his company removed 30 baby elephants from Botswana and transported them to South Africa where they suffered beatings to "train" them in preparation for international transport to zoos and circuses abroad. The National Council of Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals brought cruelty charges against Ghiazza and after lengthy and expensive court procedures was awarded custody of the animals. Most of the Tuli elephants have been freed in national parks and private reserves in South Africa.

**REPORTED IVORY SEIZURES SINCE JUNE 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place Seized</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1997</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td>83 kg, 2140 blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1997</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>&quot;huge quantity&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Late&quot; 1997</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 pieces, One whole tusk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1998</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1998</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>600 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1998</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>&quot;Africa&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1999</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1999</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>700 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1999</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,100 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150 tusks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>&quot;Far East&quot;</td>
<td>1,845 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1999</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td>390 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>420 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 tusks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2000</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 tusks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

officials uncovered “around 375 pounds of ivory, including 24 elephant tusks and seven statues” allegedly smuggled from Angola (AP). On September 18, 1999 two tons of ivory was seized in Dubai Airport, “one of the largest ivory seizures since the ban on trade in ivory was implemented,” according to KWS. The accompanying table, “REPORTED IVORY SEIZURES SINCE JUNE 1997” shows how this illegal activity has grown again. KWS Director Rotich contends that the traditional ivory smuggling routes have been reopened.

Without a market, all this ivory is worthless. Japan, a major lobbying force behind the evisceration of the ivory ban, is an enormous ivory market. Despite the overwhelming evidence of elephant poaching and ivory smuggling, Japan’s CITES position on elephants leading to COP 11 is that the “experimental trade of ivory in 1999 did not create any problem.”

There is a tremendous opportunity for illegal ivory smuggling into Japan and sale on the Japanese market, even with the new amendments to Japan’s laws regarding domestic management of ivory. Once it gets into Japan and is carved into signature stamps called kankos it is almost impossible to ascertain whether the ivory is from the legal shipment authorized by CITES or from an illegally smuggled consignment. As Kenya’s and India’s proposal notes, “although certification seals are available for attachment to carvings ‘recognised as having been produced from legally obtained tusks,’ and there is a penalty for affixing a seal to a carving other than the one for which it was issued, it is neither mandatory for such seals to be affixed nor illegal to sell a carving without a seal. Thus, though the certification system can be used to identify a legal carving by a dealer wishing to do so, it would appear to be of little or no use in preventing the sale of illegally-acquired ivory on the Japanese retail market.”

Since 1997, elephant poaching has increased substantially across Africa and illegal ivory seizures have occurred with greater frequency across the globe. The ivory experiment has failed - again. We must restore the rational reverence for elephants embodied in the Appendix I listing of all African and Asian elephants and the complete ban on the global trade in elephant ivory.

KWS Director Rotich tells of an ecotourism group whose vehicle was held up for some time while a small herd of elephants crossed before them. When one wildlife watcher asked the guide why they were waiting so long the guide responded, because the elephants have the Right of Way. And so it should be.
Ivory of the Sea?

Many conservationists argued that the downlisting of certain populations of African elephants to allow an “experimental” sale of ivory would set a dangerous precedent that CITES Parties would use to open up trade in other listed species. This blueprint has been followed in Cuba’s proposal to downlist Hawksbill sea turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) from Appendix I to Appendix II to sell its stockpiled turtle shell to Japan in a one-time sale and to allow further annual sales of up to 500 sea turtles a year.

Allowing trade in sea turtle shells is as grievous an error as allowing trade in ivory. This is especially true when one acknowledges that sea turtles are shared wildlife with great ecotourism value for a number of nations. Although the proposal calls for downlisting the “Caribbean population of Hawksbill Turtles… inhabiting Cuban waters,” there is clearly no definitive Cuban population of a migratory marine species such as turtles. For example, the species’ distribution includes the waters of the Seychelles, a nation that burned two and a half tonnes of confiscated sea turtle shell in 1998 in a clear message of defiance toward those who would profit by killing these animals and selling their parts.

The IUCN considers Hawksbills to be “critically endangered.” Anne Meylan of the Florida Marine Research Institute and Marydele Donnelly of the IUCN / SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group, wrote in an article in *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* that “Of all the species of marine turtles, the hawksbill has endured the longest and most sustained history of exploitation,” and that “individual populations from around the world will continue to disappear under the current regime of exploitation…” CITES Parties would send a very clear and exceedingly dangerous message to the world if they mistakenly open up trade in parts of “critically endangered” wildlife such as hawksbills. 🦖

**Silent Thunder,** *In the Presence of Elephants*

Katy Payne  
Hardcover ISBN: 0-684-80108-6

Long before Katy Payne’s powerful book, *Silent Thunder, In the Presence of Elephants,* was published, she told us about her experience with elephants in the Portland, Oregon, Washington Park Zoo. She felt, rather than heard, what she later found were sounds — actually infrasound. She remembered feeling the same kind of vibrations from the lowest notes of an organ in the church she attended as a child.

Katy and Roger Payne had recorded “The Songs of the Humpback Whale” from hydrophones in the sea. These marvelous songs by the huge humpback whales were a prelude to Katy Payne’s inspired understanding of the secret communications of the largest land animals: the Asian elephants.

She explains, “We ran the tape recorder at its slowest speed so that in playing back the tapes we could speed them up, raising the pitch of all recorded sounds and bringing the lowest sounds into the range of human hearing.”

Katy Payne has deep empathy for animals in general, and for elephants in particular, and interprets their actions and their feelings and their communication techniques. She had grown to know them so well while in Zimbabwe, that she even dreams about them. The deep attachment formed for the elephants Katy studied during her five separate scientific expeditions in Zimbabwe make the tragedy of the cull of these elephants especially powerful and shocking.

*Silent Thunder* makes no mention of the major human struggle which took place at the 1989 meeting of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) at which the member countries decided to place all elephants on the Treaty’s Appendix I (endangered). African elephant populations were heading for extinction as gangs of poachers decimated them for the ivory trade at the behest of Asian ivory dealers. Zimbabwe fiercely resisted the endangered listing which was so valiantly fought for by Constance Harriman, head of the U.S. Delegation to CITES. At the 1997 CITES meeting Zimbabwe fought back, winning the vote to sell its ivory stockpile to Japan, which effectively started a wave of poaching for ivory all over again.

The book ends sorrowfully with human deaths and elephant deaths and even the seeming death of a river. But there is still hope because in the river’s new channel, the elephants have dug wells, and when they have been counted, the total is 1,000 wells for all animals in the vicinity to drink from!

Katy Payne’s list of acknowledgments finishes with the following words: “Finally, I wish to acknowledge the compassionate animals in whose remembrance I have written all these words. All these greeting rumbles, and all these cries for help.” 🐘

- Christine Stevens

© Doug Perrine

© Doug Perrine

Tortoiseshell of the “critically endangered” Hawksbill Sea Turtle, *Eretmochelys Imbricata,* is crafted into jewelry, cigarette cases and other ornaments for international commercial trade.
Whales Threatened by Japan and Norway

By Ben White

Japan has proposed the downlisting of the Antarctic population of minke whales, one North Pacific population of minke whales, and one North Pacific population of gray whales. Norway has proposed the downlisting of the Northeast Atlantic and the North Atlantic Central minke whale populations. Downlisting would remove the whales from Appendix I, which prohibits all commercial trade, and place them on Appendix II, which allows limited trade.

The Secretariat of CITES recommends rejection of all the whale downlisting proposals.

Final authority for all whaling matters is now in the hands of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), which has an indefinite moratorium in place forbidding all commercial whaling and the sale of whale products between countries. The downlisting effort at CITES is spurred by Norway’s and Japan’s frustration at their inability to defeat the IWC moratorium. They are hoping for a friendlier reception from CITES in order to execute an “end run” around the IWC prohibition. They will need more than two thirds of the countries present at CITES to vote in favor of the downlisting for it to succeed. The position of the United States is that any decision on international sale of whale meat, whether or not it is cloaked in the temporary guise of a “zero quota”, should remain the responsibility of the IWC, not CITES.

An Unbearable Trade

The trade in bear gallbladders and bile continues to put pressure on endangered bear populations across the globe. All bear species are listed under the Convention’s Appendices, but different CITES Parties have different regulations regarding the bear parts trade. The CITES Secretariat’s document for consideration at COP 11 warns that “Differences in national, federal, state or provincial laws allow for confusion and enforcement difficulties; for example, where trade in bear gall bladders is permitted on a domestic market but import or export is banned.” Since bear parts such as the gallbladder are visually indistinguishable, allowing some legal trade in some bear species’ parts makes strict enforcement of CITES and national bear protection legislation difficult.

The Parties to CITES attempted to address some of the complicating factors in Harare, Zimbabwe in 1997 where they unanimously resolved “that the continued illegal trade in parts and derivatives of bear species undermines the effectiveness of the Convention” and that “poaching may cause declines of wild bears that could lead to the extirpation of certain populations or even species.” Parties were urged “to take immediate action in order to demonstrably reduce the illegal trade in bear parts and derivatives” by, among other actions, “confirming, adopting or improving their national legislation to control the import and export of bear parts and derivatives.” Unfortunately, it seems that few countries, including the U.S., have complied.

A global moratorium on the international trade in bear viscera would help individual CITES Parties protect their resident bears from poaching and smuggling of their parts. Pending legislation in the U.S. Congress, the Bear Protection Act, should be passed and used as a model for the rest of the world.
Call the Fashion Police

Thoughtless western demand for “shahtoosh,” the luxurious fabric made from the fine wool of Tibetan antelopes called chiru and woven into expensive shawls, continues to threaten the survival of the species (see AWI Quarterly, Winter 1998).

As the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service tries to crack down on illegal shahtoosh commercialization in America, some of the wealthy buyers show ignorance, others resentment. Discussing potential confiscations in a November 1999 Vanity Fair story, “O.K. Lady, Drop the Shawl,” one New York socialite is quoted saying “‘I’m an animal-lover. I don’t want to do anything illegal. I feel duped.’” Publicist Peggy Siegal hyperbolically expressed fear of the “closet police,” coming into homes and removing shahtoosh garments. Apparently, at a dinner party with New York Governor George Pataki, one Middle Eastern princess exclaimed, “‘there are no endangered species. This shahtoosh thing is all fiction of the animal rights fanatics.’”

China Daily reports that the Chinese State Forestry Administration (SFA) “have smashed 17 rings of poachers and apprehended 66 members.” It has also confiscated “a total of 1,685 Tibetan antelope skins and 545 heads.” On May 26, the SFA, in coordination with provincial government representatives, destroyed many of the confiscated items in a huge bonfire. Speaking at the awareness-raising burning, Zhang Jianlong, director of SFA’s department of wild fauna and flora conservation, noted the role that market demand has on driving the trade: “It is a few rich people from these countries, who are blinded by fashion, that are buying cashmere products made from Tibetan antelope skins.”

To enhance the global effort to protect the chiru and end the trade in shahtoosh, an international workshop was held from October 12 to 14, 1999 in Xining, China. The Governments of China, France, India, Italy, Nepal, the United Kingdom and the United States were represented along with representatives from various non-governmental organizations.

The consensus statement that came out of the meeting, the “Xining Declaration,” recognizes that the consumer market for shahtoosh is one of “the fundamental reasons leading to the continued large-scale poaching of wild populations of Tibetan antelope;” and the participants agreed “that the total eradication of production of and markets for shahtoosh and its products is the key to the survival of the Tibet antelope.” To this end, delegates appealed for greater wildlife law enforcement in shahtoosh consumer countries and an expanded program of public awareness and education about the deadly conservation risks of buying shahtoosh. Manufacturing countries are urged to crack down on domestic processing plants and do more to shut down the internal trade and smuggling out of the countries.

But even after this Declaration was signed, antelope poaching for shahtoosh continues. China Daily reports on January 18, 2000 that four major poaching cases surfaced between December 1999 and January 2000 involving over 700 pelts. The Xinhua News Agency reports that an additional “828 Tibetan antelope furs were seized in Hoh Xil, a nature reserve in far western China, and two poachers were arrested” on February 19, 2000 during an anti-poaching drive. According to Ming Ruixi, an official from Forestry Police Bureau in Qinghai Province, the most important way to stop poaching is to root out the market for shahtoosh that clearly drives the trade. Citizens across the globe must be educated to the plight of the chiru and the devastating impact of purchasing shahtoosh.

In October 1999, the Tibetan Plateau Project (TPP) and the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) filed a joint “petition” with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to list the Tibetan antelope as an endangered species pursuant to provisions of the Endangered Species Act. A Tibetan antelope ESA listing would restrict the import, export, and interstate transport and commerce of shahtoosh within the U.S.

Implementation of CITES alone is inadequate for preventing the sale of shahtoosh products in the U.S., because the Convention only prohibits the trade (import and re-export) of shahtoosh (CITES 1975). Establishing the case that suspected shahtoosh smugglers are responsible for importing or conspiring to export shahtoosh products that may be in their possession is more difficult than meeting the ESA standard of proving that a suspect may have offered shahtoosh for sale in interstate or foreign commerce.

Poacher’s camp which was located on the Tibetan plateau.

Fighting to save clearly endangered Tibetan antelopes throughout their range, especially in China, is an enormous and dangerous endeavor. Chinese authorities are waging war against poachers and appear to be aggressively targeting the well-armed bandits who increase chiru kills in order to increase the size of their bank accounts.

A May 13, 1999 report from the Environment News Service highlights the crackdown as one poacher was killed and two were wounded in a shootout with wildlife law enforcement agents that resulted in 42 arrests and “the confiscation of more than 1,000 pieces of Tibetan Antelope skin.”

Approximately 75,000 Tibetan Antelope (chiru) in remain in the wild. It takes three slaughtered chiru to make one shahtoosh shawl.
Disappearing Planet of the Apes

A Taste For Extinction

The flesh of species such as chimpanzees, gorillas, elephants, giant pangolins, and other wildlife (“bushmeat”) has historically provided a source of food for people throughout central and western Africa. Today, encroachment of logging companies and destruction of natural forest lands have led to the wholesale decimation of wildlife habitat as well as the escalation of the bushmeat trade. What was once a locally used food source has become an expensive delicacy in commercial trade — a trade that threatens the existence of the species involved. As Richard Leakey, former head of the Kenya Wildlife Service told CNN: “The slaughter of chimpanzees and gorillas, our closest relatives, is absolutely diabolical. I can’t imagine that this can go on much longer before these animals are extinct.”

The number of great apes involved in this unsustainable trade is enormous. The Ape Alliance, an international coalition of over 30 organizations including the Born Free Foundation, the World Society for the Protection of Animals and the Jane Goodall Institute, estimates that in northern Congo “up to 600 lowland gorillas are killed each year to feed the trade” and that one-ton of smoked bushmeat is unloaded every day in Yaounde, the capital of Cameroon.

Karl Ammann, one of the most vocal opponents of the bushmeat trade succinctly averred in a New York Times Magazine article that “the DNA of chimpanzees is 98.5 percent the same as that of humans....[E]ating them [is] ‘98.5 percent cannibalism’.”

Timber corporations ripping through wooded areas of Africa have not only destroyed the forests on which wild animals depend, but have cleared logging roads which enable poachers to transport animals’ carcasses to markets in other regions, and sometimes to expensive restaurants in western Europe. Dr. Anthony Rose of The Biosynergy Institute estimates “that bushmeat trade across equatorial Africa is more than a billion dollar business” and that “as logging expands, the number of monkeys and apes killed for the cooking pot increases.”

Currently, killing apes for bushmeat provides a “quick buck” for humans. But when the apes are gone, the buck is too. In countries where the transnational timber corporations are wiping out forests, funds are lacking for enforcement of laws that prohibit killing and selling highly endangered species such as great apes. There is a moral obligation for these exploitative companies to completely cease facilitating the trade in bushmeat on their logging roads using their logging trucks.

Governments in need should receive funds to hire and train competent enforcement agents to fight the bushmeat trade. In some cases, poachers can become protectors and be paid to ensure that the resident wildlife is preserved. Greater availability of alternative food sources and other employment opportunities would be significant additional steps toward positive change.

CITES and The Great Ape Conservation Act

At the upcoming Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES this April in Kenya, a “Discussion Paper” will be offered by the United Kingdom on “Bushmeat as a Trade and Wildlife Management Issue.” The paper notes “that the loss of animals through the bushmeat trade is having a greater impact on conservation in some areas than habitat loss.” Action by all CITES Parties is essential to stem the decline of bushmeat species.

The U.S. is already well on the way to addressing the issue. United States Senator Jim Jeffords (R, VT) has engaged in a noble effort to elevate America’s role in ending this repugnant bushmeat trade. On May 10, 1999 he introduced in the United States Senate the “Great Ape Conservation Act,” S. 1007, to “perpetuate viable populations of great apes in the wild” and “assist in the conservation and protection of great apes by supporting conservation programs of countries in which great apes are located.”

Karl Ammann’s award-winning photo of a gorilla head waiting for the cooking pot graphically illustrates the brutal slaughter of primates for the bushmeat trade.
Chimp Bill Introduced

On November 22, 1999 Representative James Greenwood (R, PA), introduced H.R.3514, the “Chimpanzee Health Improvement, Maintenance and Protection Act” (CHIMP) to create a congressionally-chartered non-profit retirement sanctuary where all chimpanzees formerly used in research could permanently live without the threat of ever returning to an experimental laboratory or being subjected to further invasive experiments or tests.

This bill may create the sanctuary system that could ultimately house the 652 chimps currently in danger at The Coulston Foundation. The CHIMP Act is as timely as it is important.

Commenting on the proposed legislation, Dr. Jane Goodall said: “Never before has there been such a concrete opportunity to work in cooperation with the scientific community, government officials, and the world’s most renowned primate experts to provide chimpanzees who have given so much of themselves to science with a safe, permanent home to live out the remainder of their lives. This is a crucial time for us in our stewardship to define their future with respect, compassion and justice. They deserve nothing less.”

Coulston on the Ropes Again

The Coulston Foundation (TCF) continually allows the grossly negligent deaths and inhumane treatment of chimpanzees for whom it is responsible. Now TCF is facing a new set of problems from the Food and Drug Administration for violations of Good Laboratory Practice (GLPs) regulations.

GLPs are in place to regulate experiments “to assure the quality and integrity” of the laboratory practices for research involving “food and color additives, animal food additives, human and animal drugs, medical devices for human use, biological products, and electronic products.” Just as TCF repeatedly has violated the Animal Welfare Act, now it has been cited for nearly 300 violations of GLPs.

Infractions from the FDA inspection report include:

…not all studies had an approved written protocol that clearly indicated the objectives and all methods for the conduct of the study.
There is no assurance that all the surgical procedures were approved.….The identity of a study animal on a [xxx] report dated [xxx] was corrected from [xxx] using a scrap piece of paper. ([xxx] indicates redacted, or blacked out, information)
Temperature monitoring records are incomplete….Humidity is not monitored during the entire study.
The animals were fasted the day prior to any study activity. There was study activity daily for the first [xxx] days of the study, and weekly thereafter. The animals experienced decreased appetite and diarrhea. No animals were taken off the study for health reasons.

A certified “warning” letter from the Department of Health and Human Services to Dr. Frederick Coulston, TCF’s CEO and Chairman of the Board, concludes that the conditions at his facility “are serious violations of the GLP regulations,” and warns that the results of future studies at TCF would be considered “seriously flawed” if these deficiencies are not corrected.
The Three R’s: Replacement, Reduction and Refinement of Tests on Animals, A Conference in Bologna

At the third annual meeting of the World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences that took place in Bologna, Italy from August 29 to September 2, 1999, Christine Stevens – founder and president of the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) was honored with the 1999 Henry Spira Award To Improve The Lot Of Laboratory Animals In Academic Institutions And Commercial Laboratories. AWI worked with the British Universities Federation of Animal Welfare led by Major C.W. Hume to bring about publication of “The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique,” by Russell and Burch.

Throughout the conference, the theme of this book that started the whole movement to replace, reduce, or refine experiments on animals, was cited. Co-author, W.M.S. Russell of the University of Reading, UK, spoke to the assembled conference urging the entire body to energetic action.

“The tie I am wearing is a gift from my friend Klaus Cussler, of the Paul Ehrlich Institute. It has about 100 tortoises on it, all moving slowly in the same direction. But one of them is saying, “GET A MOVE ON!” So that is my message to this Congress — let’s get a move on and see how much we can do together to achieve the 3 R’s revolution by the time we next meet in Boston in 2002.”

Hugh Richardson of the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre praised Russell and Burch’s “seminal book” and reported that “by the middle of the 1980s the Council of Europe had adopted a convention based on the three R’s, and that the EEC had passed a major new Directive….Directive 86/609 is binding on all the member states of the European Union which have now adopted their own legislation to meet or surpass the minimum standards it lays down. Representatives of the Member States meet regularly with the Commission to discuss ways of improving the application of the Directive in promoting the 3 R’s throughout the European Union.” For example, in February the European Commission approved three in vitro replacements for laboratory animals in toxicity tests: one to test corrosives, another to test photo toxicity, and the third a topical toxicity test. Toxicity tests are the most urgently needed for replacement of animals because they are generally extremely stressful and painful.

Valerie Stanley of the Animal Legal Defense Fund, known for her pioneering victories for animals in court cases, accepted the award for Mrs. Stevens and read her statement to the conference, as printed here:

“I am happy to accept this award on behalf of Christine Stevens. She has asked me to read her remarks:

“I wish to express my gratitude to this 3rd World Congress. I have long admired the work of European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM) for its dedication, energy and commitment to find and implement tests that supplant the cruel methods of testing on animals that have been used for so many years.

“With all the resources the United States has, all of its wealth not only in terms of money, but in intelligence and innovation, in terms of finding and implementing non-animal tests, the United States cannot even begin to compare with the genuine strides and accomplishments of ECVAM and its allies such as the Multicenter Evaluation of In-Vitro Cytotoxicity (MEIC).

“In this regard, ECVAM and the American Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) are more than worlds apart geographically. In the United States, we seem more interested in stating that we are dedicated to finding non-animal methods than in actually producing and validating them. If pharmaceutical and household product manufacturers in the United States are really serious in pressing forward with the necessary research, why haven’t we made breakthroughs that equal MEICs?”

But the U.S. is seriously behind the more enlightened research community in Europe. Our commitment to Henry Spira’s great legacy in furthering elimination of unnecessary animal testing must not falter. 🐾

### Bequests to AWI

To any who 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, located in Washington, D.C., the sum of $_______ and/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 specific wishes about the disposition of your bequest, we suggest you discuss such provisions with your attorney.
In Monstrous 20,000 Cow-Factory Farms, Hormone Injections Are Given Regularly—Abnormal Amounts of Milk are the Goal

By Chris Bedford

A merican’s small family dairy farms face extinction. The farm gate price of milk has dropped to below 1978 levels, as a result of market manipulation by large dairy cooperatives which function like giant agribusiness corporations.

As a consequence, many family dairy farmers may be forced into bankruptcy this year. The U.S. Department of Labor predicts farm employment losses will exceed 175,000 in the next five years. And this estimate was released before the current crisis. The impacts from this potential loss for rural communities, the environment and animal welfare are devastating.

The same industrialization of food production that has transformed poultry and hog raising is rapidly transforming dairy production. In dairy factory operations, farmers become factory workers, environmentally destructive amounts of manure are produced, animals are confined for most their lives and output is pushed through processes that can damage human and animal health. Milk production is artificially stimulated through injections of a recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH) also known as Bovine Somatotropin (BST). BST use can painfully injure lactating cows by draining calcium from bones and tissues, causing ulcers along their backbone and disfiguring swelling of leg joints (see page 6 of AWI Quarterly, Vol. 48 No. 2).

BST has also been implicated in human health problems by causing increased production of another bovine hormone called IGF-1 (Insulin Growth Factor 1). IGF-1 has been proven to increase risk for uterine and breast cancer and heart disease in women. Both BST and IGF-1 are not destroyed by the 15-second pasteurization process used on most commercial milk. FDA approval of Monsanto’s version of BST, known by the trade name of Posilac, was based on pasteurization tests of 30 minutes or more, not 15 seconds.

Traditionally, milk has been produced by small, family dairy farms milking 30-100 cows at any one time. Although many of these small farmers experimented in the mid-1990s with (BST) they abandoned the product after seeing what it did to their cows.

“It just wore my neighbors’ cows out,” said dairy farmer, George Donnon of Rising Sun, Maryland who never used Posilac. “It increased production some during the first lactation. But it didn’t work after that. And it caused some serious physical problems for the animals.” The dairy factory operations are the principal consumers of Posilac/BST. Heifers are given the drug during their first lactation — forcing them to produce milk for two years or more — increasing per cow output by approximately 15%. After this first artificially extended lactation, the cows are so worn out that they have to be sold for meat. Small family dairy farmers typically keep their cows for five or six lactations.

“Use of BST divides the large operations from the small family farmer,” said Eddie Boyer, a dairy farmer from New Oxford, Pennsylvania. “A family farmer cares about his cows. He calls them to the milking parlor by name. He wants to extend their productive lives as long as he can.” Ironically, BST use and the expansion of dairy factory operations is behind much of the current crisis facing small family dairy farms. The construction of giant BST-dependent dairy factories, milking 20,000 cows or more, in the desert areas of California, Arizona and Idaho has produced large amounts of cheese at artificially low prices. These new dairy factories create environmental problems/disasters wherever they operate — often spilling millions of gallons of manure into scarce and vulnerable arid land water supplies. Since dairy factories externalize so much of the real environmental impacts, production costs are lower than on family farms. Cheese produced by these dairy factory operations is unloading large dairy cooperatives like Dairy Farmers of America and Land O’Lakes on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Cheese traded on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange sets the price of all milk sold in the United States through a series of Milk Marketing Orders issued by the federal government. By dumping subsidized, dairy factory produced cheese in Chicago, large dairy cooperatives can drive down the farmgate price of milk — reaping huge windfall profits while impoverishing the small farmers who are members of the coops. In 1978, when farmgate milk prices were higher than they are now, consumers paid a $1.20 for a gallon of fresh milk. Today that same gallon of milk costs almost $3.

“Someone is making money producing milk,” said Fred LeClair, a dairy farmer from Watertown, New York. “It’s just not us. Right now, I lose about $6 for every hundred pounds of milk I produce (11.6 gallons = 100 lbs). I don’t know any business that can operate long at these kinds of prices.”

Some believe the current low prices are an effort by large cooperatives to “rationalize” milk production, make it more “efficient”, by driving small producers out-of-business. Large dairy factory operations are protected through special premiums paid by processors and by low-interest loans unavailable to small dairy farmers. “It is time to draw a line between small farmers like myself and large corporate operations,” said George Donnon. “Our interests are different. I want to maintain our way of life without having to get bigger. If I get a higher price for my milk, I will milk fewer cows, not more. And that’s good for me and the environment, and the cows.”

Four year old April Donnon milking April, a cow named after her, on her father’s farm in Rising Sun, Maryland. Mr. Donnon owns 75 cows.
The Polish Resistance

By Tom Garrett

John Steinbeck once wrote that family farmers are “the soul and the guts of this nation or of any other nation.”

This can be nowhere truer than in Poland. Since Polish peasants armed with scythes overran Russian artillery at Raclawice during the Kosciuszko uprising of 1793, Poland’s most stubborn defenders have been found in the countryside. In the 19th Century, under leaders such as Jacob Szulic, the Polish peasantry threw off serfdom. Their obdurate resistance halted Stalinist attempts, between 1949-54, to consolidate Polish agriculture into state farms. Poland emerged from Communism in 1990 with 80% of its farmland still in private hands and well over a quarter of the population engaged in farming.

Today, having survived Communism, Poland’s peasants, standing athwart the juggernaut of corporate globalization, face a far more implacable enemy. The worldwide crash in grain and hog prices, compounded by a flood of cheap imports from the European Union’s highly subsidized agriculture, has left Poland’s farmers in a desperate plight, creating what Andrew Nagorski, writing in Newsweek International, calls “a bumper crop of despair.” Far from coming to Polish farmers’ defense, the country’s deeply unpopular coalition government has capitulated to E.U. demands to “modernize” Polish agriculture as a price for admission. Agricultural Minister Artur Balasz has announced that the number of Polish farms, in accordance with E.U. requirements, must be reduced from two million to 800,000 by 2003. How will 1.2 million farm families be removed from the land in three years? The answer, beyond the screen of persiflage, seems brutally simple: To maintain an economic climate in which “weaker” farmers cannot survive economically.

As Polish farms suffer what farm wife Ewa Blieska, quoted in Newsweek, calls a “slow death,” the great transnational agribusiness corporations, like vultures settling beside a wounded animal, are entering the country. Chicken factories similar to those that swept the U.S. in the 1960s are taking root in western Poland, pushing out peasant producers. Early last year (see AWI Quarterly, Vol. 48/49 No. 4/1) the world’s largest “pork production” company began a drive to take over pork production in Poland. Ignoring warnings by the farm unions, Smithfield is moving aggressively to bring the vertically integrated system that has destroyed family agriculture in states such as Virginia (where Smithfield now owns 95% of all hogs raised) and North Carolina, to Poland. Smithfield Chief counsel Richard Poulson, predicts that Animex, Smithfield’s Polish subsidiary, will become Europe’s largest pork production company with sales in excess of one billion dollars annually.

In Poland, where virtually every farm — no matter how small — raises a few pigs, the corporate drive poises a dagger at the heart of private farming. For pigs, and

Photos: Palace of Culture and Science where Tom Garrett, Agnes Van Volkenburgh and Gail Eisnitz spoke to 3,000 attendees of the Samoobrona Congress.
for the cause of animal welfare, the implications are horrifying. Today, most of Poland’s 18 million pigs are raised in the traditional, relatively humane way, in pastures or on straw, able to interact socially and carry out normal motor patterns. If corporate hog factories supplant family farms, the lives of sows, imprisoned wretchedly in steel crates, will become a parabola of misery and the ghastly American syndrome — miasmic “lagoons,” dumpsters overflowing with bloated carcasses — will spread across eastern and central Europe. If it cannot be stopped in Poland, there is no chance of stopping it in countries like Belarus (where Smithfield is rumored to be negotiating) and the Ukraine.

On January 17, Agnes Van Volkenburgh, Slaughterhouse author Gail Eisnitz and I arrived in Warsaw for the Congress of Peasant-National Bloc, an alliance of Samoobrona with independent trade unions and small political parties, and for the opening of Andrzej Lepper’s counterattack against Smithfield. The following morning, we walked through a gathering crowd into the monumental Kongressa Hall of Warsaw’s huge, Stalinist-era Palace of Culture and Science and were seated in the front row. While folk troupes from the Carpathian and Bieszczady Mountains performed on the stage, thousands of delegates to the Congress — peasants from across Poland, coal miners in black uniforms, pensioners, military veterans aligned with General Tadeusz Wilicki’s National Front — took their seats. We stood for the Polish National Anthem, which begins “While we live Poland shall not die.” Then Lepper rose to speak. After a blistering attack on economic policies that have led to 14% unemployment and a fire sale of state owned assets to foreigners, he turned to the plight of Poland’s peasants. He dwelled movingly on animal welfare, contrasting peasant farming where each farm animal is named and newborn young are brought into family homes in cold weather, with the mass, mindless cruelty of industrial agriculture. Our turn came after a recess. Agnes spoke briefly and eloquently, gaining thunderous applause. With Agnes translating, I explained what has happened to family farming in America and what lies in store for Poland if Smithfield is allowed to take over. Gail then recounted the appalling situation in American slaughterhouses.

We spent January 19th in Warsaw, meeting government officials and environmentalists. Before dawn on the 20th we joined Andrzej Lepper for a trip to northwestern Poland, lunching with agricultural bankers and touring a small slaughterhouse en route. In Czluchow, the town’s meeting hall was packed with hundreds of farmers waiting for Lepper. The farmers heard Lepper out. Then, for two hours, angry, desperate, sometimes despairing, they poured forth their troubles. There was much talk about hog factories since a Danish firm, Poldanor, has a permit to build a 300,000 feeder pig complex not far away.

January 21 dawned with snow and sleet. We drove westward on roads lined with Lombardy poplar through a part of Poland that was once German territory and had witnessed still another trail of tears when the German population was driven out in 1945. In late morning, we reached the ancient city of Szczecin, on the Odra River which forms today’s German border and pulled up in front of the Smithfield owned AGRYF slaughterhouse. Farmers carrying Samoobrona signs were waiting, the press had arrived. Lepper led us to the entrance where a row of faces peered through the glass. At this point, the manager, acting out his own version of Polish bravado, came outside without a coat and stood for an hour in the bitter wind, shivering violently and arguing, before the press, with the infuriated farmers. The problem, it seemed, was that AGRYF, true to the attitude of its corporate masters, was refusing to buy small lots of hogs because they “lacked uniformity”. Lepper finally heard enough. “Listen well” he said. “If there is any more of this I am coming back to shut you down.”
The next stop was in downtown Szczecin where we met with the local farmers cooperative (which has a minority interest in the Agury plant) to discuss the Smithfield takeover. Then, in a cold, sleeting rain, we went to see a hog factory left over from Communist times at a state farm 20 miles or so outside the city. We passed the workers’ quarters, a five story apartment building positioned, incongruously, in a muddy field. But when we reached the hog factory the gates were padlocked and the sole person in attendance was the office manager. Word had come earlier in the day, she said, for the crew to lock everything and leave. The basic operational features, open cesspools and spray fields, seemed similar to U.S. hog factories. “In the summertime the smell hereabout is almost unendurable” one of the farmers said. “As for dead hogs, they dump them in a sump in the woods. The flies practically darken the sun.” The last stop in Szczecin was to call on Marian Jurczyk, a towering figure of the anti-communist resistance and bitter rival of Lech Walesa, at the twilight of his political career. Jurczyk, receiving us in his imposing office, announced that he would resign as Mayor of Szczecin the following week.

Six inches of snow fell in the night. We left before dawn, driving south through a hushed and peaceful countryside. Morning revealed the Odra valley and a sweep of marshlands and floodplain forests. The tracts of forest and open space in northwestern Poland, contrasting with the patchwork of small farms often found elsewhere, are a legacy of numerous landed estates which, with the expulsion of their German owners, remained intact as state farms. We stopped for lunch at an ecotourism resort maintained by one of Lepper’s supporters. Hours of tortuous night driving on snow-packed roads brought us to Warsaw, and at noon of the 22nd, after a harried morning of press interviews and meetings with environmentalists, we said goodbye to our friends and returned to the United States.

What has AWI accomplished thus far? Three thousand copies of a forty-minute video developed by Diane Halverson and narrated in Polish by Agnes Van Volkenburgh were delivered to Samoobrona and other Polish NGOs. The tapes are based around the Polish September tour, but they contain additional footage from hog factories and aerial coverage of the North Carolina floods. Along with written material, translated by Agnes, they have been distributed across Poland providing the sinew for a press and media campaign. Excerpts from the tapes have appeared on two Polish cable channels and numerous television stations. The March 10 issue of Nie (circulation 800,000) contains a scathing attack on Smithfield quoting AWI extensively. A similar article appeared in the daily paper Nasz Dziennik. The breakthroughs on radio, which is more important in Poland than in the U.S., have been dramatic. Agnes and Lepper were featured on TOK FM, Poland’s main talk radio station. Appearing on Radio Zet, which is the most listened to-station in the country, Agriculture Minister Artur Balasz was asked whether he supported Lepper or Smithfield in the battle over pig factories. In a startling turnaround, Balasz announced that he supported Lepper and that pig factories cannot be tolerated in Poland.

In the Polish countryside, Samoobrona’s campaign against Smithfield and other multinationals is gaining force. On February 8, for example, 2000 farmers gathered to protest Cargill’s failure to pay farmers on time for deliveries of grain. Concurrently, a campaign led by Rural Solidarity head, Roman Wierbicki, has succeeded in blocking a giveaway of Poland’s sugar processing capacity to foreign companies. On March 6, farmers will “send a message” by blockading roads and highways for three hours all across Poland. Meantime, an alliance is coalescing between the peasants and the Polish environmentalists. It will have its first test when humane and environmental groups from throughout Poland send cadres to Warsaw to participate in Samoobrona-led protests at German, Danish and U.S. Embassies on March 14.

The Polish campaign has opened the door for AWI to carry its message, that mass abuse of animals is the core evil of industrial agriculture, to an ever wider audience. Agnes and I were invited to address a Congress of Peasant Parties from ten eastern and central European nations in Prague on March 11. On March 26, we will address the World Congress of Trade Unions in New Delhi, India. In attendance will be the leaders of India’s 30 million member peasant unions who have given the agribusiness giant, Monsanto, vector of “genetically modified” seeds, an ultimatum to leave India.

---

**Human Population, 6,000,000,000 and Growing**

The world has reached a population of six billion, meaning the number of the globe’s inhabitants has doubled in less than 40 years.

It took all of human history for the planetary population to reach one billion in 1804, but then little more than 150 years to reach three billion in 1960. Now there’s twice the number.

*While the world adds another 3,500 humans every 20 minutes it loses an entire plant or animal species in that same time — or about 27,000 species a year.*

Despite a gradual slowing in the overall growth rate, world population is still increasing by 78 million a year—the equivalent of adding a city almost the size of San Francisco every three days.

-Reprinted from *EcoNews*
Dog Nursing Pups Mutilated in So-called “Padded” Trap

Shortly before Christmas, a mother dog was seen limping around the neighborhood in the White Knoll, South Carolina community. Her right front paw was held in the viselike grip of a steel jaw leghold trap. Apparently, the dog wasn’t able to pull her foot out of the trap, but she had succeeded in pulling the trap’s stake out of the ground to get back to her puppies. Although trappers refer to the device as a “padded” leghold trap, the trap had mangled the dog’s paw, and she had lost three of her toes.

Dave Johnston, a volunteer with Pets, Inc., a local animal rescue organization, lured the emaciated mother dog in with food. “She was quite cooperative,” Johnston said. “She was exhausted. She went sound asleep in the van.” Johnston was only able to catch two of her puppies, but he knew there were more so he returned until he was able to round up all of five of her offspring. The puppies were only weeks old.

Thankfully, this story has a happy ending. The sweet mother dog has been adopted by a loving family and named Honey. After only a few weeks in her new home, Honey has thrived, gaining nearly 25 pounds. She doesn’t like taking her twice-a-day antibiotic treatment or having the bandage on her paw changed. But this treatment, along with a trip back to the veterinarian every other day to monitor her progress, appears to be paying off. Honey’s maimed paw is healing better than expected, and it probably won’t have to be amputated. And all of her puppies have been adopted to good homes.

The owner of the inhumane, indiscriminate trap has not stepped forward to assume responsibility for setting it. Residents of White Knoll are concerned that the steel jaw trap, which had been set near a grade school, could have caught a child.

Meantime, Honey appears to be enjoying her new home, although she is apprehensive of people, following her ordeal. Her new family is very protective of her. When they realized that she hated loud noises, they spent New Year’s Eve with her on the floor of their bathroom. Honey is bonding with the two other dogs in the family, and the woman who adopted Honey acknowledged that she’s made great strides, describing a day when “…I caught her playing, jumping around on three legs and her nubby foot. She looked at me like I wasn’t supposed to see that.”
On April 11, 2000, Judge Thelton Henderson of the U.S. District Court in San Francisco ruled against the blatant defrauding of consumers by the U.S. government. The judge struck down the new “dolphin-safe” label for canned tuna fish—a label that is distinctly dolphin unsafe. Judge Henderson questioned the diligence of the Department of Commerce in adequately studying the reason for the lack of recovery of several species of dolphins, hard hit for decades in the eastern tropical Pacific.

Despite the death of over seven million dolphins who were chased, exhausted and netted to catch the tuna schools beneath them, Secretary of Commerce William Daley made a preliminary finding last year that there was no proof that this technique of fishing caused “significant adverse impact.” His finding triggered the release of a new, official Department of Commerce “dolphin-safe” label for canned tuna fish. The new label would have been used on cans of tuna caught by harassing dolphins. Judge Henderson essentially voided this fraud and sent the government back to the drawing board. His ruling came in the nick of time, with Mexico poised to flood the U.S. with tons of dolphin-deadly tuna.

Thanks to especially vocal consumers, all canned tuna now sold in the United States is caught without netting dolphins. Three all major American tuna importers have vowed to continue the present definition of dolphin-safe and reject the phony label.
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Another Dealer is Exposed for Illegally Acquiring Dogs for Experimentation

As many as 1,000 former racing greyhounds may have been acquired fraudulently by a USDA-licensed Class B, random source breeder and sold for experimentation, with the dogs being used for experimental purposes while they were in the breeder’s possession. The dogs were marketed as “designed to help the animals be adopted to homes.”

Allegedly most of the dogs were sold to Guidant Corporation, a cardiac research facility and manufacturer of implantable pacemakers and defibrillators, as needed for experimental purposes at the company’s site in St. Paul, Minnesota. Research facilities that want to ensure they do not get stolen or fraudulently acquired dogs and cats should not use Class B random source dealers.

Most of the dogs Shonka sold for experimentation have been killed, but approximately 100 may still be alive at Guidant. The laboratory is reversing the experimental procedures it conducted on the dogs and is releasing them. Some of the dogs have had surgically implanted wires removed and after recovering from the surgery, the greyhounds will be adopted to good homes as initially anticipated by their owners.

The thieves are believed to have been in an older car, dilapidated, and record-keeping.
U.S. Navy Kills Whales In The Bahamas

BY BEN WHITE

In early 1998, the U.S. Navy was testing an anti-submarine device called Low Frequency Active (LFA) sonar off the Kona coast of Hawaii, intentionally hitting humpback whales with up to 155 decibels. AWI led the interference to marine mammals, putting human swimmers in the water to force the Navy to turn off its huge sonar. We warned that the consequences of bombing sensitive creatures with intense sound could be devastating, even though not necessarily readily apparent.

In 1999, the Navy issued a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) covering its LFA sonar. The thick document announced that the Navy was in the process of building four ships that would carry LFA sonar into 80% of the world’s oceans for thousands of hours a year, ostensibly to find quiet enemy submarines. The operational limit of the LFA sonar would be about 240 decibels, over a hundred million times more intense than the level used on the Hawaiian humpbacks. And this would be completely safe, the Navy asserts, because it would keep a close lookout for passing whales and turn off the LFA sonar if whales swam within 1.5 kilometers of the vessel. Outside that distance, the whales would “only” receive 180 decibels or less, a level the Navy argued caused no damage at all. This was a staggering assertion, since the well-established level at which whales start avoiding an area is about 120 decibels—a million times less intense. Based on tests on its own divers, the Navy has set 140 decibels as the maximum level to which a human can safely be subjected.

In researching active sonar devices, AWI and others discovered that they had been tested for at least a decade, often without the required “incidental take” permits, and that on several occasions mass strandings of cetaceans occurred just on the heels of Navy exercises. Dr. Alexandros Frantzis of the University of Athens has tied a very unusual stranding pressure wave. Upon inspection of a beaked whale head with a CAT-SCAN machine at Harvard, it was discovered that the creature had suffered a concussion, further proof of an acute trauma brought on by a pressure wave. Those of us fighting the Navy’s testing and deployment of active sonar knew immediately that it involved in some sort of exercises exactly at the same place and time as the Bahamas strandings. The Navy at first denied any link whatever. Subsequently the Navy has been very careful with its response, issuing a statement asserting that seven Navy ships and three submarines were in the area, five of which were operating “their normal array of active sonar” as they passed the Bahamas, not LFA sonar.

On May 10, AWI held a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., to blow the whistle on the Navy for killing the whales and dolphins in the Bahamas and to call for an immediate halt in further testing or deployment of active sonar devices until Congress convenes oversight hearings into the safety and necessity of these very real threats to ocean life. Speakers were Joel Reynold of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Ken Balcomb of the Center for Whale Research, Dr. Naomi Rose of the Humane Society of the United States, Dr. Marsha Green of the Ocean Mammal Institute, and Dr. Charles Bernard, retired Navy officer and designer of weapons systems for thirty years. The message was delivered to a bank of TV monitors in the House of Representatives.

The Environment Comes Second

A t the recent meeting of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Alexey Yablokov, the distinguished Russian Scientist who is a member of AWI’s International Committee, and was an advisor to former President Boris Yeltsin, presented a letter, with several other scientists, to President of Russia, Vladimir Putin protesting his termination of the State Committee on the Environment.

According to the report in The New York Times (May 24, 2000), there is a deep-seated belief in the Kremlin that the widespread pollution is not important and that economic recovery must come first, and afterwards, the environment can be given attention.

Yablokov has testified before the U.S. Congress on the radiation, as well as air and water pollution, that desperately needs to be addressed in Russia. President Putin said he will think about it.

“Report: Japan is Top Importer of Endangered Species”

A c c o r d i n g to Kyodo News Service, February 8, 2000, “Japan in 1996 was the world’s top importer of endangered tortoises and birds whose trading is restricted by an international convention, a survey by a Japanese group monitoring wildlife trafficking said today. Japan also ranked second as an importer of live primates and orchid-type plants listed on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). …According to the survey, Japan bought 29,051 tortoises from abroad, absorbing some 55% of the species traded worldwide, and purchased 136,179 wild and bred birds, or 43% of all birds trafficked globally. …A total of 5,374 live primates such as cynomolugus monkeys and common squirrel monkeys were imported to Japan, the world’s second largest amount for trade. Japan was also the second largest importer of furs of animals belonging to the cat family…”

A Fur Promotion Frenzy

S aga Furs of Scandinavia is desperately attempting to invoke abysmal fur sales. In the hope of manipulating consumer demand, Saga is offering promotions to designers including giving designers free fur, offering free trips to Copenhagen to learn about fur, sponsoring fashion shows of designers who feature Saga Furs, and providing designers with access to their factories for production of fur fashions. ...

---Information from the San Francisco Chronicle, Trish Donnelly, on March 14, 2000---

The Farm Bureau Prediction on China

A ccording to The New York Times (May 24, 2000), “China could account for a quarter of all U.S. agricultural exports.” According to the March 29th Mercury, “The evidence collected shows the brands have created large weeping and infected wounds on many seals.” The Parks and Wildlife Director, Max Kitchell, said, “a significant number of seals were left with horrific injuries which could be life-threatening.”

The Navy, bowing to pressure from the environmental and animal protection community, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Marine Mammal Commission, cancelled the testing of active sonar devices as part of its LWAD (Littoral Warfare Advanced Development) trial off New Jersey. This is the first time the Navy has altered its schedule for active sonar deployment.

We have also just learned, in papers the Navy filed in a new Hawaii LFA court challenge to be heard on June 13, that the planned testing of the LFA on sperm whales in the Azores “will not be carried out this year.” This obviously leaves open the possibility of next year, but for now, both the immediate demands of our press conference have been met.

Elephant Seals Hot Iron Branded

o t iron branding has caused terrible pain to animals, both wild and domestic. Photographs of branded elephant seals, with hot iron brand marks covering a significant part of the animals’ sides (both sides so scientists can read the number easily) were published in the Sydney, Australia Mercury.

According to the March 29th Mercury, “The evidence collected shows the brands have created large weeping and infected wounds on many seals.” The Parks and Wildlife Director, Max Kitchell, said, “a significant number of seals were left with horrific injuries which could be life-threatening.”

The brands, part of a 10 year population study, have now been mercilessly stopped by the Macquarie island government.

Above: Dead male dense-beaked whale bruised and internally damaged; found March 16, 2000, Cross Harbor, Abaco.

The Voice of the Turtle is Heard in Our Land

— Song of Solomon 2:12 (King James Version Bible)

By Ben White

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund—What They Do

Just at the close of World War II, a conference in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, created the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the monster that eventually morphed into the more manageable World Trade Organization (WTO).

The World Bank is the largest lender in the world to poor countries, supported in part by almost a billion dollars a year of U.S. tax dollars. The type of development funded is often disastrous: megaprojects such as dams that flood habitats, villages and fertile valleys, huge deforestation schemes, and the conversion of grasslands to trampled cattle farms. When countries cannot meet their payments on the World Bank loans, they borrow from the IMF. The IMF is very willing to make the payments if, and only if, the countries are willing to take its “advice” on how to “improve” their economies. This advice comes in the form of “SAP’s”-short for Structural Adjustment Programs, in exchange for helping meet their payments. Thus the IMF is able to dictate the economic policies of the debtor countries. Its influence is vast and draconian. If the debtor countries refuse to go along, all international sources of money dry up.

Once in the debt cycle, very few countries are ever able to pay their debts. Almost all of the recipients of the IMF’s projects have become more dependent. From 1984 to 1996 alone, the cash flow from third world countries to commercial banks was over 178 billion dollars, prompting one former World Bank official to say: “Not since the Conquistadors plundered Latin America has the world experienced a flow in the direction we see today.”

The World Bank and the IMF and Wildlife

This is where animal suffering comes in. Beside the damage to our ecological heritage, this suffering is often ignored. For example, there are three areas in India known as the “Endangered Olive Ridley Turtle” that are designated as “endangered” by the World Bank and IMF. Once-daily nesting of these turtles has either ceased or significantly declined after the World Bank instructed the country to protect the beaches. Therefore, the World Bank is effectively preventing the annual delightful sight of millions of the creatures climbing the beach to lay their eggs.

Why We Marched as Turtles

At the WTO meeting in Seattle, AWI helped lead 240 people dressed as sea turtles in protest against the WTO’s rejection of U.S. law requiring turtle excluder devices on boats of any kind. Several countries refused employing these inexpensive devices, insisting that our law unfairly restricted trade. The WTO struck down our law. Turtles are also globally imperiled by rapacious development and fishing policies promoted by the IMF and World Bank. So, the turtle demonstrators resurfaced for a protest in D.C. against these institutions. The turtles have been a tremendous hit—symbolically protesting the WTO’s usurpation of American sovereignty, including enforcement of our animal protection laws, and the ecological destruction wrought by the World Bank and IMF.

Sea turtles march against the World Bank and IMF in Washington, D.C.

While the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) met in Washington behind closed doors and police barricaded this week, citizens from around the world were protesting in Washington to protect the Asian elephant. Its forests contain areas identified by the World Wildlife Fund and the Wildlife Conservation Society as Level One Tiger Conservation Unit warranting the highest level of environmental protection. The forests are unique because they are still connected by roads and borders that allow large mammals the range they need. The planned mines will cut off the corridors, reducing the forests to islands surrounded by human activity. Stranded tiger populations inside these “forest islands” become infected and die out.

After initially calling the mine sites “degraded” forest uninhabitable to wildlife, the World Bank was joined by MOEF in eventually admitting the vital function of the corridors and that the mine “will not be detrimental to the tiger.” It promised local groups that it would send experts to assess the situation, but never followed through.

The Environmental Impact Assessments prepared by the World Bank and the MOEF gloss over the impact of the mines on the corridors and the wildlife they host. Nor do they official assessments include an analysis of the atmospheric impact of mining and burning more coal, impacts whose brute is inevitably borne by developing countries as climate change accelerates. Coal is the dirtiest and more carbon-intensive of fossil fuels, releasing more greenhouse gases into the earth’s atmosphere than any other source. The World Bank supports the poorest and will suffer the most in a warming world.

The mines’ impacts on local residents have also gone unheeded. The project sites are home to tribal communities and Neolithic act now marked for eradication. To make way for the mines, entire villages have been forcibly evicted and resettled under conditions that ensure their pauperization. Those who do benefit from the coal and the money run out, vast areas of the region will be laid waste, devoid of the indigenous communities, and all too soon, the short-lived mining economy. Coal expansion also effectively preempts development of affordable, clean, renewable forms of energy which are desperately needed and would be of sustainable economic benefit to the region.

During his March trip to India, President Clinton visited Ranathambore Tiger Reserve where he discussed the threats to the tiger’s survival and spotted two tigers in the wild. In subsequent speeches he called on business leaders to help preserve the tiger populations as part of India’s heritage. But is it U.S. eagerness for Indian economic development which encourages such pervasive efforts as extinguishing India’s tigers and pre-empting sustainable energy development? The World Bank and the tiger or development bankers’ professed environmentalism is sincere or not is known only to themselves. But the actual track records of the institutions involved suggest a global pattern of perverse effects, like the ones that loom in India.

Nothing about globalization is simple, but it doesn’t take a policy sophisticate like Mr. Clinton or World Bank President James Wolfensohn to know that devastating forests, extinguishing wildlife and dislocating and denying sustainable livelihoods to local populations are bad things. More than one million Indian children who signed an immense “Save the Tiger” scroll know it, and have a perfect right to demand the World Bank adopt an environmentally and socially responsible energy investment strategy in India. If they can do it, U.S. taxpayers can do it, too, and perhaps even raise the consciousness of world leaders and development bankers. **
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By Bittu Sahgal, editor of Sanctuary Asia, India’s largest circulation wildlife magazine and Daphne Wysham, research fellow of the Washington-based Institute for Policy Studies.

World Bank-sponsored mining projects in India could destroy thousands of acres of essential wildlife habitat and wipe out endangered species such as tigers, a symbol of India’s robust ecological heritage. The tiger was photographed in Kanha National park in Madhya Pradesh in Central India.
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Political “Spin” and Wildlife Conservation

CITES 2000

BY ADAM M. ROBERTS

The Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) concluded in Nairobi, Kenya on April 20, 2000. The 151 nations that are signatories to the Convention considered over 250 treaty proposals regarding levels of protection for wildlife threatened by consumption for international trade. *AWI’s* positions on these proposals were supported in over half the votes—clear victories; in about a third of the votes we clearly lost; and the remaining proposals were amended in some compromise fashion (for instance, not changing the species’ status, but specifically disallowing trade in specimens, known as a “zero quota”). Did animal advocates or wildlife exploiters prevail overall at this CITES Meeting? It depends on whose reports you read. Politics and political debate in Washington, DC is often dominated by political “spin”—when policy debates end, each side attempts to portray itself the victor in the press and to the public. 8,000 miles away from Washington in Nairobi, molded media messages bombarded the news on a daily basis as opposing forces claimed triumph on a host of issues. In 1997, CITES Parties undermined the nearly decade-long ban on the global trade in elephant ivory by downlisting from Appendix I to Appendix II the elephant populations of Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe to allow sale of hunting trophies, live animals, hides and leather goods (for Zimbabwe), and a total of 59 tons of raw ivory to Japan. Elephant poaching escalated once the ivory trade was reopened. Numerous reports circulated in Nairobi revealing the carnage. The Born Free Foundation’s Stop the Clock Report analyzed elephant poaching and ivory confiscation data for a number of countries. While the CITES Secretariat’s official figures claim 235 elephants poached in 1998 and 1999, Born Free’s analysis shows a conservative figure of 6,159 elephants poached in 1998 and 1999—26.2 times the “official” record. Considering potential for underreporting, Born Free estimates the actual kill may be up to five times higher. But despite reported rampant poaching across Africa, Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe petitioned to open the ivory trade further to allow a combined 24 tons of ivory to be exported annually and for all three countries to trade in elephant hides, leather goods, trophies, and live animals. In addition, South Africa proposed to downlist its elephant population to allow 30 tons of ivory to be sold as well as other elephant parts and live animals. Kenya and India, both facing an upsurge in elephant poaching since 1997 and desperately underfunded and understaffed in their anti-poaching efforts, proposed putting all elephants back on Appendix I and opposed South Africa’s new weakening proposal. “Consensus building” was a clear theme of the Meeting—especially regarding African elephant range state opinions on the future of elephants and the trade in elephant ivory. Anticipa- tion of an explosive debate revolved around Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe all withdrew their proposals (thus leaving their elephants on Appendix II but not allowing further trade in ivory); Kenya withdrew its uplisting proposal; and South Africa’s pro- posal, which was amended to remove the ivory sale, was adopted by consensus. This is where the biggest media “spin” begins. If one reads pro-ivory trade organizations’ literature, such as a press release from the International Wildlife Managers Consortium -World Conservation Trust (IWMC) the compromise was a “Win for Sustainable Conservation of Elephants and Patience of Southern African Nations.” The President of this pro-use organization is actually Eugene Lapointe, former Secretary-General of CITES. But for us, the clear message is that the ivory experiment failed once more and bloody ivory is again illegal in international trade. A disturbing element of the elephant debate (or ultimate lack thereof) was America’s impotence. Historically a vocal opponent of the ivory trade, the U.S. voice was silent throughout. In fact, the “final” U.S. negotiating position on the elephant propos- als was not final at all—it was “pending.” The U.S. would have opposed proposals that permitted any ivory trade but would have abstained on the proposal by Kenya and India to put elephants back on Appendix I. In another example of political spin, when President Clinton issued a one-paragraph statement saying that the U.S. would oppose proposals “to reopen trade in elephant ivory,” the IWMC’s pro-use propaganda reported: “U.S. Congress, President Clash Over Elephants.” Why this supposed “clash?” Six Members of Con- gress sent a letter to the head of the U.S. Delegation urging support for the expanded ivory sale. What’s purposefully excluded from this report is reference to other letters from the Legislative Branch to the same Head of Delegation urging opposition to the ivory trade and support for Kenya and India—not one meager letter signed by six Congressmen, but 4 separate letters: one signed by Congress- man George Miller, the Ranking Minority Member of the House Resources Commit- tee, one signed by the Chairman and Rank- ing Minority Member of the House Interna- tional Relations Committee, one signed by 20 Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and one signed by 25 Mem- bers of the United States Senate. The Senate letter concluded: “At this critical juncture, we believe it will take the full energy and commitment of the United States delegation to return to elephant popu- lations the protections they still need.” Unfortunately, the U.S. exerted little energy and did little commitment toward the legislators’ laudable goal. Shunting down the ivory trade again - even without U.S. help - was vital, but the tone of the dialogue makes it clear that the issue will resurface repeatedly. Over the next two years, much time, effort, and money will be devoted to establishing a monitoring system to examine illegal kill- ing of elephants, and when the “system” appears to work, in all likelihood, legal ivory will flow again. The problems with

---

*Appendix I species are threatened with extinction and are or may be affected by international trade and are subject to a prohibition on international commercial trade. Appendices II species are not yet threatened with extinction but may be at risk without strict regulation of the legal international commercial trafficking in these species’ parts and products made from them. Appendix III species are identified by individual Parties as subject to internal regulation to prevent over-exploitation.*

---

A young elephant at Daphne Sheldrick’s wildlife orphanage in Nairobi, Kenya. Daphne and her committed corps of specialized animal handlers help rear young orphaned wildlife including elephants, rhinos, and zebras with the ultimate goal of reintroduction in the wild.
Japan and Norway kill over 1,000 minke whales each year. These incorrigible countries persist in their attempts to create a global commercial trade in whale meat.

A report from the Japan Wildlife Conservation Society asserts, "Japan has admitted for the first time that it is will also increase the possibility of its smuggling by reactivating an embargo, Cuba should benefit financially from wildlife exploitation. Ultimately, the proposal was defeated, again by secret ballot. In addition to preserving the protection for whales and sea turtles, notable increases in protection were given to the manatee-like Australian Dogung, the Horned and Uvea Parakeets of New Caledonia, China’s Melodious Laughing Thrush, Asian Box Tur-

des, and Madagascar’s Mantella Frogs. Marine fish species did not quite fare as well. The Parties refused to list three species of sharks: great white sharks, whale sharks, and basking sharks. All three species have low reproductive rates and declining populations, and are killed for their fins and other body parts. Fins float in high-priced Asian “shark fin soup;” basking shark skin is made into leather goods; great white shark livers are used for medicines, and shark meat is sold for human consumption. Unfortunately, all three proposals were defeated on the grounds that the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) has competency over fisheries management. (The FAO has begun considering shark conservation and has developed an “International Plan of Action for the Conserva-

tion and Management of Sharks.”) CITES also considered over 50 resolutions and other documents and on many of these issues we had success. On the trade shell will encourage sea turtle poaching in other regions and illegal sale of those shells and products made from them. The debate was filled with high emotions and not-so-subtle political jabs at the U.S. for its embargo on Cuba (an argument that to compensate for lost national revenue as a result of the embargo, Cuba should benefit financially from wildlife exploitation. Ultimately, the proposal was defeated, again by secret ballot.

The simple message from CITES is that the IWC has no authority to act in such a manner. Although elephants and whales dominated the debate, CITES Secretary General Willem Wijnstekers accurately noted in his opening statement “This meeting is not about elephants, it is also about elephants, it is not about whales, it is also about whales.”

Strong rhetoric surrounded the dialogue on downlisting critically endangered hawksbill sea turtles from Appendix I to Appendix II to allow trade in stocked turtle shell from Cuba to Japan and establish an annual quota of not more than 500 specimens. A report from the Japan Wildlife Conservation Society asserts that “Reopening of international trade of “bekko” [tortoiseshell],” William Wijntek said during the session. He noted that “Reopening of international trade of “bekko” [tortoiseshell],” William Wijntek said during the session.

China’s Torture Chambers

The results of an extensive undercover investigation into China’s cruel bear bile bears for the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) were revealed in a new report discussed at the 17th meeting of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) in Nairobi, Kenya. WSFA’s report, “Inside China’s Torture Chambers,” documents how thousands of bears are kept in horrific conditions in hundreds of farms across China, producing approximately 7000 kg of bear bile every year for the traditional Chinese medicine market. WSFA fears that China will apply to register some of its bear farms (WSFA can not yet register, thereby circumventing the existing international ban on trade in endangered bear bile from facilities approved by the CITES Secretariat can have their parts sold in global commercial trade while wild bears of the same species ostensibly are protected from such profitable exploitation. Such a move would hasten the demise of bears in the wild, with many taken from the wild each year to restock the farms, and encourage the continued development of this barbaric form of “farming.” The bears kept on these farms endure the most appalling levels of cruelty and neglect, with many wounded and scarred due to the friction caused by being kept in tiny metal cages suspended above the ground. They have no choice but to lie squashed in their cages on a bed of bars, some with a constant stream of bile seeping from their stomachs, where an open wound allows workers to insert a tube or piece of metal to “tap” the bile twice a day. Bears producing bile after just a few years, after which they outline their usefulness and are left to die or killed for their paws and gall bladders. A single bear paw may sell for several hundred dollars - almost a year’s salary for the average worker in China.

For the first time the Parties have addressed the issue of “bushmeat,” the consumption, and increasingly the cross-border sale, of wild animal flesh including ele-

Above: Minke whale butchered on a Japanese whaling boat in the Antarctic.

Right: According to the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, despite the 1986 IWC ban on commercial whaling, Japan and Norway kill over 1,000 minke whales each year. These incorrigible countries persist in their attempts to create a global commercial trade in whale meat.
Wildlife Conservation Heroes

The 2000 Clark R. Bavin Wildlife Law Enforcement Award

By Adam M. Roberts

During the Species Survival Network reception on April 11, 2000, CITES Secretary General Willem Wouter Wijnstekers graciously presented the Animal Welfare Institute’s Clark R. Bavin Wildlife Law Enforcement Awards. This honor is named for the late Chief of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s Division of Law Enforcement who pioneered the Division’s highly effective covert investigations and “sting” operations.

The evening’s featured speaker was Maneka Gandhi, India’s Minister of State for Social Justice and Empowerment, whose passionate presentation was entitled, “How we make room for animals as well?” Ms. Gandhi spoke eloquently about a variety of animal protection issues including conservation of endangered species such as tigers and elephants.

Ms. Gandhi pointed out:

The totally illegal but nevertheless thriving trade in Indian wildlife is directed primarily at the international market. Our tigers go to China in the form of bones, penises and claws for homemade remedies. Our antelopes go to fashionable Western soups…

Of the 1997 CITES decision in Harare to allow an experimental one-time sale of elephant ivory Ms. Gandhi exclaimed, “India cannot afford any experiments.” She observed, “if South Africa were to sell its entire existing stock of ivory it would earn 5 million dollars,” and questioned, “what is 5 million dollars to the South African economy that they should put the entire world’s elephant population at risk?” She noted that “Countries that lack respect to all living beings may not be poor in monetary terms but their moral poverty, their rapaciousness will destroy all of us.”

Ms. Gandhi concluded: “Today animals need us more than ever. The past century has been the cruelest in history... It is time to declare the hundred years’ war over and stop trading in their pain and blood.”

This evening was ultimately dedicated to those honorable men and women who spend their lives fighting to stop the illegal killing of wild animals and illicit trade in their parts and products.

Mr. Frank Leslie

is an officer with the Menou National Park unit in Kenya and was responsible for an ivory seizure in 1995. Mr. Leslie said:

“For 16 years I have been seconded to the Interpol General Secretariat in Lyon, France, where I work as a Specialist Officer. For the past three years, Mrs. Ekdahl has coordinated the activities of the Interpol Working Group on Wildlife Crime. She has also been a key participant in projects that have identified criminal trafficking in contraband wildlife and exposed their business relationships and networks. Her work was instrumental in the development of the Interpol Guidelines on the Investigation of Wildlife Crime and has been a key figure in the establishment of the International Wildlife Crime Network.”

Mr. Clement L. P. Wmale has served Zambian National Parks and Wildlife since he left school. For several years he was an investigator with Zambia Anti-Corruption Commission. Mr. Wmale has been involved in the development of Anti-Poaching Plans and Anti-Poaching Units. As such he has contributed to the arrest and conviction of many poachers and wildlife criminals.

“Mr. Wmale is a dedicated professional with a strong commitment to wildlife conservation. He is highly respected by colleagues and the community. He has been directly involved in the arrest of several poachers and has been instrumental in the confiscation of large quantities of ivory, rhino horn, and other wildlife products.”

Mr. banks said of Roy:

“His commitment and knowledge meant he never shied from conflict with the politicians and business interests that continue to take apart what remains of India’s natural heritage.”

Mr. Dullo finally retired from service in 1992 and passed away in August 1999.

Posthumous awards also honored Chadian Park Ranger Mahamat Abakar and Park Ranger M’Bakari, who were ambushed and killed while being involved in an anti-poaching patrol in the Sokouma National Park.

In Remembrance of Nick Carter

Nick Carter’s death on March 16th in Zambia marked the loss of a dedicated and passionate conservationist. His work took him all over the world – from London’s emergency animal clinics in the 1950s to the Far East and Africa to investigate wildlife smuggling and illegal whaling. His painstaking investigations to expose pirate whaling operations gained him recognition in the 1970s and led to the seizure in South Africa of two whaling ships before their maiden voyages. Countless endangered whales were saved.

In 1994, Nick was a recipient of AWI’s Clark R. Bavin Wildlife Law Enforcement Award for his last project, the Lusaka Agreement Task Force. Nick was killed in a car accident on his way to a meeting in Zambia.)

I want to add a quote about one of Nick’s brilliant ideas: He took a small ad in a journal for maritime engineers asking if anyone was interested in helping to stop the illegal trade in wildlife in India. Because of his efforts, numerous undercover operations were undertaken that led to the arrest and conviction of many wildlife criminals.

The 2000 Clark R. Bavin Wildlife Law Enforcement Award.

Artist John Perry created and donated these magnificent painterly sculptures that honor significant individual wildlife law enforcement efforts across the globe.
Dr. Patricia Gray, Artistic Director of National Musical Arts, led the 14-year-long planning of the program, which took place February 19-21, 2000. It began with a public symposium at The National Zoo, which filled the Whittell Auditorium, followed by a second symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), and then a concert at The National Academy of Sciences. The final event was a workshop for all the presenters and education experts in the fields of science and music for the purpose of developing education materials, specifically a CD-ROM and an interactive website, aimed initially at middle-school children.

National Musical Arts (NMA), the resident ensemble of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), created The BioMusic Program which was spawned from NMA’s involvement in a biodiversity conference co-hosted by The National Academy of Sciences and The Smithsonian Institution in 1986. From that momentous inception, The BioMusic Program grew to become a unique conduit between the sciences and arts, as it seeks to examine music in all species—human and non-human—and to explore and understand its powerful role in all living things. The BioMusic Symposium presented included: Dr. Roger Payne, President, Ocean Alliance and member of AWI’s Scientific Committee; Dr. Bernhard Kranz, Wild Sanctuary, Lebanon, Illinois; Dr. Robert Loftin, School of Veterinary Medicine, Harvard Medical School; and Dr. Jelle Atema, Director, Boston University - Marine Biology Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA; Dr. Luis Alberga, Chair and Curator, Department of Ornithology and Mammalogy, California Academy of Sciences; and Dr. Carol Krumhansl, Professor of Psychology, Cornell University.

Dr. Roger Payne’s presentation was titled “Whale Songs and Musicality,” and stated in part that “The composing of music is a communal bond and a defining element for whales. Each season, the Humpback whales’ songs are structured in phrases of balanced lengths which are presented in a specific order, are memorized by all of the group in the area, repeated exactly by all, and are retained after six months of the beginning point for the new season’s compositions.”

Bernard Kranz, an award winning musician, has lived an adventurist life traveling throughout remote regions of the world to record specific sound environments. Using small and simple audio technology, he theorized that regions of the world are uniquely “tuned” by the musical sounds of its inhabitants and are readily identified by these musical sounds. He has named this phenomenon a “Biophony,” a word created from “symphony” and “biology.”

The concert performed by the National Musical Arts (NMA) at The National Academy of Sciences featured works based on The BioMusic Symposium presentations. NMA performed Mozart’s “Musical Joke” because recent research by Dr. Luis Alberga and Dr. Meredith West (Indiana University) and presented at the AAAS symposium demonstrated that Mozart’s musical relationship with his pet parrot was so powerful that this famous chamber music work was actually composed as a requiem to the bird and features exact musical quotations from the pet parrot. George Crumb’s “Vox Balaenae” for electrified flute, electrified cello, and electrified piano concluded the concert. Crumb was so moved after hearing the recording, “The Songs of the Humpback Whale,” that he worked with Roger Payne to create this chamber music classic. Recorded by hydrophones in the ocean depths, this recording captures the whales’ own vocalizations and songs and became a best seller for months. This recording was also distributed by the National Geographic to all subscribers.

Music of the Birds
A book published a few months before the Symposium, Music of the Birds: A Celebration of Bird Song by Lang Elliott, includes a compact disk giving clear interpretations of each of the singers’ voices as well as color photographs of each of the bird species captured with open beaks, pouring forth their individual songs. Elliott knows the characteristics of a vast number of bird songs and approaches secretively to portray each bird as he sings. Together with the beautiful color photographs, Elliott quotes poets who have written about dozens of North American woods and fields. Beside a photograph of a Yellow Warbler (photo page 3), William Wordsworth is quoted:

The birds pour forth their souls in notes Of rapture from a thousand throats.

A photograph of a Scarlet Tanager (photo left) is accompanied by Geoff Craven’s Chaucerian:

Hard is the hert that loveth nought.

In May, when all this mirth is worn, When he may on these brachures hange Her belue stedef songe al aye.

The Rhetorical Perspective for all of the BioMusic events addresses “What is music?” How are musical sounds used to communicate within and between species? Is music-making a biological function? Do musical sounds within the natural world reveal a profound bond between all living things? It is these and related interfaces between art and science, humans and other species that The BioMusic Program cultivates.

The interest in the symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science was overwhelming as demonstrated by the standing room only crowds which spilled into the adjoining halls.

The media’s response was equally enthusiastic and wide ranging. Television and radio coverage included the CBC, Dutch Public Television, Dutch National Radio and Television, NPR, and the BBC. Internet coverage included, among many others, ABCOnline, Discovery Channel com, and EarthStar.org. Feature articles appeared in newspapers in Russia, Germany, and Poland. Science News made BioMusic its cover story for its April 16th edition and two “Perspective” articles will appear soon in Science Magazine.

On May 6th, The New York Times published a most interesting follow-up interview titled “Conversation with Luis F. Baptista” by Claudia Dreifus. Baptista, one of the world’s leading experts on bird song, dialect, and language, was asked “What are the parallels between human and bird music?” Baptista replied: “I know of birds who have voices that can be heard for a mile. But we can’t even identify birds in the same way real instruments. The strawberry finch has beautiful single notes that come down the scale and sound just like a flute. There is another songbird, the diamond firetail from Australia, whose voice sounds like some kind of woodwind, an oboe perhaps. Then, in Costa Rica, I’ve encountered a wonderful night bird, and it sings four notes coming down the scale, and the quality of its voice is just like bassoon.”

“Then, if you look at pitch, scholars have found that certain birds use the same musical scales as human cultures. One scholar has found that the hermit thrush actually sings in the pentatonic scale used in Far Eastern music. One of the most incredible cases is the canyon wren, who sings in the chromatic scale, and his song reminds me of the introduction and finale of Chopin’s Revolutionary Etude.”

Dr. Russell Lowell is quoted:

As a twig trembles, which a bird
Lights on to sang, then leaves unbent;
So is my memory thrilled and stirred—
I only know she came and went.

Robert Louis Stevenson was chosen to comment on photographs of Whales and a Carolina Chickadee:

My bedroom, when this awaking mood, fall by all birds,

Music of the Birds
A Celebration of Bird Song


Elliott writes: “Bird song preceded human music. Considered from a scientific perspective, it evolved with the appearance of songbirds during the Pliocene and Pleistocene periods—several million years ago.” His words are illustrated by a photograph of a Wood Thrush.

Elliott chooses Ralph Waldo Emerson’s words to illustrate his picture of a Black-capped Chickadee: “No sorrow in thy song, no winter in thy heart.”

The Skylark of Europe inspired Shelley’s famous poem, “To a Skylark.”

Higher still and higher
From the earth thou springest,
Like a cloud of fire;
The blue deep thou singest.
And singing still doth soar, and soaring ever singest.

Opposite the photograph of another sweet singer, the Gray Catbird (photo right), James Russell Lowell is quoted:

As a twig trembles, which a bird
Lights on to sing, then leaves unbent;
So is my memory thrilled and stirred—
I only know she came and went.

Robert Louis Stevenson was chosen to comment on photographs of Whales and a Carolina Chickadee:

My bedroom, when this awaking mood, fall by all birds,

Robert Louis Stevenson was chosen to comment on photographs of Whales and a Carolina Chickadee:

My bedroom, when this awaking mood, fall by all birds, which is the greatest pleasure in life.
**rBGH Reconsidered**

By Chris Bedford

**Recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH) was the first genetically engineered food product to be sold in the United States.** Approved for use by the Food and Drug Administration on November 5, 1994, rBGH has played a significant role in the industrialization of dairy production. Human tests have shown that rBGH is safe for human consumption, but there are concerns about its effects on animal welfare and poses a health risk to consumers. The use of rBGH has been controversial, and various studies have been conducted to examine its effects on animal health, welfare, and public health. The European Union has banned the use of rBGH in milk production.

**What it does**

The use of rBGH, also known as BST (for Bovine Somatotropin) and Posilac (Monsanto’s product name), is injected by needle into cows every two weeks to increase individual animal milk production (by weight) from 10 to 15 percent. rBGH can extend lactation periods for up to three times their normal length. The current rBGH record is 1,374 days of milk production during a single lactation.

Bovine growth hormone (BGH) is a normal product of the pituitary gland of cows. rBGH, a synthetic version of BGH, is produced by snipping a piece of cow DNA that carries the code for rBGH and inserting it into the DNA of e-coli bacteria. This unnatural extension of lactation produced by rBGH severely affects the cow by doubling the metabolic stress from the onset of lactation, thus reducing needed nutrients, particularly calcium. Use of rBGH also stimulates production of another bovine hormone, Insulin Growth Factor-I (IGF-1) by up to 80%. In turn, IGF-1 is secreted into the milk in increased levels. The increased stress is related to the production of IGF-1, which increases the frequency of clinical mastitis, a very painful condition of the cow’s udder. The warning label on Monsanto’s Posilac® explicitly states, “Cows injected with Posilac are at increased risk for clinical mastitis.” Increased incidences of mastitis, in turn, necessitate increased use of antibiotics which can pass through to the milk. Currently, about 82% of commercially produced antibiotics are tested for on a regular basis. A Wall Street Journal investigation found 20% of milk tested had illegal antibiotics present.

Small family dairy farmers, animal welfare activists, environmentalists, consumers and others have focused on this improper approval process in an effort to have Posilac withdrawn from the market.

**rBGH in the European Union**

In November, 1999, the European Commission adopted a measure that would permanently ban the use of rBGH in Europe. This action, announced by Commissioner David Byrne before a European Parliament hearing on November 24, 1999, represents the final act of a six-year struggle over rBGH use. On December 20, 1994, the European Commission prohibited the marketing and use of rBGH, also in the European Union until December 31, 1999. The prohibition was enacted to give two EC scientific advisory bodies time to study the impact of rBGH use on animal welfare and public health. One of those committees, the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare, examined the effects of rBGH use on (1) the incidence of mastitis and other disorders in dairy cattle and (2) overall effects of rBGH on animal production.

On March 10, 1999, the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare issued a 90-page report that concluded, “rBGH (rBST) use causes a substantial increase in levels of foot problems and mastitis and leads to injection site reactions in dairy cows. These conditions, especially the first two, are painful and debilitating, leading to significantly poorer welfare in the treated animals. Therefore from the point of view of animal welfare, including health, the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare is of the opinion that BST should not be used in dairy production.”

Monsanto, with support from the U.S. government, sought to counter these European actions by having the rBGH ban declared an illegal restraint of trade under GATT. But before such a charge could be pursued, a series of international standards for the rBGH use had to be established. On June 30, 1999, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, meeting in Rome, Italy failed to agree on an international standard for the Maximum Residue Level (MRL) for rBGH in milk. This ruling effectively stopped the GATT complaint by the United States and gave a green light to rBGH by individual countries and the European Union.

Right now, rBGH is licensed for use only in Mexico, the United States and South Africa. **Two AWI Missions to Central Europe**

By Tom Garrett

On March 10, Agnes Van Volkenburgh and I traveled to the ancient Czech city of Prague with Samoobrona Chairman Andrej Tanski to meet a farm union and environmental protection, animal welfare and public health. One of those committees, the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare, examined the effects of rBGH use on (1) the incidence of mastitis and other disorders in dairy cattle and (2) overall effects of rBGH on animal production.

On March 10, 1999, the Scientific Committee on Animal

Health and Animal Welfare issued a 90-page report that concluded, “rBGH (rBST) use causes a substantial increase in levels of foot problems and mastitis and leads to injection site reactions in dairy cows. These conditions, especially the first two, are painful and debilitating, leading to significantly poorer welfare in the treated animals. Therefore from the point of view of animal welfare, including health, the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare is of the opinion that BST should not be used in dairy production.”

Monsanto, with support from the U.S. government, sought to counter these European actions by having the rBGH ban declared an illegal restraint of trade under GATT. But before such a charge could be pursued, a series of international standards for the rBGH use had to be established. On June 30, 1999, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, meeting in Rome, Italy failed to agree on an international standard for the Maximum Residue Level (MRL) for rBGH in milk. This ruling effectively stopped the GATT complaint by the United States and gave a green light to rBGH by individual countries and the European Union.

Right now, rBGH is licensed for use only in Mexico, the United States and South Africa. **Two AWI Missions to Central Europe**

By Tom Garrett

On March 10, Agnes Van Volkenburgh and I traveled to the ancient Czech city of Prague with Samoobrona Chairman Andrej Tanski for a meeting of farm unions and agrarian parties from the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and Slovenia. The meeting was convened to draft the guiding principles and ethical platform.

On the following morning, a committee convened to draft the guiding principles of the proposed alliance. Tanski, presiding over the group, told us, “If we want to change something in this country, we need to be together, to be united. We need something to manage. We need a technical expertise we need to convert our system, and help us to establish markets, we can supply the land, the buildings and the people. We have 40,000 unemployed farmers. We need something to do.” We assured Tanski that we would bring a team of experts to Poland as soon as possible.

On May 8, 2000, we flew to Warsaw to complete arrangements for a small AWI sponsored-pesant-ecologist conference. She was joined on the flight by AWI’s Farm Animal Advisor Diane Hal-
Join the Fight to End Abuse of Laying Hens

Millions of laying hens are subjected to three shameful cruelties: forced molting, debeaking and battery cages. At last, the industry is listening to the sharp criticism of its routine practices. Now is the time to write to the head of the United Egg Producers with a strong protest against this unnecessary pain and suffering inflicted on the innocent and helpless birds.

1.) Forced molting is induced by denying all food and in some cases water, to the caged hens. For 5-14 days all sustenance is withheld. The industry does this to induce a molt. The hen loses her feathers, and when finally given food and water again, the survivors lay bigger eggs.

2.) Debeaking requires the hen’s beak to be cut through so she can’t peck the other hens jammed into a cramped battery cage in which four or five hens are forced to exist. Scientific studies have shown that the cut beak causes permanent pain to the hens.

3.) Battery cages are so small that none of the victimized hens can even spread their wings. Their claws sometimes grow around the wires of the cage floor, causing more pain and distress. Hens have a strong urge to dust bath, to run about and eat natural foods, and to build and lay their eggs in a nest where the chicks can hatch—but every pleasure is denied them, all for the sake of commercial gain.

The United Egg Producers (UEP) is at last realizing that it is being seriously criticized. United Poultry Concerns’ Karen Davis and Veterinarians for Animal Rights’ Ned Buyukmihci and Teri Barnato have led the fight. Both Karen and Ned have doctorate degrees, and their words carry weight with publications as diverse as The Washington Post and Feedstuffs, the big agribusiness trade journal. On May 1st, Feedstuffs told its readers that UEP “recently named an advisory committee to reconsider the guidelines in view of new scientific and social trends.”

On April 30th, Marc Kaufman’s article “Cracks in the Egg Industry” appeared on the front page of The Washington Post. He quoted the author of a bill in the California Assembly to outlaw forced molting, Ted Lempert, who said, “I was first shocked by the practice because of the horrible cruelty, but the health issues really demand attention.” Kaufman’s article states, “Federal statistics show salmonella in eggs was associated with 28,644 illnesses and 79 deaths from 1985 to 1998. Several studies concluded that there was also a link between the stress of forced molting of hens and salmonella in them and their eggs.”

UEP has decided, after receiving thousands of critical letters, that it needed to appoint an animal welfare advisory committee to revise UEP’s current guidelines.

ACTION Please write to the president of the United Egg Producers and tell him you don’t want to eat eggs that come from hens who have been debeaked and are in cramped battery cages. Tell him you are appalled that hens are starved for 5 to 14 days in an effort to increase their production. You might mention that you are shocked to learn that hens are starved and deprived of water to save a mere 4 cents on a dozen eggs. Please tell him that you will never eat eggs again unless they come from happy hens on humanely operated farms.

He may be addressed:
Mr. Albert E. Pope, President, UEP
1303 Hightower Trail, #200
Atlanta, Georgia 30350
telephone: (770) 587-3871, fax: (770) 587-0041
email: alpope@mindspring.com
website: www.unitedegg.org

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE
P.O. Box 3650, Washington, D.C. 20007
Address Correction Requested
ABOUT THE COVER

Honey is a Guernsey who came to the Humane Farming Association several years ago from a sanctuary that closed. Honey lives at the nation’s largest, 5,000 acre Farm Animal Refuge, Swuanna Ranch, in Glenn County, California. She and the other cows, mostly Holsteins, usually stay in the second valley where she was photographed.

The fate of most cows has become worse than at any other time in the history of the United States. The big industrial dairies, where cows are treated like cogs in a machine, are buying up cows as fast as they can and subjecting them to repeated painful injections of recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH), or as the manufacturer, Monsanto, calls this substance, Posilac, to make them produce so much milk that they soon sicken and die or are sold to a slaughterhouse (see story below). The meat packers have trampled on the US Humane Slaughter Act which Congress passed more than forty years ago to protect cattle, swine, sheep, goats and horses from the overriding greed of the enormous slaughter corporations (see pages 10-13).

“A Winnable Fight…”

The first conference on the dangerous artificial hormone rBGH was held June 17th in Washington, DC. Corporate giant, Monsanto, rBGH’s manufacturer and promoter, hates to admit that rBGH is a hormone so it has given it the bland name, “Posilac,” and has sold more and more of the big industrial dairies on injecting it. Chris Bedford of the Maryland Sierra Club organized the meeting, bringing together highly qualified scientists, family dairy farmers, environmental and humane workers.

Starting with an overview of milk production industrialization, dairy farmers graphically described the effects of repeated rBGH injections on their cows: severe mastitis requiring treatment with antibiotics, traces of which remain in the milk, huge swellings in feet, legs, and udders, plus chronic lameness. All the farmers present had tried and rejected rBGH injections of their cows. Delegates from the Community Association for the Restoration of the Environment described community destruction caused by industrial dairy operations. Michael Hansen, a Consumers Union scientist, discussed the link between human cancer and Insulin-like Growth Factor-1, a secondary hormone produced in cows injected with rBGH. He reviewed FDA’s and the National Institutes of Health’s approval of rBGH, concluding that it was approved despite the fact that mandatory long-term toxicity tests were not conducted. Author Robert Cohen drew attention to the number of ex-Monsanto employees who went to work for FDA before rBGH was approved.

Presidential candidate Ralph Nader emphasized the effectiveness of grassroots efforts; he suggested a good demonstration in front of FDA and letters to Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services, to whom FDA reports. For as distinguished scientist and long-time watchdog, Sidney Wolfe said, “FDA has never been worse.”

Ask for the manager of your local supermarket, Nader urged the Conferrees, and say that you want milk products only from cows not injected with rBGH, and you want them labeled so you’ll know the difference. For your business, they’ll accede to your reasonable request. “This is a winnable fight,” he told the Conference.

The day concluded with a well-documented summary of how Canada outlawed rBGH despite Monsanto’s attempts to conceal its health threats. In the US we must make much more vigorous efforts to fight rBGH—it must be banned in the US as it has been in other countries. This is a winnable fight indeed!
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AWI has a new website location and email address. Please visit http://www.awionline.org and send emails to awi@awionline.org

Contact AWI at: P.O. Box 3650, Washington, D.C. 20007
phone: (202) 337-2332, facsimile: (202) 338-9478
Despite overwhelming evidence that the world’s whales are struggling against a huge array of new threats, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) voted in Adelaide, Australia, July 3-6, to fast track a scheme designed to legitimize commercial whaling. Inexplicably, many formerly pro-whale groups and nations (including the US) assisted this process, offering ways to strengthen the “Revised Management Scheme” (RMS) even though its adoption will lead directly to the abandonment of the fourteen-year-old moratorium on commercial whaling. The resolution, introduced by Sweden and nine other countries, set a timetable for completing the RMS and voting on its structure at next year’s full IWC meeting in London. It was passed by consensus.

The push to hasten the renewal of commercial whaling couldn’t have come at a worse time. Papers presented at the IWC conference show that whales are threatened by toxic pollution, global warming, the collapse of food sources and the bombardment by intense man-made sounds as never before. Just a sampling of these papers revealed that:

- Emaciated gray whales are washing up along the Pacific Coast of North America by the hundreds (278 in 1999, over 300 so far in 2000). The number of new calves added to the population has shrunk from a high of 1520 in 1997 to 282 last year. Scientists are mystified as to the cause of either event.
- Orca families living off the San Juan Islands of Washington State are dying off. Biopsy assays show some of the highest levels of PCBs ever found in any wildlife.
- Dolphin meat labeled and sold as whale meat in Tokyo has levels of mercury and other heavy metals in concentrations hundreds of times higher than the maximum safe levels for human consumption.
- Sea otter populations in some parts of the Bering Sea are collapsing under pressure from predation from orca whales. This has never been seen before and it is thought to reflect a dramatic shift in food regimes in the North Pacific.
- The US Navy, in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, is studying the rare mass stranding of four species of whales and dolphins which occurred in the Bahamas immediately after a series of military exercises in March. The studies are concentrating on the effect of sonar on beaked whales. These extremely deep diving whales died not only after the Bahamas exercises but following tests of Low Frequency Active Sonar by NATO forces in Greece in 1996.

The seeds of many of these threats were planted long ago. The chemicals developed during and soon after World War II are just now finding their way into the tissues of marine mammals. Heavy metals and organochlorines bio-accumulate with each step up the food chain. After decades of being eaten by small creatures, then in turn by fish of increasing size, these toxic time bombs are beginning to reach lethal levels of concentration in whales and dolphins.

Given these concerns, the idea of accepting the intentional slaughter of whales is outrageous, but the concept is gaining momentum. The premise behind this scheme is the fantasy that we can take everything we know about whales: abundance, recruitment rate (number of babies added each year), mortality rate, environmental threats, number of whales being accidentally or deliberately killed; feed all of these numbers into an algorithm, and out will pop a number of whales that can be “harvested” each year without collapsing the populations.

The problems of this approach are myriad. First is the difficulty of counting whales. Whale populations are estimated from ships that cruise on a certain pattern, count all of the whales seen, and extrapolate based on a formula which guesses how many whales are unseen. Primarily, because of the difficulty in seeing and correctly identifying species of these usually hidden ocean creatures, this method has always failed. Highlighting this inherent uncertainty, the Scientific Committee at this year’s IWC meeting found that the long-held number of minke whales in the Southern Oceans is far less than the 760,000 estimated by the Japanese. Even though this number has been used for years to justify the Japanese killing of over four hundred of these whales a year, the Committee found that the actual number may be as low as a third of that estimate.

The second most obvious problem is the fact that whales have historically lied about the numbers and species of whales they kill. And not just a little. During the sixties and seventies, the Japanese, working with the Russian whalers, under-reported their catch of sperm and blue whales by tens of thousands. The presence of observers, highly dependent on the goodwill of the ship’s crew and captain, has never been a barrier to cheating.

Besides the slide back into allowing commercial whaling, the pivotal issue at this year’s meeting, was the proposal by Australia, New Zealand and other Pacific nations to establish a South Pacific Ocean Sanctuary that would ban any killing of whales in a wide area, forever. Major initiatives within the IWC require a 3/4 majority of the 35 member countries. Supposedly, each country has one vote. But the defeat of this popular pro-
posal (with fourteen votes for, eleven against and four abstaining) demonstrated that Japan has finally bought off enough countries to stymie pro-whale initiatives in the IWC. Those voting against the sanctuary included Antigua/Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent/Grenadines, and a new Japanese recruit—Guinea. This makes seven poor and small countries that vote with Japan in trade for economic assistance (see article at right).

One surprise at this meeting was the willingness of some powerful organizations to push for the adoption of the RMS and the subsequent return to commercial whaling. World Wildlife Fund was one of the groups working behind the scenes to legitimize the outlaws and bring whaling “under control.” The damage wrought by splitting the pro-whale camp can be seen in this quote from the July 5 Christian Science Monitor:

“Even some environmental groups have begun quietly saying that they would accept a resumption of commercial whaling under strict conditions. “We’re never going to be promoting it,” says Cassandra Phillips, a whale expert with the British-based World Wildlife Fund, “but we can see a situation where it might be allowable.”

To counter this conciliation by some organizations, and to breathe life back into

Continued on following page
steadfast opposition to the expansion of whaling, AWI drafted an opening statement that doubled as a sign-on letter. Over two dozen major international organizations endorsed the following text:

Recognizing the massive global support for the complete protection of the world’s whales, the undersigned groups attending the 52nd meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) wish to reaffirm our total opposition to the resumption of commercial whaling.

We therefore support:
- The adoption of the Global Whale Sanctuary as proposed by Australia in 1998, permanently banning all directed takes of whales up to the high-water mark of all seas, with the exception of truly subsistence aboriginal whaling necessary for human survival.
- The urgent international protection of small cetaceans.
- The recognition of whale watching, non-invasive research and educational programs as the optimum utilization of whales.
- The evolution of the IWC into a conservation body that undertakes an audit of all environmental and anthropogenic threats to cetaceans, including: the status of habitat and food sources, a detailed monitoring of the effects of global warming, ozone depletion, and toxic contamination, and a review of the effects of sound pollution in the seas.

We oppose:
- The development or adoption of any regime that lifts the current moratorium on commercial whaling. We specifically reject the concept that it is possible to conservatively and reliably count wild species of whales accurately enough to allow a directed take. Any regime based on such a method is fatally flawed.

A plan allowing the intentional killing of whales assumes a certainty as to how many whales there are, the nature and severity of all threats facing whales, and honesty on the part of the whalers reporting their kills. None of these elements exists. All that is really certain is that the threats are greater than ever before and increasing; and the countries pushing for an acceptance of commercial whaling are the same ones with a long history of falsifying catch records. The greed and managerial incompetence that pushed the great whales to near extinction are still alive and well within the IWC.

The moment cries out for taking stock of the damage we are doing to wild species of whales through toxics, dramatic climate and food regime changes, and the proliferation of loud sounds in the oceans. This is not the time to unleash the harpoons.

—Ben White

Brazen Japan Plans Further Whale Slaughter

Japan has ignited a firestorm of criticism by launching a new round of “scientific” whaling, this time targeting ten endangered sperm and fifty Bryde’s (pronounced “Brutus”) whales in the North Pacific. Japan has ignored the International Whaling Commission’s condemnation of any expansion of its “research” whaling that now kills over 400 minke whales yearly in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary; on July 29, four whaling ships embarked on a deadly mission and have already killed Brydes, sperm and minke whales, working towards their gruesome goal of 160 dead whales this year. Taking advantage of a loophole in the IWC, Japan need only call its whaling “scientific” to be legal technically, even though the whale meat is sold for food. But the ruse fools few. Sanee Shida, a Greenpeace spokeswoman in Tokyo, said, “If you need to research African elephants, that doesn’t mean you kill and eat them.”

Protests have been lodged at the highest levels of government by Britain, the United States and New Zealand. US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright met with Japanese Foreign Minister Yohei Kono and asked him to either call back the ships or face economic sanctions. Japan responded belligerently, saying it has a right to kill the whales and that any sanctions would be in violation of the World Trade Organization (WTO).
AWI Joins Federal Lawsuits to Protect Manatees
Deaths Set Record Pace in 2000

In January of this year, AWI joined a coalition of 18 environmental and animal welfare groups led by Save the Manatee Club (SMC), in filing two federal lawsuits, one against the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the other against the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), both aimed at protecting the endangered Florida manatee and its shrinking habitat.

The deaths of Florida's West Indian manatees, whose closest relative is the elephant, have continued to increase despite being listed for federal protection under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and state protection under the Florida Manatee Sanctuary Act of 1978.

The lawsuits are a result of USFWS's and FWC's continued unwillingness to protect the manatee, a species that was on the original Endangered Species list in 1966. Both lawsuits ask that state and federal agencies implement and enforce existing environmental laws to stop manatee deaths and bring them back to healthy population levels. Key to the suit against the Corps is its repeated issuance of permits for development in manatee habitat without analyzing the cumulative effects of the permits on the species or its habitat.

With ever-increasing human encroachment into its fragile habitat, the manatee's mortality rates are increasing at an alarming rate. As of July 24, 2000, FWC's Florida Marine Research Institute listed preliminary year 2000 numbers as high as 189. Official numbers from the FWC show a mortality rate of 100 during the first quarter of 2000, well ahead of the 80 during the same period in 1999. So far this year the FWC has been able to determine that 61 manatee deaths have been caused by watercraft. This number is only six short of a record setting number in 1999 with 5 months left in 2000. Only an estimated 2,400 of these gentle, slow moving herbivores exist today and at these death rates, the Florida manatee cannot survive.

Simple steps such as speed limit enforcement and boat propeller guards would not only help reduce manatee deaths and injuries, but such efforts would also reduce human injuries. In the past, the Florida state legislature has attempted to pass legislation requiring propeller guards on new boats. Unless federal and state agencies act now, the dramatic boating population explosion in Florida will destroy the manatee whose fossil record in Florida dates back to at least 45 million years ago.

AWI's companion organization, the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, has been working with the coalition's legislative team to secure an additional $500,000 from the US Congress for manatee protection. These additional funds, which have been approved by the House of Representatives, would double the USFWS budget to deploy more on-water law enforcement officers.

Drop Caviar from the Menu

Fish and Wildlife Service officers at Baltimore-Washington International Airport in Maryland became suspicious when they saw labels on tins of Russian caviar begin to peel off. That suspicion led to the largest criminal penalty for wildlife smuggling for one of America's biggest caviar importers—US Caviar and Caviar Ltd. The company has agreed to a plea bargain in which it will pay a remarkable $10.4 million fine. The company's president, secretary, and main trading partner will also do a combined 77 months in prison according to Baltimore's newspaper, The Sun.

The company participated in an elaborate scheme involving the fraudulent labeling of thousands of pounds of caviar from the Caspian Sea. The caviar was imported into the United States via the United Arab Emirates, complete with fake Russian health certificates and false invoices. An account in The New York Times notes that "In 1998 alone, the operation funneled more than 18 tons of sturgeon caviar from the Caspian."

Caviar is the eggs of fish species known as sturgeon. The Fish and Wildlife Service notes that sturgeons of the Caspian Sea are thought to yield "the highest quality caviar" and comprise "more than 90% of the world caviar trade." All sturgeon species are listed under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Therefore, all caviar imports into the United States requires valid export permits from the country of origin.
Gunsmoke

France has found itself under the gun (if you’ll pardon the expression) to bring its hunting laws in line with the Directives of the European Union. The Directives’ primary concern is the protection of European fauna. The initial EU laws were passed in 1975, and the 1.6 million strong hunting lobby in France has been violently protesting and stalling ever since. Only the threat of possible EU fines has coerced the Jospin government to move. In France, a compromise bill curtailing open seasons passed by a vote of 275 to 252 with 36 abstentions. There is serious doubt that it will satisfy the EU. Dominique Voynet, the French Environmental Minister and the nemesis of French hunters, has described it as “the nearest possible to an armistice.”

The CPNT (the nation’s hunting, fishing and shooting party) pledged to disrupt the voting with a demonstration involving 577 hounds. Only 20 hounds showed up. Apparently, the remainder of the packs were blocked in the legendary traffic of Paris. Zut Alors!

One of France’s greatest draftsmen and painters, Honoré Daumier, made a series of satirical sketches of both hunters and lawyers. Here, a jubilant huntsman, enthusiastically brandishing his gun, tells a local peasant: “What luck! I’ve killed a tree sparrow! I won’t go home empty handed!” His tiny victim, melodious song stifled, lies dead at the hunter’s dancing feet. The French hunting lobby’s response to the European Union’s Directive to curb hunting of migratory birds like this songster illustrates the same irrational mindset.

A Family Affair

Bird Smugglers Busted and Sentenced

Father Mike, mother Johanne, and son Harold: the Flikkema family of Flikkema Aviaries in Ontario, Canada have all been investigated, arrested, and now sentenced, for their collective roles in an international wild bird smuggling scheme. In July 2000, the father-son duo was fined $75,000 by the Ontario Court of Justice and Mike Flikkema was also sentenced to three months in jail.

Flikkema Aviaries was previously fined $8,500 a year ago for four charges related to worldwide illegal bird trafficking. Included in this illegal activity was the importation into Canada of two highly endangered Illiger Macaws. Michael Flikkema has reportedly been fined as far back as 1982 for offenses related to bird smuggling.

The current charges resulted from a 17-month collaborative investigation between Environment Canada and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, during which the Flikkemas illegally imported and exported thousands of threatened and endangered birds such as tropical finches, parakeets, and mynas. According to Environment Canada, they faced a total of 483 charges under Canada’s Wild Animal and Plant Protection and Regulation of International and Interprovincial Trade Act.

Gary Colgan, Chief of Wildlife Enforcement for the Canadian Wildlife Service, said, “Smuggling wild birds is a highly profitable, criminal enterprise that jeopardizes the world’s most vulnerable animals... A high percentage of these birds die when captured from the wild, making the situation even more tragic.”

Matriarch Johanne Flikkema faces charges similar to her husband and son in Canada, but first must serve out a six-month sentence handed down in Buffalo, New York on June 1, 2000 for illegally importing over 200 African finches into the US through Canada. She was also fined $7,500. Mrs. Flikkema’s imprisonment is the first under the federal Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992. The Society for Animal Protective Legislation, AWI’s companion organization, played a leading role in this important law’s enactment.

Green singing finch, one of the species of birds smuggled by Flikkema Aviaries.

One of France’s greatest draftsmen and painters, Honoré Daumier, made a series of satirical sketches of both hunters and lawyers. Here, a jubilant huntsman, enthusiastically brandishing his gun, tells a local peasant: “What luck! I’ve killed a tree sparrow! I won’t go home empty handed!” His tiny victim, melodious song stifled, lies dead at the hunter’s dancing feet. The French hunting lobby’s response to the European Union’s Directive to curb hunting of migratory birds like this songster illustrates the same irrational mindset.
Congressional Action on Animal Legislation

Before our federal legislators escaped from Washington for their August recess, significant action was taken on three animal protection bills: the Great Ape Conservation Act, the Bear Protection Act, and the Shark Finning Prohibition Act.

On July 25th, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pass the Great Ape Conservation Act (H.R. 4320). The bill, introduced by Congressman George Miller (D, CA), establishes a Great Ape Conservation Fund of five million dollars to support conservation programs for gorillas, orangutans, bonobos, chimpanzees, and gibbons. Habitat destruction by unscrupulous logging company profit-seekers and the trade in bushmeat increasingly threaten endangered species.

Congressman Miller called the depletion of great ape populations “an ecological and moral tragedy.” He said the bill “would be one significant step in the effort to avoid the permanent loss of great apes and the environment in which they live.” Senate action on the bill is expected in September.

The Senate has begun moving another vital bill, the Bear Protection Act (S.1109). Senator Mitch McConnell (R, KY) authored the legislation, which bans the import, export, and interstate commerce in bear viscera such as the gallbladder and bile. On July 26th, the bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and now awaits consideration by the full Senate.

The Chairman of the Committee, Bob Smith (R, NH), and twelve other Committee Members are cosponsors of the bill.

At the bill’s mark-up, Chairman Smith refuted arguments that the bill should be weakened to deal only with the import and export of bear parts, not interstate commerce. Smith said that any amendment to remove the domestic provision would “gut” the bill. He noted that hundreds of bears are poached for their gallbladders across America and that the current inconsistency in state laws facilitates laundering and illegal sale of bear parts.

The Bear Protection Act, which has a total of 67 Senate cosponsors—more than any other pending animal protection bill—now awaits a vote by the full Senate. A companion bill (H.R. 2166) introduced in the House of Representatives by John Porter (R, IL) languishes in three House Committees and has yet to see any positive movement.

Lastly, by an overwhelming vote of 390–1, the House of Representatives passed the Shark Finning Prohibition Act on June 6, 2000, a bill to prohibit the viciously inhumane practice of slicing off a shark’s fins while the conscious shark struggles in pain. The bill now awaits action in the Senate.

Helping lead the international campaign to ban this horrific practice, campaigner Susie Watts notes that when fishermen catch sharks while fishing for other bounty such as tuna or swordfish, “they keep the fins and throw away the rest of the body, reserving space in the hold for the more valuable fish.” Watts continues: “these sharks are frequently ‘finned’ while still alive and are then thrown back into the water to be eaten by other fish, starve, or bleed to death.”

The trade in shark fins exists primarily to supply the high Asian demand for expensive shark fin soups where a single bowl in Hong Kong or Taiwan could fetch US $100. The fins are ultimately processed and sold dried, frozen, or canned. According to the conservation organization WildAid, “Experts agree that an estimate of 100 million sharks and shark-like fish caught around the world annually is not unreasonable.”

Lacey Act Turns 100

The first American wildlife conservation law celebrates a century in force this year. The Lacey Act, authored by a Republican Congressman from Iowa named John Fletcher Lacey, prohibits the interstate and international trade in illegally taken wildlife.

In 1999 alone, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was involved in 1,476 Lacey Act cases. Some of these cases included illegal importation of reptile-skin boots, interstate trafficking of jaguar and ocelot mounts, and illegal hunting of deer, elk, and antelope.

According to the Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation, Lacey’s daughter “remembered her father as always having had a great love for the outdoors and that it pained him to see the increasing degree of wanton destruction of forests and wildlife in the late 1800s.” This year, the Iowa General Assembly passed a resolution honoring Lacey. It says in part: “no person better represents the model of a citizen conservationist than John Fletcher Lacey, and no act better represents the progress made in conservation of the environment in the last century than the Lacey Act.”

Sunken remains of a dismembered shark.
Cutting the Gordian Knot

A Simple Solution to the Slaughterhouse Disaster: The slaughter line must be slowed, 300 animals cannot be rendered unconscious in a single hour.

In 1905, publication of Upton Sinclair’s novel The Jungle describing the abominable state of American slaughterhouses set off a storm of public protest. Meat sales across the country dropped by one third and on July 30, 1906, Congress passed the Meat Inspection Act, mandating that any meat entering interstate commerce must be inspected and approved for purity by federal meat inspectors.

In 1958, another major reform, driven by a national campaign in which the Animal Welfare Institute was deeply involved, came to America’s slaughterhouses. This was the federal Humane Slaughter Act which requires that the animal be rendered “insensible to pain” by a “rapid and effective” means before being “shackled” to the conveyor chain, or “line,” upon which they are hung by a hind leg, where their throats are cut and where they are skinned and dismembered. Federal meat inspectors are empowered to enforce the Humane Slaughter Act by shutting down the line if animals are being killed “not in accordance” with the Act. Because shutting down the line for even a few minutes costs a packing house thousands of dollars in lost production, this is a potentially powerful enforcement tool.

The Humane Slaughter Act was enthusiastically supported by the unions because improperly stunned animals cause worker injuries. While the unions were strong, the Act appeared to work well. During the ’80s and ’90s, however, disquieting reports began seeping from behind the closed gates of America’s slaughterhouses. The publication of Gail Eisnitz’s blockbuster book Slaughterhouse in 1997 (AWI Quarterly, Vol. 46, No. 4), the product of years of painstaking and often dangerous investigation, revealed a situation on the killing floors far worse than any outsider could have imagined. For chapter after chapter, Eisnitz documents horrors almost beyond imagination, not in a few isolated cases, but from North Carolina to Washington State. The Humane Slaughter Act, she found, is entirely unenforced; most workmen—apparently even some inspectors—never heard of it. Living cattle, fully conscious and struggling, are shackled to the line to be skinned and dismembered. Live hogs are routinely dumped into scalding vats. “There’s no way these animals can bleed out in the time it takes to get up the ramp” workmen told Eisnitz. “By the time they hit the scalding tank they’re still conscious and squealing. Happens all the time.”

For those who must see to believe, a video of conscious cattle being skinned and dismembered alive at IBP’s (formally Iowa Beef Processors) huge Wallula, Washington slaughterhouse was shown recently on Seattle television (see Barbaric Butchery of Cows, page 13). Workers at the plant, who have defied one of America’s most sinister corporations to tell the truth about conditions under which they labor, have sworn in affidavits that up to 30% of the animals going up the line are still alive.

How has an industry gained such dominance that it can ignore not only the Humane Slaughter Act but a whole spectrum of laws designed to guarantee food safety, safeguard workers, protect the environment, prevent control and manipulation of markets and prevent illegal immigration? What can be done?

To answer the first question one must turn to the history of meat packing and the takeover of the industry during the ’70s and ’80s by the ruthless entrepreneurs who now control it. In a startlingly brief time these men broke the power of the unions, replaced a longstanding American-born workforce with legal and illegal immigrants, subjugated federal and state regulators and eliminated independent competitors to gain control of the market. How they did it—by “union busting,” in deals suffuse with the cloying redolence of corruption—has yet to be fully told.

But if the answer to the first question is complex and shrouded, the answer to the second is not complex at all. Although it required the elimination of active unions and the “neutralization” of government officials before it could be applied, the primary “reform” introduced to “increase efficiency” was brutally simple. This was to increase the speed of the line, or chain, upon which victims are hung and butchered, by 200 to 300 percent. It is from this single operational change that the disastrous situation in American slaughterhouses chiefly derives. Conscious animals are carried, struggling and vocalizing, down the line because those assigned to kill the victims do not have time to perform the task correctly. Those who dismember live animals do so because they will be fired if they do not. The appalling injury rate among slaughterhouse workers—characterized by Gail Eisnitz as “walking

"...there are accidents because the cows are still alive. At the back hoof, the cow was kicking and it cut off one worker’s three fingers. The cows are kicking and jumping and everything. And the company didn’t save the fingers, so the worker lost them...."

—excerpt from affidavit of slaughterhouse employee
wounded”—is equally a function of excessive line speeds. Struggling animals cause innumerable injuries. But even absent this, workers are driven to such dangerous haste that accidents are inevitable.

Additionally, line speeds have played a major role in the dramatic—by some estimates 500%—increase in food poisoning experienced since meat packing “reforms” began in 1970. It is physically impossible for a line inspector to properly inspect the current output of 100 cattle and from 600 to 1000 hogs each hour! As line speeds accelerated, inspections became more and more cursory. The situation was immeasurably worsened in 1998 when USDA’s Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), once again yielding to industry wishes, introduced a system it calls Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) that allows companies to devise their own methods of guaranteeing food safety. The practical effect of HACCP has been to remove inspectors from the line, thus eliminating any possibility that the Humane Slaughter Act might be enforced, and to replace systematic carcass inspection with “random spot checks” for bacteria. Fortunately the Court of Appeals ruled HACCP violates the plain language of the Meat Inspection Act which requires that federal inspectors must “carefully examine” each carcass before approving it* (see Court Says No to Self Regulation, page 12). But the decision does not alter the fact that it is not possible, given the ratio of carcasses to inspectors, to perform careful examinations.

The answer to the second question is therefore obvious. Atrocities against animals can be brought to an end, worker injuries reduced to a modest fraction of the present rate, and meat contamination substantially relieved by a simple corrective. That is to reduce line speeds in slaughterhouses to 1970 levels or around 40% of current velocities.

For those who say this is not “administratively feasible” or would require “excessive bureaucracy” there is, once more, a simple answer. It can hardly be beyond human ingenuity to devise tamperproof governors to fix the maximum velocity of the line and to prevent managers who believe that “minimally stunned” animals “bleed better” from reducing the lethality of stunning devices. At the same time, sealed video cameras should be installed to keep the killing floor under constant surveillance.

The economic effects of an enforced slowdown of line speeds would be little short of revolutionary. Dominant packers have used accelerated line speeds to help them to force smaller plants out of business and gain control of the market. A slowdown would reverse the process by compelling the industry to bring its large, unused capacity back on line.

Some idled plants, such as IBP’s huge Council Bluffs, Iowa slaughterhouse which was closed in 1998 (apparently to help create a processing bottleneck and depress the price of live hogs) belong to dominant packers. But there are hundreds of small plants, driven from business, that might still be restored. Once assured that a line speed reduction really would be enforced, investors would rush to bring idled plants back into production and break ground for new ones. The percentage of packing capacity controlled by the dominant packers would drop dramatically. Their ability to repress producer prices with “captive supply” and artificial bottlenecks would be lessened accordingly.

Vertical integration, which has very nearly destroyed independent hog farmers in the US, would be jolted hard by a slowdown in line speeds. It would take years and massive investment in processing facilities for companies such as Seaboard and Continental Grain to regain their “fully integrated” status. The allure of vertical integration might wind up considerably less appealing.

In the meantime, as small slaughterhouses come back on line across rural America, the free (cash) market would begin to re-establish itself. Small sale barns would re-open. Tens of thousands of family hog farmers who quit raising hogs because they lacked feasible markets, would gain the option of returning. Many doubtless would.

How about labor? Reduced line speeds would open up tens of thousands of new jobs. How do we answer industry’s assertion that unless INS waived all restrictions (an INS raid on the slaughterhouse in Gibbon, Nebraska exposed 68% of workers in that plant). We can only answer with the facts: The allure of vertical integration might wind up considerably less appealing.

Continued on following page

---

* The federal Centers for Disease Control currently estimate that food contamination causes 76 million illnesses, 325,000 hospitalizations and 5,000 deaths in the US each year. The earlier CDC estimate of deaths, which some authorities continue to use, was 9,000. Illnesses such as Crohn Disease, closely related to bovine paratuberculosis, and viral lymphoma which statistical studies link to hamburger consumption, are not considered.
Continued from previous page

the workers as “non-documentated Hispanics”) a slowdown would create an acute labor shortage?

In the US twenty-five years ago, (and until quite recently in Canada), slaughteringhouses were operated by well paid unionized workers who often spent their entire working lives in the same plant. They did not leave voluntarily. They were driven out and replaced by a shifting population of immigrants (average time on the job today is little more than a year) desperate enough to tolerate bad treatment and dangerous conditions for as little as a third the hourly wage paid under union contract. Reduction of line speeds would open the way to re-Americanizing the work force. Packers would be forced to compete for labor by offering higher wages and benefits. Less dangerous conditions would make the work less unattractive to non-immigrants. Small packers resuming business would seek out former employees still living in the community.

A slaughterhouse, under the best of conditions, is a grim and terrible place. That can never change. But slowing line speeds to 1970 levels would greatly reduce the atrocities now committed against helpless animals. It would avoid thousands of worker injuries every year. It would reduce public exposure to meat borne pathogens that are the chief cause of up to 9,000 food poisoning deaths in the US each year. A substantial percentage of these victims are young children. A forced line speed reduction would also do a great deal to open a closed, monstrously rigged system to the workings of the free market. And it would hasten the day when instead of using a captive workforce that can be exploited, bullied, maimed and discarded with complete impunity, packing companies will have to compete for US workers on the US labor market.

—Tom Garrett

Congressman Brown Spoke Out Against “Skyrocketing” Line Speeds

George Brown, the distinguished California Congressman who was elected for the first time in 1963, led the long fight for justice for animals. Brown, who died on July 15, 1999, was a particularly outspoken advocate for farm animals. In a 1998 letter to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Brown wrote that he was “deeply troubled” that the USDA was not properly enforcing the Humane Slaughter Act (HSA), resulting in “additional suffering to millions of farm animals who otherwise would have been assured more humane treatment.” Brown specifically referred to stimulated line speeds in the slaughterhouses: “With fewer slaughterhouses killing a growing number of animals, slaughter ‘line speeds’ have skyrocketed.” Brown continued: “Today, as workers struggle to kill as many as 1,100 animals per hour, or one animal every three seconds, they often find themselves resorting to unbelievable brutality to keep the production line running uninterrupted. Workers in these operations describe the common practice of pounding away at cows’ heads with ineffective stunning equipment; of ‘piping’ or beating disabled animals to death with lead pipes. They report the standard practice of ripping frozen animals from truck walls, after transport in winter months, leaving chunks of flesh behind; sawing off the legs of live cattle to extricate them when caught between planks on unloading docks. In short, slaughter workers admit to routinely strangling, beating, scalding, skinning, and dismembering fully conscious animals in violation of the HSA.”

Congressman Brown’s leadership for farm animals, laboratory animals, animals trapped for their fur, and animals killed painfully as predators will be sorely missed.
Barbaric Butchery of Cows

"I estimate that 30 percent of the cows are not properly knocked [stunned] and get to the first legger alive....To still be alive at the second legger the cows have gone alive from the knocker to the sticker to the belly ripper (he cuts the hide down the center of the cow's abdomen) to the tail ripper (he opens the [rectum]) to the first legger (he skins a back leg and then cuts off the foot) to the first butter (he skins from the breast to the belly and a little bit on the back) to the worker who cuts off both front feet. Those cows then go to a worker who sticks a hook into the joint where the first legger took off the foot and the cows are hung from the trolley hook. I can tell that these cows are alive because they're holding their heads up and a lot of times they make noise." This is an excerpt from the affidavit of a worker at the IBP, Inc. cattle slaughtering plant in Wallula, Washington.

Seventeen employees of the plant have provided affidavits to Gail Eisnitz of the Humane Farming Association (HFA), who recently completed an investigation of the slaughter facility. Her findings are appalling. Apparent violations of the law include torture of cows and failure to stun and kill them humanely, hazardous conditions for the workers, and contamination of the meat intended for human consumption. The Animal Welfare Institute joined HFA and a coalition of other animal protection, consumer and human rights organizations in petitioning the Attorney General of Washington State to initiate enforcement action against the slaughter facility.

In an ongoing effort to raise the profit margin, slaughter plants are increasing the "line speed" which is the rate animals are moved through the stunning, killing and dismembering process at slaughter facilities. The workers simply cannot keep up, and are unable to put the time and attention into ensuring the humane slaughter of livestock. Workers have described lines that move so fast that cows are being skinned alive, with their limbs flailing, their heads turning, and their eyes blinking. Workers' affidavits indicate the line speed at the IBP plant increased from 105 cows per hour in 1980 to a current total of more than 300 cows per hour! *

**Lamb on the Lam**

A runaway lamb, thought to have escaped from a slaughterhouse, recently achieved something many New Yorkers dream of but few accomplish—he moved fast on the FDR Drive on Manhattan's East Side during a busy time of the day. Two cops on routine patrol on Second Avenue at 120th Street, a very urban neighborhood, first spotted him heading downtown at a brisk trot. At 96th Street, he veered left and got on FDR Drive (we're talking about rush hour traffic here). Danger was somewhat averted when New York's finest halted traffic. As the lamb hopped the divider several times and continued towards Brooklyn, though obviously flagging, an unidentified civilian (one of several who tried to help) angled his car in the animal's path bringing the chase to a safe conclusion.

A very tired lamb, now named Franklin, is resting (and eating) at the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) Bergh Memorial Hospital. Soon a sanctuary will find a spot for him and the youngster—still an adolescent—can look forward to a comfortable life. Lots of cheers for the police, and warm-hearted civilians, but most of all for the plucky Franklin who won his freedom the hard way—in Manhattan traffic. ✈

**ACTION** Please contact the Governor of Washington, Gary Locke, to encourage that legal action be taken against IBP for its brutal slaughter practices. Letters should be sent to: Governor Gary Locke, Office of the Governor, PO Box 40002, Olympia, WA 98504-0002. His fax number is 360-753-4110, and email can be sent via his website at: http://www.governor.wa.gov/contact/govemail.htm

Franklin, the wayward lamb thought to have escaped from a slaughterhouse, calms down at ASPCA shelter after a wild chase in Manhattan. His run ended on the FDR Drive, when a driver cut him off at the pass, enabling an ASPCA agent to lasso him.
A Tribute to Ruth Harrison

When you think of Ruth Harrison, who died at age 79 on June 13 at her London home, your immediate thought would be of her long crusade against factory farming. But you could also think of Henry Salt, Mahatma Gandhi, George Bernard Shaw, Rachel Carson and Richard Ryder—movers and shakers, all.

Ruth Harrison was one of them and together they ushered in the modern era of animal protection—call it what you will: "welfare" or "rights" (Ruth preferred the former, even though she is thought of in the context of "rights").

She was catapulted into that league of reformers with her 1964 book, Animal Machines, a faultlessly documented and indignant assault on the excruciatingly intensive housing of veal calves, chickens and pigs. When she learned that no one else was speaking out against these atrocities, she dropped everything and began her book. She was following Rachel Carson’s path in writing Silent Spring because no one else wanted to expose pesticide dangers.

She visited these heart-breaking prisons, especially those of crated, infant, male dairy calves taken from their mothers soon after birth, tethered in small, dark stalls, not allowed to suckle anything, given little water, fed antibiotics and iron deficient artificial milk to fatten them and keep them anaemic so they could be killed at 12 weeks to fill the plates and satisfy the palates of customer-preferred, tender, white meat. She also described in detail the overcrowding of caged laying hens, broilers and pigs.

Ruth pointed to the economic forces behind it all. "Life in the factory farm," she wrote, "revolves entirely around profits, and animals are accessed purely for their ability to convert food into flesh or 'saleable products'." She also reported on the feeding of antibiotics, growth stimulants, hormones and tranquilizers with no regard to the consequences to the human consumer.

She sent her completed manuscript to Rachel Carson, whom she had never met, and asked her to write the foreword. So stunned by what she read, Rachel asked a mutual friend, Christine Stevens, "could it be true?" Christine replied, "Indeed, it is true" and encouraged her to write the foreword. In it, Rachel expressed hope that the book would "provoke feelings of dismay, revulsion and outrage" and called for a consumers’ revolt.

Carson’s endorsement, a good publisher, her husband’s graphic photos and serialization in a London newspaper helped to spread the word. The public reaction was so intense that the Ministry of Agriculture ordered an investigation chaired by Professor F.W.R. Brambell. The Brambell Report led to an Act of Parliament governing farm animal welfare. It wasn’t long before theveal crates were abolished and better conditions were provided for chickens and pigs.

Despite her modest manner, Ruth was a genuine "whistle blower." But she never dreamed that her "radical" efforts would be rewarded by inclusion in the 1986 Queen’s Order for the Protection of Animals Kept for Farming Purposes. (Ruth was inspired by Salt and Henry Thoreau in throwing off the British Rule of India. Gandhi entered Ruth’s life when her mother, Clare Winsten, painted his portrait.)

Her promising theatrical career met a roadblock when she received a leaflet on the plight of veal calves. Not only did that permanent detour lead to reforms in England, but in many other European countries. (Her book was published in seven countries and was the inspiration for the European Convention for the Protection of Animals Kept for Farming Purposes.)

Animal Machines also lit the fuse for greater animal advocacy when a group of British scholars in 1971 wrote Animals, Men and Morals: An Enquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-humans. Ruth’s essay opened the book which also included a chapter by Richard Ryder who coined the term “speciesism.”

Up until her death from cancer she was deeply involved in the development and acceptance of alternative methods of raising meat animals. Helping her in this were several animal behaviorists, as well as Diane Halverson, AWI Farm Animal Advisor and her sister Marlene of Northfield, Minnesota.

Her honors, numerous affiliations and many contributions to animal welfare—such as blowing the whistle on the cruel electrocution methods of euthanasia unknowingly used by a large shelter for dogs, which was quickly changed when it learned the electric current must pass through the brain—are too many to list but her never-ending dedication and focus on helping factory farm animals, hopefully will spur long overdue reforms in the US.


European Community's Efforts to Improve Animal Welfare

The European Community (EC) Proposal on Animal Welfare and Trade in Agriculture, submitted to the WTO Committee on Agriculture on June 28, 2000, states, "In Practice, our concerns with animal welfare are most acute in relation to highly-intensive and industrialized production methods for certain species, in particular poultry and pigs. This type of production is most often found in developed rather than developing and least developed countries. "...It is important to secure the right of those WTO members that apply high animal welfare standards to maintain them.

"...The EC’s work on animal welfare is continuing, and the EC reserves its right to make further submissions in the light of developments."
Rescue of Battery Hens in Tasmania

According to a release from the Australian Action Animal Rescue Team, a seven-member team broke into PURE FOODS, Tasmania's largest battery hen producer on July 8, 2000. The ammonia and noxious fumes overpowered the team when entering the buildings, causing burning eyes, sore throats and difficulty in breathing. The hens all had severely mutilated beaks, making it very difficult for them to eat.

Later that same day the rescuers approached a supposedly free-range egg-producing operation southwest of Hobart, owned by the same company. This operation had somehow gained approval by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). The rescue team and the media were refused permission to view the hens, who had been de-beaked by the same contractor. The hens themselves were confined to a big warehouse type shed with small popholes leading to a yard, which looked unused.

The intensive media attention revealing the horrible conditions in which these hens are kept put the authorities under pressure. A meeting of Government, industry and certain representatives of animal welfare groups was called, but no initiatives were added that would make any noticeable difference to the millions of hens that are enduring so much suffering in their tiny cages. Banning battery cages was not even considered. The executive director for the Australian Egg Industry Association, Hugh McMaster, and RSPCA President, Hugh Wirth, drew up a draft agreement on hen housing, proposing to phase out certain cages and increase the floor space of a standard cage by 20% at some future time. The plight of the laying hens continues unabated.

A Sport Most Foul

A trio of stories from The New York Times in June 2000 reveals that brutal brawls between fighting birds are alive and well in the United States—not only in rural America, but also in enclaves of inner cities. Busts in two New York City boroughs, Brooklyn and the Bronx, resulted in hundreds of charges against individuals who breed gamecocks to fight and those who witness the fights and wager on them.

In a dilapidated Bronx movie theater, 36 people were arrested and charged with “animal fighting,” a felony in New York. Another 154 were charged with a misdemeanor for watching the fights. By the time police rammed through the theater doors, sending gambling patrons scattering in all directions, including up to the theater roof, eight birds were already dead.

Days later, armed agents with the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals raided a Brooklyn pet store, charging its owners, Jermias Nieves and his son David, with animal fighting and animal cruelty. The agents discovered a padded training room where roosters were trained to fight, breeding hens, thousands of dollars, and the barbaric weapons of battle. All of the live animals confiscated during these raids were euthanized.

According to one Times story, a representative with the United Gamefowl Breeders Association estimates that cock-fighting generates “hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales of birds, medicines, feed, and breeding and fighting gear.” “Fighting gear” includes knives and sharp metal spurs affixed to the roosters’ claws to maximize injuries, including punctured lungs, broken bones, pierced eyes and a variety of fatal lacerations. “Medicines” include drugs such as “Strychly Speed” (strychnine) and “Pure Aggression,” stimulants used to enhance the birds’ fighting prowess.

Only three states still allow legal cockfighting: Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. Pending federal legislation would close a loophole that allows fighting birds to be transported to states where cockfighting is legal (see AWI Quarterly, Spring 1999, “Anti-Cockfighting Bill Introduced in Congress”). Colorado Senator Wayne Allard authored the Senate bill, S. 345, which has amassed 58 cosponsors. It was approved in Committee on March 2, 2000 and awaits floor consideration. The House companion bill, H.R. 1275, has 185 cosponsors.

But, according to The Washington Post, further consideration of the bill by the full Senate will be difficult, despite widespread bipartisan support. Two former Senators, Steve Symms of Idaho and J. Bennett Johnston of Louisiana, are receiving as much as $85,000 to lobby against the bill. According to the Post, both “have close ties to powerful lawmakers such as Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott.” Perhaps consideration of the cockfighting bill would help define whether or not this Congress is truly compassionate.

Bequests to AWI

To any who 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, located in Washington, D.C., the sum of $___________ and/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 specific wishes about the disposition of your bequest, we suggest you discuss such provisions with your attorney.
Changing the Housing Standard for Monkeys in Laboratories

Biomedical and psychological testing conducted with monkeys is often tainted by unresolved ethical questions. Although animal advocates tend to focus their concerns on cruel experimental procedures, the resultant suffering from a particular test is usually of a relatively short duration. The sum total of suffering inflicted is much more pervasive when one examines the monkeys’ housing conditions prior to the experiment—conditions which may cause continuous suffering lasting for years on end.

The standard monkey cage is so small that the imprisoned animal cannot take a few normal steps in either direction, let alone run or jump. Usually, cages are devoid of high perches that would at least enable a monkey to make use of the vertical dimension of the cage. Permanent confinement in such extremely small, barren enclosures causes many individuals to develop the monotonous habits of stereotypically pacing back and forth, running in circles, somersaulting or bouncing up or down. These movement patterns reflect a frustrated need for exercise and become deeply ingrained over time. Ironically, scientific investigators label these behaviors—rather than the cage size—as abnormal.

Further, in order to minimize housing expenses, monkeys are commonly kept in double-tier cages, with one row stacked on top of another. This doubles the number of animals that can be accommodated in one room, but involves serious adverse welfare implications for the individual animals. Those relegated to the lower rows are restricted to a quasi-terrestrial lifestyle for which they are not adapted biologically. They are unable to withdraw in alarming situations and retreat to a safe place above the human "predator" who periodically captures them and subjects them to uncomfortable, painful, distressing, life-threatening, or even deadly procedures. Moreover, they are forced to live in a shady, depressingly dark environment with light often so dim that caretakers have to use flashlights to identify and inspect them.

The striking difference of illumination between upper and lower cage rows belies the scientific principle that environmental variables must be controlled strictly to ensure the validity of collected research data. Biomedical investigators presumably should be adamant that research animals be kept in a standardized environment in which extraneous variables such as illumination (which can affect almost all functions of the body) are as uniform as possible for all research subjects. Nonetheless, there seems to be a tacit agreement among primatological researchers to exempt this variable from rigorous scientific methodology since, in order to meet a uniform standard, all cages would have to be arranged at the same level of the room and the number of available animals, therefore, would be cut in half.

Both human and nonhuman primates are distinguished by a high degree of sociality, which is a basic condition for their survival in the wild. They possess an inherent need for social contact and interaction. Laboratory monkeys, however, are commonly kept in single-cages, thus being deprived of direct contact with conspecifics.

Permanent solitary confinement is extremely distressing for human and nonhuman primates alike. As is the case with incarcerated humans, individually caged monkeys show signs of boredom, depression, frustration and anger, resulting in unmistakable signs of mental disturbance. Distinguished scientists recently acknowledged that "approximately 10% of captive, individually housed monkeys have had some veterinary record of self-injurious behavior within their lifetime." This means that 10 out of every 100 research monkeys bite themselves to the point of serious injuries when being housed in the traditional, single-caging system.

What prompts investigators to imprison innocent nonhuman primates under living conditions that are regarded as a cruel form of punishment for convicted human primates?

For one, many investigators are seemingly unaware of how their research animals are housed. A well-known biomedical scientist made the following observation in a professional journal: "Most investigators think only briefly about the care and handling of their animals and clearly have not made it an important consideration of their work." If scientists don't care enough to verify that the research animals they use are housed in accordance with sound scientific methodological principles, there is little hope that they will support efforts to refine current housing practices.

Another consideration is money—some would say greed. It is certainly true that upgrading cheap monkey housing conditions requires additional financial investment, but this initial investment will quickly yield important returns. Better housing conditions will lead to more valid scientific data, therefore reducing the number of animals needed to obtain the information. Money is saved and animals' lives are spared.

—Viktor Reinhardt, Adam M. Roberts and Annie Reinhardt
Suing the Circus

The Animal Welfare Institute has joined the Performing Animal Welfare Society, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the Fund for Animals in a lawsuit filed on July 11th, against Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus. The suit alleges that Ringling Brothers violated the Endangered Species Act because of its cruel treatment of endangered Asian elephants.

The Notice of Intent to Sue and the lawsuit detail how Ringling Brothers’ trainers and handlers routinely and severely beat elephants to try to make them submissive; the elephants experience pain and distress, they cry out and they bleed because of these beatings. In one particularly horrific incident, an employee testified about the vicious beating of an elephant named Nicole while an executive manager of the circus, Jeffrey Steele, was nearby. When the employee was asked if it was possible that Mr. Steele did not observe the beating, and therefore was unaware of it, the employee testified that while he did not believe that Mr. Steele could have avoided seeing the beating, he certainly could not have missed hearing the repeated “whacking” sound of the ankus (bull hook) on Nicole as well as Nicole’s cries of distress. In addition to the beatings, elephants are kept chained virtually the entire time they are not performing.

The lawsuit further describes how baby elephants are separated from their mothers by Ringling Brothers before they are even weaned. The babies, desperate to reunite with their mothers, suffer large lesions on their legs from struggling against the shackles that are used to keep them isolated from their mothers. The baby elephants endured “unnecessary trauma, behavioral stress, and physical harm and discomfort,” according to a letter from USDA Under Secretary Michael Dunn.

Crime Subcommittee Holds Hearing

On June 13th, a hearing was held on the Captive Elephant Accident Prevention Act in the US House of Representatives Crime Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. More than 150 people crowded into the standing room only hearing to see the show. The bill, H.R. 2929, was introduced by Congressman Sam Farr (D-CA). If passed, it will prohibit circuses from using elephants in traveling shows and from permitting the public to ride on the backs of elephants.

Renowned television game show host and friend of animals, Bob Barker, testified in support of the legislation and showed a shocking videotape of performing elephants going on rampages and having to be gunned down in the middle of crowded communities.

Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee Bill Young testified eloquently about the plight of elephants used for rides and traveling circuses. He described an elephant who was repeatedly hit in the eye with the hook of an ankus merely to make him get back in line and a baby elephant who was beaten, shrieking in pain and fear.

Conspicuous by their absence from the witness table of the hearing was Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus.
But Will He Get Frequent Flyer Miles?

In the United States, an estimated 5,000 animals are killed, injured or lost during transportation by commercial airlines each year. Animals, treated as mere baggage, are mishandled by baggage personnel, exposed to extreme heat or cold, and denied sufficient oxygen while in the cargo holds. Despite vehement opposition from the airline industry, legislation has been adopted by Congress to help address this dire situation.

The new law, the Safe Air Travel for Animals Act, requires airlines to report the loss, injury or death of animals. This information must be made available to the public on a monthly basis by airline companies, where it can be used to help concerned citizens make educated, humane decisions about when, and if, to transport their animals by air. In addition, the legislation mandates improved training for individuals involved in the handling of animals during air transport.

A not-so-surprising change in the treatment of animals has occurred since the new law holds airlines accountable for the care of animals during transport. The case of Dakota, a 10-year old Basenji, is but one example. He was mistakenly loaded into the unheated cargo hold of a plane that departed on a nearly five-hour flight from Washington, D.C.'s Dulles Airport to San Jose, California. After the plane was en route, an airline employee discovered the problem, and the pilot was informed that the dog was likely to freeze to death in the cargo hold.

Dakota's owner, passenger Mike Bell, was taken to speak with the pilot. "He indicated he was not sure if my dog had survived to this point," Bell said, "However, he was hopeful. If he were alive, the dog would not make it to San Jose under these conditions. So in the best interest of the dog, he was going to divert the plane and land in Denver."

The plane landed in Denver and to Bell's great relief, Dakota survived the freezing temperatures. Bell re-boarded the plane with his dog and carried him to the back row of seats on the plane, as passengers cheered. Dakota sat with Bell for the final leg of the flight. Parents brought their children back to pet the dog, who was wrapped up in blankets to warm him. Dakota is lucky to be alive.

In response to the new law, some airlines have prohibited transportation of pets as checked baggage or have implemented restrictions during the hot summer months. Animals are still transported in cargo holds, so despite these changes, we encourage pet owners who can avoid air travel with their animals to do so. 🐶

---

Random Source

Dog and Cat Dealers

Beware of these 27 remaining Random Source Class B dealers who are selling dogs and/or cats to laboratories for experimentation:

- **Alabama:**
  - John Pesnell, Pesnell Kennels (Arab)

- **Arkansas:**
  - C. C. and Joanette Baird, Martin Creek Kennels (Williford)

- **Connecticut:**
  - Glenn Lawton, Team Associates (Dayville)

- **Illinois:**
  - Michael Cooper, Triple C Farms (St. Joseph)

- **Indiana:**
  - Gene Clark, Salt Creek Kennel (Trafalgar); John and Mark Lynch, LBL Kennels (Reelsville)

- **Iowa:**
  - Dennis and Toots Conrad, Conrad Livestock (Keota)

- **Michigan:**
  - Fred Hodgins, Hodgins Kennels (Howell); Mark Ulrich, Cheri-Hill Kennel and Supply (Stanwood); Roberta and James Woudenberg, R&R Research (Howard City)

- **Minnesota:**
  - Kenneth Schroeder (Wells)

- **Missouri:**
  - Mildred and Danny Schachtele, Middlefork Kennels (Salisbury)

- **New Jersey:**
  - West Jersey Biological Services, Inc. (Wenonah)

- **New York:**
  - Ray and Valerie Dolan, R & V Kennels (North Java)

- **North Carolina:**
  - Carolina Biological Supply Company (Burlington); Barbara Phillips, Pearcroft Cattery (Beaufort); S. E. Lab Animal Farm, Inc. (Raleigh); Simons, L.B.S. Biological, Inc. (Graham); John Wise, Carolina Kennel (Dunn); John H. and Eva Wise, Hillside Kennel (Four Oaks)

- **Ohio:**
  - Andrea Ball, Kiser Lake Kennels (St. Paris)

- **Oklahoma:**
  - Henry Lee Cooper, C & C Kennels (Wewoka); James Hester, Amernetia, Inc. (Pryor); Henry Lee Cooper, C&C Kennels (Wewoka)

- **Pennsylvania:**
  - Mike Kredovski, Biomedical Associates, Inc. (Friedensburg); Bruce Rotz (Shippensburg)

- **Tennessee:**
  - Preston Cates, Jr. (Dunlap)
**In Remembrance of Mary Warner**

Mary Warner, the friend of dogs stolen by dealers to sell to research institutions, has died at her home in Virginia. Mary was one of that vanishing breed, a private person who saw a need to protect animals and sprang into action—literally, because her organization was named *Action 81*. The 81 referred to Highway 81 which saw heavy traffic in unmarked trucks and vans, carrying abducted dogs to auctions or sales where the pathetic victims would breathe their last fresh air before spending the rest of the their days in cages, being tested or waiting to be tested. *Action 81* unceasingly sought to trace lost pets and return them to their distraught owners.

Mary was petite, soft-spoken and a dynamo. Whether on horseback in the Virginia countryside, romping with her dogs—most of whom seemed larger than she—or in Richmond telling it like it is to legislative committees, Mary was a presence. Her unfailing good humor concealed a tireless worker whose legacy we can all appreciate.

—John Gleiber

**Frontier “Justice”**

In the fall of 1997, to demonstrate the abusive, inhumane and illegal methods in which animals are being trapped, Alaska wildlife biologist Gordon Haber released a video of a two-year old black wolf in a snare on a site that was covered with the carcasses of at least four dead caribou. Haber who is an outspoken opponent of current trapping methods and is a leading advocate for wolf protection has studied wolves in Alaska for 35 years.

The wolf in question had been trapped at the carcass-covered snare site for at least three days when Haber discovered the animal still alive. Before releasing the wolf, Haber contacted officials from the National Park Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for help in caring for the injured wolf, but no one came to the site. He decided to release the wolf instead of allowing him to languish longer. Sadly, the wolf died of blood loss three weeks later when state and federal wildlife biologists botched an attempt to amputate the injured leg in the field with nothing but a Swiss army knife.

Following the incident, Alaska State Troopers investigated Haber, trapper Eugene Johnson and state and federal game officials for various crimes and for possible charges. In the end, despite comments by the state prosecutor who said that “an appearance of wrongdoing cuts across the board, no charges will be pressed.”

However, after being spared legal action by the State of Alaska for maintaining an illegal trapping site, Johnson filed civil charges against Haber. In July 2000, a jury comprised of five women and one man from Tok (a small town in east-central Alaska near the Canadian border) ordered Haber and his sponsor, *Friends of Animals*, to pay damages totaling $190,000: $186,500 to Johnson, plus $500 for the wolf and $3,000 for equipment. The jury, from the trapping community, felt that the emotional distress trapper Johnson suffered as a result of his loss justified the settlement.

Both Haber and *Friends of Animals* are currently reviewing the jury’s decision and will decide whether or not to appeal.

**Initiatives Against Cruel Traps in Oregon and Washington**

The worldwide movement against the use of steel jaw leghold traps has gained powerful momentum in the United States. *Protect Pets and Wildlife*, a coalition of over 100 groups, including the *Society for Animal Protection Legislation*, has gathered 360,000 signatures, sufficient to qualify trapping initiatives for inclusion in statewide ballots in both Oregon and Washington. These two measures, virtually identical in content, ban the use of cruel traps and snares for recreational and commercial trapping.

A huge, inflatable bobcat in a steel jaw leghold trap bobbing up in both states was an attention grabbing device that brought the issue into focus for the public and helped to trigger this enormous number of signatures.

Oregon’s trap line requirements are among the most lax in the nation: lines need be visited only every 48 hours, and, appallingly, traps set for coyotes need never be checked. Inhumane traps cause endless suffering, not only to target species, but to pets, deer and birds including the eagle—our country’s symbol.

If these two ballot measures are voted into law, Oregon and Washington will join other American states that have banned use of the steel jaw trap, as well as 89 forward-looking foreign nations including all the states of the European Union.

For further information contact *Protect Pets and Wildlife* at (425)787-2500 or visit their website at http://www.jps.net/prooaw.htm.
The United States Fish and Wildlife Service acted on behalf of two of the world’s most charismatic species this spring when it listed the koala and the Canada lynx as “threatened” under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Such a federal listing denotes a species that is likely to become endangered throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

The popular tree-dwelling Australian koala was almost wiped out by the fur trade in the early 1900s. But now, logging, agricultural expansion, and urban sprawl have encroached on the koala’s eucalyptus forest home, destroying much of the vital ecosystem on which the species depends. Much of the forestland is cut down for woodchips in particular, which are exported to paper mills in Japan. According to Deborah Tabart, Executive Director of the Australian Koala Foundation (AKF), “At the moment with landclearing and development the way it is, the koala doesn’t have much chance of survival.”

The Service received 3,000 responses to its proposal to list the koala. The primary objections to the listing came from individuals within the Australian state governments, such as Victoria and New South Whales, who claimed that the koala should be considered individually within each Australian state rather than across the entire range. The US argued in response that a species’ population status could not be decided by looking at “political boundaries within countries.”

Fish and Wildlife Service Director Jamie Rapaport Clark said of the decision, “By listing koalas as threatened under the ESA, we are able to help educate the public about the need for conservation efforts to protect these enchanting animals and their habitat.”

Similar protected status was conferred upon the only lynx in North America, the Canada Lynx (Lynx Canadensis). This listing, however, involved almost a decade of petitions, notices, public comments, and lawsuits. On the proposed lynx listing, over 3,500 comments were received, more than three to one in favor of the threatened designation.

The lynx occurs across the US on both private and public lands, with a substantial amount of its habitat falling within lands that are controlled by the National Forest Service. However, Federal land management plans do not adequately protect the lynx or its primary prey species, the snowshoe hare. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, “timber harvest and its related activities are a predominant land use affecting lynx habitat.” Commercial trappers and loggers are the greatest enemies of the lynx.

As a result of the listing, it is illegal to take wild lynx, possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship illegally taken lynx, export lynx as well as lynx parts or products without an appropriate permit, or deleteriously modify lynx habitat. Unfortunately, the Service did not simultaneously designate “critical habitat” for the lynx, which is vital to ensuring that a listed species has the necessary territorial protection to enable recovery.