

Humane Society of the United States



An in-depth background investigation of the
dark past of their evolution.

CONTENTS

1) EVOLUTION OF HSUS

- From Animal Welfare to Animal Rights
- Friction With Grass-Roots Groups
- HSUS and the International Arena/Environmentalism
 - Sustainable Use/*Animals in Peril*
- HSUS and Education
 - NAHEE
 - Excluding the "Opposition"
 - California's Environmental Education
 - Using Local Humane Societies
 - Center for Respect of Life and Environment
- HSUS and Religion

2) FINANCIAL

- Executives
- Executive salaries
- "Obscene Salary Watch"
- Financial dealings/irregularities
- Where the money goes
- Abuse of tax-exempt status
- The Jack Anderson affair
- Wills's subsidised wedding?
- Paul Irwin the banker
- Kickbacks from direct mail producers?

3) BREAKING STORIES

- Dog Bite Prevention Week
- Jailbird director "Sonny" Bloch
- Washington D.C. Animal Contract
- Iditarod in Danger
- Free Willy!
- Criminal investigation in California

4) PERSONALITY PROFILES

- Bloch, H.I. "Sonny"
- Deday LaRene, Nathaniel C.
- Forkan, Patricia
- Fox, Michael
- Grandy, John W.
- Hoyt, John A.
- Irwin, Paul G.

L-B-11-01-m

Lieberman, Susan
Pacelle, Wayne
Stephens, Martin
Telecky, Teresa
Wills, David

5) PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES

6) AWARD PROGRAMS

7) DOCUMENTS

"Easy Targets — Did HSUS expose zoo links to canned hunts or just play to the grandstand?" (*Animal People*, October 1994)

"HSUS Usurps AHA Disaster Relief Role" (*Animal People*, May 1994)

"The Contract that Never Was" (*International Harpoon*, May 1994)

"Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills" (*Animal People*, December 1995)

"HSUS Isn't Talking" (*Animal People*, November 1995)

"A Whale of a Tale from Inside HSUS" (*Animal People*, October 1995)

"One Nonprofit's Woes" (*U.S. News & World Report*, October 2, 1995.)

"Is it time for Helen Jones of ISAR to retire?" (*Animal People*, October 1995.)

"What's Best for Willy?" (*Animal People*, September 1995)

"Triple Trouble for Humane Society of US" (*Animal People*, September 1995)

"HSUS Raids the Fund for Animals" (*Animal People*, May 1994)

"Zimbabwe: Driving Wildlife to Extinction — An Investigative Report on the Crisis Facing Elephants and Rhinoceros in Zimbabwe" (HSUS/HSI, Oct. 7, 1993)

"Zimbabwe: At the Leading Edge of Conservation" (by the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management of Zimbabwe, Nov. 20, 1993)

"Dog Bite Prevention Campaign Pairs Post Office with Animal Rights Organization" (NAIA News, July-August 1995)

"The Trojan Horse of Animal Protectionism: The Battle Over Curriculum" (CFAAR Newsletter, March 1994)

"Humane Society's Perfect World" (*Anchorage Daily News*, Dec. 19, 1992)

"A Discussion — Rights for Animals" (HSUS publication, 1990)

"Questions on Humane Society Finances" (by Jack Anderson and Dale van Atta, *Washington Post*, Feb. 20, 1991)

"Where Charity Begins at the Top" (by Jack Anderson and Joseph Spear, *Washington Post*, Oct. 13, 1988)

"'Excessive' Pay at Humane Society" (by Jack Anderson and Joseph Spear, *Washington Post*, Sept. 8, 1988)

"Dubious Deals in the Humane Society" (by Jack Anderson and Dale van Atta, *Washington Post*, Sept. 7, 1988)

"What You Should Know About: Animal Welfare Fraud" (distributed by Trans-Species Unlimited at the 1988 annual conference of HSUS)

"H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet" (distributed by Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud at the 1988 annual conference of HSUS)

8) ORGANISATION

9) MEMORABLE QUOTES

10) ON-LINE ACCESS TO HSUS

11) BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) EVOLUTION OF HSUS

In 1954, a radical splinter group separated from the American Humane Association and set up the National Humane Society. Among them were Cleveland Amory, who would later leave to form the radical anti-hunting organisation Fund for Animals, and Helen Jones, currently president of the International Society for Animal Rights and reportedly an eccentric, alcoholic, pet-hoarder (see "Is It Time for Helen Jones of ISAR to Retire?"). This new organisation would later be renamed the Humane Society of the United States.

Documentation on the first 25 years of HSUS's existence, other than that produced by the organisation itself, is scant, but it indicates policy was fairly well focused on animal welfare issues. However, HSUS did not, and never has run an animal shelter, the function that is most commonly associated with a "humane" society. Indeed, "HSUS policy since it was founded in 1954 has been to avoid doing hands-on animal care" (*Animal People*, November 1995), although it recently came close to landing the animal control contract in Washington D.C. (see "Washington D.C. Animal Contract").

In the last 15 years, HSUS has experienced phenomenal growth in its constituency, causing one commentator to refer to it recently as "the General Motors of the animal protection industry." In 1970, when John Hoyt took over the presidency, HSUS had just 30,000 constituents and an annual budget of about \$500,000, and ten years later there were still just 50,000 constituents. But by 1990 this figure had grown to 1.3 million, and today stands at 2.5 million, making HSUS one of the largest animal welfare/rights organisations in the U.S. With a budget in 1994 of \$23,265,940, it ranked second behind the North Shore Animal League (\$31 million). To keep this in perspective, however, Greenpeace International had a budget in the same year of \$145 million.

From Animal Welfare to Animal Rights

At its 1980 national membership conference in San Francisco, a vote was taken that would profoundly shift the policy direction of HSUS. It was formally resolved that the HSUS would "pursue on all fronts ... the clear articulation and establishment of the rights of all animals ... within the full range of American life and culture." The literature resulting from that meeting also contained the statement that "there is no rational basis for

maintaining a moral distinction between the treatment of humans and other animals ..."

However, with the rise in violence and controversy in the 1980s associated with animal rights groups such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and the unstructured Animal Liberation Front, HSUS strove to distance itself in the public's mind from other groups and establish for itself a "moderate" image as an "animal protection" organisation.

(To an extent, this was inevitable: many of the staff of HSUS, including its two top officers [John Hoyt and Paul Irwin] are meat-eaters, while the leadership of the animal rights movement in general is vegetarian or vegan. [Other notable exceptions are Fund for Animals and the National Anti-Vivisection Society; *Vegetarian Times*, February, 1995.]

As a consequence, the HSUS has employed caution in advertising its true philosophy of animal rights.

A 1990 fundraising flyer entitled "A Discussion — Rights for Animals" (see "Documents") begins: "The Humane Society of the United States has long been in the forefront of advocating the recognition of rights of and for animals," and includes such radical proposals as providing animals with access to courts. Nonetheless, the intent of this diatribe is to intellectualize HSUS's stance on animal rights in such a way as it can dissociate itself from the mainstream animal rights movement. "In the past ten years, the term 'animal rights' has been overused, and, in the process, the concept has become muddled," it states. "... Overuse and careless use has led not only to confusion and imprecision but also to a loss of perspective as to how much work lies ahead before animals acquire rights in a practical and legal sense."

Juxtaposed with this shyness, overt animal rightists have enjoyed growing prominence in HSUS over the last decade, even though the most oft-cited example, vice-president for Bioethics and Farm Animal Protection Michael Fox, has been somewhat sidelined when it comes to determining policy. (Fox was recently appointed head of the HSUS affiliate the Center for Respect of Life and Environment, to enable him to promote animal rights more vigorously than is acceptable under the banner of HSUS itself.) Others with influence within HSUS proper include vice-presidents Patricia Forkan and Wayne Pacelle, and a gaggle of other staffers recruited from the radical animal rights group Fund for Animals, prompting FFA founder Cleveland Amorv to remark: "They ought

to pay us for training their staff for them. They know we can't get into a bidding war when they offer our people two and three times the salary they're making here" (*Animal People*, May 1994).

HSUS staffer Virginia Bollinger was formerly an investigator for the radical People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), while the recently fired vice-president David Wills is married to the former wife of Alex Pacheco, PETA's president. And while HSUS president Paul Irwin states unequivocally that "On the issue of animal research, we seek reform, not abolition" (*American Society for Microbiology Newsletter*, Feb., 1993), HSUS's official spokesman on animal research, Martin Stephens, personally espouses abolition (see "Personality Profiles").

Irwin argues in the same newsletter that, "Far from being taken over by anyone, radical or otherwise, HSUS has enjoyed a continuity in leadership for the last 20 years." But as they say, people make policy.

Most telling, however, is that the rhetoric of "animal protection" which HSUS employs when addressing its wider constituency through various publications, changes when the audience is more select. Speaking at the 1990 HSUS annual meeting, then-president Hoyt said:

"In the early stages of the advent of the philosophy of animal rights, it appeared that established groups such as the HSUS and newly emerging groups such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals could make common cause on most issues mutually supporting each other's actions and endeavors. ... until, sadly, it became apparent to us and others that the motives and ambitions of the leaders of this endeavor were seriously flawed. ... there has evolved over the past few years a fairly radical difference in the tactics employed by various groups in seeking to achieve their goals. ... Those utilized by some animal rights groups tend to be confrontational and demonstrative, sometimes resulting in the destruction of property, personal intimidation, and, on rare occasions, violence. This is not to say that the rights of animals should be either ignored or minimized as meaningful and vital philosophy. Indeed, it must not be. But what needs to be said, and understood, is that those who seek to codify the rights of animals in law or custom are but a small minority. ... Do we then imagine, even for one brief moment, that a government — our government — which declines to sign a magna carta on behalf of children ... will be moved to do our bidding to stop the use of animals for research or prohibit their use for food? ... I hardly think so. ... nor do we believe that the American public will in any large measure be responsive to those groups advocating such abolition."

Such statements are not isolated or casual. At the 1984 HSUS convention, John McArdle, then HSUS vice-president for laboratory animals, issued specific instructions on how to avoid

being associated with the very goals members were being asked to pursue. Acknowledging the limited appeal of an uncompromising vegetarian philosophy, McArdle advised delegates to "avoid the words 'animal rights' and 'antivivisection.' They are too strange for the public. Never appear to be opposed to animal research. Claim that your only concern is the source of animals" [a reference to the use in biomedical research of unclaimed pound animals] (as quoted by Katie McCabe, "Who will live and who will die?", *The Washingtonian*, 1986).

Since then, top officers of HSUS have repeatedly stated in public that they are not unequivocally opposed to animal research, but the biomedical research community remains unconvinced. In a personal communication with a fellow researcher (Mar. 15, 1993), ophthalmologist Pat Cleveland of the University of California, San Diego, wrote:

"HSUS really needs to be called to task for its triple sided hypocrisy. When HSUS addresses scientists they say they support animal research as necessary. When HSUS addresses the public they say it is evil but sometimes necessary. When HSUS addresses its members and other animal rights groups, they say it is evil and unnecessary."

The consequence of such duplicity on the part of HSUS is that many animal-use groups now brand it an "animal rights" organisation, which has sought to establish a "false middle ground" between researchers and abolitionists, on which it claims to represent mainstream America. The only fundamental difference between HSUS and other animal rights groups is that it has set itself a much longer time frame within which to achieve its goals, seeking to affect change from within the system rather than forcing change from without.

The conclusion that frequently follows this assertion is that many of its members — animal lovers who would not support animal rights, if they fully understood the meaning of this philosophy — do not understand the agenda their own organisation is pursuing.

In another letter, this time to the American Society for Microbiology Newsletter (February, 1993), Cleveland eloquently compares HSUS to other animal rights groups as follows:

"What separates the HSUS from other animal rights groups is not their philosophy of animal rights and goal of abolishing the use of animals in research but the tactics and timetable for that abolition. It's like the difference between a mugger and a con man. They each will rob you — they use different tactics, have different timetables, but the result is the same. The con man may even criticize the mugger for using

confrontational tactics and giving all thieves a bad name, but your money is still taken."

As a representative of the biomedical community, Cleveland is perhaps more acutely aware of the two (or three) faces of HSUS than most. In her article "Beyond Cruelty" (*The Washingtonian*, February 1990), Katie McCabe quotes John Hoyt as saying that "the HSUS is not an anti-vivisectionist organization." The official HSUS policy, McCabe notes (and this is supported by HSUS literature), is to promote the "three Rs" in animal research, namely: to reduce the numbers of animals used, to replace animal models where possible, and to refine methods of experimentation to minimise suffering. In the October 1986 edition of *The Washingtonian*, Hoyt is quoted as saying: "The HSUS recognizes that benefit for both animals and mankind has been achieved through some scientific research and testing on animals. ... We do, however, vigorously support the humane treatment of animals in biomedical research and testing labs."

McCabe then contrasts this with a 1986 "holiday fundraising appeal," signed by Hoyt, which describes what happens in research laboratories as "absolutely horrifying. ... [Animals] will be attached to electrodes, plunged into freezing temperatures, or suffer through other physical or psychological experiments too horrible to describe. Please don't think this is impossible, or that I have exaggerated the situation. The truth is that it happens just this way every day."

The four-page appeal, which McCabe reports was mailed every year up until the time she filed her report, concludes with the following request: "Any amount you can send will be greatly appreciated and will help us end the suffering of almost 450,000 dogs and cats tormented in research experiments each year." McCabe then confronts Hoyt with this statement to see how it fits in with his statement that HSUS "is not an anti-vivisectionist organization":

"Despite his signature on the letter, Hoyt strongly disavows its language: 'That sort of statement is certainly overdrawn from the standpoint both of the organizational policy and my own personal view. So I'm not happy with that characterization.' But the letter, Hoyt acknowledges, has not been redrafted since it first went out in 1986."

McCabe also draws attention to the overtly abolitionist views on vivisection of the two HSUS vice-presidents mentioned above, Michael Fox and Martin Stephens, quoting the latter as saying: "I

myself am an anti-vivisectionist, but I wouldn't impose that viewpoint on people now."

Similar, perhaps less well-documented, cases of HSUS toning down its message so as not to frighten off mainstream support can be found in many other areas, but the point that it is not only the biomedical community that must confront this deceptiveness is perhaps most easily illustrated by citing from two other organisations representing different interests in the animal-use community. The first example comes from *Animal Scam*, by Kathleen Marquardt and Mark La Rochelle of the Montana-based organisation Putting People First, which caters largely to a constituency of hunters:

"The HSUS ... currently serves as a front to legitimize [sic] the animal rights movement to pet owners. HSUS split off from AHA [the American Humane Association] in 1954. In 1980, it adopted the animal rights line that 'there is no rational basis for maintaining a moral distinction between the treatment of humans and other animals.' ... Many people make contributions to HSUS thinking the organization provides money for animal shelters. In fact, HSUS does not run a single shelter. It benefits from the confusing similarity of its name with that of the much older AHA, of which many local shelters are members." (Marquardt and La Rochelle, p15)

The second example comes from *The Hijacking of the Humane Movement*, by Rod and Patti Strand. The Strands are pedigree dog breeders, and Patti is executive director of the National Animal Interest Alliance and a director of the American Kennel Club:

"The HSUS is a nationally known organization that practices animal rights while collecting mainstream contributions from an unsuspecting public. It had already moved into the animal rights camp by the mid 80s, but even today most Americans think of it as a be-kind-to-pets organization. Dr. John McArdle, while director of lab-animal welfare at HSUS, advised HSUS delegates in 1984 never to use terms such as animal rights or antivivisection. Instead of using these alarming words, he recommended working against the source of animals used in research. In other words, getting people worked up over the possibility that their pets may wind up on a lab table would enhance the opportunity to restrict animal research. Fundraising from a pet-owning public, he might have added, is also easier if they think you're in favor of pet ownership. McArdle, now with the American Antivivisection Society, may have gone too far when he suggested that brain-dead humans should be substituted for animals in medical research. 'It may take people a while to get used to the idea, he said, but once they do the savings in animal lives will be substantial [sic; quotation marks, perhaps belonging before and after 'he said', missing].'

"To demonstrate further where HSUS sits on the animal welfare/animal liberation spectrum, HSUS Vice President Michael W. Fox told Newsweek in 1988: 'Humane care is simply sentimental, sympathetic

supporters included the promotion of animal rights as one of the organization's goals. Other signs of the HSUS shift to an animal rights philosophy are demonstrated by its Breakfast of Cruelty campaign aimed at eliminating bacon and eggs as the all-American breakfast [for the apparent hypocrisy of this campaign, see "H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet"], and the Until There are None Adopt One campaign aimed at making animal shelters the politically correct place to get a pet until there are no more surplus animals. ...

"Despite these deviations from traditional humane society concepts, the animal-welfare-oriented public remains naively supportive. The programs can be interpreted more than one way and HSUS naturally retains its traditional, legitimizing name." (Strand and Strand, pp60-62)

Friction With Grass-Roots Groups

The above accounts are in every way typical of how HSUS is perceived within the animal-user community. However, based on my research, I would take issue with an aspect of perception expressed by Marquardt and La Rochelle, to wit: "The HSUS ... currently serves as a front to legitimize the animal rights movement to pet owners."

Without access to the authors' research materials, I will not comment here on the past relationship between HSUS and the animal rights movement as a whole, but in the present climate there is little evidence that HSUS fulfills any function other than a self-serving one. Indeed, far from being seen as a paternalistic overseer and "legitimiser" of the fragmented and oft-maligned animal rights movement as a whole, it is widely perceived by smaller animal rights groups as a destructive force.

For starters, many grass-roots groups take a cynical view of what they see as HSUS's true agenda, accusing it of operating like a big business and of jumping on the animal rights bandwagon to exploit the business potential while others do all the work and take the negative press (see, for example, "What You Should Know About: Animal Welfare Fraud" and "H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet"). Specifically, it is claimed, the size of HSUS enables it to steal others' ideas, their thunder and hence their funds, with the result that the grass-roots movement is now strapped for cash as never before. As Cleveland Amory, the co-founder of HSUS who left disillusioned in 1974 to form the Fund for Animals, puts it: "I'm not an admirer of HSUS. They've always been primarily a direct-mail operation, and what's known in animal rights circles as a credit-grabber" (*Animal People*, May 1994).

One of the highest-profile, and comical, "grabs" they have tried to perform in recent years does not actually affect grass-roots groups because they were never really involved, but to anyone who knows the whaling issue, it serves to illustrate HSUS's audacity. In a "Backgrounder" provided by HSUS in October 1995, it is stated: "The HSUS has led the international community to adopt a global whaling moratorium" While there are too many interests vested in saving whales for HSUS ever to monopolise the ultimate fund-raiser, the same audacity has allowed it to squeeze less powerful groups to the sidelines of other high-profile and prestigious causes (see "Iditarod in Danger" and "HSUS Usurps AHA Disaster Relief Role").

Even more dubious a practice (though by no means unique to HSUS) is relying on its credibility and reach to divert donations away from worthy causes such as animal shelters — in which it has no involvement — to non-issues (see "Easy Targets — Did HSUS expose zoo links to canned hunts or just play to the grandstand?", and "The Contract that Never Was"), or issues that do a lot for HSUS but little for animals (see "Free Willy!").

HSUS AND THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA/ENVIRONMENTALISM

As the power base of HSUS has grown, so it has expanded into two other arenas, which are complementary: the international advocacy/fundraising market, and environmentalism. Today, it is the preeminent American animal welfare/rights organisation on the international scene.

Its earliest activities in the international arena were in the mid-1960s in association with the World Society for the Protection of Animals. (HSUS CEO John Hoyt would later serve as president of WSPA from 1986-90.)

In 1976, HSUS started turning up at meetings of the International Whaling Commission, but whales were its only focused international cause until the late 1980s when it started attacking the wild bird trade, and joined in the fundraising free-for-all associated with "saving" elephants. HSUS staff also started showing up at meetings of CITES, IUCN, and the International Livestock and Environmental Accounting Program. More recently, they started getting involved in affairs of the European Community, and appointed their first European director who

resides in Bonn but covers the European Parliament in Strasbourg closely, mainly dealing with marine mammal issues.

HSUS was also doling out cash to animal welfare organisations around the world from its Alice Morgan Wright-Edith Goode Fund. (Disbursements from this fund, which had assets of \$1,301,573 as of Dec. 31, 1992, are regularly reported on in *HSUS News*.)

It was against this background that in 1991, three new organisations were formed under the HSUS umbrella: Humane Society International (HSI), EarthKind (USA) and EarthKind (International). In the simplest of terms, HSI is the international arm of HSUS which serves to justify the parent raising funds on species not found in the U.S., and to test foreign fundraising markets. In this latter capacity, HSI is already reported to be seeking ways to exploit the benefits of operating outside the saturated direct-mail market of the U.S. (see under "Organisation").

The two EarthKind bodies, meanwhile, are the specialised troops for leading HSUS's foray into the environmental market, a new policy direction announced by vice-president Jan Hartke at HSUS's 1990 annual conference. (For further details on EarthKind, see under "Organisation".) In the 1992-93 edition of *Public Interest Profiles* (Foundation for Public Affairs), the "Current Concerns" listed for HSUS include "The environment and its impact on animals", along with another international issue, "Banning commercial trade in elephant ivory".

The blurring of the distinctions between animal welfare/rights agendas and environmentalism/conservation has been under way since the early 1970s when the preeminence of whales and seals as fundraising vehicles became apparent. Campaigns to "save" these species could be couched in either animal welfare terms or environmental ones, depending on the constituency, but it soon became apparent that the most successful fundraising campaigns included an element of both.

With the fundraising markets in the U.S., certain European countries and perhaps Australasia now saturated, organisations which grew fat off the whales and seals — and later elephants — have been forced to embrace ever broader ranges of issues to remain competitive. Thus it is that we find HSUS — until 15 years ago a "humane" society — campaigning to save rainforests, while the archetypal "environmental" organisation, Greenpeace, has

been reduced to ridiculous anthropomorphisations of whales now that their survival as species has been assured.

Such a potted version of history may seem too cynical, as many animal lovers doubtless have a natural affinity for "environmental" issues of the Save-the-Whale variety (as distinct from "conservation" issues). *Animals' Agenda* (July/Aug. 1990) has this to say:

"Though there's still a contingent within the animal rights movement that doesn't want environmental problems mixed in with 'its' issues, most humane activists consider themselves part of the environmental movement. Grassroots groups across the country jumped with ease into the local Earth Day celebrations and, among national humane organizations, The HSUS deserves commendation for its vigorous efforts to promote Earth Day awareness."

Yet whatever the true motivation of groups such as HSUS to meld animal rights with environmentalism, the blurring of these agendas poses a very real threat to environmental or conservation efforts that do not embrace animal rights as an underlying principle. Many cases of devastation visited upon local peoples in the name of "saving" megafauna have been documented, from the inhabitants around the national parks of Africa to the sealing communities of the Arctic Circle. In all such cases, campaigns to "save" the animals in question have contained heavy, quasi-environmental messages. The up side has been that the advocates for the animals could be easily recognised as such by anyone with expertise in these matters. HSUS now wants to change all that with an array of "stealth" weapons.

EarthKind is the most obvious weapon in HSUS's "stealth" armoury, but how many other "environmental" cloaks is this animal rights group hiding behind?

Take an organisation called Green Seal, Inc., for example. Launched in the U.S. in 1990, Green Seal is a national, non-profit organisation which confers its logo — a green tick on a blue globe — on household products it deems to be environment-friendly. But it is partly funded by HSUS, HSUS is represented on its board, and in its first year of operation its chairman, Denis Hayes, received the Joseph Wood Krutch medal from HSUS (see "Award Programs").

In announcing the establishment of this organisation (*HSUS News*, winter 1991), HSUS informed its members that: "The logo

will verify that the product causes the least harm to the environment among products of its class." All good and well, one might think, but another sentence in the same article tells quite a different story (*italics added*): "Corporate behavior could be significantly affected by millions of consumers who, acting together, demand *humane* and environmentally preferable products."

Putting a seal on a product attesting to its environment-friendliness or humaneness (no animal-testing involved, for example) is one thing. Making humaneness a condition for winning environment-friendly status is quite another. But who will know?

Sustainable Use/*Animals in Peril*

In concert with its move into the international arena, HSUS has emerged as a leading trasher of the concept of "sustainable use".

This concept has been embraced at the policy level by governments around the world, national and international development agencies, conservation groups, by the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), agencies of the UN, and the World Bank.

In November 1994, for example, in a closing statement to CITES, the EC said: "The member states and candidate member states of the European Community have noted with satisfaction the consensus of the 9th meeting of (CITES) to extend practical support to the globally agreed principle of sustainable use of the world's natural resources, based on scientific and objective data."

Faced with such a threat, HSUS and HSI have been leading a campaign to debunk the concept.

In the autumn 1994 *HSUS Newsletter*, president Paul Irwin wrote:

"Over the past few years, a storm has raged in the conservation community over whether economic incentives can be used to conserve species. Proponents of this strategy, so-called sustainable use, claim that wildlife ... cannot survive unless they have commercial value to humans. In these proponents' view, the way to save crocodiles from extinction is to market their skin for shoes; the way to save elephants is to trade in their tusks or sell elephant-foot wastebaskets; the way to save parrots is to sell them as pets. ...

"History has demonstrated that it is not possible for humans to use wildlife sustainably ... when there is commercial value in the sale of the animal or the animal's parts. Placing a price on an animal's head always enhances the incentive for killing that animal and increases the probability that commercial use will drive the species to extinction. ...

"'Sustainable use of wildlife' is a bankrupt philosophy that capitalizes on brutality and death. What the world needs for the new millennium is not a philosophy of death but rather a philosophy of life — of humane stewardship — that glorifies and preserves the lives of all."

In 1994, the book *Animals in Peril: How Sustainable Use Is Wiping Out the World's Wildlife* was published under the name of John Hoyt, though many others were reportedly involved in the project. *Animals in Peril* is intended as the HSUS's blueprint for the future of the planet, a sort of response to *Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living*, the 1991 document from UNEP, WWF and IUCN.

The following extract sets the tone:

"If the sustainable use lobby gets in the way, wild animals will soon become just another commodity to be bought, sold, traded, and finally used up when, inevitably, the demand exceeds supply ... And we will awaken one day, too late, to find that our precious wildlife heritage has been stolen from us by those who know the price of every creature and the value of none."

Based on the premise that man cannot be trusted to take care of his own best interests, the lifestyle we are now required to pursue hinges heavily on recognising the "intrinsic value" of wildlife and becoming a race of ecotourists. (HSUS has strongly opposed the seal hunt in the Pribiloff Islands. It might be worthwhile someone researching the potential for ecotourism on these barren, windswept, remote outcrops of rock.)

What impact this book will have in the years to come is hard to judge. The quality of analysis is such that it will never become another *Silent Spring* (Rachel Carson) or *Animal Ethics: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals* (Peter Singer), and initial sales figures seem to support this. As of October 1995, just 6,000 copies had been sold, despite the fact it is being offered to HSUS members at a discount price of just \$7.95 (\$9.95 in bookstores).

However, given the undiscerning manner in which animal rights writers quote one another when it suits their purposes (a distinct characteristic of this book, by the way), it may well be that this book ends up being quoted widely in animal rights literature. Even the animal rights newsletter *Animal People*, whose generally

discerning editor Merritt Clifton has no love for the HSUS, has reviewed this book favourably under the title "True scary elephant tales" (January/February 1995).

Should this happen, it may be desirable for proponents of sustainable use to pool information that can be readily used to discredit this book, as for one person to do so on his or her own would be impossible because of the wide range of fields covered. To give those who have not read this book a possibly typical insight into the quality of information contained therein, I offer the following two examples from an area in which I have some expertise, whaling:

p49: "The protection belatedly accorded the great whales came too late to help the Atlantic gray whale, which is now extinct, or the Asiatic gray whale, which is virtually so." Comment: Gray whales in the Atlantic are known only from remains. There are no records of them ever having been hunted commercially.

p51: "In 1993, Norway openly defied IWC by also killing some 300 minke, and it even tried to smuggle several tons of whale meat out of Norway in violation of the ban on international sales of whale products. In 1993, three-and-a-half tons of frozen whale meat were discovered at Oslo Airport, labeled as shrimp and destined for Japan via South Korea." Comments: i) Norway was perfectly within its rights under IWC rules to go whaling; ii) "it" clearly means Norway. Norway did not try to smuggle whale meat. Rather, it arrested a private individual for attempting to smuggle the meat; iii) despite considerable efforts by the Environmental Investigation Agency, no proof whatsoever was ever unearthed that the meat was destined for Japan. This was pure speculation.

This last example also proves my point about animal rights writers wittingly being undiscerning about their sources of information. The source given for this gem is the Animal Welfare Institute, which has been accused in the past of inventing stories (see "US Government Accused of Gagging Scientists", *International Harpoon*, IWC annual meeting, May 1994).

In this regard, I also wish to point out the extremely heavy reliance of *Animals in Peril* on one source for its account of the African ivory trade.

Chapter 4, entitled "The Poaching Explosion of the 1980s: Wiping Out Half of Africa's Elephants". reads as if Hovt has access to

voluminous background information that enables him to document the horrendous tales of greed that have brought Africa's elephants to (what else?) the brink of extinction. A quick check at the back of the book, however, reveals that of 76 references, 30 come from the Environmental Investigation Agency. While I am not in a position to judge the quality of EIA's information on the ivory trade, when it comes to the whaling dispute this organisation is renowned for concocting stories in the realm of fantasy. (For more information on EIA and whaling, start by contacting Kate Sanderson, secretary of the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission, Tel: 47-776-45903; fax: 47-776-45905.)

HSUS AND EDUCATION

For some Americans in particular, the most worrying aspect about HSUS has been its success in introducing the animal rights message into school curricula. In contrast with radical animal rights groups who visit classes and tell them, for example, that hunters are murderers, HSUS has sought to work from within the system. This is a long-term strategy to wean society off using animals, and involves making accomplices of unwitting teachers in delivering a low-key, but insidious animal rights message.

One man who takes this very seriously is Dr. Pat Cleveland, a biomedical researcher and head of the Coalition for Animals and Animal Research/San Diego. Much of the following information is taken from Cleveland's overview of the problem presented in "The Trojan Horse of Animal Protectionism: The Battle Over Curriculum" (see "Documents").

In preparing materials for the classroom, HSUS is as duplicitous as when presenting itself to its constituency at large, overtly pushing mainstream issues — environmental awareness and humane treatment of animals — while covertly pushing animal rights. This cautious approach is not only effective; it is essential. The teaching community may be "liberal" by professional standards in general, but the general approach to educating young minds remains one of coaxing them in the right direction, not ramming controversial ideas home. And in this regard, most teachers — and education authorities — probably view themselves as fairly conservative. HSUS's image as a credible, mainstream organisation is everything in its quest to influence the minds of children, because it must first persuade these adults to act as its messengers

Most teachers are unaware of this deception, says Cleveland, and welcome materials teaching the virtues of treating animals humanely because it reduces violent behaviour in classrooms. The other principal component — caring for the environment — is embraced for its own sake. It can be presumed that many of them view the animal rights message, if they discern it at all among all the welfare and environmental material, as merely incidental.

NAHEE

At the level of elementary education, HSUS has already established a reputation for itself as "the authority" on humane and environmental issues, and has a representative on the prestigious National Environmental Education Advisory Council of the Environmental Protection Agency.

This reputation has been built above all by the HSUS division known as the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education (NAHEE). Originally called the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, NAHEE was set up with an endowment in 1973. In 1992, it had a budget of \$940,000 (up 30% over 1991) and 14 full-time staff.

The goals of NAHEE were articulated in the 1992 HSUS annual report as follows: "... NAHEE strives to ensure that humane attitudes become a viable part of mainstream education and environmental perspectives." This it strives to achieve by preparing its own materials, and by monitoring and evaluating "new children's books, children's magazines and newspapers, as well as all major elementary and secondary teaching magazines and newspapers to encourage the promotion of humane values in publications other than our own."

As examples of how NAHEE has influenced other publications, Cleveland points to "grossly misleading articles" biased against using animals in medical research which have appeared in *Weekly Reader*, with a circulation of 9 million, and its companion for middle schools, *Current Science*.

NAHEE's own production mill — which has sent educational materials to no fewer than 13 other countries — centres around the Kids in Nature's Defense (KIND) Club, and its publication *KIND News*, which has won several awards, including the *Partnerships in Education Journal's* 1990 Merit Award for

Collaborative Alliance, and the APEX '92 Award of Excellence. APEX awards are given for outstanding graphic design, editorial content and overall communications effectiveness.

KIND News is distributed to classrooms through the Adopt-A-Teacher program, by which organisations or individuals send donations relative in size to the number of teachers they want to adopt. Many local humane societies have "adopted" as many as 50 teachers in this way, and in 1992 the program was awarded a Certificate for Environmental Achievement by the National Environmental Awards Council.

KIND News is published at three reading levels for children in grades one through six, and covers what Cleveland calls "laudable humane and environmental themes." It does not broach animal rights issues. However, it is "laced with a heavy dose of respect for animals, endangered species and an emphasis on not harming animals."

More up front than *KIND News* is the accompanying teachers' guide, *KIND Teacher*, which raises animal rights issues without identifying them as such. According to Cleveland, *KIND Teacher* "indoctrinates the children by having the teacher lead discussions on the use of animals in dissection, the use of wild animals in laboratory research, the use of animals in product safety testing, the keeping of wild animals in zoos and circuses, the capture and sale of wild birds, hunting, trapping and rodeos."

Strand and Strand (p61) gives a more detailed account of the kind of material to be found in *KIND Teacher*:

"An interesting aspect of the newspaper [*KIND News*] is the teachers' guide that accompanies it. For example, in one guide, short stories from the animal's viewpoint relate their lives as entertainers. Teachers are instructed to read the animals' accounts of their lives to the students and have them write happier stories for the animals; the animals in the sketches are depicted as upset, overworked, or beaten during the course of their entertainment lives. Children are then instructed to make a list of ways people can entertain themselves without using animals. The surface agenda of the newspaper is one most parents would approve. The hidden agenda is one of developing attitudes that support the animal rights philosophy."

For middle and secondary students, NAHEE publishes the newspaper *The HSUS Student Action Guide*. This is more direct in its message, openly promoting activism by encouraging the formation of Earth-Animal-Protection clubs. "These clubs," says Cleveland, "target a number of animal rights issues including

laboratory animal research, product safety testing, dissection, animals in science fairs, zoos, animals in entertainment, hunting, trapping and dolphin safe tuna. The students are referred to HSUS to obtain specific misleading materials on these issues as well as animal research and so called alternatives to animal research."

Another educational package prepared by NAHEE and reported on in *Pennsylvania Sportsman* (October 1990) is *People and Animals — A Humane Education Guide*. This package reportedly requests teachers to show films such as *Love to Kill*, and read story books such as *The Hunting Trip*, by Robert Burch, and *Lafcadio, the Lion Who Shot Back*, by Shel Silverstein. In these materials, hunters are referred to as "selective exterminators" participating in a "blood sport" or a "war on wildlife." They are described as "drunken slobs" with "maniacal attitudes toward killing" and "a psychological need to dominate that can only be satisfied by killing."

The impact of such materials on young minds, or how many such minds they reach, is hard to quantify. HSUS claims *KIND News* is read by 790,000 children nationwide (1994 annual report), though how many children read each issue, or how many teachers make use of their free copies of *KIND Teacher* are not known. Certainly, not everyone is prepared to give HSUS the same "credit" as Cleveland.

In the November 1995 edition of *Animal People*, editor Merritt Clifton suggested the reach of *KIND News* could be far greater if HSUS were not so mean-spirited:

"Almost as useless [as organisations who consider 'education' to mean mass mailings to rented donor lists] are such entities as the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education ... whose *KIND News* is available to classrooms by paid subscription only. We know exactly how much it costs to publish and distribute such a newspaper, and we know that HSUS could send the appropriate edition of *KIND News* free to every schoolroom in America for less than it recently paid one corrupt vice president. The NAHEE endowment was willed to HSUS for just such an effort, to offset the barrage of free materials sent to classrooms by the hunting and animal agriculture industries. As we reported in October, the Illinois Department of Environmental Conservation is actually paying teachers to use pro-hunting and trapping propaganda — which must be countered."

But HSUS makes no pretense at being an altruistic organisation bent on changing the world overnight. Credibility, not altruism, will bring results in the long run, and it is the awards showered

NAHEE from the Education Press Association of America, the Partnerships in Education Journal, and Association Trends, that are true indicators of its success in penetrating the system.

For concerned parents like Cleveland, meanwhile, *something* is doing a good job of twisting the minds of America's children, and it has to be stopped. A national poll conducted by Gallup in 1993 found that 60% of American teenagers "support animal rights", including bans on all laboratory and medical tests that use animals. This finding Cleveland terms "alarming".

(For more information on NAHEE, see under "Organisation".)

Excluding the "Opposition"

Lest anyone fall into the trap of thinking HSUS merely wants to have its voice heard along with that of animal users, the following cameo illustrates how HSUS views the notion of letting educators and children decide for themselves. In a recent display of shameless hypocrisy, HSUS president Paul Irwin had the gall to berate the *government* for seeking to influence children's minds with a message he found unacceptable.

In February 1993, Irwin wrote to Secretary for Health and Human Services Donna Shalala objecting to educational materials distributed by Shalala's department, specifically a poster and lesson plans entitled *Let's Visit a Research Laboratory*, and a student brochure and accompanying teacher's guide entitled *Animals and Science*. The materials employed cartoons to explain the use of animals in laboratories, and referred to people who would ban such experiments as "extremists".

"These materials inappropriately target young people, who do not possess the cognitive ability to make meaningful decisions regarding highly controversial and complex issues such as the use of animals in biomedical research," complained Irwin.

"Moreover, the content is highly selective and at times misleading, revealing a biased and prejudicial point of view, not a balanced treatment of the subject. The materials fail to provide an accurate representation of animal experimentation and its limitations, and they dismiss the mainstream concept of 'alternatives' to the use of animals in research, in favor of the belittling and misleading term 'adjuncts.' ... Because of the bias and lack of fairness obvious in the above-named materials, and because the topic itself is highly controversial and therefore

inappropriate for young children, The HSUS calls upon the new administration to discontinue the use of public funds for the production, distribution, and promotion of this propaganda."

Irwin's self-righteous lament was echoed in *HSUS News* (spring 1993), which also contained the following quote from NAHEE executive director Patty Finch: "Teachers often receive biased materials in the classroom. But we don't expect our government to be the source of blatantly biased materials."

A call for the government to set higher standards than others in ensuring the balanced nature of classroom materials is disingenuous, to say the least, coming from a charity with tax-exempt status, a status granted in recognition of its role as a surrogate for the government.

Meanwhile, Irwin's assertion that a controversial issue such as biomedical research should not be raised with young people "who do not possess the cognitive ability to make meaningful decisions" suggests he is not familiar with HSUS's own publications.

In the September 1991 edition of *KIND Teacher* (an issue plucked at random from the pile), teachers are directed to ask their classes to express their views on 12 subjects, *including the testing of cosmetics on animals*. Suggested answers provided for the teacher include: "Hunting for sport is wrong," "Most people should spay or neuter their pets or pay a big fine," and "The steel-jaw leghold trap should be outlawed." "Uncontroversial" is not the word such answers bring to mind.

California's Environmental Education

As the previously mentioned cases involving *Weekly Reader* and *Current Science*, and the case detailed above, illustrate, NAHEE is not simply concerned with producing its own educational materials and leaving the rest to chance in the hands of "adopted" teachers. Through experience with NAHEE in his home state of California, Cleveland provides us a first-hand account of how NAHEE can influence major publicly-funded publications from within the system.

In its 1992 annual report, HSUS announced that certain NAHEE materials had been incorporated into *A Child's Place in the Environment*. California's new environmental education

curriculum guide. "The guide promises to have a substantial impact since one out of nine children in the U.S. attends school in California. In addition the guide will inevitably serve as a model nationwide," said the HSUS report.

Perturbed by this news, in 1993 Cleveland obtained a late draft from the California State Board of Education of the first-grade edition of a guide entitled *Respecting Living Things*. To his horror, three out of the nine people assigned to review the draft were affiliated with NAHEE, while one NAHEE field representative was on the guide committee.

Cleveland also found a "pronounced" animal rights bias in the lists of recommended reading at the end of several units. Half of them, he recalls, were animal rights books such as *The Animal Rights Handbook*, *67 Ways to Save the Animals* by Anna Sequoia and Animal Rights International, *The Animals Agenda* and *Going Green. A Kid's Handbook to Saving the Planet*.

Cleveland studied these resources and found them to contain "grossly misleading and dishonest presentations of how animals are used by humans and in some cases gory pictures of animals that are totally inappropriate for first graders."

Furthermore, under resources listed as "organizations concerned with Humane Treatment of Animals" were many animal rights organizations such as HSUS, NAHEE, The Fund for Animals, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), and the Animal Protection Institute of America.

A common theme that ran through the unit *Respecting Living Things* was that "animals were anthropomorphized and respected to the point that they were elevated to the same plane as humans," says Cleveland. Another theme was that out of respect for animals (including insects) they should not be captured and taken into the classroom for study — "Look Learn and Leave Alone".

He also found a poem contributed by NAHEE, entitled "Are You A Good Kind Lion", to epitomise "the heart of the disguised animal rights message." Two extracts from that poem read: "Don't hurt the animals for any reason," and "They're worried you'll hunt them, or on them you might feast."

Working with the California Biomedical Research Association, Cleveland took the case up with the State Board of Education.

Together, they succeeded in having all the animal rights groups and books listed as resources, and the NAHEE poem "Are You a Good Kind Lion", deleted prior to the guide's publication in 1994. The call not to capture any animals — even insects — for classroom examination was replaced with a discussion on the proper methods of capturing and caring for animals.

Cleveland calls this partial success "heartening", but warns that this episode "graphically illustrates how close animal rights activists came to having their philosophy accepted" as part of the nation's "largest and most influential" humane and environmental educational curriculum.

Using Local Humane Societies

Cleveland has also investigated the way in which HSUS — and other animal rights groups — can gain access to schoolchildren through representatives of local, respected humane societies.

One organisation he found to be mentioned often in the same context as HSUS/NAHEE is the Western Humane and Environmental Educators' Association (WHEEA), a grouping of "education officials" from more than 20 humane societies and SPCAs in the western US, mostly California.

According to Cleveland, WHEEA provides a framework for these educators to network and share classroom material on animal rights along with humane and environmental themes. At WHEEA's 1994 annual meeting, for example, the keynote speaker was Kim Sturla of the animal rights group Fund for Animals, while two HSUS representatives were there promoting *KIND News* and the Adopt-A-Teacher program. WHEEA's newsletter, *The Packrat*, is a bulletin board for animal rights educational material from a large number of animal rights groups such as: the American Anti-Vivisection Society, Animals Agenda, Animal Legal Defense Fund, Animal Rights Information Service, Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, Fund for Animals, HSUS, Last Chance for Animals, NAHEE, PETA, PETA Teachers Network, Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and the United Coalition of Iditarod Animal Rights Volunteers.

Cleveland explains the strategy of WHEEA thus:

"Most humane societies have one or more education officers who go to schools and teach children about proper pet care, humane treatment of animals, endangered species and environmentalism. Because most teachers perceive the local humane society to be an animal welfare

organization they are welcomed by the schools. WHEEA members take advantage of this relationship to introduce an animal rights message along with their regular presentations."

Center for Respect of Life and Environment

In the context of HSUS and education, one must also note the role of another division, the Center for Respect of Life and Environment (CRLE).

CRLE is headed by the flamboyant and controversial Michael Fox, HSUS's vice-president in charge of Bioethics and Farm Animal Protection, and reportedly was established for the express purpose of allowing him to promote his many radical views without detracting from the mainstream animal welfare image of the HSUS (see under "Organisation"; also "Fox, Michael").

Since 1991, CRLE has functioned as the higher-education companion to NAHEE. According to HSUS's annual report for 1994, in that year CRLE staff "responded to more than fifteen hundred requests for information related to careers and educational opportunities working for animals and the environment and for information on steps faculty and students can take to 'green' their colleges by making them more environmentally responsible."

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of CRLE (other than HSUS's habit of trying to distance itself from statements made by Fox), is the religious slant it introduces. As will be examined in the following section, religion plays a significant role in guiding HSUS policy — hardly surprising when one considers that its two top officers are former preachers.

To illustrate this melding of education and religious teaching, one of the chief programs of CRLE is the Theological Education to Meet the Environmental Challenge (TEMEC) program. According to HSUS's 1994 annual report, the TEMEC program provides "technical assistance and support to theological institutions that are implementing curricula that bring together a concern for the environment and a concern for social justice and humane, sustainable practices." Among the projects conducted under TEMEC in 1994 were three national conferences "that brought together leading theologians and religious scholars to explore effective responses to environmental challenges."

In moving on to look at HSUS and religion, it is necessary to consider the link between seemingly benign animal-welfare education for kids through KIND News, and its religious agenda for more mature minds. In the view of Pat Cleveland, education and religion are not separate agendas of HSUS, but parts of the same continuum:

"If the Catholic church had set out to indoctrinate public school children with a new moral value system imbedded in a humane and environmental curriculum, there would have been a huge outcry and controversy. A religious cult is indoctrinating public school children but there is little outcry or controversy because the religious overtones and the value system have been masked, the religion is called New Age, the value system is animal rights.

"Thomas Berry an 'Ecotheologian' and the 'Spiritual Guide' for HSUS's Center for Respect of Life and Environment was one of the several of the speakers at HSUS's 1992 annual meeting who focused on New Age themes of total reverence and respect for animals and the environment because the spirit of god was in the whole universe equally. Although totally open about the spiritual and religious aspects of their movement in the annual meeting, HSUS is careful not to present its *KIND News* as part of a religious movement."

HSUS AND RELIGION

I have not explored this area in depth, but several authors (including HSUS CEO John Hoyt) suggest it cannot be ignored if one is to have a full appreciation of how the leadership of the HSUS thinks.

In broaching the complex present-day relationship between religion, environmentalism and animals rights, *Trashing the Economy* offers the following as background (Arnold & Gottlieb, pp275-276):

Religion does not intersect environmentalism only at the animal rights node. We observe that a proposed "wedding of spirituality and ecology" has developed in American's [sic] religious community that extends well into the mainstream of the environmental movement. For example, the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City devoted its 1989 High Holy Day Message to the environment. The American Baptist Church and the United Methodist Church produced policy statements on the environment that urge the faithful to pursue ecologically sound lifestyles. The Presbyterian Church (USA) developed a similar statement. The Vatican's January 1990 World Day of Peace focused on the environment. The Roman Catholic Church also added "abuse of the environment" as a sin in its new universal catechism issued in 1992, the first new catechism in 426 years. ["A new Catholic catechism," by Alan Riding, New York Times, Nov. 17, 1992.]

In early 1990 astronomer Carl Sagan and twenty-two other well-known researchers appealed to world religious leaders to join scientists in protecting the environment. At a Moscow conference Sagan asserted "a religious as well as a scientific dimension" to the problems of global change. An appeal signed by the scientists said that "efforts to safeguard and cherish the environment need to be infused with a vision of the sacred." More than a thousand churchmen were present at the conference, which was jointly sponsored by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Russian Orthodox Church. The religious leaders hailed the scientists' appeal as a "unique moment and opportunity in the relationship of science and religion." [Seth Shulman, "Sagan appeals to world religious leaders," *Nature*, Vol. 343, Feb. 1, 1990.]

US News and World Report commented, "A marriage between religion and environmental concern makes intuitive sense to the many people who feel the divine most keenly in a natural setting. Clark Kellogg of New York's Riverside Church says that the closest he has ever come to God was while sitting in a warm spot high in the Sierra Nevadas. 'I realized that everything was wonderful — alive and connected — and I was a part of it,' he says. He is now helping to draft a declaration that would dictate the church to environmental action." [*U.S. News and World Report*, Nov. 27, 1989, pp66-67.]

Within this hodgepodge of greening mainstream religions one can also find some rather unexpected fringes, for example, Jews for Animal Rights (we didn't make this up), which promotes vegetarianism and provides materials for celebrating bar/bat mitzvahs, confirmations, and other holidays in accordance with animal rights principles; and the International Network for Religion and Animals (we didn't make this up, either), an association of Christians, Jews, Moslems, Buddhists and Hindu believers which seeks "to apply the moral principles of these religions to human interaction with animals, especially with regard to the treatment of experimental laboratory animals, animal products used as food, and animals used for clothing and entertainment purposes;" among many other similar organizations. [The Encyclopedia of Associations, 27th Edition - 1993, p1208.]

The greening of the Church is not a mere bandwagon effect: it reflects some serious theological complications. Some churchmen such as Lynn White, Jr. have suggested that arrogance toward nature is central to Judaism and Christianity and that survival depends upon nothing less than a drastic reformulation of basic theological tenets. White made the case that the Bible causes humans to exploit nature because it sets man above nature. Genesis holds that man was created in God's image, White wrote, and that God gave man dominance over all living creatures. True stewardship of the earth, advocates claim, would require that mankind yield its claim to the central place in creation and temper the quest for personal salvation. Paul Gorman of New York City's Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine said, "This is as radical a challenge to the Judeo-Christian tradition as Copernicus and Galileo."

Thus, it is not only along the animal rights axis that we find religious, moral and philosophical motivations. Even though Victor Scheffer did not posit a dimension of the sacred as one of the fundamentals in "Environmentalism's Articles of Faith," it does exist and it is powerful. It, like the environmental paradigm itself, appears to challenge rather than enhance notions of the sacred current in Western civilization.

When set against this background, the fact that the driving forces behind the HSUS — CEO John Hoyt and president Paul Irwin — are deeply religious men, takes on new significance. Both men attended Rio Grande College in Ohio, and Colgate Rochester Divinity School (for more details, see "Personality Profiles").

Before taking charge of the HSUS in 1970, Hoyt had a 13-year career in the ministry. Ordained a Baptist in 1957, he preached in Allen Park, Michigan, until 1960, when he moved to the First Presbyterian Church in Leroy, New York. He then served as senior minister at the Drayton Avenue Presbyterian Church in Ferndale, Michigan, until 1968, when he became senior minister at the First Presbyterian Church in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Irwin, an ordained United Methodist Minister, spent his pre-HSUS days "in ecclesiastical responsibilities in Massachusetts and New York," according to the official HSUS bio. "His principal focus was in professional education and internship for parish ministers in affiliation with Boston University School of Theology."

On pursuing their new careers in animal welfare and then animal rights, neither abandoned his religious calling. Among the many posts both men hold, Hoyt is a director of the HSUS affiliate the Interfaith Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature, while Irwin is a director of the American Bible Society.

In 1990, the Interfaith Council published the booklet Replenish the Earth — The Bible's Message of Conservation and Kindness to Animals: The blurb inside the cover describes the Council's mission as follows:

"The Interfaith Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature is composed of people of various religious faiths who are interested in the preservation of God's creation; that is, the natural environment and the other creatures with which we share this planet. It is our belief that the health of the earth's ecology, and the welfare of humanity, are inextricably linked."

In the pages that follow is an explanation, replete with abundant quotations, claiming to prove that, at the very least, the Bible advocates the humane treatment of animals and respect for the environment, with references also to passages suggesting man and animals are equal in the eyes of God. It would indeed be interesting to read reviews of this work, if any exist, by traditional Bible scholars. For the address to write for a copy of this publication, see "Organisation".

Other recommended reading on the subject comes from the horse's mouth, in John Hoyt's *Animals in Peril*. Since the thrust of this book is to discredit "sustainable use" in terms that most people can understand, and given the HSUS's demonstrated reluctance (re the public embracing of "animal rights") to express its true agenda overtly, it is possible that Hoyt understates his beliefs in the passage that follows. To determine whether this is so, further research is needed on the teachings of the Interfaith Council, always remembering that it is an affiliate of the HSUS. Following are pp218-222 from *Animals in Peril*:

Human Reverence for Animals

Through the ages, from the very beginning of recorded history, humans have demonstrated an interest in, and respect for, the welfare of animals. Such concern has often had a religious basis or manifestation; reverence toward animals has, from the dawn of civilization, characterized human societies throughout the world. Even today, there is deep within our psyches an arcane yet profound understanding that remembers our being part of nature and living alongside the animals. Some scientists believe that humans instinctively yearn for a renewal of this kinship with nature and our fellow creatures.

This "eco-spirituality" is reflected in many of the teachings of the world's major religions, as well as in the spirituality of indigenous peoples, who have traditionally respected and even revered animals as integral parts of their communities and cultures.

The World's Religions Teach Conservation

It is a little-known fact that all of the world's major faiths have, as important parts of their laws and traditions, teachings requiring protection of the environment, respect for nature and wildlife, and kindness to animals.

While it is well known that such tenets are part of some Eastern religions, such as Buddhism and Hinduism, there is also a largely forgotten but remarkably strong tradition of such teachings in Christianity, Judaism, and Islam.

All of these faiths recognize a doctrine of God's love for all creation, and for all of the living creatures of the world. The obligations of humans to respect and protect the natural environment and other life forms appears throughout the sacred writings of the prophets and leaders of the world's great religions. These tenets of "environmental theology" contained in the world's religions are little known and seldom discussed, much less widely observed or practiced. But the widespread contemporary ignorance of these teachings makes them no less important. Indeed, they are more relevant today than ever, for at a time when the earth faces a potentially fatal ecological crisis, traditional religion shows us a way to preserve our planet and the life forms living and dependent on it.

The Bible's Ecological Message

The early founders and followers of monotheism were filled with a sense of wonder, delight, and awe by the beauty of creation and the seeming wisdom of wild creatures. Indeed, nature and wildlife were sources of inspiration for many of the prophets of the Bible, and one cannot fully understand the scriptures on their

teachings and symbolism, without an appreciation for the natural environment that inspired so much of what appears in them.

The Bible clearly imparts a reverence for life — for God's creation, if you will — which humans were given the responsibility to care for as good stewards. It teaches that if we despoil nature, we are destroying God's handiwork and violating our sacred trust as its caretakers.

There is nothing in the Bible that would justify our modern-day policies and programs that despoil the land, desecrate the environment, and destroy entire species of wildlife. Such actions clearly violate God's commands to humans to "replenish the earth," to conserve natural resources, and to treat animals with kindness, as well as subverting God's instructions to the animals to "be fruitful and multiply" and fill the earth.

In contrast, there are various laws requiring the protection of natural resources to be found in the Mosaic law, including passages mandating the preservation of fruit trees (Deuteronomy 20:19, Genesis 19:23-25); agricultural lands (Leviticus 25:2-4); and wildlife (Deuteronomy 22:6-7, Genesis 9). The Bible often refers to the impressive intelligence of wild creatures, such as in Jeremiah 8:7-8, Proverbs 6:6-8 and 30:24-8, Numbers 22:22-35, and Isaiah 1:3. Numerous other Biblical passages extol the wonders of nature and teach kindness to animals — even including the Ten Commandments, which require that farm animals be allowed to rest on the Sabbath.

Eastern Religions' Reverence for Life

Some Eastern religions are even more emphatic in advocating or requiring respect for animals. Both Hinduism and Buddhism are well known for teaching concern and compassion for all living creatures and for the sanctity of nature and the earth. Such precepts are the cornerstones of these faiths. What is not as widely appreciated is that the Muslim religion, in its laws and traditions, contains extremely strict prohibitions against cruelty to animals and destruction of the natural environment. The Prophet Mohammed taught that animals and natural resources, such as trees, should always be treated with reverence, and that respect for nature is extremely important.

Such principles are, unfortunately, not as widely practiced as they are preached; but there has been some useful application of them. Several groups worldwide are working to apply Buddhist ideals to current problems facing animals and the environment. In October 1985, Buddhist leaders from Thailand and Tibet announced that they were joining forces to try to halt the destruction of the natural environment, calling on Buddhists everywhere to join the campaign. These efforts have been endorsed and supported by the Dalai Lama and other Buddhist leaders worldwide.

Buddhist perspectives have already been effective in influencing the policies of governments and populations of some Asian nations. For example, Sri Lanka has over 17 million people, 70 percent of them Buddhist and 20 percent Hindu. Although the nation is poor and overpopulated, it is still "a country of wildlife, a place where people and wildlife have lived together in a system of mutual tolerance for centuries," according to Dr. Chatsumarn Kabilsingh of Thammasat University in Bangkok, Thailand. Kabilsingh writes:

"Buddhist teachings emphasize the importance of coexisting with nature rather than conquering it. Devout Buddhists admire a conserving lifestyle rather than one which is profligate.

"The very core of Buddhism evolves around compassion, encouraging a better respect for and tolerance of every human being and living thing sharing the planet.

"Wherever Buddhism is influential, studies will usually show some direct benefit for the natural world. In Sri Lanka, predominantly Buddhist, crowded by Western standards, wildlife has not been virtually eliminated as it has been in many parts of the world. The reason, according to researchers, is the country's largely religious and devout population.

"Formal protection generally results from government action, but such actions, it is felt, would never have made much effect if they were not readily accepted by the people. Successful conservation there is based on deep philosophical convictions." [Chatsumarn Kabilsingh, "How Buddhism Can Help Protect Nature," *Tree of Life: Buddhism and Protection of Nature (Buddhist Perception of Nature, Hong Kong, 1987)*, p7]

In Thailand, Buddhist influence has helped conserve much of the native wildlife. Dr. Kabilsingh observes that the last remaining refuge for the nation's open-billed storks is Wat Phai Lom, a Buddhist temple near Bangkok:

"Open-billed storks would be extinct in Thailand but for the fact their last remaining breeding ground is within the sanctuary of this temple. Ecologists point out it is scientifically important to save this species, whose sole diet is a local, rice-devouring species of snail. Without the storks, the snails would proliferate, then pesticides would be brought in, and an unnecessary, poisonous cycle would go into effect.

"Buddhist precepts of personal and social conduct can take much of the credit for saving the open-billed stork in Thailand ... It is likely that, like the open-billed stork, much of what still survives of the natural world here is linked, in varying degrees, to the influence of Buddhism, the philosophy's focus on awareness, attitudes, and actions which should never harm, and ideally should actively help, all life on earth." [Ibid.]

In order to save the rain forests of northeast Thailand, Buddhist monks have even "ordained" trees, clothing them in the sacred orange robes [sic] of holy men in an effort to make the cutting of a tree tantamount to the unpardonable sin of killing a monk.

Many of India's most successful and prosperous citizens are adherents of Jainism, a religion so strict in its avoidance of harming living creatures that Jainist monks, when walking outside, wear masks over their mouths and sweep the paths in front of them to avoid inhaling or crushing insects. The Jains have built animal structures and hospitals throughout the country, where stray and injured camels, cows, water buffalo, pigeons, parrots, and other creatures are cared for.

With some 2 billion Buddhists, Hindus, and Moslems in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, there is obviously great potential for stimulating a spiritually based appreciation for nature and wildlife in much of the Third World.

Indigenous Peoples' Respect for Animals

Many other religions, including the Baha'i faith and those of Native Americans, Amazon Indian tribes, and other indigenous peoples, stress the sanctity of nature, and the need to conserve wildlife, forests, plants, water, fertile land, and

Native American peoples were shocked by the Europeans' callous and destructive attitude toward what the Native Americans considered kindred creatures and sacred land. The feelings of many of them were expressed eloquently (if apocryphally) in words popularly attributed to Chief Sealth of the Duwamish tribe in Washington state in the mid-1800s. He is purported to have pleaded with the Europeans about to take his land to preserve it and cherish it, saying:

"If I decide to accept your offer to buy our land, I will make one condition. The white man must treat the beasts of this land as his brothers. I am a savage and do not understand any other way ... What is a man without the beasts? If all the beasts are gone, men would die from great loneliness of spirit, for whatever happens to the beasts also happens to man." [Lewis Regenstein, *Replenish the Earth*, pp229-32.]

One of our best opportunities to preserve wildlife and wilderness, and to gain the support of local people in this struggle, is to respect, promote, and help support the reverence toward animals and nature of faiths and cultures the world over. We do not have to invent new religions or philosophies in order to save the planet; we just have to return to the roots of our old ones.

2) FINANCIAL

EXECUTIVES

(As reported in HSUS News, Fall 1995)

Officers

O.J. Ramsey	Chairman of the board
Coleman Burke	Chairman emeritus
David Wiebers	Vice chairman
Amy Freeman Lee	Secretary
John Hoyt	Chief executive
Paul Irwin	President
G. Thomas Waite	Treasurer
Patricia Forkan	Executive vice president
Roger Kindler	Vice president, general counsel

Staff vice presidents

Richard Clugston	Higher Education
Michael Fox	Bioethics & Farm Animal Protection
John Grandy	Wildlife & Habitat Protection
Randall Lockwood	Training Initiatives
Wayne Pacelle	Government Affairs & Media
Deborah Salem	Publications
Martin Stephens	Animal Research Issues
David Willis	Investigations (since fired)
Murdaugh Stuart Madden	Senior Counsel

Directors

Donald Cashen
Anita Coupe
Judi Friedman
Harold Gardiner
Alice Garey
Jane Goodall
Julian Hopkins
Jennifer Leaning
Amy Freeman Lee
Eugene Lorenz
Jack Lydman
Virginia Lynch
William Mancuso
Thomas Meinhardt
O J Ramsey

James Ross
 Marilyn Seyler
 Paula Smith
 John Taft
 Carroll Thrift
 Robert Welborn
 David Wiebers
 Marilyn Wilhelm
 K. William Wiseman

EXECUTIVE SALARIES

1994 Executive Salaries

John Hoyt	CEO	\$226,704 plus housing
Paul Irwin	President/treasurer	\$210,256
John Grandy	Vice president	\$108,122
Patricia Forkan	Vice president	\$107,744
Rodger Kindler	Vice president	\$99,130
G. Thomas Waite	Treasurer	\$98,766
David Wills	Vice president	\$93,311 (now fired)
Michael Fox	Vice president	\$86,157
Kenneth White	Vice president	\$73,076 (now departed)
Arthur Keefe	Director of development	\$72,419 (now departed)
Randall Lockwood	Vice president	\$71,546
Murdaugh Madden	Vice president	\$70,636
Katherine Benedict	Director of administration	\$68,345
Richard Clugston	Vice president	\$64,361
Martin Stephens	Vice president	\$63,665
Ferris Kaplan	Marketing director	\$61,144
Deborah Salem	Vice president	\$59,438
Janet Frake	Assistant secretary	\$55,726
David Ganz	Consultant	\$53,000
Marcia Glaser	Assistant secretary	\$44,473
Wayne Pacelle	Vice president	\$43,241
Asa Orsino	Senior vice president	\$42,228

Notes:

- i) Salaries 1990-93, as reported in *The Animals' Agenda*, March 1991, *Animal People*, December 1992, December 1993, December 1994.
- ii) 1994 salaries as reported in *Animal People*, December 1995.
- iii) Salaries include benefit plan contributions.
- iv) By way of comparison, in 1993 Hoyt ranked fifth and Irwin ninth on *Animal People's* comprehensive list of top-paid staff in "major national animal and habitat protection groups." Top of the list was Russell Train of WWF, who retired that year on a salary of \$349,660 which included a lump-sum retirement benefit of \$300,000. Second was David Ganz, then president of the North Shore Animal League, whose salary of \$313,588 included severance pay. Ganz now works for the HSUS.

Missing from 1993 Listing

The following salaries were provided by *Animal People* in its December 1993 edition, but these names are missing from its 1994 listing, despite the fact that at least some are known to be still employed HSUS. Patty Finch, for example, works for NAHEE, while Betsy Dribben works for HSI. It seems likely, therefore, that they are now being paid through these subsidiaries, which would make the actual list of highly paid executives significantly longer than indicated above.

Jan Hartke	Vice president	\$87,115
Tom Waite	Assistant treasurer	\$84,384
Marc Paulos	Vice president	\$68,657
Patty Finch	Vice president	\$59,330
Ben Hayes	Director of membership	\$54,176
Charlene Drennon	Regional director	\$51,638
Leesteffy Jenkins	Consultant	\$43,749
Betsy Dribben	Consultant	\$40,000
PLUS 40 more persons		\$30,000+

Top Executive Salaries 1990-94 (US\$)

	'90	'91	'92	'93	'94
Hoyt	146,927 (H, 4)	n.a. (H, 4)	172,442 (H, 9)	210,611 (H, 5)	226,704 (H, 3)
Irwin	123,301 (9)	n.a. (11)	156,656 (13)	195,288 (9)	210,256 (6)

Notes:

(1) Salaries include benefit plan contributions. IRS 990 filings under "Salary" for Hoyt and Irwin for calendar 1994 were \$197,000 and \$186,039, respectively. To these are added filings under "Contributions to Employee Benefit Plan" of \$29,704 and \$24,207, respectively.

(2) Rankings among top animal and habitat protection groups in the US, including top officers of zoos, are shown in parentheses. 1991 rankings are based on 1990 salaries (see below). As some surveys are broader than others, changes in ranking are not significant.

(3) "H" denoted housing included.

(4) HSUS executive salaries for 1991 were omitted from the IRS Form 990 filed with the New York State Charities Bureau, even though they are required by law. At the end of 1991, HSUS became a division of the newly formed HSI. Hoyt was promoted to presidency of HSI and Irwin was promoted to the presidency of HSUS. Both are believed to have received substantial raises at this time.

"OBSCENE SALARY WATCH"

Literature distributed by animal rights/welfare organisations in the US is peppered with derogatory references to the high salaries of executives in large organisations, and the following advertisement in the September 1995 issue of *Animal People* indicates someone wants to do something about it:

OBSCENE SALARIES

Recent articles in *Animal People* and *Vegetarian Times* revealed outrageous salaries and perks at HSUS and other groups collecting funds to help animals.

Boards of Directors should be made accountable for this greed.
Suggestions welcome.

Send stamped, self-addressed envelope for networking and action.

OBSCENE SALARY WATCH, PO Box 168, Gualala, CA 95445.

I wrote to this organisation on Nov. 27 offering to exchange information and ideas, and am awaiting a response. Others may also be interested in writing or passing this address on.

FINANCIAL DEALINGS/IRREGULARITIES

The most recent annual financial report of the HSUS is presented in the Summer 1995 issue of "*HSUS News*". This includes the "Statement of Financial Position" as of December 31, 1994, and the "Statement of Revenue and Expenditures" for the year ended December 31, 1994. Principal figures (rounded off to the nearest \$100) are as follows:

Statement of Financial Position (1993 in parentheses)

Total assets:	\$42,240,600 (\$41,335,500)
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$42,240,600 (\$41,335,500)

Statement of Revenue and Expenditures (1993 in parentheses)

Revenue	
Contributions & grants:	\$17,072,400 (\$15,460,100)
Bequests:	\$4,033,600 (\$5,688,500)
Investment income:	\$2,229,400 (\$2,735,710)
Sale of literature and other income	\$1,040,937 (\$606,800)

Expenditures

Animal-Protection Programs:

Public education, membership information, and publications	\$9,986,300	(\$6,552,700)
Cruelty investigations and regional offices	\$2,753,500	(\$2,674,600)
Wildlife, animal habitat, and sheltering programs	\$2,608,600	(\$2,197,100)
Youth-education programs	\$1,071,100	(\$1,016,200)
Legal assistance, litigation, legislation and government relations	\$1,330,400	(\$1,049,500)
Bioethics and farm animals	\$705,700	(\$713,200)
Gifts and Grants to Other Humane Organizations:	\$247,800	
Payments to Annuitants:	\$168,900	(\$160,800)
Supporting Services:		
Management and general	\$1,887,200	(\$1,936,800)
Membership development	\$1,197,100	(\$2,721,900)
Fund-raising	\$2,277,800	(\$1,681,400)
Total Expenditures:	\$24,227,184	(\$21,013,200)
Excess of Revenue Over Expenditures:	\$149,200	(\$3,478,000)

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

The following financial data are condensed versions of information provided on HSUS's IRS Form 990 filings. Percentages indicate the proportion of the budget used for overheads (incl. fundraising) as reported to the IRS. However, it is important to note that the IRS allows charities to write off some direct-mail fundraising costs as program services under the headings of "membership development" and "public education" (see "Abuse of Tax-Exempt Status").

The Notes provided are important and come from analyses in the publications *Animals' Agenda* and *Animal People*. They indicate how the proportion of the budget allocated to overheads would change if the reporting guidelines of the National Charities Information Bureau were applied. The adjusted figures are from the above publications, not from the NCIB itself.

The NCIB, like HSUS, is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organisation. It is a public service, based in New York, which functions as a consumer advisory body for people who want to donate to charities, helping them to avoid scams or front organisations. Its reporting requirements are stricter than those of the IRS; however, it has no enforcement powers.

Specifically, the NCIB requires approved charities to spend at least 60% of their budgets on program services, not including direct-mail fundraising. Unlike the IRS, it does not allow charities to write off direct-mail fundraising costs as program services.

When HSUS's figures for 1994 were adjusted in accordance with NCIB reporting guidelines, the percentage of the budget spent on overheads more than doubled, to 46%, which should earn it a black mark under the NCIB's "Basic Standards in Philanthropy". This is not exceptional, however. According to *Animal People*, WWF and the International Fund for Animal Welfare routinely exceed the 40% limit.

1994	
Budget	\$23,265,940
Programs	\$16,276,528
Overhead	\$4,860,461 (21%)
Assets	\$39,829,156
Fixed	\$9,734,164
Cash/securities	\$30,226,476

Note: For 1994, *Animal People* did not include an explanation but merely a percentage for overhead when adjusted to comply with NCIB guidelines. The revised percentage on overhead was 46%.

1993	
Budget	\$20,381,958
Programs	\$12,383,942
Overhead	\$5,547,806 (27%)
Assets	\$41,335,492
Fixed	\$9,241,994
Cash/securities	\$30,008,802

Note: For 1993, *Animal People* did not include an explanation but merely a percentage for overhead when adjusted to comply with NCIB guidelines. The revised percentage on overhead was 33%.

1992	
Budget	\$18,902,292
Programs	\$11,990,618
Overhead	\$5,909,029 (31%)
Assets	\$36,465,350
Fixed	\$9,150,215
Cash/securities	\$26,237,918

Note: HSUS allocated \$888,725 in direct mail costs to program services. Reallocating this amount indicates a balance of 64% for programs, 36% for overhead.

1991	
Budget	\$17,115,911
Programs	\$14,074,765
Overhead	\$2,536,310 (18%)
Assets	\$30,007,837
Fixed	\$8,590,066
Cash/securities	\$19,208,184

Note: HSUS spent \$5,679,769 on "public education, membership information, and publication," much of which was in connection with fundraising. Because key lines were left blank on the Form 990 and because essential attachments were missing, it is impossible to ascertain how this amount was allocated between program services and fundraising.

1990	
Budget	\$16,485,209
Programs	\$13,852,985
Overhead	\$2,632,224 (16%)
Assets	\$25,832,300

Fixed	\$2,726,277
Cash/securities	\$21,370,331

Note: HSUS allocated to programs \$5,296,342 spent on public education, membership information, and publications, most of which involved direct-mail fundraising appeals. Reallocating the amount produces a balance of 52% for programs and 48% for overhead.

1989	
Budget	\$13,560,523
Programs	\$11,125,666
Overhead	\$2,434,857 (18%)
Assets	\$22,897,352
Fixed	\$2,572,831
Cash/securities	\$18,598,727

**Cash Contributions to Other Charitable Organisations in
Calendar 1994 (U.S. \$)**

(Source: Federal Form 990)

Advocates for Animals	1,300
American Fondouk Maintenance	1,300
Animal Rights International	15,000 ⁽¹⁾
<i>Animals' Agenda</i>	2,500
Animals' Crusaders, Inc., The	1,300
Asociacion Uruguaya de Proteccion a Los Animales	1,300
Assistance Aux Animaux	1,300
Bellerive — Into the Blue	775.40
Between the Species	1,000
Blue Cross of India	1,300
Brooke Hospital for Animals	3,300
CACDA — Contribution	500
Chai	3,000
Clatsop County Animal Control	500
County Wicklow Society for Animal Protection	1,300
Deutsche Tierfreunde EV	1,300
Dublin Society for the Prevention of Cruelty	1,300
Dyrebeskyttelsen Norge	1,000
Earth Communication Office	1,666.67
Earth Island — H. Uplinger	166.66
Eden Surviv — all	3,000
E. Magazine Ad (Jan/Feb)	12,639.20
Ferne Animal Sanctuary	1,300
Friends of Dogs	1,300
Friends Washoe	2,500
Fur Bearers, The	1,300
Global Comm — M. Fox	3,500
Global Tomorrow Coalition	2,100
Great Ape Project	5,000
Green World Center	400
Guan Animals in Need	1,300
Hellenic Animal Welfare Society	1,300
Humane Society of Nacogdoches County	1,300

ICI — Sustain Future	2,000
International Development Conference	5,000
International Society for Animal Rights	1,300
J. Hoyt — Krause/Cheeta	110
J. Omogo — Kiopa	100
J. Wauer Exp — J#233	5,000
Lake City Animal Shelter	1,300
Land Stewardship Project	200
League Conservation Voters	20,000
Ligue Française Des Droits de L'Animal	1,300
Maile	600
Mississippi Animal Rescue	1,000
Missouri Antivivisection Society	1,300
Montgomery County Humane Society	200
National Equine Defence League	1,300
National Humane Education Society	1,300
Nordic Society Against Painful Experiments on Animals	1,300
Oregon Bear — Initiative	50,000
Oregon Bear/Cougar Coalition	75,000
Pacific Orca Society	2,500
Pelican Man's Bird Sanctuary	1,400
People's Dispensary for Sick Animals	1,300
Pets — Contribution/Sponsorship	750
Pythagoras, Vienna, Austria	1,300
Renew America	1,000
Riverdale Ctr. — T. Berry	250
RNRF — 94 Member	1,000
SAWA — Expo Contribution	1,000
Shewmaker Animal Hospital	495.77
Spay/Neuter USA	500
Society for the Protection of Animals	1,300
SPCA National Council of Southern Africa	1,300
SPCA of Illinois	1,387.36
SPCA of Massachusetts	5,000
Stop the Overpopulation of Pets	1,300
Svenska Djurskyddforenin	1,000
T. Cook — Inst Psychiatry	1,003.50
Tierschutzverein Fur Berlin	1,300
World Society for the Protection of Animals	5,500
WSPA	14,725
WSPA — Evans for vehicle	30,000
WSPA — Bosnia Rabies Epic	3,000
Zero Population Growth	2,500

Contributions attributed to affiliated organisations	327,169.56
	28,497

	\$298,673

Note:

1) Founder and director: Henry Spira. Advisory Committee includes John Hoyt and Paul Irwin of HSUS.

ABUSE OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

HSUS is classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)3 organisation, which means, among other things, that it is tax-exempt. Heads of such organisations provided me with the information in the following paragraph which is quite specific with regard to how 501(c)3 organisations can operate. However, I failed to locate the wording in pertinent legislation explaining any of the points contained in the following paragraph, despite a fairly extensive search at the Library of Congress. A check would therefore be recommended before using this information.

501(c)3 organisations are not supposed to be advocacy groups per se, but this requirement is applied realistically. The Internal Revenue Service recognises that just by the fact that people form a group based around a common idea, they will in fact advocate a cause. Therefore, 501(c)3 organisations are allowed to spend 6% of their budget advocating causes. There is also an exception allowing an organisation to spend up to 20% on advocacy, averaged over a five-year period. However, an organisation cannot campaign on behalf of or against specific legislators or pieces of legislation.

Several animal-use organisations such as the Fur Commission USA (see below) do not believe HSUS satisfies these requirements, and at least two are attempting to apply political pressure with the goal of having HSUS's 501(c)3 status reviewed.

These efforts are being conducted in parallel with a review under way in Congress of the advocacy role played by organisations which receive federal funds. In July 1995, an amendment to the FY'96 Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Bill was approved by the House Appropriations Committee that would prohibit non-profit organisations and companies receiving federal grants from using those funds for political advocacy, and place strict limits on advocacy by grantees using funds other than federal grants, similar to the limits already applied (in theory) to 501(c)3 organisations. A Senate version of the bill was under consideration.

"Congress has the responsibility to separate true charities from political action groups," said one of the sponsors of the House bill, Ernest Istook, at a news conference on July 24, 1995. "Taxpayers shouldn't be forced to sponsor lobbying groups which disguise themselves as nonprofits."

Although this proposed change in legislation is not aimed at organisations like HSUS (which receives no federal grants), it does seek to define political advocacy, which currently has no definition in U.S. law. The amendment would include under political advocacy not only engaging in partisan politics and lobbying, but also seeking to influence executive or judicial decisions at the federal, state and local levels of government. Such a definition, once written into law, could prove a powerful tool in attacking all non-profits which engage in excessive advocacy.

Attention is also being drawn by animal-user groups to the ways in which organisations such as HSUS use imaginative accounting practices to hide how much they really spend on lobbying. According to its IRS Form 990, in calendar 1994 HSUS admitted to spending \$865,502 on lobbying, of which \$750,452 went on "direct lobbying" and the remainder on "grass roots lobbying". With a total budget that year of \$23,265,940, this means HSUS spent just 3.7% of its budget on lobbying — well within the limit.

This does not seem to jive with reality, however. As Patti Strand of the National Animal Interest Alliance perceives it (personal communication): "They [HSUS] don't do anything for animals. It's all fundraising and advocacy."

The difficulty in demonstrating this derives from the extreme flexibility the IRS allows non-profits in reporting their expenditures. Perhaps the most insidious tactic in recent years has been to write off direct mail campaigns as "public education", allowing them to spend ever more on fundraising while appearing to spend more on programs. According to *Animal People* (October 1995), in 1994 "about a third of all humane groups doing national direct mail solicitation called some of it 'public education,' and the program expense figures they provided to donors were correspondingly bogus."

And the cycle is a vicious one. *Animal People* continues: "As more groups get away with such tactics, the pressure on others to do likewise — to stay competitive — becomes more intense. The volume of funding going to humane causes increases, in small increments, year after year, but the share going to the direct mail mills grows faster, leaving less to the groups which instead of focusing on fundraising get on about their work."

And in the case of direct mailings and publications, a single page can contain not only informative text ("education") juxtaposed with a solicitation ("fundraising"), but also unashamed advocacy. HSUS publications combine "education" with advocacy all the time, and are never without a solicitation. Yet how it chooses to report associated publishing costs on its IRS returns is anyone's guess. In 1994, under its Statement of Revenue and Expenditures, any one of the following three categories could have been used to disguise the cost of advocacy materials: Public education, membership information, and publications; Membership development; and Fund-raising. In this particular Statement, there is no category for advocacy, so there is no way of telling even where the \$865,502 HSUS admitted to spending on lobbying elsewhere in the tax filing is included.

HSUS advocacy in human form — readily apparent on Capitol Hill whenever bills relating to wildlife are under discussion — are plain to see, but hard to assess in terms of cost if they are full-time staffers with other tasks (as opposed to professional lobbyists). A clearer picture of how important HSUS views advocacy can be derived from its many publications, which not only report on HSUS's lobbying activities but in doing so, add greatly to that lobbying effort.

In its highest-profile publication, the monthly *HSUS News*, the fall 1995 edition provides the following clear-cut cases of advocacy related to specific items of legislation, either extant or that HSUS would like to see introduced:

- The Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992 is declared "a success!". The act came up for reauthorization this autumn, and we are told HSUS presented testimony to Congress in September on its efficacy.
- HSUS reports that it has been lobbying for legislation "that would greatly reduce the suffering of horses being transported to slaughter in the United States."
- HSUS reports that it "actively supported" the introduction of ordinances prohibiting performing wildlife in Hollywood, Florida and Quincy, Massachusetts, and was pressuring New York State to ban performing elephants.
- HSUS reports that it has filed suit against the National Marine Fisheries Service, charging it with having failed to take actions required under the Endangered Species Act to protect sea turtles.
- HSUS announces its intention to sue the Fish and Wildlife Service over its decision in March to remove three species of kangaroo from the Endangered Species Act list of endangered and threatened species.

- A full-page report attacks what HSUS considers federal government subsidisation of "industries that harm animals". These include: the spending of "large sums each year to promote the trophy hunting in Africa of hundreds of species by wealthy Americans" (an attack on the U.S. Agency for International Development); the annual appropriation of "millions of dollars to the Animal Damage Control Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a program whose agents systematically kill predators on public lands to benefit the livestock industry"; and an "outrageous giveaway" by the USDA of \$2 million annually to the U.S. mink industry "for fashion shows and other promotional activities" as part of the Market Promotion Program (MPP). "Determined to eliminate the subsidy" to mink farmers, HSUS reports that it had worked with named Congressmen to amend the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, through which the MPP is funded. The report concludes: "The HSUS presumes that its members will contact their senators, urging the elimination of the mink subsidy," and provides a contact number for the HSUS Government Affairs department so members can find out how their Senators voted.
- A full-page report expresses HSUS's support for an initiative by a group of Representatives and Senators demanding that the U.S. Department of Agriculture enact stricter regulations governing the welfare of dogs in "puppy mills".
- A two-page report details HSUS's efforts to have state legislatures enact stricter or new animal welfare legislation, and expresses its approval or otherwise of a score or so specific pieces of legislation under the title "Victories for Good Bills, Defeats for Bad Ones."
- A three-page report on the keeping of exotic and wild pets concludes: "Speak out against laws that make exotic- and wild-animal ownership easier and more accessible. If your locality introduces legislation to restrict exotic- and wild-animal ownership, be sure to voice your support for such legislation."
- A three-page report entitled "Trophy of Death" attacks trophy hunting by Americans in Africa and argues for strengthening of the Endangered Species Act to restrict species that can be imported to the U.S. as trophies. The Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and Rep. Don Young, "one of Congress's most avid hunters" and chairman of the House Resources Committee, are singled out for implicit criticism. HSUS reports that it presented a report (see "Zimbabwe: Driving Wildlife to Extinction") to a Senate subcommittee holding a hearing on the ESA, "which demonstrated to the subcommittee that even the current ESA allows too many foreign endangered and threatened species to be imported, and that if anything, the ESA needs to be strengthened in this area."
- A three-page attack on GATT, entitled "What Laws Are at Risk?", names U.S. laws which could be undermined: the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the High Seas Driftnet Fisheries Enforcement Act, the Sea Turtles Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, and the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.
- HSUS urges members to give their "full support" to the Bear Protection Act introduced to Congress, and names the sponsors of the House and Senate versions.

Even more up front about encouraging members to become involved in the political process is the quarterly newsletter *Animal Activist Alert*, made up entirely of articles on specific pieces of legislation telling readers exactly what to do to ensure the desired result. The following is just a sampling of three items out of seven under the title "Legislative Lineup" in the 1995 edition Vol. XIII, Issue 2:

AGRICULTURE/FARM ANIMALS

H.R. 263

SPONSOR: Andrew Jacobs (D-IN) **PURPOSE:** To amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane living conditions for veal calves. **STATUS:** Introduced 1/4/95. Referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Has 2 cosponsors; needs more. **ACTION NEEDED:** SUPPORT — Write to your representative and ask him/her to sign on as a cosponsor. Write to your senators and ask them to introduce a similar bill in the Senate.

COMPANION ANIMALS

H.R. 1619

SPONSOR: Susan Molinari (R-NY) and Carolyn Maloney (D-NY) **PURPOSE:** The National Senior Citizen Pet Ownership Protection Act. To prohibit the owners and managers of federally assisted rental housing from preventing elderly and disabled residents of such housing from having pets. **STATUS:** Introduced 5/11/95. Referred to the Banking and Financial Services Committee. Needs cosponsors. **ACTION NEEDED:** SUPPORT — Write to your representative and ask him/her to sign on as a cosponsor.

WILDLIFE

H.R. 353

SPONSOR: John Edward Porter (R-IL) **PURPOSE:** The Black Bear Protection Act of 1995. To prohibit the export of black-bear viscera. **STATUS:** Introduced 1/4/95. Referred jointly to the House International Relations, Resources, and Ways and Means Committees. Has 27 cosponsors; needs more. **ACTION NEEDED:** SUPPORT — Write to your representative and ask him/her to sign on as a cosponsor. Write to your senators and ask them to introduce a similar bill in the Senate.

But it was a quarter-page advertisement in the *Washington Post* (Sept. 12, 1995) that finally made the Fur Commission USA snap. The advertisement coincided with a report in *HSUS News*, fall 1995, attacking the Market Promotion Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (see above). The text of the advertisement ran as follows:

Your Tax Dollars For Luxury Mink Coats? Get Real

THAT'S RIGHT. While the average taxpayer is getting squeezed, our deficit has skyrocketed and we're cutting the federal budget — some want to continue a taxpayer subsidy to the mink industry.

Since 1989, \$13.2 million of your tax dollars have gone to the Mink Export Development Council for overseas fashion shows and advertising.

THAT'S WRONG. And that is why the U.S. House of Representatives voted 232-160 on July 21, 1995 to eliminate the taxpayer subsidy to the mink industry.

NOW IT IS UP TO THE U.S. SENATE

"a total waste..." Salem, OR, Statesman Journal

"a taxpayer subsidy for the luxury fur market is absurd..." Charleston, SC, The Post and Courier

"There is too much pork. And pork in mink coats is much too much." South Bend Tribune

Stop The Fleecing Of The American Taxpayer. Call Your Senators Today.

In response to the above advertisement, the Fur Commission USA issued a press release on the same day:

FUR COMMISSION USA CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) should be investigated by Congress for abusing its tax-exempt charitable status by running political ads and engaging in intensive lobbying efforts, according to Fur Commission USA (FCUSA) officials. The group represents U.S. fur farmers.

In letters to Senators Larry Craig (R-ID) and Alan Simpson (R-WY), FCUSA Chairman Skip Lea said a September 12 HSUS ad which appeared in the *Washington Post* was a clear abuse of the organization's tax-exempt status. The ad called for elimination of federal programs to promote agricultural exports, including mink. The two Senators are preparing legislation which would restrict the ability of tax-exempt organizations to use federal funds for political advocacy. Similar legislation passed in August in the House. Congressman David McIntosh (R-IN), who co-sponsored the House measure, said it was intended to prevent charities from using tax dollars to "walk the halls of Congress ... masquerading as charities."

"Most taxpayers would be shocked to know that their tax dollars are being used to promote the extreme, animals-first agenda of animal rights organizations like the HSUS," said Lea. "This is an organization whose leadership has said, 'The life of an ant and the life of my child should be accorded equal respect.' This anti-human value system is completely out of step with the values of mainstream America."

Lea said the HSUS is guilty of "the ultimate hypocrisy" in attacking the mink export program. "Here's a group which has lived off its tax-exempt status for years, using tax dollars to attack everything from bacon and egg breakfasts to the breeding of pets and the use of animals in life-saving medical research. Now they're watchdogs for the taxpayer? Get real."

Research tip: For information on the progress of proposed legislation to prevent the use of federal funds for political advocacy, contact the office of Senator Istook on: (202) 225-2132. The press officer is Steve Jones.

Research tip: Fur Commission USA: Tel.: (612) 222-1080; Fax: (612) 293-0532. Press officer: Christine Dennis.

THE JACK ANDERSON AFFAIR

In September 1988, syndicated columnist Jack Anderson wrote a series of pieces alleging impropriety by then-president of HSUS John Hoyt and then-vice-president Paul Irwin, which appeared in the *Washington Post*, among other publications (see "Excessive Pay at Humane Society", and "Dubious Deals in the Humane Society"). Anderson reported that Hoyt and Irwin had undertaken financial transactions with their employers which resulted in significant personal gain, without the knowledge of HSUS's full board. He also reported that the board had hired two law firms to conduct independent investigations of HSUS's finances. Both probes revealed that the top officers received significant compensation in addition to their salaries, while one found this to threaten HSUS's tax-exempt status.

Anderson reported that in 1987, HSUS bought Hoyt's home for \$310,000, while Irwin wrote himself \$85,000 in cheques as reimbursements for lease payments and improvements on ocean-front real estate. According to Anderson, HSUS's board never authorized "these and other dubious financial deals arranged by its officers," and did not learn of them until late that year. In December 1987, the board formed an audit committee and ordered an independent investigation of the books by Washington law firm Harmon and Weiss. In April 1988, Harmon and Weiss completed a preliminary report critical of Hoyt and Irwin's conduct.

According to Anderson's summary of the report, Hoyt had lived in a house in Germantown, Maryland, since 1970. On May 4, 1987, he sold the house to HSUS for \$310,000, but continued to live there rent free, with the HSUS providing the house in lieu of a portion of his compensation. Irwin, meanwhile, received \$85,000 from HSUS in October 1987, to reimburse him for payments he made on the lease of 11 acres of ocean-front land and restoration of a cabin in Phippsburg, Maine. These transactions were approved by a three-person committee without asking the majority of the board, although HSUS's bylaws require the board to set the president's compensation.

Still according to Anderson, Hoyt and Irwin maintained the two purchases were for the good of HSUS. Hoyt's home would purportedly be used by future presidents, while the organisation would have an interest in Irwin's ocean-front property. On learning of Irwin's land deal, however, the board had decided to consider the \$85,000 as a loan and told him to pay it back. This

was in line with the finding of the Harmon and Weiss report, which found the HSUS did not receive any interest on the property, and therefore the money should have been listed in the organisation's tax filings as part of Irwin's compensation. Anderson's summary continued as follows, with quotes coming from the Harmon and Weiss report. The HSUS was found to have prepared and filed "false documents" with the federal government, as a result of which the HSUS could face civil penalties and possible criminal penalties "for aiding and abetting in Hoyt's and Irwin's understatement of income." Harmon and Weiss concluded that "excessive compensation payments" that were not authorized by HSUS's full board, "threaten the status of [HSUS] as a charity under the federal tax law and appear to constitute a wasting of its assets."

Furthermore, HSUS's IRS forms for 1987 indicated that Hoyt had received \$95,000 and Irwin \$80,000 from the organization for their services, but those IRS filings failed to include other benefits. Over the previous four years, they had both also received money from two HSUS affiliates — the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) and the National Humane Education Center (NHEC) — without the knowledge of HSUS's full board. Since 1985, NHEC had paid Hoyt \$55,000 and Irwin \$38,000, while NAAHE had paid Irwin \$10,000 over the previous two years. These payments had apparently been arranged by Irwin, and were never approved by the board. When they appeared in the 1987 IRS forms, they were not credited to Hoyt or Irwin, but rather called "payments to annuitants."

Furthermore, with regard to the sale by Hoyt of his house to HSUS and his subsequent rent-free accommodation, HSUS's IRS filing said the rent was worth \$600 a month. The Harmon and Weiss report, however, placed the rental value at between \$2,500 and \$3,000 a month.

In April 1988, the HSUS board engaged lawyer Jacob Stein for a second opinion, and the following July Stein submitted his findings. Stein concurred with many of the Harmon and Weiss findings but reached different conclusions. He recommended some procedural changes, but concluded that nothing criminal had occurred and HSUS's tax-exempt status was not in jeopardy. However, with regard to payments from HSUS affiliates, Stein did report: "The reason for channeling of the payments through the two corporations is that the salaries of Mr. Hoyt and Mr. Irwin

were to be concealed from other organizations. The problem with it all is that it was concealed from the full board of [HSUS]."

Stein's report also noted the insurance premiums paid by HSUS on behalf of Hoyt and Irwin, as a result of which their compensation rose to \$139,622 and \$114,325, respectively. Not included in Stein's figures, however, was the deal whereby Hoyt sold his house to HSUS, and continued to live there rent free. Anderson's articles caused the then-presidents of two of America's richest animal-welfare organisations, Frederick Davis of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and John Kullberg of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, to write to Anderson accusing him of being out of line. "I am confident that future disclosures of all the facts will document his [Hoyt's] integrity," Davis wrote.

In response, Anderson filed another article (see "Where Charity Begins at the Top").

"Maybe our report on the money to be made in animal charities hit too close to home," wrote Anderson. "Davis and Kullberg run wealthy nonprofit organizations themselves." He supported this assertion by citing a 1983 report in which the Massachusetts SPCA was listed as the wealthiest animal-welfare group in the country, and the American SPCA as ninth.

Kullberg, who headed the American SPCA from 1977-1991, is now head of the HSUS Wildlife Land Trust.

WILLS'S SUBSIDISED WEDDING?

Most of the information that follows derives from *Animal People*, Oct. 1995 (see "A Whale of a Tale from Inside HSUS"). The case is also referred to in *U.S. News & World Report* (Oct. 2, 1995).

In June 1995, HSUS Staff Vice President for Investigations David Wills married Lori White, former wife of PETA president Alex Pacheco, at a ceremony on the roof of an apartment building in Puerto Escondido, Mexico. It is suspected that the costs of the wedding party may have been billed, at least in part, to HSUS as business expenses.

The ceremony was presided over by HSUS CEO and president John Hoyt and Paul Irwin, both former clergymen, with Irwin officiating. Also said to have been married at the same ceremony was Wills's ex-roommate and former national director of Fund for Animals, Wayne Pacelle, who had joined HSUS two months earlier as Staff Vice President for Government Affairs and Media.

The guest list, according to Sherry DeBoer, an animal rights activist in California who claims to have introduced the couple, was short: Hoyt; Irwin; Michael O'Sullivan, executive director of HSI Canada; Congressional representative Charles Wilson (D-Texas), White's former employer; Jill Rooney, her current employer; veterinarian Hugh Wheer and his wife Cynthia; a Mexican veterinarian and his wife; and DeBoer plus her date.

DeBoer claims it was a cheap affair with "wilted gladiolas" and "very cheap cake with cheap frosting." She also claims the wedding party "all had cats and dogs eating off our plates" because they spent their four days in Puerto Escondido rescuing strays. She also says they hired a team of carriage horses for four days, to give them the time off.

At about the same time, *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton received a tip that HSUS chairman O.J. Ramsey was probing the use of HSUS funds in connection with the wedding. His interest was aroused further by the timing and content of a curious solicitation appeal to members on August 15, signed by Ramsey. The key to Clifton's investigation was the wedding party's itinerary.

According to DeBoer, none of the party had spent any time in Mexico City, either on the way down or on the way up, other than to stay in a hotel adjacent to the airport on the return journey.

"We bought big baskets to sneak in all the animals we were taking back," she is quoted as saying.

The Aug. 15 appeal to members from Ramsey, however, suggested otherwise. "Just recently, Paul Irwin, HSUS president, visited 'Willy' at the Reino Aventura theme park in Mexico City," wrote Ramsey (see "Free Willy!"). "I asked Paul to make this field visit immediately, and to prepare a special report to all HSUS members and donors. Although we had originally intended for the Report [sic] to come directly to you from Paul in Mexico, unavoidable postal delays made it necessary to forward it through our headquarters in Washington D.C."

Could Ramsey have caught on to a bogus claim for business expenses, and now be trying to cover up by justifying Irwin's trip? Was the Mexican postal system really so bad, or had Irwin only been pressured into writing a report on his return from the wedding?

According to Merritt, the Irwin report, dated August 8, which accompanied the appeal was just 450 words long — hardly the kind of output that might justify a trip to Mexico. It was enclosed in a replica Mexican envelope, and "consisted almost entirely of facts about the orca star of the 1993 hit film Free Willy! already published thousands of times in hundreds of media." Perhaps embarrassed by his lack of anything new to report, Irwin tried to explain his brevity: "I can provide additional details, if needed," he wrote, "upon my return to Washington D.C."

Clifton responded to Irwin's written pledge and asked for additional details, but received no response.

PAUL IRWIN THE BANKER

In the editorial in its October 1995 edition, *Animal People* explains how officers of charities can pocket some extra cash without it showing up on the IRS Form 990. Among them is private banking:

"We can't prove anyone is doing it because private banks are not accountable in any way to the general public, but a well-placed investment advisor did explain how it's done. The officers of a major charity and perhaps a few of their friends incorporate their own financial institution, through which flow the revenues of the charity, which in turn become the capital for making loans and collecting interest — sometimes to and from the charity itself. The officers-turned-bankers gain a considerable incentive for maintaining huge reserves while spending relatively little on programs, especially programs that don't bring a prompt cash return."

HSUS president Paul Irwin is rumoured to be involved in private banking in some way. However, research only confirmed that he was involved.

In an edition of Moody's banking directory from "about 1991" (my source got this from a research librarian, and forgot to confirm the date), Irwin was listed among "other directors" of the Theodore Roosevelt National Bank. In the current edition of Moody's, however, this bank is no longer listed, and the telephone has been disconnected. The last listing of the bank gave its address as 1201 New York Ave., NW, Washington D.C. It is assumed it was a private bank because its total assets were just \$13-14 million.

In this regard, a possible clue to a future line of investigation appears in *HSUS News* (fall, 1995), in the section dedicated to news from HSUS affiliate EarthKind. An article on ecotourism begins with a reference to one Tweed Roosevelt, but makes no connection between him and HSUS nor gives any explanation why his views should appear in this publication:

"How do we make sure that tourism, the biggest industry in the world, is sustainable, so that tourists do not degrade or kill the things that attract them in the first place?" This is the question — here posed by Tweed Roosevelt, spokesman for sustainable tourism, president of the Roosevelt Education Foundation, and the great-grandson of Theodore Roosevelt — that policy makers worldwide must answer if the great natural places of the Earth are to survive.

By way of a little background on Tweed, his father, Archibald II, was expected to name him Archibald III, but chose instead to

name him after a type of cloth, prompting Tweed's grandmother to make off with the family silver in disgust. Tweed's father worked for the CIA in covert actions during WWII, and was in part responsible for the propaganda campaign to win public support in the US for entry into the war.

A preliminary search of foundations failed to turn up anything on the Roosevelt Education Foundation, and there was no connection revealed in Moody's between Tweed and the Theodore Roosevelt National Bank. It would be interesting to find out why the bank apparently closed, who the directors of the foundation are, and whether there is any exchange of money between the foundation and HSUS.

Contrary to speculation in the October 1995 edition of *Animal People*, Paul Irwin of Pennsylvania Trust Co. is not the same as Paul Irwin of the HSUS. (This simple statement is the result of many hours of research, and is included here to prevent others wasting resources duplicating this fruitless effort!)

KICKBACKS FROM DIRECT MAIL PRODUCERS?

As Cleveland Amory, HSUS co-founder and now chairman of Fund for Animals, recently observed, HSUS has "always been primarily a direct-mail operation" (see "Memorable Quotes"). Companies which produce direct mail on behalf of non-profit organisations are sometimes known to pay kickbacks to the people who put business their way, reporting these as consultancy fees. As a consequence, "Some non-profit executives who ostensibly pay themselves nothing are in fact pulling down six-figure consulting incomes" (*Animal People*, October 1995).

In its December 1995 edition, *Animal People* printed the allegation that HSUS president Paul Irwin was "secretly doing business" with a company known for giving kickbacks, but did not name the company or the source (see "Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills").

I have not had time before filing this report to investigate this further, but reproduce below the pertinent passage and a possible clue to the direct-mail company referred to therein, obtained from the HSUS's IRS filing in California for 1994.

Animal People was not able to either confirm or refute an electronic message from a well-reputed direct mail professional who asserted that, "Irwin has been secretly doing business with the company that you know kicks back fundraising money to executives," as described in our October editorial. Through a variety of subsidiaries, this firm does business with many of the animal protection groups that spend the highest percentage of their budget on direct mail, but we haven't yet unraveled the whole skein, nor are we sure yet that some competing organizations know that they are in effect represented by the same organization, under different business identities.

According to this direct mail professional, "Irwin has tested the Netherlands fundraising market. You see, incorporated in the Netherlands, as you must be to raise funds there, nobody in the U.S. can track the money. Irwin arranged all of that. Now, heading HSI, he is in charge of it all. Nice plan. How much front money has HSUS put into HSI? That is the money used to raise gigantic money overseas. The Netherlands, Germany, and France are all semi-virgin targets, with four times the returns we get in the U.S. You can get rich four times quicker, and with a \$150,000 investment can net \$1.5 million the second year. Then the skv's

the limit. The foreign governments won't audit for five years, giving time to build the mail before spending money on programs." (*Animal People*, December 1995)

The following statement appears in the IRS Form 990 filed by HSUS in California for 1994.

Note Regarding Use of Services of a Fund-raising Consultant or Commercial Fundraiser

The Society does its own soliciting; no outside persons or entities solicit "on behalf of" the Society. The Society uses an outside firm, Columbia Direct Marketing Corporation, 60 West Street, Suite 405, Annapolis, MD 21401, to assist it from time-to-time on mailing matters and creative and production matters, such as the style of direct mail pieces, but the firm has no managerial or supervisory control over solicitation campaigns, handles no money raised, and has no contract or on-going agreement with the Society, working strictly on an as-requested, job-by-job basis. In view of the above, the Society does not believe that Columbia Direct Marketing Corporation meets the definition of fund-raising consultant or commercial fundraiser within the substantive intent of applicable state statutes.

3) BREAKING STORIES

NATIONAL DOG BITE PREVENTION WEEK

Note: This is a breaking story because it will likely happen again next year and possibly for many years to come, albeit in different formats, and journalists can be forewarned. Put NATIONAL DOG BITE PREVENTION WEEK in your diaries now!

For several years now, the US Postal Service has been working with HSUS to try to reduce the incidence of dogs biting mail carriers. Hitherto, however, HSUS has not been publicly visible in this capacity, its role principally being to provide training programs to postal workers on how to avoid being bitten. This changed in a big way in 1995.

This year, from June 12-17, the Postal Service and HSUS jointly inaugurated National Dog Bite Prevention Week. This involved the mailing of a postcard to every business and home address in the country — all 128 million of them — at a cost of about \$15 million, in what the *Chicago Tribune* (June 16) described as the largest Postal Service mailing ever. According to Postal Service spokesman Mark Saunders (personal communication), "over 90%" of the mailing cost was borne by the Postal Service from revenues gained through stamp sales.

The postcard, entitled "Don't let your dog bite the hand that serves you!", took the form of a "tip sheet" of ways in which dog owners can reduce aggressive pet behavior and other people can avoid being bitten. Under the heading "How to be a responsible dog owner" appeared the following four tips (in order):

- Spay or neuter your dog — unneutered dogs are more likely to bite!
- When your letter carrier comes to your home, keep your dog inside, away from the door in another room or on a leash.
- Don't let your child take mail from the letter carrier in the presence of your dog. Your dog's instinct is to "protect" the family.
- Obedience training can teach your dog proper behavior and help you control your dog in any situation.

The postcard also sports the HSUS logo and its contact address for further information "about dog bite prevention and responsible pet ownership."

As Postal Service spokesman Saunders was quick to point out, dogs biting postmen is a serious issue, and one that is apt to be treated lightly by the public. "People tend to see the postmen and

dogs issue as a joke," he said, adding that, as "the top animal welfare organisation in the country," the HSUS "adds credibility." The response to this year's campaign was "overwhelmingly positive," he said.

Why should HSUS add credibility? Well, for one thing, stated a press release by the Postal Service, HSUS has been designated as "the national clearinghouse for dog bite statistics." But Norma Woolf of the National Animal Interest Alliance decided to check this claim with the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta, Georgia, and was informed that no official repository for dog bite statistics exists, and that HSUS had simply obtained its statistics from the CDC (see "Dog Bite Prevention Campaign Pairs Post Office with Animal Rights Organization").

Woolf also took exception to the order in which tips for being a responsible dog owner appeared, the accuracy of the suggestion that spaying and neutering prevents bites, the fact that the suggestion to spay and neuter appears at the top of the list, and the fact that it dovetails nicely with HSUS's campaign against "pet overpopulation" aimed primarily at dog breeders.

"The whole project was supposedly to prevent dog bites, but what it really does is to promote the HSUS agenda," she told me.

"When we look at the list of how to be a responsible dog owner, the top thing on the list is spay and neuter your dog, and it says unneutered dogs are more likely to bite. The information for that comes from a single study done in the city of Denver several years ago. ... The information out of that study was that unneutered dogs chained in yards are more likely to bite ... The whole HSUS agenda is to get everyone to spay or neuter their dogs, so they're scaring people into doing it, basically."

And while most of the other information Woolf found to be basically sound, "if you're going to have things listed in a hierarchy, obedience training should be first, not the HSUS agenda of spay and neuter your dog."

Saunders's response was that the order in which tips appeared was random, and that he was unaware of the HSUS campaign against dog breeders.

He also admitted that a large amount of responsibility for the project rested with him personally, and was adamant that the Postal Service had not been "duped". "We approached the HSUS," he said. not the other way around.

Saunders claimed no knowledge of the HSUS's wider agenda on pets and believed the only reason for recommending spaying and neutering was because this reduced dog bites. He also argued that it was a shame to have dogs breeding when there are so many dogs in shelters that must be euthanised for want of a home.

He was not dogmatic about this, however, and seemed genuinely interested in the notion that HSUS was using messages that could be easily accepted by mainstream society to further a long-term agenda that would not be apparent to a casual observer.

The other worrying aspect of this campaign is that it provided HSUS with heavily subsidised, nationwide advertising — a tremendous coup. Not only is its name promoted by association with a quasi-public corporation, but it also gets to build a "prospect" mailing list at almost no cost. In terms of fundraising potential, the strategy is brilliant because HSUS need only service those members of the public who have already responded to the initial subsidised mailing.

In this regard, it is significant that when people applied for further information from HSUS, included with information on dog bites gleaned from the study done years previously in Denver (referred to by Woolf), was a solicitation for gifts to HSUS.

Americans for Medical Progress reported in its newsletter *News and Notes* (Vol. 2, Issue 3) that it had asked members of a Congressional oversight committee to look into this situation and make the mailing list which this campaign generated for HSUS available to any group requesting it.

Given the success of this year's campaign, Saunders informed me that there will certainly be another promotion of National Dog Bite Prevention Week next year, although the exact format has not been decided. Saunders's position of responsibility for the campaign and apparent readiness to listen to other viewpoints suggest it may be possible to prevent HSUS getting free advertising in every household in America next year.

The best quote of the whole affair came from Rachel Lamb, HSUS's director of animal care and the person with whom the Postal Service's Saunders liaises (*Chicago Tribune*, June 16, 1995). In response to the suggestion that the whole campaign was an enormous waste of money, Lamb is quoted as saying:

"Some people think we're pouring too much money into educating the public on this, but they're wrong." As Lamb correctly points out, people are wrong to think HSUS is pouring money into this — it's the Postal Service. \$15 million of it.

There was also an amusing sidebar to this campaign, as reported in the same Americans for Medical Progress newsletter. By chance, a radio reporter happened to interview HSUS vice-president Michael Fox while marching in a local July 4 parade. "Fox was carrying a sign calling for freedom from leash laws," the newsletter reported, accompanied by his unleashed dog. Strangely, one of the tips circulated by the campaign to reduce dog bites was to keep dogs on leashes.

Research tip: For information on the future of National Dog Bite Prevention Week, and HSUS's role therein, call Mark Saunders of the U.S. Postal Service on (202) 268-2171.

JAILBIRD DIRECTOR "SONNY" BLOCH

For full details regarding this unsavory ex-director of the HSUS, now in custody on multiple charges, see "H.I. 'Sonny' Bloch" under "PERSONALITY PROFILES". I have included this in the category of "Breaking Stories" because there will be developments in this case. Given that HSUS president Paul Irwin reportedly told a gathering of HSUS staff following Bloch's arrest that he "is still our friend," any development in the case would be an opportune time to remind journalists to call Irwin for comment.

WASHINGTON D.C. ANIMAL CONTRACT

This is a "local" story of concern to the citizens of Washington D.C., but is an interesting case for all because the possibility exists of HSUS or its officers operating behind the scenes to gain control of a contract they could not secure through legitimate channels. Background for the following came primarily from the Washington Post, Sept. 20 and Oct. 26, 1995, and Animal People, December, 1995 (see "Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills").

From 1980 until this November, the contract for running the animal shelter owned by the city of Washington DC had gone to the Washington Humane Society (WHS: no relation to HSUS).

For some time now, city officials have been preoccupied with a multimillion-dollar deficit and the imposition of a congressionally mandated financial control board. The budget crunch has been so severe that the city has stopped paying many contractors, including the WHS. At the end of April 1995, the city refused to extend its contract for one more year, and gave it instead six months. As of October 14, the WHS claimed it was owed more than \$372,000 by the city. It also announced that it would vacate the shelter effective midnight on October 30.

Six months previously, meanwhile, now-disgraced HSUS executive David Wills had begun negotiations to take over the contract, leading to the tabling of a bid by HSUS that would have included building and operating a \$10 million state-of-the-art "model shelter". In addition to offering the traditional services of an adoption centre, the shelter would have provided low-cost veterinary care, a cruelty investigation team, a national educational centre for humane societies and animal control agencies, as well as a veterinary training facility — all at no cost to the city. Leading negotiations for HSUS with the city was the disbarred lawyer Deday LaRene, fresh out of prison and doing community service.

In exchange, HSUS wanted several things, including three to five acres of land and tax-exempt status for all real estate owned by HSUS in the District of Columbia. According to the *Washington Post* (Sept. 20), the deal would also have excluded the WHS from involvement in the shelter, although it is not clear whether this was stipulated as a condition, or would simply have been a natural consequence.

Then on Sept. 18, after six months of negotiations, HSUS suddenly withdrew its offer. In a letter to the mayor, it indicated that it was unwilling to proceed with the project unless it could "own absolutely" the parcel of land near Catholic University which the city had offered for the shelter to be built on.

Johnny Allem, spokesman for the city, said the letter "was a surprise to us. We thought everything was worked out. We have done everything they asked." He also said that the land was owned by the federal government and could not be transferred to HSUS, but that a long lease had been worked out.

According to *Animal People*, however, the unofficial reason why HSUS had pulled out was because "it was Wills' deal" (see

"Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills"), referring to its vice president in charge of investigations David Wills, who had recently been accused of embezzlement and sexual harassment (see "Wills, David"). "With Wills on his way out at HSUS, no one else really wanted the potential expense and embarrassment that could go with running animal control in a nearly bankrupt city." In other words, Wills had committed HSUS to something no one except him wanted to handle.

Just when everything was looking bleak for the remaining animals at the shelter, a new organisation appeared named Animal Link, and won a short-term contract of 50 days to run the shelter.

In personal communication at the time, the editor of *Animal People*, Merritt Clifton, informed me that he had been tipped off that the seed money for Animal Link had been provided by John Hoyt and Paul Irwin of HSUS, suggesting HSUS was trying to get control of the contract through the back door. However, this was not reported in the December issue of *Animal People*.

It was reported, however, that the phone for Animal Link was being answered by none other than Wills, "apparently performing the duties of an executive director as an ostensible volunteer." Assisting him at the shelter was his new wife, Lori White, who was already working as a volunteer for WHS, and between them they had reportedly set up a board comprising an employee of the Department of Commerce and two former staffers of WHS who had been dismissed.

Animal Link's contract expires Dec. 20, whereupon a long-term contractor will be chosen through competitive bidding, according to the Washington D.C. Department of Human Services.

According to *Animal People*, Animal Link has not had sufficient time to acquire non-profit status and is currently trying to finance operations and position itself to win the contract by soliciting donations via a special bank account opened for it by Animal Allies, a cat rescue group in Culpepper, Virginia, called Animal Allies. It is illegal for one organisation to use another organisation's non-profit status to raise funds, and it has been suggested to me that this arrangement between Animal Link and Animal Allies may not be legal.

If Animal Link loses the contract negotiations, the future of the Washington D.C. animal control contract becomes a non-issue

and Wills ends up jobless. If he ends up with a job, however, there may be a can of worms to be opened.

Merritt Clifton (personal communication) hypothesises that Wills engineered the withdrawal of WHS to clear the way for him (and HSUS) to move in. "I suspect that Wills may have pulled a few strings to ensure that Washington Humane didn't get paid on time," said Clifton, "and would therefore bail out of their contract when they got shaky."

Now that Wills is being sued by HSUS (see "Wills, David"), HSUS will presumably try to distance itself from him as much as possible, which means the story about seed money from Hoyt and Irwin being used to set up Animal Link may never be confirmed. If it is ever found to be true, however, it will strongly indicate that HSUS was attempting to gain control of the animal control contract through the back door, having failed through up-front negotiations. The plan might then have been to reabsorb the then-disgraced (but still officially employed) Wills back into the HSUS fold as head of the new shelter. With Wills now officially fired and set to go to court with HSUS, this is impossible.

Research tip: Mary Healey, executive director of the Washington Humane Society, can be reached on: (202) 723-5730 ext. 229.

IDITAROD IN DANGER

(See "Humane Society's Perfect World"; also HSUS News, winter 1995; Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 10, 1992; Aug. 30, 1995; Oct. 31, 1995).

HSUS's involvement with an Alaskan institution, the Iditarod sled race, has put the very existence of the race in jeopardy, while critics have accused HSUS of only being interested in fund-raising on a high-profile theme.

Other animal rights groups had been keeping a close eye on the Iditarod for some time before latecomer HSUS began low-key monitoring of the race in 1991, under the leadership of the now-disgraced David Wills (see "Wills, David").

Despite the fact Wills was on record as saying that, "in a perfect world, there would be no Iditarod," he managed to smooth-talk his way into the confidence of the Iditarod Trail Committee, convincing them at a symposium in Fairbanks that HSUS was a "moderate" organisation that was not antivivisection and not anti-hunting, and only interested in raising the standard of welfare of dogs in the race.

The Trail Committee and HSUS subsequently announced that they would work together to eliminate dog deaths, and several new rules were introduced in following years as a result, including a juggling of the required rest breaks and the introduction of necropsies for dead dogs. Wills even managed to persuade four-time Iditarod champion Susan Butcher (who also hunts and traps) to attend HSUS's 1992 national conference. In 1993, Wills was appointed to the Iditarod's animal care committee, which was seen as a significant concession to HSUS because it gave it veto power over who was picked to be chief race veterinarian.

But at the end of the 1994 race, the relationship came to a sudden end following the death in the race of one of Butcher's dogs. HSUS began calling for boycotts of race sponsors, and in April 1994 announced on the television show *Good Morning America* its opposition to the Iditarod in its current form.

Anchorage Daily News columnist Craig Medred had warned about this tactic long before:

The silver-tongued Wills never outlined any Humane Society strategy for me ... , but what that organization is up to here is clear. Get a little concession here, a bigger one there, and then when the opponent is weak, launch the Blitzkrieg. (*Anchorage Daily News*, Dec. 19, 1992)

The Trail Committee immediately severed its ties with HSUS, but the Blitzkrieg was already in full motion. In September 1994, according to *HSUS News* (winter 1995), The Timberland Company, "the primary sponsor of past races (and a company whose sponsorship would have approached \$1 million)", announced that it would not sponsor the 1995 running of the Iditarod. Pet food producer Iams Co. also reportedly stated that it will not renew its contractual agreement with the race once it expires at the end of the 1995 running.

In the same edition of *HSUS News*, Wills reported to HSUS members:

The HSUS, based on our exhaustive findings and investigations, has concluded that long-distance competitive mushing entails an unacceptable probability of risk of death and/or injury to the dogs involved. ...

Will the Iditarod and other events cease to exist? No one knows. Clearly, public and corporate interests will watch more closely to see if these races continue to kill and harm the canine participants.

There is probably nothing wrong with dogs pulling a sled for fun and exercise. There is clearly something wrong with a competitive event that has as a guaranteed feature the death and/or injury of even one dog.

As the *Anchorage Daily News* (Aug. 30, 1995) reported in an interview with *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton, the Trail Committee had been duped into thinking a relationship with HSUS would save trouble with more extreme animal rightists in the long run:

Mushers and members of the Trail Committee have long-accused the Humane Society of using its anti-Iditarod stance as a fund-raising vehicle. Editor Clifton said there are people in the animal-protection movement who suspect the same thing.

The Humane Society "only cared about the fund-raising potential and the splash" that comes with attacking the Iditarod, Clifton said. "In any cause there is more money in taking a firm black-and-white stance. This is why the fundamentalists do much better than the Methodists."

Clifton said the Humane Society got in on the campaign late and "pretty much stole the ball." Then the Iditarod Trail Committee made a strategic mistake.

"They decided that rather than deal with the radical Friends of Animals, they thought, 'Let's cut a deal with the (Humane Society) and get a better deal,'" Clifton said. "They got double-crossed because the (Humane Society) only cared about the fund-raising potential."

On hearing of Wills's suspension from duty in 1995 following allegations of embezzling and sexual harassment, Matt Desalernos, president of the Trail Committee, said, "It doesn't break my heart. I don't think there are too many folks that have a strong liking for the Humane Society, and particularly David Wills."

Far from avoiding trouble, the only result of doing business with Wills and HSUS has been to threaten the very existence of the Iditarod.

FREE WILLY!

"Willy" (real name: Keiko) is a male killer whale who was taken from Icelandic waters a decade ago at the age of two and deposited at the Reino Aventura theme park in Mexico City. He has been the star of two movies — *Free Willy* and *Free Willy II* — reportedly grossing over \$100 million for Warner Bros. HSUS has done a lot of fundraising on the back of Willy, leading members to believe he may one day be reunited with his family. Although in the main text of articles phrases such as "hopefully release" now appear, it is important to note that the fundraising message is unequivocal. In an Aug. 15, 1995, appeal HSUS chairman O.J. Ramsey wrote: "And, when we release 'Willy' to his original family group off the coast of Iceland, hopefully some time next year, he will be the first whale ever to be freed." In an advertisement on the back cover of *HSUS News* (fall, 1995), it states: "'Keiko,' the orca who captured our hearts as the star of *Free Willy*, will soon be on his way to freedom — thanks to the Free Willy Foundation." In reality, however, Willy's future seems far from certain, and HSUS should be held accountable if and when a fairy tale ending is not realised.

The lead organisation in the campaign to free Willy is Earth Island Institute, which received a generous plug at the beginning and end of *Free Willy!* EII president David Phillips is president of the Free Willy/Keiko Foundation. Also on the board of the foundation is Paul Irwin, representing HSUS, and in July 1993, HSUS's Patricia Forkan hosted a congressional screening of *Free Willy!*

The foundation has been campaigning to raise the money needed to complete supposedly temporary half-way quarters for Willy at the Oregon Coast Aquarium in Newport. HSUS has said this will cost \$10 million (Aug. 15, 1995 appeal), but according to the December 1995 edition of *Animal People*, the final cost will be \$7.3 million. According to the same publication, EII's Phillips says the move will take place on January 7, 1996.

Meanwhile, the search is supposedly under way for Willy's family, reportedly being led by Ken Balcomb of the Center for Whale Research.

There are, however, compelling reasons to doubt whether Willy will ever be released, the most obvious being that Iceland does not want him back.

The October 1995 edition of *Animal People* (see "A whale of a tale from inside HSUS") quotes Johann Sigurjonsson of Iceland's Marine Research Institute as saying: "The government of Iceland

has repeatedly decided in recent years not to permit reintroduction of killer whales into Icelandic waters who have been subjected to animal life in distant parts of the world for prolonged periods of time. This is because such a reintroduction could lead to the transfer of foreign bacterias or other infectious agents with unknown consequences for the local ecosystem or individual animals, and because of the uncertainty regarding how an animal kept in captivity for most of his life would survive in the wild."

Sigurjonsson also casts doubt on the claim by Free Willy/Keiko campaign leaders that "Experts are scanning the waters off Iceland to try to find the family he was taken from at the age of two so they can be reunited." Says Sigurjonsson: "Anyone conducting research on killer whales off Iceland needs a permit. To my knowledge, the appropriate authorities in Iceland have not been contacted, nor have they issued any permits to conduct such studies."

A more recent statement from the Free Willy/Keiko campaign asserts that "Vocal and DNA analysis will begin in October [1995] in Iceland to locate Keiko's family," but no explanation has been given as to how the investigators will analyse wild killer whale DNA without capturing some.

Criticism of the Free Willy campaign has naturally tended to come from the marina industry, but the fact that a long letter from Jim Bonde of Marine World Africa USA, in California, was published in the September 1995 issue of *Animal People*, suggests the animal rights movement shares a feeling of cynicism about this politically correct public relations blitz-cum-fundraiser (see "What's Best for Willy?").

Among the criticisms levelled by Bonde are: Oregon Coast Aquarium is the wrong place for Willy to go because he will have no killer whales for companions, and there are no personnel with experience in killer whale husbandry; and from a scientific standpoint, Willy is "probably one of the poorest candidates for release among all the cetaceans in North America."

Bonde accuses the Free Willy/Keiko Foundation of "politicizing his (Willy's) future for their own agenda ... Everything they're doing is predicated on the short-term goal of dumping him into the ocean and declaring victory. They have not addressed his long-term needs if he remains in captivity."

Bonde also raises the "serious ethical question" of how much fundraising the foundation should do "under the banner of releasing an animal to the wild without disclosing the fact that few if any of the serious realities of release have been addressed."

The most obvious reality that has not been addressed, says Bonde, is Willy's condition. Willy suffers from a virus known as papilloma, but it is not known whether he will continue to carry it even if he can be cured, or whether the virus is from the Atlantic. "Without answers," says Bonde, "they could be raising money to do the equivalent of sending a Pilgrim with small-pox to the New World."

"People whom one would think should know better, such as the Center for Whale Research and the Humane Society of the United States, consistently downplay the risk of inter-ocean disease transmission, further evidenced in their appeals for the release of the Vancouver Aquarium's two killer whales, Finna and Bjossa, into Icelandic waters, even though they've both been exposed to aspergillosis from the Pacific Ocean."

Bonde continues by extolling the "critical importance" of reintroducing animals to the wild as a way of ensuring the future of endangered and threatened populations, but damns the Free Willy campaign on all counts. "It is too important a tool for global wildlife management to be trivialized, sentimentalized, politicized and just plain botched in the name of animal liberation."

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION IN CALIFORNIA

Since as long ago as 1987, it has been rumoured that a criminal investigation of HSUS was under way in California.

In 1991, Jack Anderson and Dale van Atta reported in the *Washington Post* (see "Animal Aid Society Chief Lives the Good Life") that the California Attorney General's Office was taking a look at the purchase in 1988 of CEO John Hoyt's house for \$310,000 and "other curious financial decisions" made by HSUS. According to Anderson and van Atta, the attorney general wrote a terse letter to the society stating that, in his opinion, the charity had "engaged in a course of conduct" that "violated" the charity trust laws of California, a major source of funding for HSUS. HSUS responded by claiming its problems had been fixed.

but the deputy attorney general reportedly said his opinion hadn't changed. The attorney general was also reportedly looking into money HSUS paid to treasurer Paul Irwin to help fix up ocean front property in Maine (see "Dubious Deals in the Humane Society"), trips made by Hoyt's wife "on the charity's tab and other perks for Hoyt and Irwin."

I checked with the office of the attorney general in Sacramento and found that the investigation of HSUS has not been closed, but could obtain no details. This was confirmed in the December 1995 edition of *Animal People* which reported that the attorney general's office "is actively reviewing HSUS financial filings and witness depositions." Since no charges have been filed, however, there is no immediately apparent way of finding out what the investigation is about.

The only other information known is that the government officer responsible for the investigation at its initiation was a Mr. Appollus. Judging that he would not be willing to disclose anything, and has probably been reassigned, I did not attempt to locate him.

4) PERSONALITY PROFILES

BLOCH, H.I. "SONNY"

(Compiled from various Animal People articles [see "DOCUMENTS"]; Crain's New York Business, Aug. 28, 1995; Jack O'Dwyer's Newsletter, July 19, 1995; Newsday, July 23, 1995; The Tampa Tribune, Sept. 19, 1995.)

Well known in the US as a syndicated financial radio talk show host, H.I. "Sonny" Bloch, 58, has been associated with the HSUS for at least a decade, first as host of a TV program about pets and later, from 1991 until March 1995, as a member of the HSUS board of directors. In 1989, he was the recipient of the HSUS's James Herriot award (see "Programs/Activities").

In December 1994, 280 investors from 33 states filed a suit in Newark, New Jersey, alleging Bloch had fraudulently induced them to invest \$9.38 million in a worthless wireless cable system. In March 1995 he fled from the law to the Dominican Republic, purportedly to avoid "persecution" by federal agents who were probing this and other accusations, including one of statutory rape.

On May 26, as Bloch was still broadcasting daily from Santo Domingo, the Securities and Exchange Commission charged him and four others with bilking investors out of \$3.8 million by selling \$21 million worth of memberships in firms set up to buy three radio stations.

Later that day, Dominican authorities arrested Bloch at the FBI's request and returned him to the U.S. He is currently in detention at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in Manhattan, facing a barrage of charges that includes: evading taxes on more than \$700,000 of income; a civil class-action suit on behalf of more than 2,000 investors which contends he profited from a Pennsylvania-based precious-metals scam that he promoted; an eight-count charge filed in Manhattan of tax fraud, perjury, and obstruction of justice; and another charge filed in New Jersey alleging he induced a bank to replace five cashiers cheques totalling \$300,000 that he said had been stolen, when in fact they had been seized in a federal raid of his home. No statutory rape charge appears to have been filed to date.

Bloch's show, launched in 1980 and at its peak aired on 170 stations was distributed until this May by Independent

Broadcasters Network Inc., a company owned by Bloch and his family. IBN shut down in June, and on Sept. 15 filed for bankruptcy court protection in Florida.

In September this year, HSUS president Paul Irwin is said to have told a gathering of his staff: "Sonny Bloch is still our friend." According to an unsubstantiated report, Irwin may have personally participated in financial transactions involving both Bloch and football great John Riggins; Irwin and Riggins together held a controlling interest in a private financial institution; and HSUS funds might have gone through that institution.

Animal People announced in its September issue that it was investigating whether either HSUS or HSUS senior officers took investment advice from Bloch, and if so, what the result was, but no findings have thus far appeared.

DEDAY LARENE, NATHANIEL C.

(Most of the following material can be found in Animal People articles [see under "DOCUMENTS"], but was also reported widely in the mass media, n.b. Detroit Free Press.)

Nathaniel Deday LaRene is a disbarred lawyer and ex-jailbird now doing community service with HSUS. A long-time associate of David Wills, LaRene's noted clients included Detroit Mafia boss Vito Giacalone and his son, Billy-Jack, who were called before a federal grand jury in 1975 probing the disappearance of Teamsters boss Jimmy Hoffa earlier that year, and the late Michigan Ku Klux Klan grand dragon Robert Miles in 1988. It was on account of his ties with the Giacalones that LaRene served time.

In September 1992, both Giacalones and LaRene were indicted for conspiracy and evasion of \$410,000 in taxes, but a key witness vanished on the eve of the trial and a Justice Department lawyer was convicted of leaking grand jury documents, including witness lists, to LaRene. In December 1993, LaRene took a plea bargain in return for which the government agreed not to prosecute him concerning his potential exposure in other investigations. Those investigations included an obstruction of justice probe into the theft of confidential Justice Department reports involving Giacalone. The reports were found in Giacalone's office with LaRene's fingerprints on them. Wills testified for LaRene at his sentencing hearing in May 1994. but LaRene served a year in

prison anyway. On his release, he went to do community service for HSUS, where his wife, Joan Witt (a Wills employee at NHHS, MHS, and NSAP) was already working. LaRene's main job in recent months seems to have been negotiating a deal to take over the Washington D.C. animal control contract, relinquished by the Washington Humane Society at least in part because the city was slow to pay for contracted services. HSUS pulled out of the negotiations on September 18.

HOYT, JOHN A.

Hoyt is currently president of HSI, but according to the December 1995 edition of *Animal People*, he will hand this post over to Paul Irwin on January 1, 1996. He will then serve as HSI vice-president until he retires in May, officially for health reasons. He is reportedly a multi-millionaire (*Animal People*, December 1995), which is not hard to believe given his salary (see "Executive salaries").

Hoyt was born in Marietta, Ohio, on Mar. 30, 1932. He has a B.A. degree (1954) and a Doctor of Divinity degree (1968) from Rio Grande College, Ohio, and a Master of Divinity degree (1958) from Colgate Rochester Divinity School, New York. The official HSUS bio does not indicate this, but the Doctor of Divinity degree is an honorary degree conferred upon Hoyt after long service (1979-86) as a trustee of Rio Grande College.

Hoyt's career shows no sign of a background in humane work prior to joining the HSUS. He was ordained to the ministry of the Baptist Church in 1957, and was the pastor of Allen Park Baptist Church, Michigan, from 1958-60. He then became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Leroy, New York, until 1964. He then served as senior minister at the Drayton Avenue Presbyterian Church in Ferndale, Michigan, until 1968, when he was awarded his doctorate in divinity and assumed the post of senior minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Fort Wayne, Indiana. From 1970-92, he served as president of HSUS, and was then promoted to the newly created post of chief executive officer. Other current posts include president of HSI; president & chairman of EarthKind (International) and EarthKind (USA) (both established in 1991); vice-president of the World Society for the Protection of Animals (president from 1986-90); chairman of the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education since 1973 (president from 1970-73); director of the Interfaith

Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature (an HSUS affiliate); and director of the Global Tomorrow Coalition.

Hoyt is married to Gertrude (Trudy) Ellen Mohnkern, and has four daughters. He resides at Rte 1, Box 3020, Bumpass, VA 23024, an address which will raise a few eyebrows if unsubstantiated rumours of Hoyt's homosexual relationship with David Wills are ever confirmed. I do not know what happened to Hoyt's controversial, long-time residence in Maryland, which he sold to the HSUS for \$310,000 and continued to live in for a time rent-free (*Washington Post*, Sept. 7-8, 1988).

Hoyt is not a vegetarian, but says he's trying his best not to hurt too many animals. "My concern about the ways in which animals are raised, transported, marketed, and slaughtered has caused me to reduce my consumption of animal products significantly over the past several years (Animals International, WSPA, autumn 1992)."

And he excuses killing the animals he does choose to eat by recounting his childhood remembrance of traditional animal husbandry: "I certainly did not relish chopping off the head of a chicken, and I very much dreaded the day when my grandfather would butcher a pig or a calf; but death for those animals was quick and painless and until then they had lived in natural settings and comfortable quarters."

IRWIN, PAUL G.

Currently president of HSUS, Irwin has been an officer of the organisation since 1976, and was its treasurer from 1976 to 1993. He is currently president of HSUS, but according to the December 1995 edition of *Animal People*, he will hand this post over to Patricia Forkan on January 1, 1996, and concurrently take over John Hoyt's role as president of HSI.

He has earned a Doctor of Letters degree from Rio Grande College, Masters degrees from Boston University and Colgate Rochester Divinity School, and a baccalaureate from Roberts Wesleyan College. "Postgraduate work has also been done at Harvard University, Andover Newton Theology School, and the Massachusetts Mental Health Center," says the official HSUS bio. The bio continues: "Prior to his association with The HSUS, Mr. Irwin, an ordained United Methodist Minister, was engaged in ecclesiastical responsibilities in Massachusetts and New York. His

principal focus was in professional education and internship for parish ministers in affiliation with Boston University School of Theology. He initiated and administered programs focused on the enablement of the handicapped and disenfranchised. Mr. Irwin also served a rotation in Brazil with Project Hope.

"Mr. Irwin serves on the board of directors for the American Bible Society, the Wilhelm Schole, Humane Society International, EarthKind, the Center for Respect of Life and Environment, the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education, the International Center for Earth Concerns and the World Society for the Protection of Animals." He also represents HSUS on the board of the Free Willy Foundation.

He is rumoured to be involved in private banking, though this may arise from his role as a director of the apparently now defunct Theodore Roosevelt National Bank (see "Paul Irwin the private banker").

He is also a car buff and has more than one home (personal communication with Merritt Clifton, editor, *Animal People*).

FORKAN, PATRICIA

Patricia Forkan has a B.A. from Penn State and did graduate work at American University. Virtually raised in an upstate New York shelter still directed by her mother, Forkan served as the first executive director of the animal rights (and in particular anti-hunting) organisation Fund for Animals in the 1970s. She then moved to HSUS, where she is currently senior vice president.

According to the December 1995 edition of *Animal People*, Forkan will assume the presidency of HSUS on January 1, 1996, replacing Paul Irwin, who will take the top slot at HSI. Her rise to the top is thought to have been made possible by the recent firing of David Wills, vice president in charge of investigations, who had long been seen as eventual heir to the throne at HSUS.

Forkan serves on the U.S. Trade and Environmental Policy Committee.

FOX, MICHAEL

Michael Fox was born and educated in England. After a spell teaching at Washington University, he joined HSUS in 1976 for the purpose of applying investigative science methods to the study of the use of animals as pets, lab subjects and livestock, as well as in zoos and schools. He is currently HSUS vice president in charge of Farm Animals and Bioethics, and director of the HSUS division Center for Respect of Life and Environment.

Fox is considered an authority on animal behaviour and animal welfare science, is the author of more than 30 books, is a contributing editor to McCall's magazine, writes a syndicated column called "Ask Your Animal Doctor" for United Features, and is a frequent guest on radio and TV talk shows and on the lecture circuit.

He represents himself as having the following qualifications: D.Sc., Ph.D. (medicine), B. Vet. Med., and MRCVS. In his columns, he introduces himself simply as a veterinarian. However, according to Patti Strand of the National Animal Interest Alliance, he has never actually practiced veterinary medicine in the U.S. No information has been uncovered on his career prior to entering the U.S.

Fox holds various extreme views with which HSUS as a whole cannot afford to be associated too directly, and it was reportedly on account of his desire to promote such radical teachings that the Center for the Respect of Life and Environment, which Fox heads, was established. Katie McCabe quotes HSUS CEO John Hoyt as saying the Center was created "to let Dr. Fox direct some of his views in a channel that was an arm's length removed from the HSUS. He sometimes makes statements on biomedical research and other things that don't always reflect our view." (*The Washingtonian*, Feb. 1990)

This distancing act has also been expressed by Fox's colleague at HSUS, Martin Stephens, vice-president in charge of Laboratory Animals (letter to *The Scientist*, Aug. 31, 1992):

"Fox is a prolific author who wears many hats in his professional life, only one of which is his role at HSUS. His writings on animal research issues are outside the scope of his responsibilities at HSUS; therefore, his views on this subject are his own. Nevertheless, [Adrian] Morrison [Americans for Medical Progress] and other pro-animal research propagandists delight in seeking out controversial statements by Fox in their attempts to portray HSUS and the animal protection community as radical."

Those delightful controversial statements include:

On his fellow man: Fox views his own species as "the most dangerous, selfish, and unethical animal on earth" (as quoted in Robert James Bidinotto, "Animal Rights: A New Species of Egalitarianism," *The Intellectual Activist*, Sept. 14, 1983, p.3.)

On vivisection: "Fox refuses to condemn vivisection on moral grounds. In fact, he views morality and legality as "the greatest evils of today," and insists, "I'm not preaching animal liberation. I'm preaching liberation from an attitude that still justifies vivisection as a necessary evil" (as quoted by Katie McCabe, "Beyond Cruelty", *The Washingtonian*, Feb. 1990).

On eating meat: "I regard vegetarianism as more than a personal choice, I see it as an ethical imperative," Fox once said. HSUS does not promote vegetarianism, and CEO John Hoyt eats meat.

On animal rights: If anything, Fox believes that merely to give animals rights would be selling them short. At HSUS's 1990 annual conference, for example, he gave a slide show entitled "The Future of Creation", in which he said society needs to go beyond animal rights, and enter into a triangular relationship called "PAN": People's Rights, Animal Rights, and Nature's Rights. He also apparently belongs to the minority of animal rights activists who are ready to acknowledge their cause as a religion. At the 1990 North American Conference on Religion and Ecology, he said that mankind must abandon "the male, monotheistic religion of reason," and return to the "religious tradition of earlier times, which linked humanity to the animal kingdom through the Earth-mother, the matrix-creatix ... Gaia, Pan, Diana (quoted in *The People's Agenda*, January/February, 1993)."

(See also "Memorable Quotes".)

GRANDY, JOHN W., Ph.D.

According to the official HSUS bio, Grandy holds a Bachelor's degree (1966) in Forestry and Wildlife Management from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and a Master's degree (1968) in Wildlife Biology from University of Massachusetts, specializing in management of waterfowl, especially black ducks. However, the name and title at the top of the resume are John W. Grandv Ph.D. According to a sworn affidavit submitted by Grandv

to the National Trappers Association (Apr. 15, 1994), his doctorate is in Wildlife Ecology and Management. Since no mention is made on the HSUS bio of how Grandy became a doctor, it can be assumed that is an honorary doctorate.

Previous Employers & Posts (where known):

Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries

U.S. Forest Service

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Wildlife specialist and program coordinator for the National Parks and Conservation Association in Washington D.C. (for three and a half years).

1974-75: chief assistant to the senior scientist at the President's Council on Environmental Quality.

1977-79: Served on Department on Interior's National Wildlife Refuge and Predator Control Advisory Committees.

1975 (approx.) - 1981: Executive vice-president of Defenders of Wildlife, a Washington DC-based conservation group.

1981: Joined HSUS.

Grandy is currently HSI vice president for wildlife and habitat protection. According to the official bio, he is also president of the Monitor Consortium of animal welfare/rights organizations; treasurer of American Committee for International Conservation; and a member of the National Animal Damage Control Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Agriculture. In February 1994, he was elected as a member of the US Technical Advisory Group, as established by the American National Standards Institute to represent the US to the International Organisation for Standardisation in their efforts to create international humane trap standards.

LABUDDE, SAM

The notorious Sam LaBudde, who almost single-handedly brought the U.S. tuna fishing industry in the Eastern Tropical Pacific to its knees, and has been banned from International Whaling Commission meetings for his threatening behaviour to delegates, warrants a mention here for serving as a consultant to HSUS for its campaign against "dolphin-deadly" tuna in Europe (*HSUS News*, fall 1991). For a fuller history of this character, see Arnold & Gottlieb, pp 492-511, from which most of the following information derives.

According to *HSUS News* (fall 1991), LaBudde is "a biologist" who provides consultation to HSUS on the issue of dolphins being

couple of semesters of college before dropping out. He then drifted through a succession of temporary jobs, including tree-planter, boat repairer and deckhand, before completing a Bachelor of Arts degree at Indiana University in 1986, at the age of 30. A Bachelor's degree — and an Arts degree, at that — is not typically considered grounds to call oneself a "biologist", and LaBudde would agree: In an article about his eco-saboteur exploits in the *Atlantic Monthly*, published in 1989, he says: "I'd just come out of college. I was *trying* to become a biologist" (italics added). I could find no evidence that he had since pursued higher education. In the same article, he describes his ability at misrepresenting himself to others as "great".

His first job upon graduating was waiting tables, and he then landed himself a temporary contract for a Washington company providing fisheries observers. After one three-month stint as an observer aboard a Japanese trawler, the company released him and he decided to try for a job with an environmental organisation. He ended up in the offices of Earth Island Institute, which was busy waging a campaign against tuna fishermen at the time, and offered his services. They sent him off to the Marine Mammal Fund, a small organisation in San Francisco desperate for film that could be used to destroy the tuna industry.

With a pocketful of cash (including at least \$12,000 from Earth Island Institute), LaBudde drove down to Mexico to talk his way on board the worst-looking tuna boat he could find, the Panamanian-registered *Maria Luisa*, with a French-made net totally illegal for Eastern Tropical Pacific tuna fishing with dolphin. After years spent rusting at quayside, the *Maria Luisa* had recently be refitted by a newcomer to the tuna game for less than half the amount typically spent just on a new net. The owner kept the old net, even though it had been designed for Atlantic fisheries, had a wide mesh that would snag dolphin fins and snouts and trap them, was bright red (which agitates dolphins), and had no dolphin release device at all. A boat of U.S. or Mexican registry fishing on dolphin with such a net would be subject to a heavy fine, but the *Maria Luisa* was registered in Panama. The net was subsequently reworked slightly, and incorrectly, but not enough. It was still "completely unlike any other being used to fish for tuna on dolphins. And it was totally illegal by U.S. standards" (Arnold & Gottlieb, p501).

Indeed, the boat was in such a sorry state that the new owner had trouble finding a crew, and it eventually sailed with a man at the helm with no experience of captaincy. The rest of the crew

included deck hands from eight nations, relatives of the owner, a co-investor, and a 23-year-old navigator. As Arnold & Gottlieb describe it, "it was exactly the kind of boat LaBudde was looking for — a dolphin disaster waiting to happen." LaBudde made sure it happened by getting a job as a speedboat driver and mechanic, even though, as the captain later recalled, "Sam was useless with the speedboat engines. ... When we had to take an engine apart once, Sam just watched helplessly. He didn't know anything about engines."

In October 1987, the boat sailed, LaBudde with his video camera at the ready. The net turned out to be useless, most of the crew — including the captain — quit and LaBudde was so inept at his assigned job that he ended up as cook. The boat sailed again under a new captain, and at last, in January 1988, LaBudde got what he needed: two illegal sets on dolphins which furnished "grisly footage of dolphins being hauled up from the sea in the red net, crushed in the winch block and flopping around dying on the deck, ..." (Arnold & Gottlieb, p506).

LaBudde and Earth Island Institute then edited five hours of raw film footage down to 11 minutes, splicing images of a large number of trapped dolphins caught in a bad set — most of which were successfully released — with extraordinary scenes such as a single dolphin crushed in the block. In March 1988, the edited version aired on CBS, ABC and CNN, replete with LaBudde's comment: "the events that I filmed are tragically representative ... the things you will see on this film happen every day ... I would like to say that I feel that what is shown on the film is representative of the U.S. Fleet."

Years of successful efforts to bring down dolphin mortalities in the Eastern Tropical Pacific suddenly accounted for nought, and in 1992 the U.S. instituted a "dolphin safe" policy prohibiting imports of tuna caught in dolphin sets. The U.S. tuna fishing industry was devastated.

Aside from having caused the heavy loss of jobs both within the U.S. and at canneries overseas, the dolphin-safe policy is considered by the fishing industry to be an ecological disaster. But in September 1995, it seemed that they were finally winning back some hard-fought ground with the acceptance by five environmental organisations — the National Wildlife Federation, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Center for Marine Conservation, Greenpeace and WWF — of a deal that would allow tuna caught by foreign fleets setting nets on dolphins into the

U.S. (For further information, contact the Fishermen's Coalition: 619-575-4664.)

HSUS, however, remains a hardliner in the dolphin-safe camp, joining hands with Earth Island Institute in condemning this outbreak of common sense. LaBudde is still involved with EII (his name appears atop an EII press release dated Sept. 27, 1995), and could still be a consultant for HSUS.

The true story of how LaBudde spliced together film evidence from an atypical tuna boat and then presented it as typical was not known to the public at the time the film did its damage. Should HSUS — or other hard-line "dolphin-safe" advocates — decide to invoke the LaBudde factor in the current legislative battle, the true story of LaBudde "the biologist" and HSUS consultant deserves a wider audience.

LIEBERMAN, SUSAN

Susan Lieberman appears here because a large number of sources felt the combination of an HSUS background and her current position of authority within the government warranted attention, and related second-hand tales of her abuse of that power. Most of these tales I could not substantiate with first-hand sources and have omitted here; hence the brevity of this report.

Lieberman formerly served as an executive of HSUS, making a name for herself in the areas of importation to the U.S. of wild-caught birds, and the ivory trade. In June 1988, when WWF was still officially opposed to a total ban on trade in ivory, Lieberman, representing a consortium of animal welfare groups, was the only speaker at a Congressional hearing to support a total ban on the import and export of any elephant products in and out of the U.S. (BBC Wildlife, Dec. 1988).

She then secured a political appointment with the Fish & Wildlife Service to work on CITES issues under Marshall Jones. According to one source, she is today "the major force for protecting everything at Fish & Wildlife, and the main power for the U.S. at CITES."

She is said by some sources to have scant regard for her obligations as a government official when they conflict with her private agenda. The most widely heard-of case I could find concerned a 1994 joint proposal by WWF and the Audubon

Society to have Atlantic bluefin tuna listed under CITES. The U.S. government is said to have refused to table this proposal, at which point Lieberman, though a government official, went against U.S. policy and, in her official capacity, asked Argentina to table the proposal. Argentina refused, so Kenya was approached.

Lieberman is also a source of concern for the pet industry as it relates to birds.

In the late 1980s, a major battle began between importers of wild-caught birds and the animal welfare movement, and in particular HSUS. Spearheading the attack for HSUS was Lieberman. Now that she is working on CITES issues from inside the government, Marshall Meyers, a lawyer for the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC), is not happy.

"Our concern has been that, as an advocate in HSUS of imposing bans on the [wild-caught bird] trade, and now being inside the government where they're imposing bans on the trade, leaves a number of people quite uneasy," says Meyers.

Meyers has found, through experience dealing with FWS staff biologists outside of Washington, a strong "anti-trade" attitude, and the belief that money should not be made out of wild animals. However, he will not use the word "infiltration" to describe a perceived spread of animal rights doctrine, even in such cases as Lieberman's. "This country is a very open society. These are open bids. Whether or not the judgement of the government in allowing people to do things is proper is a different story," he says.

This is an ethical problem which Lieberman illustrates perfectly. As part of the effort to administer the law relating to bird imports, FWS has created an independent parrot specialist group with which it consults. Two of the members of that group, Lieberman and Rosemary Nam, are also employees of FWS.

"I find it interesting that Sue Lieberman sits on that board," says Meyers. "She's not an ornithologist. Rosemary Nam is an ornithologist. But here they are, in the government, calling this outside group for consultation on what decisions they ought to make, and they're part of the group. It may be technically perfectly legal — but it leaves the perception of a conflict. ... It's a red flag, and the government should be above reproach on these types of things. I think it raises some real questions of

perception, and in a lot of other countries that wouldn't be allowed, that an advocate can come in and take over the position to make decisions they were lobbying for."

Another lawyer who refused to be named informed me that there had been some friction on the board on which Lieberman and Nam sit because position papers had been put out without the knowledge of the full board.

Another incident Meyer recounts that suggests what can go on at the FWS involves a bird importer in Chicago, Frank Curic, and the London-based animal rights group the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA). According to Curic, two EIA staffers followed a shipment of his from Africa into New York, filming, and then gained access to the quarantine station using false names, claiming they were from FWS. The police showed up and the two people started giving other names, and turned out to be EIA. When the issue was raised with FWS, FWS said they had deputised them to help out. However, Meyer gave no indication that Lieberman was personally involved in this case.

Against the above somewhat disparaging comments about Lieberman should be balanced the following comments (personal communication) from *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton. His mention of "hanky-panky" refers to some of the unsubstantiated rumours which I had heard (not reproduced here).

"Re Sue Lieberman, I think some of your sources need a quart of prune juice in the worst way. I've talked to her once or twice a year in the course of researching articles for about eight years, and although I've never done an article specifically about her, I've never been aware of any reason to do one, either. Her reputation in animal protection circles is as a meticulous researcher and an absolute straight arrow in her personal life, who left HSUS to take a job at much lower pay precisely because she does not engage in any kind of hanky-panky, sexual or financial. I just ran a double-check, by asking someone who's known Lieberman a lot longer than I have what anyone's ever whispered about her, and the word came back, "Nothing. She was too straight for HSUS." Which is just about what I'd always thought. I can even think of one occasion, in the middle of the wild-caught bird bill fracas of 1992, when we got word of someone on the pet trade side of the issue being involved in an ethically very dubious situation of a personal nature, and I called Lieberman among a raft of others during the course of checking it out. Her response was that even if the dirt was true. she didn't

want to know about it because she didn't believe decision-making should be influenced by anything but the merits of the issues. I've remembered that conversation because I've so rarely encountered people who were unwilling to hit below the belt if they thought they could get away with it. In fact, I still have all the notes from that investigation.

"The worst thing I've ever heard about Lieberman that seems to be true is that she doesn't suffer fools especially well. I can identify with that trait. Ideally one should be more tolerant."

PACELLE, WAYNE

Wayne Pacelle joined HSUS in April 1994 as Staff Vice President for Government Affairs and Media, a capacity which may help to achieve his long-stated goal of building "a National Rifle Association of the animals rights movement" (*Animal People*, May 1994).

From 1988 to that time, he worked for the Fund for Animals, a fairly radical antihunting group with more than 200,000 members, first as executive director and later as national director. He has also served as president of the Animal Rights Alliance, and chairman of the Animal Rights Network, Inc. in Vermont.

A graduate of Yale University, Pacelle "claims to be an expert on wildlife biology" but the only degree Marquardt et al could find was in history (Marquardt and La Rochelle, p12).

Pacelle has long had a close relationship with the now-disgraced David Wills. While working for the newsletter *Animals' Agenda*, he wrote a highly flattering profile of Wills (*Animals' Agenda*, May 1988), and reportedly helped block publication of a report critical of the Michigan Humane Society under Wills's stewardship. After Wills became an HSUS executive in 1991, he is said to have "influenced [John] Hoyt and [Paul] Irwin to hire Pacelle, Aaron Medlock, and Bill Long away from the Fund for Animals ..."

An interesting illustration of Pacelle's character concerns the case of the Fund for Animals' Black Beauty Ranch "sanctuary" near Tyler, Texas, described in *Animal People* (May 1994) as "the Fund's signature project, home of numerous animals rescued through Fund intervention in abusive and exploitive situations." It was here that the Fund "was caught breeding 'rescued' animals

and selling the offspring for slaughter. Pacelle confessed that he had been aware of the skullduggery for some time, yet FFA did not hesitate to raise a considerable sum of money from unsuspecting donors for this bogus sanctuary (Marquardt and La Rochelle, p12)."

From the same publication:

"According to the Village Voice [Dec. 18, 1990], Cleveland Amory's group, the Fund for Animals purchases animals at livestock auctions for its animal 'sanctuary' at the Black Beauty ranch near Dallas, Texas. FFA uses the ranch and such 'rescued' animals to raise a great deal of money ... But Black Beauty ranch manager Billy Saxon was recently caught running a hog and cattle business on the side. According to the article, Saxon intermingled his business with that of the sanctuary. He also admitted breeding FFA boars ('rescued' from slaughter) with his sows and then selling the offspring for slaughter.

"FFA's Wayne Pacelle acknowledged that he had been aware of the cattle-raising business for some time but said he had kept Saxon on because of his fine work at the ranch. Saxon finally was fired, and walked away with a pocketful of the 'profits of death.' Amory claimed to be shocked that anyone could believe that just because Saxon raised livestock for slaughter, he did not care about the animals. Yet Amory is the first to label every other livestock producer an animal 'exploiter.'

"Meanwhile, FFA raised a bundle for its 'sanctuary.'" (Marquardt and La Rochelle, pp72-73)

Extracted from the same publication, Pacelle on pets:

"One generation and out. We have no problem with the extinction of domestic animals. They are creations of human selective breeding." [Author's note: "Wayne Pacelle, response to question on panel, Illinois Agricultural Leadership Foundation Conference, Washington, D.C., Mar. 10, 1993. Pacelle later claimed to have been referring to farm animals only, but the question he was answering was 'What about domestic animals?' That includes pets."

(See also "Memorable Quotes".)

STEPHENS, MARTIN

Martin Stephens, HSUS vice-president in charge of Animal Research Issues, has an M.S. and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He is married to Jo Shoemith Stephens, an attorney member of the Animal Legal Defense Fund with a private practice in Washington, D.C.

As HSUS's official spokesman on laboratory animal issues, he personally espouses the abolition of vivisection, but, in true HSUS form, does not see it as practical to force this down America's throat now, preferring to squeeze it down gently.

"I myself am an anti-vivisectionist, but I wouldn't impose that viewpoint on people now," he is quoted as saying (Katie McCabe in "Beyond Cruelty", *The Washingtonian*, Feb. 1990). By using the key word "now", Stephens gives away HSUS's long-term agenda, reiterated in another quote, this time from *People* magazine (Jan. 18, 1993): "It's true, scientists are doing things to animals they wouldn't think of doing to people ..., but for now, we think it's a justified and necessary evil."

Officially, then, HSUS policy on animal experiments is not to promote abolition but merely to promote the "three Rs" — reduction, replacement and refinement — a policy with which no reasonable person could argue. In a letter to *The Scientist* (Feb. 22, 1993), Stephens articulates this apparently conciliatory attitude thus:

"HSUS does not oppose all animal research. Our policy advocates reform, not abolition. Our programs are pragmatic attempts to reduce the suffering and use of laboratory animals without compromising biomedical science."

That said, I was unable to find any statement from HSUS endorsing any specific form animal research, so there is no way of knowing what research does meet with its approval.

The honest answer is probably none. In the HSUS publication prepared by Stephens entitled "Alternatives to Current Uses Of Animals in Research, Safety Testing, and Education — A Layman's Guide," he is unequivocal about what he sees as the logical conclusion — i.e., the long-term goal — of the three Rs approach:

"Replacement, reduction, and refinement constitute the three Rs of the 'alternatives approach' to laboratory practices. The ultimate goal of this approach is the complete replacement of laboratory animals with non-animal methods."

TELECKY, TERESA M., Ph.D.

Teresa Telecky is HSUS director in charge of the Wildlife Trade Program. She is the co-author of "Zimbabwe: Driving Wildlife to Extinction." *Animal Care*, 1993, 33(1), 1-4.

Elephants and Rhinoceros in Zimbabwe" (see Documents), and of an article for HSUS members based on that report, "Trophy of Death" (*HSUS News*, fall 1995).

Born April 29, 1958, in Chicago. In 1980 she attained a B.S. in Zoology from the University of Nevada, and in 1982 attained an M.S. in Zoology from the same institution. In 1989 she attained a Ph.D. in Zoology from the University of Hawaii. The following information comes under "Professional Expertise" in the summary of her resume distributed by the HSUS: "Four years as Associate Director in the Wildlife and Habitat Protection Section of the [HSUS], specializing in issues related to the international trade in wildlife. One year as a National Science Foundation post-doctoral fellow in Japan. Fourteen years of college training in zoological research and animal husbandry. Seven semesters of college teaching in anatomy, physiology, and evolution. Five summers working for federal agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Seven years work in the health care field."

WILLS, DAVID

(Much of the following material is from Animal People; see "DOCUMENTS". See also "One Nonprofit's Woes," from U.S. News & World Report. The latest scandal surrounding Wills has also been reported in The Chronicle of Philanthropy, CHAIN Newsletter [a California-based magazine for humane officers], an Associated Press article syndicated on Oct. 1, most major Alaskan media, and other publications ranging from daily newspapers to dogsledding periodicals.)

David Wills, 43, is the most consistently controversial character to be associated with HSUS, with a reputation for involvement with seedy characters and dubious practices. The rumour mill explains his ability to avoid the long arm of the law on a "special relationship" he enjoys with HSUS CEO John Hoyt.

As of Nov. 13, 1995, Wills was working under mysterious circumstances as executive director of the animal shelter in Washington DC. The story, as far as it can be pieced together, that preceded Wills's arrival in this position, follows:

According to the HSUS internal rumour mill, Wills is said to have come from a broken home in Baltimore, and to have had a troubled early marriage. He also picked up a felony conviction for breaking and entering.

His introduction to humane work came at the beginning of the 1970s, when he chanced upon an HSUS staffer soliciting funds. "Sounds like a pretty good scam," he is reported to have said, and the staffer decided to introduce him to Hoyt.

Still in the realm of HSUS folklore, Hoyt the preacher saw Wills as a prospect for redemption. He also saw him as a surrogate son, having managed to sire four daughters but no male heir.

Shortly thereafter, Wills entered the professional arena, with the result that documentation and hostile witnesses start replacing rumour.

In 1972, at the age of 19, Wills stepped straight into the top position at the Nashua Humane Society (NHS), making him the youngest person ever to head a major humane society. He landed the position on the strength of a personal recommendation from Hoyt and a resume which — by his own admission — was fictitious. In that resume, he had fraudulently claimed to have a masters degree in journalism, and to have worked for the Washington D.C. Humane Society.

At NHS, Wills won a reputation as both a lady's man and an aggressive fundraiser. In one of his last deeds there, in 1978, he moved to put a franchisee of a major pet store chain on the NHS's board of directors, and reputedly began sending people who came to the shelter looking for purebreds to the store instead. When a local dog breeder objected, she obtained a letter from Hoyt admitting that putting a pet store owner on the board of an animal shelter might constitute a conflict of interests.

Wills then left the NHS in 1978, and soon thereafter was threatened with a statutory rape charge. Also following his departure, NHS money turned out to be missing, with estimates ranging from \$10,000 to \$2 million.

Michigan Humane Society

In 1979, again with Hoyt's endorsement, Wills became executive director of the Michigan Humane Society (MHS), bringing along Nashua assistant Joan Witt. The MHS board did not learn about Wills's Nashua legacy until 1982, and when a Detroit TV station aired a report on the subject in 1983, the threat of legal action allegedly deterred other media from delving deeper.

Soon after arriving in Detroit, Wills became close friends with Deday LaRene, the tax lawyer who would go on to be imprisoned and debarred for tax evasion along with his Mafia kingpin client (see "LaRene, Deday"). In May 1994, at LaRene's sentencing hearing, Wills would testify: "To see him [LaRene] put away for a year where he cannot use his brain for the betterment of society is an egregious miscarriage of justice." On his release from prison, LaRene immediately entered community service with HSUS.

In 1987, Wills and Hoyt proposed a merger of MHS and HSUS so the latter could gain hands-on experience in shelter operation that might have aided fundraising. But the merger was shelved in 1988, about the time dubious financial transactions involving Hoyt and HSUS president Paul Irwin were exposed by syndicated columnist Jack Anderson [see "'Excessive' Pay at Humane Society" and "Dubious Deals in the Humane Society"].

By 1989, Wills had a salary of \$100,000 and was driving a Porsche 944, but in June of that year he resigned along with fellow board members Paul Henecks, Robert Sorock, and TV personalities John Kelly and Marilyn Turner, when the board became aware of a deficit eventually estimated at \$1.6 million. In November 1989, former MHS bookkeeper Denise Hopkins was charged with embezzlement and eventually convicted for pocketing \$60,000, but the bulk of the money was never accounted for. It was during the trial of Hopkins, in which Wills testified against her, that the media learned of Wills's sordid start in life, to wit, a conviction for breaking and entering followed by a fictitious resume.

Unnamed sources have also been reported as saying a disgruntled MHS employee, Ron Schmidt, on finding out he was about to be fired by Wills, informed the MHS board about Wills's cocaine habit. In October 1992, shortly after Deday LaRene was indicted, Schmidt was found murdered. The case has never been solved, leaving the question of motive. Schmidt was terminally ill with cancer at the time he was beaten to death, suggesting someone needed him out of the way in a hurry. One theory is that he might have been planning to assist in the investigation of the missing MHS money.

Journalist Merritt Clifton also reported that he had gathered statements from MHS staff who had served under Wills that he had sexually harassed and physically intimidated them. Wills acknowledged having had sexual relations with subordinates.

wrote Clifton, but denied harassment or coercion, and the statements were never published because the would-be plaintiffs refused to go on record, fearing for their safety.

NSAP

In August 1989, Wills set up the now dormant National Society for Animal Protection (NSAP) with a start-up gift of \$10,000 publicly presented by HSUS's Hoyt. Joining Wills on the new board were other former key players from MHS — Kelly and Sorock (both then also HSUS board members), Turner (later to become an HSUS board member), Joan Witt (now HSUS and wife of DeDay LaRene), Sienna LaRene (then wife of Deday LaRene) and Julie Morris, now director of shelter outreach for the American SPCA. Also on the board was Hoyt.

Though Wills had escaped the rap over the missing MHS funds, it was during this period that the spotlight began to expose his dubious associations and maverick approach to others' money. Shortly after his resignation from MHS, the Teamsters Union made an unsuccessful attempt to organize at the shelter. Two of Wills's alleged associates were involved in the Teamsters: John Burge, a nephew of Jimmy Hoffa who was convicted in 1991 of taking kickbacks from trucking companies in exchange for ensuring labour peace; and Rolland McMaster, Hoffa's longtime aide, who served five months in jail in 1966, also for taking employer kickbacks. Burge was also president of Atlantic Western Personnel Leasing Corp., an employee leasing firm in which McMaster and another reputed Wills associate, Dean Turner, were executives.

When Atlantic Western went bankrupt in March 1990, Wills intimated to then-NSAP volunteer Sandra LeBost, of Royal Oak, Michigan, that he had lost an investment in the company of \$40,000. On June 30, 1995, LeBost won a mediation judgement of \$42,000 in settlement of unrepaid loans to Wills of \$28,311 and her father's gold watch, with a claimed worth of \$10,000, but has not yet received the money.

In a parallel case, mediators have recommended that Wills pay \$15,000 to plaintiffs William and Judith McBride, of Ortonville, Michigan, who allegedly made a loan to Wills in May and June 1991, and were also not repaid. Wills has conveyed his intention to contest this case, contending the McBrides entrusted him with funds as investors, not as lenders.

Turner's mother, TV personality Marilyn Turner, was questioned about the Atlantic Western case by a Michigan grand jury. She and her husband John Kelly served on the board of MHS, resigning when Wills did and joining him on the board of NSAP. Kelly would also subsequently serve on the board of HSUS after NSAP was absorbed by HSUS in 1991 and Wills moved there to become Staff Vice President for Investigations.

In this capacity he often traveled overseas on undercover assignments, and handled cash payments to informers who helped expose animal cruelty. Informants rarely give receipts, which would require Wills to be extremely trustworthy in conducting his duties. A recent development suggests the HSUS's trust may have been misplaced.

Fired Again

On Aug. 9, 1995, Wills was relieved of his duties at HSUS following allegations by employees of sexual harassment and embezzlement, and officially placed on "administrative leave". On Aug. 11, after rumours about the circumstances had raced through the animal protection community, he was handed his notice, and his contract was formally terminated on October 14. Wills's departure came as HSUS/HSI board members questioned the use of funds to cover costs related to his wedding (see below) and his personal debts. Unnamed sources within HSUS have indicated that he drew "significant loans" against his salary, had taken a female subordinate abroad without prior authorization, and had submitted expense accounts for meetings that never took place. Details of some of the alleged transactions were recorded by current and former employees, who also alleged sexual harassment by Wills at various times over a three-year period.

In September, formal charges were filed against Wills with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in Washington. Plaintiffs Cristobel (Kitty) Block and Virginia Bollinger, both of whom worked for Wills, have alleged sexual harassment, while they and another Wills aide, Kimberly Roberts, have accused him of stealing funds earmarked for society projects and falsifying expense-account reports. In *U.S. News & World Report* (see "One Nonprofit's Woes", Bollinger is reported as saying Wills took girlfriends to dinner and identified them in expense reports as "biologists." Roberts, meanwhile, detailed her claims in an 11-page statement in which she says she uncovered "strong evidence of the embezzlement" of at least \$16,500 from society projects

in 1995 alone. She also claimed there were other "questionable" expenditures by Wills, including "large cash sums," allegedly used for informers.

Wills was reported to have strongly denied the charges, while the HSUS said it had hired outside investigators to look into the charges. At its annual meeting in early October, the HSUS board of directors considered prosecuting Wills in connection with the missing money, and subsequently decided to sue Wills, seeking the recovery of funds allegedly misappropriated for his personal use.

Another milestone in Wills's HSUS career was his use of influence to raise the presence of animal rightists in the organisation. In 1994, he recruited three members of the Fund for Animals — Wayne Pacelle (his ex-roommate), Aaron Medlock and Bill Long. He also recruited Virginia Bollinger from PETA, and was an influence in bringing over David Ganz, former president of the North Shore Animal League. And shortly before getting the axe, in June 1995, he married Lori White, former wife of PETA president Alex Pacheco, at a seaside resort in Mexico.

The ceremony was presided over by former clergymen Hoyt and Irwin, and the costs are believed to have been at least partially paid for with HSUS funds. In any event, Hoyt and Irwin said they were in Mexico on business at the time (see "Wills's subsidised wedding?").

Post HSUS

Before he had even been officially terminated at HSUS, Wills had found stop-gap employment handling the animal control contract for Washington D.C., running a new organisation called Animal Link (for details, see "Washington D.C. Animal Contract"). The contract with the city was set to run out on December 20, so his future is far from certain.

With regard to the HSUS lawsuit, Wills addressed the National Press Club on November 16, at which he claimed his contract was . "abruptly terminated for my 'failure to cooperate' in responding to a series of malicious and false allegations against me." He continued: "I believe I have become a pawn in a struggle for power and money both within HSUS and between competing animal rights organizations. HSUS is doing everything in its power to silence me, including filing a civil lawsuit against me. I was even advised by my health insurance company that HSUS had

tried to cancel health insurance for myself and my nine-year-old son with asthma," an apparent reference to the son of his latest wife, Lori White, by a previous marriage. "Make no mistake: when it comes to the treatment of people, the word 'humane' does not apply to HSUS."

He also stated his intent to contest HSUS's suit in court. "I am in the process with my attorneys of preparing a defense and countersuit in several forums that I assure you will reach the highest levels of the Humane Society's management," he said. "I am confident that I will be vindicated in the courts, but in that process many of the confidential informants who have assisted my investigations into animal rights abuses may be compromised or their lives endangered."

5) PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES

One of the distinguishing characteristics of HSUS is that it spreads itself over a very wide range of issues. The following information is therefore just a sampling of the higher-profile campaigns in which it has engaged, with some preference being given to those with interesting details.

That said, it is worth noting how HSUS views its own priorities. According to information provided by HSUS to *Public Interest Profiles* (Foundation for Public Affairs, 1992-93), its "Current Concerns" are as follows:

- Animal protection programs with an emphasis on companion animals, laboratory animals, and farm animals.
 - Anti-fur campaign.
 - Banning commercial trade in elephant ivory.
 - The environment and its impact on animals.
 - Humane education.
 - Wildlife and habitat education.
-
- 1978: Launched an investigation into dog kennels near Tallahassee, Fla., that led to the prosecution of four people in connection with training greyhounds for races by having them chase live rabbits (*Close-Up Report*, February 1979).

 - 1988, October (launch): "Shame of Fur", HSUS's first major anti-fur campaign, launched in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Dallas and Washington D.C. Told consumers that wearing fur is "cruel" and "unfashionable"; involved posting anti-fur messages on billboards and buses, organizing protests against fur stores, a public-service announcement narrated by Sir Laurence Olivier, and a full-page advertisement in the October edition of *Cosmopolitan* magazine with the caption: "Here's the part of a fur coat most people never see. It's not a pretty sight."

The campaign was coordinated with the World Society for the Protection of Animals, of which both John Hoyt and Paul Irwin are officers. Hoyt at that time was WSPA president. HSUS vice-president Patricia Forkan headed the "International Fur Commission", formed by WSPA to launch an international anti-fur campaign.

"Fur coats," HSUS said, "are products of agony. Millions of sentient mammals — who have highly evolved central nervous systems and thus suffer and feel pain just as humans do — are brutally raised or trapped and killed each year for fur garments

that, with the current availability of many warm alternatives, are mere extravagances in our advanced civilized society" (*Washington Post*, April 8, 1989).

To give an idea of how long it had taken HSUS to get involved in the anti-fur campaign, it was in the early 1970s that Cleveland Amory of the Fund for Animals started parading the banner "Real People Wear Fake Fur."

In addition to being a latecomer, HSUS's campaign was also allegedly startlingly unoriginal in content. According to the Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud (see "H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet"), it was a direct rip-off of another anti-fur campaign in the Netherlands, with other ideas being stolen from another campaign in the U.S. by Trans-Species Unlimited. For example, Trans-Species Unlimited had developed the concept of "fur-free zones" two and a half years before HSUS came up with "no furs allowed areas." According to the Coalition, the HSUS "had never tackled the fur issue as such, focusing instead on the narrow topic of leghold traps." After grass-roots organizations made fur a "safe" issue, however, HSUS leapt on the bandwagon.

In 1991, the campaign was joined by Tony La Russa, manager of baseball's Oakland Athletics, who appeared in a magazine advertisement proclaiming: "When you buy fur, you really strike out."

- Beautiful Choice campaign urging companies producing personal-care products to take the following pledge:

- That cosmetics and other personal-care products marketed by this company as part of the "Beautiful Choice" campaign have not been tested on animals either by this company or by any outside organization;
- That this company has neither tested the ingredients of such products on animals nor requested such tests of an outside organization;
- That this company will support efforts by The Humane Society of the United States to end the use of animal testing for cosmetics and other personal-care products (*Close-Up Report*, 1990)

HSUS was joined in this campaign by The Body Shop, an organisation long steeped in scandal.

- 1988: Breakfast of Cruelty. A letter-writing campaign against leaders of the pork and egg industries intended to prompt reforms in the way hogs and chickens are raised. According to the HSUS, "Behind virtually every slice of bacon and every

suffering (*Kiwanis Magazine*, Sept. 1988).") HSUS members were provided with postcards to send to the presidents of National Pork Producers and United Egg Producers.

Given that HSUS does not promote vegetarianism, and CEO John Hoyt is not a vegetarian, the campaign was viewed with a fair dose of cynicism by some grass-roots animal rights groups, most of which do promote either vegetarianism or veganism. The Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud offered the following comment (see "H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet"):

"According to the latest information available to the Coalition, a grand total of 3 of HSUS' 70 odd employees were vegetarians! Imagine anything more ludicrous than HSUS staffers coming in to work on the 'breakfast of cruelty' campaign after wolfing down a breakfast of bacon and eggs. The Coalition even has reliable information that the HSUS national office is regularly visited by a vending truck selling 'organic meat.'"

- Primate Project, aimed at ending "the cruel trade in wild primates for research purposes"; HSUS has successfully lobbied for a ban on government funds to animal research centres using formerly wild chimpanzees (*Close-Up Report*, June 1992).
- Government Alternatives Project, to force federal funding agencies to reform animal testing methods.
- Humane Charter Project, to encourage private funding agencies to adopt HSUS's animal research guidelines.
- Military Project, to make information on Department of Defense animal research publicly available.
- Campaigning for elimination of the use of shelter animals in research, and the use of animals in cosmetics and product safety tests.
- Campaigning for stricter standards in the horse-slaughtering industry. Aside from attacking operators of slaughterhouses, HSUS has also gone after the racing industry, pointing out the plight which awaits horses that can't cut it on the track (see, for example, *HSUS News*, fall 1994; summer 1995).
- Campaigning to ban hunting and trapping on the 90-million-acre national wildlife refuge system. HSUS also led an effort to block a hunter harassment bill in New Jersey.

- Support for a moratorium on patenting genetically altered animals.
- 1988, December: Urged members to desiccate their American Express credit cards because the company mailed a fur coat catalogue entitled: "Fur — because winter is long and life is short." HSUS urged members to "Follow your heart. Drop your American Express." (*The Gamecock*, Columbia, S.C., Jan. 9, 1989)
- 1989, February: Protested the U.S. Air Force's planned cull of jackrabbits causing a hazard on the runways of McClellan Air Force Base in California (*Sacramento Bee*, Feb. 23, 1989). An HSUS spokesman said the Air Force should find an alternative to killing the rabbits, while a spokeswoman for Animal Allies said the shooting couldn't be justified without specific proof that jackrabbits actually damaged aircraft. "If they don't have any cases of this actually happening, it seems they're just creating some kind of fun day for hunters," she said.
- 1989: Petitioned U.S. Department of the Interior to list the African elephant as an "endangered" rather than "threatened" species in an effort to outlaw ivory sales in the U.S.
- 1989: Filed a lawsuit to stop a deer hunt at the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia (*Washington Post*, Dec. 4, 1989).
- 1990: Participated at Earth Day in Washington, D.C., "to raise public awareness of the environmental threats to our planet and the animals with whom we share the earth (habitat depletion, rainforest destruction, pollution of our waters, etc.) and to build a strong base of public support to force environmental changes in the workplace and our daily habits (*Action Alert*, 1990)."
- 1990: "[Called] for a partnership among the churches and conservation, environmental, and animal-protection communities [to encourage] religious leaders and environmentalists to work together to establish a global environmental ethic throughout the world (*Action Alert*, 1990)."
- 1991: Sends letters to 8,000 District of Columbia residents asking them to urge Giant and Safeway supermarkets to sell eggs laid by non-caged hens. Giant began selling "organic nest-fresh eggs" at 70 cents to \$1 more per dozen, but Giant vice president consumer affairs Odonna Matthews said sales were "very, very

slow." Safeway decided not to sell the eggs because an adequate supply could not be guaranteed (*Washington Post*, Aug. 8, 1991).

- 1992: Threatens to sue Encyclopedia Britannica after it changed the 1991 entry by HSUS vice-president Michael Fox on the uses of dogs for biomedical research:

"Another common use of dogs, especially purpose-bred beagles, is in biomedical research. Such use, which often entails much suffering, has been questioned for its scientific validity and medical relevance to human health problems. For example, beagles and other animals have been forced to inhale tobacco smoke for days and have been used to test household chemicals such as bleach and drain cleaner. In addition, dogs have been used to test the effects of various military weapons and radiation."

Encyclopedia Britannica received hundreds of protest letters from scientists claiming the entry was inaccurate and misleading, and ignored the benefits to society of biomedical research. Robert McHenry, general editor of Britannica, wrote to Fox to say that he could not "escape the conclusion that ... the passage is unbalanced and unnecessarily inflammatory" (*Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 23, 1992).

- 1992: Wins a joint lawsuit with the Animal Legal Defense Fund and two individuals against the U.S. Department of Agriculture to extend coverage under the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act to include mice, rats, and birds used in laboratories (*Close-Up Report*, June 1992; *HSUS News*, spring 1992). In 1994, this ruling was overturned by a federal appeals court (*HSUS News*, fall 1994).

- 1992: Calls on U.S. delegation to CITES to support Appendix I listing for all African elephants after six southern African countries proposed Appendix II status. HSUS said that "Ivory fever ... a sickness [affecting] man [with symptoms of] greed and an arrogant disregard for life and the right of a majestic species" is leading to a "renewal of the ivory trade" that "means, without a doubt — without question — the decimation and eventual extinction of [elephants]." When the Zimbabwean government in 1991 announced a plan to kill 15,000 elephants living in overpopulated herds, HSUS said "Zimbabwe's proposed cull seems to be nothing more than a thinly veiled ploy to convince the world that elephants are not endangered ... (*Close-Up Report*, Jan. 1992)."

- 1993: Launches "Farm Animal Awareness Week" to encourage people to eat more "humanely". Campaign includes interesting examples of anthropomorphisation, such as:

- "For cows, hearing the King is a moo-ving experience. Experiments in Illinois found that cows give 35% more milk when they listen to the music of Elvis."
- "Like other working mothers, cows use day care. If several calves are born in a herd, the mother cows will share baby-sitting duties. One or two cows remain while the rest go for food or water. When they return, they take a turn at baby-sitting."

During the countdown to the second Farm Animal Awareness Week, in 1994, the American Animal Welfare Foundation (Tel.: 612-293-1049) attempted to alert the public to HSUS's intentions. In a press release dated Sept. 16, Foundation president Harold DeHart said:

"While at first blush HSUS's claims may seem silly or harmless, they are actually trying to sell a frightening idea. By saying that cows love Elvis music, HSUS is attempting to equate humans with animals and to persuade Americans that it's wrong to eat meat, eggs, and milk. We urge consumers to see this campaign for what it is: a desperate attempt to make them feel guilty about using animal products."

- 1994: Announces the findings of an investigation into "canned hunts" in the US, accusing 24 zoos of selling exotic animal species to operators who then made them available for "hunters" to shoot. HSUS was subsequently exposed for using data that were either out of date, inaccurate or unsubstantiated (see "Easy Targets — Did HSUS expose zoo links to canned hunts or just play to the grandstand?").

- 1995 (?): Eating With Conscience campaign launched, organised by anti-meat campaigner Howard Lyman. Wildlife Harvest (May 1995) linked the campaign to an attempt by the anti-meat movement to turn small farmers against large outfits, i.e. divide and conquer. "The antis' and vegetarians are trying to stir-up a hornet's nest between family-farm pork producers and large-scale corporate pork producers," stated Wildlife Harvest. "Tom Floy, president of the Iowa Pork Producers Association, cautioned that farmers should be wary of efforts that drive a WEDGE between Iowans." The publication also said that singer Willie Nelson was working with family farmers in northern Missouri to close down a "large-scale confinement hog operation," but did not state whether he was doing so at the behest of HSUS.

- Campaigning against pet "overpopulation". This has been a

have all pet dogs and cats spayed/neutered and another to outlaw what it calls "puppy mills". This has included supporting state and local efforts to pass mandatory spay/neuter laws.

On Mar. 18, 1993, in Orlando, Florida, HSUS proposed a one-year "voluntary" ban on the breeding of cats and dogs to lessen an "overpopulation crisis" of 110 million pets nationwide (Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Mar. 19, 1993). "We are faced with a tragedy," president Paul Irwin was quoted as saying. "Many people are still breeding cats and dogs while millions of unwanted animals languish in shelters or on the streets without a home." If the voluntary ban failed, the paper reported, the HSUS wanted a mandatory two-year moratorium.

In a press release issued in conjunction with the above, it is stated that the HSUS is not opposed to pets, or "companion animals", as animal rightists prefer to call them: "[HSUS president Paul] Irwin stressed that The HSUS is not attempting to eliminate companion animals with these measures. 'Dogs and cats can be a wonderful source of joy and companionship for all of us,' Irwin said. 'We hope that these efforts will give every dog and cat the chance to be someone's lifelong companion.'"

This statement was doubtless included to allay growing fears that HSUS's ultimate objective is to get rid of pets altogether, an objective readily admitted by PETA. These fears will not have been lessened by the arrival at HSUS in April 1994 of Wayne Pacelle, former national director of the Fund for Animals. In addressing the Illinois Agricultural Leadership Foundation Conference on Mar. 10, 1993, Pacelle was asked to comment on his view of domestic animals. He replied: "One generation and out. We have no problem with the extinction of domestic animals. They are creations of human selective breeding."

6) AWARD PROGRAMS

JAMES HERRIOT AWARD

Annual award inaugurated in 1987 for individuals or agencies who, "through communication with the public, [have] helped to promote and inspire an appreciation of and a concern for animals" (*HSUS News*, summer 1995).

Known recipients are:

James Wight (aka James Herriot; 1987);
H.I. "Sonny" Bloch, former HSUS director and current jailbird (1989);
Roger Caras, president of the American SPCA (1991);
Father Thomas Berry, an "ecoth theologian" and "spiritual guide" (as well as officer) of HSUS's Center for Respect of Life and Environment (1992; see "HSUS and Religion");
Richard Donner and Lauren Shuler Donner, executive producer and producer of *Free Willy* and *Free Willy II* (1995; *The Sunday Telegraph*, May 23, 1993, contains this great comment from Richard: "Richard Donner, a Hollywood film-maker, is typical of anti-whalers; asked on a BBC documentary why he opposed Norway's decision to hunt whales, he retorted angrily: 'They are human'.").

RUSSELL AND BURCH AWARD

Annual award inaugurated in 1991 and worth \$5,000 to a scientist or scientists who make outstanding contributions toward advancing the 3Rs. The award commemorates British scientists William Russell and Rex Burch who, in the late 1950s, proposed that researchers refine procedures involving animals to minimise suffering, reduce the number of animals used, and replace animal-based research with non-animal methods.

Known recipients are:

Dr. Alan Goldberg, director of Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (1991);
Dr. Charles Branch of Auburn University for developing an alternative to using live dogs for teaching cardiovascular physiology in veterinary and medical schools (1992);
Michael Balls, D.Phil, director of the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods, in Italy (1994). The Centre was set up by the European Commission in 1991 to validate

replacements for laboratory tests using animals, and according to *HSUS News* (winter, 1995), was funded as a result of leadership shown in the European Parliament by British MEP Anita Pollack. Pollack is a former president of the Intergroup on Animal Welfare, established by IFAW and now largely funded by WSPA (vice-president, John Hoyt). She was also a keynote speaker at HSUS's 1994 national conference.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH MEDAL

The Joseph Wood Crutch medal is awarded annually. I did not manage to discover its value, or on what grounds it is awarded. Known recipients are:

Denis Hayes, chairman of Green Seal Inc., which places labels on what it considers environment-friendly products, established in 1990 with the help of HSUS (1990; HSUS has a member on the board of Green Seal);

Russell Train, who retired from WWF in 1993 with the fattest salary of any animal welfare/habitat protection organisation executive in the US of \$349,660, which included a lump-sum retirement benefit of \$300,000 (1991);

John Walsh, assistant director general of the World Society for the Protection of Animals (1992; HSI president John Hoyt is vice-president of WSPA).

7) DOCUMENTS

Easy Targets — Did HSUS expose zoo links to canned hunts or just play to the grandstand?

(Animal People, October 1994; for a response from San Francisco Zoo to HSUS allegations made in the following article, see "Letters" in the December 1994 edition.)

WASHINGTON D.C. — Announcing that a three-year probe "has implicated the nation's best-known zoos as suppliers of exotic animals to hunting ranches," the Humane Society of the U.S. has made recent headlines across the country — but the facts fall short of the sensational charges.

HSUS alleged that 24 zoos had sold animals to so-called canned hunts. Of the 24, however, seven had already terminated links to canned hunts that were disclosed years ago by other investigators. The allegations made against another 10 zoos remain unsubstantiated more than two months after they were named by the periodical HSUS Reports, despite HSUS investigator Richard Farinato's August 24 promise to *Animal People* that details would be forthcoming. Several of the zoos deny making such sales; one of them, the Knoxville Zoo, had cancelled such a sale before it was completed.

Of the seven zoos that were implicated in substantiated sales to canned hunts, only two, the San Francisco Zoo and Busch Gardens in Tampa, Florida, were involved in either multiple transactions or the sale of more than four animals. Only a handful of sales occurred within the past two years. Only the Mesker Park Zoo in Evansville, Illinois, acknowledged awareness of having sold an animal who might be hunted.

The HSUS allegations were amplified by an August 19 U.S. Newswire statement, timed to boost the August 20 introduction of H.R. 4497, the "Captive Exotic Animal Protection Act of 1994," by Rep. George Brown (D-California) and 15 co-sponsors. Adapted from the "Canned Hunt Prohibition Law of 1992," which died in the last Congress, the bill would ban interstate and international traffic in exotic wildlife to stock hunting ranches — many of which are essentially shooting pens. The bill has virtually no chance of passage this late in the current Congress, which will close in mid-October, and the principal author, Rep. Don Edwards (D-California) is retiring at the close of the season.

"As enablers of the canned hunting industry," charged HSUS vice president for governmental affairs Wayne Pacelle, "the zoos are as guilty as the hunters who pay to pull the trigger."

Returned American Zoo and Aquarium Association executive director Sydney Butler, "Mr. Pacelle knows full well that the AZA is vehemently opposed to canned hunts and holds any violations of its policy as a direct ethics code violation, which can result in the loss of accreditation and membership." Butler said AZA would study H.R. 4497 before issuing a position on it, but indicated that he saw no reason to oppose it.

Ethics

As of mid-September, AZA spokesperson Jane Ballentine told *Animal People*, "HSUS has not written to our Ethics Board requesting an investigation into their allegations. Many reporters have wondered why, since they are making such a huge deal out of this issue. We can't help but have our own internal theories."

Farinato and HSUS vice president John Grandy informed *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton in April at the White Oak Conference on Zoos and Animal Protection that they were preparing an anti-zoo offensive for this fall — regardless of developments at the conference, which brought together a select group of leaders in the captive wildlife and animal protection communities. After the first day of the conference found most participants in agreement on major issues, Grandy and Farinato privately urged Clifton to "lead the attack" the next day, claiming that for political reasons they and Pacelle had to "maintain cover" until fall. Clifton responded that his role was to report the news, not to make it, and that the HSUS strategy showed bad faith — especially after the AZA had repeatedly strengthened its ethics code prohibition on selling animals to canned hunts, over the objections of some highly influential members.

HSUS pledged to fight canned hunts as far back as April 25, 1973, when then-HSUS zoological representative Sue Pressman wrote to longtime Kansas humane activist Mona Lefebvre that the organization was engaged in "major investigative" work on the subject, with the goal of getting "some laws" passed. Pressman, still outspokenly critical of canned hunts, long since left HSUS, and now heads the Association of Sanctuaries. HSUS meanwhile produced neither major revelations nor legislation for more than 20 years, and in fact was conspicuously absent on November 19, 1991, when Congressional Friends of Animals hosted a briefing

on canned hunts for fellow members of Congress. Participants included representatives from AZA (then known as the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums), Friends of Animals, American SPCA president Roger Caras, and Fund for Animals president Cleveland Amory.

In the interim the then-growing commerce between zoos and canned hunts came to light through the work of investigative reporters including Clifton, who published frequent exposes of the traffic in both U.S. and Canadian media between 1981 and 1991. AAZPA responded with increasingly strict guidelines discouraging such transactions, and in 1990 backed words with deeds by stripping Arkansas wildlife broker Earl Tatum of his accreditation, for officially undisclosed reasons, just after CBS 60 Minutes revealed that Tatum and another dealer, James Fouts, of Kansas, had sold animals from the San Diego Zoo and the Oklahoma City Zoo at auctions frequented by canned hunt proprietors. Fouts, fined \$2,500 by the USDA in 1985 for illegally importing a parrot, was never accredited by AAZPA. Informed of the dealers' canned hunt link by 60 Minutes, both zoos severed relations with Tatum and Fouts in November 1989 — two months before the 60 Minutes segment aired.

Already embarrassed, the San Diego Zoo was hit again on the eve of the September 1991 AAZPA annual meeting — held in San Diego — when former San Diego Zoo elephant handler Lisa Landres, working for FoA, disclosed a 1985 deal that sent 22 animals directly to a canned hunt in Oregon. FoA also revealed several one-and-two-animal transactions between the San Diego Zoo and other alleged canned hunt suppliers — Jergen Schultz, co-owner of the Catskill Game Farm, just south of Albany, New York, and Arizona auction dealer Pat Hocter. Hocter also publishes Exotic Animal News, a periodical advertising the availability of animals to an audience including canned hunt proprietors. The Oregon canned hunt was already defunct, and the San Diego Zoo no longer had any relationship with Hocter. It immediately ceased dealings with the Catskill Game Farm, to which it had often sold animals since 1952.

Zoos crack down

The September 1991 AAZPA meeting also came just three weeks after publication of a widely distributed and quoted Clifton expose of canned hunts and the zoo connection, crediting AAZPA for progress against canned hunts, but noting the ambivalent relationship between leading AAZPA members and maior hunting

ranches, several of which belong to AAZPA Species Survival Plans. Jacksonville Zoo director Dale Tuttle, a key figure in both AAZPA and SSP administration, defends hunting ranches as a way to make species conservation pay for itself.

Finally, however, the balance tipped against Tuttle. "AAZPA strongly opposes disposal of exotic wildlife to individuals solely for the purpose of shooting," the group resolved. "Specimens should not be sold, traded, or otherwise transferred to any organization or individual for the purpose of sport, trophy, or any other form of hunting. Such action constitutes a violation of the AAZPA Code of Professional Ethics."

The San Diego Zoo adopted a similar policy, strengthening a 1976 ban on selling animals to nonaccredited facilities. Since November 1991 the San Diego Zoo has required every private purchaser to sign a contract stipulating that the animals will not be hunted, and that if a ranch begins to allow hunting, as the Dale Priour ranch in Texas did after obtaining two animals from the San Diego Zoo, it must return the former zoo animals and their offspring.

Further, president Douglas Myers pledged, "We will compile a list of known hunting ranches to serve as a red flag guide, giving names and addresses for us to avoid when searching for proper places to send zoo animals. We will check regularly to find out who has applied for federal permits to cull protected species. We will cross-reference that list with the list of private facilities receiving zoo animals. This will provide a starting point for double-checking on who is allowing hunts and who will not be sent zoo animals."

Only once since 1991 has a former San Diego Zoo animal turned up at a canned hunt — a European boar acquired by Robert Naud of Brigham, Quebec. According to San Diego Zoo public relations director Jeff Jouett, the boar "was sent to a man named Ed Novak, of Cairo, New York. The animal next was sold to Mark Smith at Bradwood Farms in Reddick, Florida. Bradwood Farms evidently went through a bankruptcy/foreclosure proceeding. That's where Naud picked up the boar, to the best of our knowledge. All of these transactions occurred prior to November 1991. Each person involved — Novak, Smith, and Naud — was promptly notified of our disgust and distress, and all business dealings with each were immediately ended. We also notified AAZPA of our findings so that other zoos may be aware of the names and reputations of the people involved."

The 1991 AAZPA and San Diego Zoo actions severed the zoo traffic to canned hunts, for the most part, though many more older deals were disclosed during the next year by FoA, the Houston Chronicle, and the activist group Voice for Animals, based in San Antonio, Texas. Most compromised, then and now, was the San Antonio Zoo, whose board of directors, Voice for Animals reported, includes alleged hunting ranch owners David Bamberger, Rugeley Ferguson, Mrs. Jack Guenther, Buddy Jordan, Betty (Mrs. Robert) Kelso, Leon Kopecky, Red McCombs, Scott Petty Jr., and Louis Stumberg.

McCombs, VfA charged, lent his address to alleged seller of zoo animals to canned hunts Larry Johnson.

Jordan, whose name resurfaced in the HSUS investigation, now denies involvement with canned hunts, but boasted in a 1989 interview with the San Francisco television news station KPIX that he made "big money" selling animals to such hunts, and was named as a supplier to canned hunts by the Houston Chronicle in 1992. He also admitted recently to Tampa Tribune reporter Nanette Woitas that while he does not sell the animals he breeds from former zoo stock "direct to a hunting range," he doesn't necessarily know where they all end up. In February 1992 Jordan reportedly sold \$40,000 worth of animals to the Triple 7 ranch — a canned hunt where as many as 2,500 exotic animals are killed each year.

Kelso is wife of Robert Kelso, whose Auerhahn Ranch purportedly hosts guest hunters from Safari Club International; bought 40 hooved exotic animals from the San Antonio Zoo between 1985 and 1991; and in 1992 was discovered by the Houston Chronicle to have purchased animals from the Cheyenne Mountain Zoo, the National Zoo, and the Philadelphia Zoo. All three zoos demanded the return of the animals upon learning of Kelso's involvement in hunting, but seven antelope obtained from Cheyenne were already dead, four of them supposedly from causes other than hunting.

The Bamberger link is most problematic for AZA. On the one hand, Bamberger runs one of the biggest and best-known hunting ranches in the U.S.; on the other, he belongs to the SSP for the Arabian oryx, managed by Tuttle.

In March 1992 the AAZPA board moved to further strengthen the anti-hunting guideline. According to an internal discussion paper

summarizing the debate that ensued throughout the next year, "The word solely" rendered the September 1991 statement "meaningless as a guideline for professional behavior," because some zoos were claiming they sold animals to canned hunts "for money, not solely for shooting," or "well, mostly for game viewing," or "for breeding, not solely for shooting."

In May 1993, the board adopted the present ethical statement, affirming that it, "strongly opposes the sale, trade, or transfer of animals from zoos and aquariums to organizations or individuals which allow the hunting of animals directly from or bred at zoos and aquariums."

Achieving passage of the statement, the discussion paper indicates, required overcoming three categories of resistance. First, it noted, both zoos and the public must realize that, "The unpredictability of sex ratio, fecundity or the behavioral adequacy of prospective animal offspring means that significant surplus will be produced in any zoo or aquarium not being managed for extinction," at least at the current level of reproductive science.

Second, the paper explained, zookeepers often suffer from the same illusions about a mythical animal-heaven on a farm somewhere that afflicts the general public: "Zoos that have sent surplus animals to a place where they might be hunted have usually done so to afford them a longer lifespan and, perhaps, the chance to reproduce. Payment for such surplus is helpful to the maintenance of long-term endangered species propagation programs — but it also encourages the false belief that zoos and aquariums create unnecessary surplus to make money. Usually unexpressed, but perhaps most important," the paper added, "it is both difficult and disheartening for zoo and aquarium biologists who spend their lives caring for animals to have to destroy them. No matter how humane, culling has seemed an extremely poor alternative in view of the fancied benefits of disposal to a ranch."

The paper pointed out that the reality of hunting ranches is often "the badly aimed wounding of tame animals lured by feeding bells and buckets of corn — or even the shooting of big cats in cages. AAZPA members have observed," it added, "that few such hunting organizations can provide those who send them animals any assurance of professional animal management or humane animal care."

Finally, the paper noted, "Only six or seven ranches currently sustain SSP animals or participate in endangered species programs. Nevertheless, the potential of their vast acreages to extend zoo efforts for vanishing ungulates must not be overlooked ... Some of these ranches may permit hunting of surplus exotic ungulates as well as deer, turkeys, and other native species."

As a concession to the Tuttle faction, the AZA ethics code accordingly "does not apply to those individuals or organizations which allow hunting of indigenous game species (but not from zoo and aquarium stocks) and established exotic species such as (but not limited to) whitetailed deer, quail, rabbits, geese, and such long-introduced species as boar, ring-necked pheasant, chukar, trout, etc."

The Catskill Game Farm

Since the current code was adopted, only four zoos on the HSUS list — the San Francisco Zoo, Busch Gardens, the Cleveland Metroparks Zoo, and the Seneca Park Zoo in Rochester, New York — are alleged to have sold animals who may have gone to canned hunts. Of these, all but Busch Gardens sold the animals to the Catskill Game Farm.

"Catskill assured me none of our animals were sold to canned hunts," said Seneca Park Zoo director Dan Michalowski, who quit dealing with Catskill anyway and said legal action could follow if the animals had gone to hunting ranches, inasmuch as Catskill had signed an agreement that neither the animals in question nor their offspring would ever be hunted. New York state Department of Environmental Conservation records show that of the three Seneca Park Zoo animals sold to Catskill since 1992, a 13-year-old lion was euthanized due to injuries received in a fight with another lion, a male ringtailed lemur drowned, and a female ringtailed lemur remains at Catskill.

Catskill co-owner Kathie Schulz, whose father founded the facility in 1933, said she was unaware of having sold any animals to canned hunts, despite repeated allegations of having done so, and added that HSUS will hear from her lawyer. But she later admitted that a related firm run by her husband Jurgen Schulz sells animals "to whatever the needs are of the public."

The San Francisco Zoo also sold two nyalas to Buddy Jordan.

By far the most serious HSUS allegations — other than the well-known situation involving the San Antonio Zoo — pertained to Busch Gardens, which sold animals to both Buddy Jordan and Earl Tatum, nearly four years after the latter lost his AZA accreditation. Jordan apparently bought 87 animals from Busch between 1990 and 1992. Tatum may have acquired hundreds of Busch animals over the past two decades. Both Jordan and Tatum signed the AZA's standard agreement that animals obtained from Busch would not be sold at auctions or be hunted, but Arkansas state veterinary records indicate that Tatum did in fact sell at least one kudu bought from Busch in 1992 to Texas hunting ranch owner Jack Moore.

As many as 4,000 hunting ranches operate in the U.S., of which about three-fourths specialize in captive bird-shooting. Of the rest, most either breed the animals killed on their premises themselves or buy animals through an extensive and fast-growing network of private breeders and exotic wildlife auctions. The foundation stock for this network did mostly come from zoos, but mostly prior to the formation of the AZA, which from its inception has worked to halt the release of animals from accredited zoos to unaccredited facilities and to promote longterm coordinated breeding strategies to reduce the numbers of surplus animals.

HSUS Usurps AHA Disaster Relief Role

(Animal People, May 1994)

WASHINGTON D.C. — On March 9 the American Humane Association renewed the agreement it has had with the American Red Cross since 1976 to serve as the coordinating agency for animal relief after U.S. disasters. Eight days later, after apparently pressuring the Red Cross at the board level, the Humane Society of the U.S. reportedly told Associated Press that the Red Cross had designated it "the official disaster relief agency for pets and other animals."

According to AP, HSUS vice president David Wills claimed, "There has been no real coordinated effort so far," ignoring the AHA role in coordinating disaster relief since 1916, and the recent disaster relief work of the North Shore Animal League and United Animal Nations.

The alleged HSUS assertions surprised no one more than AHA emergency animal relief coordinator Nicholas Gilman, coming only two days after Gilman left a post as an HSUS field representative to replace Curt Ransom, who quit the AHA job because he was tired of the constant travel.

"There isn't even anyone assigned to work on disaster relief fulltime at HSUS as far as I know," Gilman told *Animal People*. "The AHA is the only national animal welfare agency with a fulltime emergency animal relief staff member. I don't know what HSUS is up to, but certainly a lot of organizations have been jumping into disaster relief," he continued. "That's good for improving the response to relieve animal suffering, but you also have to look at the possibility that it's good for fundraising. We welcome HSUS participation," Gilman added. "We only hope that confusion does not ensue in terms of which agency is the lead agency as designated by the Red Cross." The issue is critical because of the need to coordinate efforts amid chaos when essential supplies may be scarce.

An HSUS release dated March 16 but received at *Animal People* on April 19 said HSUS had formed a disaster relief team in 1992. A cover letter signed by Stephen Dickstein, identified as "project coordinator, disaster relief team," pointed out that the release said HSUS had been recognized as "an official disaster relief agency," not "the official agency," as AP had it, and said he was unaware that either AHA or HSUS had been designated the coordinating agency.

The Contract that Never Was

The following is a case study of HSUS (and Greenpeace) claiming false victory. It was reported in detail in the "International Harpoon" in May 1994. The following version has been edited slightly. Full documentation resides with the High North Alliance, tel.: 47-76-092414; Fax: 47-76-092450.

In 1992, following Norway's decision to resume commercial whaling, a boycott campaign was launched against Norwegian products, led by Greenpeace, the HSUS, and Earth Island Institute.

Nearly two years later, Greenpeace Norway reported that in 1993 alone Norwegian exporters had lost contracts worth Kr450 million (\$64 million). But according to the Bergen School of Economics and Administration which compiled a similar report

at the request of the Norwegian Foreign Office, lost contracts in 1992 and 1993 combined came to between Kr6.1 million and Kr9.7 million. The report also stated that "a number of the alleged contract cancellations mentioned in the (Greenpeace) press release do not conform to reality." Among these was a major non-existent contract between Norwegian company Raufoss A/S (a manufacturer of defense technologies, car parts, and occasionally harpoon grenades) and General Motors.

"General Motors Stops Buying Auto Parts from Company that Manufactured Whaling *Harpoon* Grenades," stated a triumphant HSUS press release dated Sept. 30, 1993.

What was not stated was that Raufoss had made neither harpoon grenades nor GM parts for three years. It does, however, make steering systems for Swedish automaker Saab, of which GM owns 50%.

Raufoss last made grenades in 1991, when it completed a one-year contract for the Norwegian government worth about Kr10 million (the service contract ended in 1992). And Raufoss also concluded its relationship with GM in 1991, when it finished a three-year contract supplying parts for Chevrolet Corvettes. This "minor contract," as Raufoss spokesman Birger Hofsten told the *Harpoon*, "came to a natural end long before the introduction of the boycott campaigns."

To what contract, then, was the HSUS referring? The key lies in a letter dated Sept. 29 from GM vice-president Bruce MacDonald to HSUS executive vice-president Patricia Forkan.

"No GM division currently purchases parts from ... Raufoss A/S or any other Norwegian company directly or indirectly affiliated with Raufoss," wrote MacDonald.

He explained about GM's past relationship with Raufoss, implying that this might have been the source of Forkan's confusion, and calmed her fears by stating: "We do not anticipate purchasing such items from Raufoss as long as Norway continues to commercially whale in violation of the Fishermen's Protective Act."

MacDonald also explained that Saab had discussed Forkan's concern with Raufoss, and had asked for written confirmation that it would not make harpoon grenades in future. "Given the Raufoss reply, GM considers the matter resolved," he wrote.

Undeterred by these revelations, Forkan ran the story she couldn't bare to kill.

"The HSUS today credited its boycott of Norwegian products for a decision by General Motors not to purchase products from Raufoss A/S," ran the press release.

"This is a tremendous victory for the American consumer, who can now purchase GM products and know that they are not supporting Norway's outlaw slaughter of whales," Forkan quoted herself as saying.

She then "substantiates" her claim by quoting just one line from MacDonald: "We do not anticipate purchasing such items in the future from Raufoss as long as Norway continues to commercially whale ..."

She also asked her constituents to associate the HSUS with the end of Norwegian whaling: "We're also encouraged because Raufoss is the only manufacturer of the harpoon grenades and without them, Norway will be unable to kill any whales in 1994."

Harpoon subsequently learned that Raufoss had indeed supplied Saab with the requested written statement that it would not resume grenade production, but also learned from the Norwegian Fisheries Department that existing supplies would last until the end of 1995, and negotiations are under way with a new supplier.

What Forkan had declined to mention — for obvious reasons — was how much the contract with GM had been worth. That information was provided by Geir Wang-Andersen of Greenpeace Norway.

Wang-Andersen reported in a boycott update that Norway had lost export contracts in 1993 worth an estimated Kr450 million, among which figured the cancellation by GM of a contract worth Kr90 million.

Harpoon first ran the figure by Raufoss spokesman Hofsten. "Complete nonsense," he replied.

Harpoon then called Wang-Andersen, who spoke on condition that he not be quoted. Wang-Andersen stated that most of the figures on his list had been obtained from the Norwegian press, and that the GM figure had come from the tabloid *Dagbladet* (Oct. 1).

The Dagbladet article stated: "The GM announcement that it will sever ties with Raufoss will mean a loss of business worth Kr90-100 million," but gave no specifics.

Wondering whether it might refer to Raufoss's business with Saab, *Harpoon* called Hofsten again. "We have had no problems whatsoever with this contract," he said.

Harpoon then confirmed with Wang-Andersen that he had not asked Dagbladet for its source, or checked the figure with Raufoss or GM. Wang-Andersen also said that he had seen the letter from GM's MacDonald to the HSUS — the letter which stated that GM did no business with Raufoss.

Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills

(Animal People, December 1995)

WASHINGTON D.C. — Humane Society of the United States executive vice president Patricia Forkan is to assume authority over HSUS domestic operations effective on January 1, 1996. HSUS president Paul Irwin, now heading domestic operations, will move over to head the umbrella organization, Humane Society International, while current HSI president John Hoyt, 65, will serve as vice president until he retires in May, officially for health reasons.

Former HSUS vice president for investigations and legislation David Wills, Hoyt's longtime protege and onetime chosen successor, was formally terminated on October 14, two months after he was officially placed on "administrative leave," and was in fact fired, in so many words, according to a very highly placed informant. HSUS has also sued Wills, seeking the recovery of funds — believed to be about \$16,500 — allegedly misappropriated to his personal use.

In a peripherally related personnel move indicating the changing HSUS corporate culture, Forkan confidante Martha Armstrong has been named vice president for companion animals, succeeding Ken White, who left last spring to head the Arizona Humane Society. Armstrong, longtime Massachusetts SPCA director of humane education and legislation, previously headed shelters in Oakland, California, and Tennessee.

Turnabout

Only 18 months earlier, in mid-1994, *Animal People* received leaked confidential memos indicating that other HSUS senior executives were attempting to force Forkan out of HSUS by transferring many of her longtime duties to Wills and lobbyists Wayne Pacelle, Bill Long, and Aaron Medlock, whom Wills recruited from the Fund for Animals. Some of Forkan's staff were urged to retire.

Virtually raised in an upstate New York shelter still directed by her mother, Forkan served as executive director of the Fund in the 1970s, prior to joining HSUS.

The changes at HSUS have so far not lifted Hoyt's interdict on staff communications with *Animal People*, imposed against editor Merritt Clifton since October 1988 when Clifton, then news editor for *Animals' Agenda*, asked Hoyt and Irwin to comment on a Jack Anderson expose of how HSUS purchased a house for Hoyt's use and loaned Irwin funds with which to buy vacation property in Maine. Our questions about the recent and impending changes went officially unanswered. Forkan and HSUS chief legal counsel Roger Kindler reportedly told other people with similar questions that our reconstruction of the changes from leaked information, as reported in our November 1995 edition, was "inaccurate" and "not even close" to what actually happened.

But they apparently supplied no specifics. Other accounts suggest the alleged "inaccuracies" are more matters of perspective than substance: did Forkan merely inherit authority, or ascend by having her hands clean? Is Hoyt retiring on schedule, or is he being discreetly ousted? Is Irwin now the big boss, or has he been kicked upstairs?

Is it real, or is it color, and do even their hairdressers know for sure?

Twist and Shout

We do know for sure that the November installment of the ongoing HSUS/David Wills soap opera was barely into the mail before new information made it obsolete, beginning with the return — unopened — of the package of 25 copies of our October edition that an anonymous caller ordered for courier delivery to the Columbus Day weekend HSUS board meeting in Seattle. The

caller, who was not board member Anita Coupe, asked that the copies be sent to Coupe's room. The weirdest twist was that the invoice, the amount of which was not mentioned to the caller, was enclosed in the package, and was earlier paid by a U.S. postal money order made out on behalf of "B. True."

The plot twisted again, like it did last summer, when at midnight on Halloween the Washington Humane Society's contract to provide animal control service to Washington D.C. expired. A newly formed organization called Animal Link took over, and within hours a private investigator tracking Wills found him answering the telephones at the Washington D.C. city shelter, apparently performing the duties of an executive director as an ostensible volunteer.

For much of this year, Wills and his former Detroit associate Deday LaRene, whom he hired at HSUS, negotiated with Washington D.C. over possibly taking on the animal control contract as an HSUS project. That proposed deal fell through, HSUS announced, on September 18. Officially the problem was that HSUS wanted the deed, free and clear, to the proposed site of a new shelter it planned to build — but Washington D.C. only leased the land in question from the federal government, and was not in a position to turn over the deed.

Unofficially, the problem was that it was Wills' deal, undertaken at least in part to impress his fiance, former Washington Humane Society animal fostering volunteer Lori White (whom he married in June in Mexico, at a ceremony conducted by Irwin, an ordained minister). With Wills on his way out at HSUS, no one else really wanted the potential expense and embarrassment that could go with running animal control in a nearly bankrupt city that owed the previous contractor more than \$400,000, against annual operating costs of \$770,000.

Wills, though, needed a job — and as executive director of the Michigan Humane Society from 1978 until mid-1989, he had experience at fundraising in a similar milieu, though about \$1.6 million of the funds he raised eventually disappeared, leading to his resignation under fire. The WHS withdrawal from animal control left an opportunity open, and Wills and White already had contact with other people willing to form a board of directors: Dee Atwell, identified as a Department of Commerce employee, who told one reporter her qualifications were "twenty years with golden setters"; Phyllis Horowitz, a former WHS volunteer who was dismissed as a purported source of friction with staff; and

Gerald Eichinger, DVM, a onetime WHS veterinary staffer who left to form his own practice, returned as a volunteer, was dismissed at the same time as Horowitz, and was remembered by other Washington D.C.-area animal rescuers for having denounced the WHS administration to media.

Links

Assembling Animal Link virtually overnight, the group won a 50-day contract with the city by outbidding a coalition out together on short notice by Sharon Smith, DVM, according to WHS executive director Mary Healy. The most financially stable humane organization in the area, the Washington Animal Rescue League, remained uninvolved. Persons familiar with WARL affairs told *Animal People* that the WARL longterm plan, backed by assets of as much as \$10 million, involves completing a low-cost neutering clinic now under construction and perhaps adding a high-volume adoption center — projects which could be jeopardized by the extra burdens coming with an animal control contract.

The 50-day interim contract expires Dec. 20. Washington D.C. Department of Human Services acting director Vernon Hawkins said a longterm contractor would be chosen meanwhile through competitive bidding. Lacking time to obtain nonprofit status, Animal Link is trying to finance operations and put itself in position to secure the longterm contract by soliciting donations via a special bank account opened for it by Animal Allies, a cat rescue group headed by Elaine Miletta of Fairfax, Virginia, with a 92-cat care-for-life shelter in Culpepper, Virginia.

The personalities and arrangements soon drew the attention of Washington D.C. media, as did problems at the shelter that began almost immediately. With only Wills, Eichinger, and one former WHS technician qualified to perform euthanasia, compared with eight euthanasia technicians on staff when WHS ran the shelter, Animal Link reportedly tried to teach volunteers the procedure in haste, with awkward results. Due to short staffing, Wills is supposed to have asked volunteers to work eight-hour shifts, getting few takers. On November 10, Wills and White purportedly walked out — and back in through a side door. On November 15, paid staff walked out because they didn't get paid, but Atwell told media that an anonymous contribution of \$4,000 saved the day. There was also a flap mentioned by some D.C. media when a volunteer left alone to work a night shift instead locked the doors and went home.

Talks

Catching heavy flak, Wills formally addressed the media on November 16 at the National Press Club — but mostly about HSUS, rather than Animal Link. "I was recently abruptly terminated for my 'failure to cooperate' in responding to a series of malicious and false allegations against me raised by three former PETA employees now working at HSUS," Wills asserted, referring to three HSUS staffers who in August filed a sexual harassment complaint against Wills with the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission. Only one of the three, so far as *Animal People* can determine, is a former PETA employee.

"PETA is by their own admission a radical animal rights organization," Wills continued. "I believe I have become a pawn in a struggle for power and money both within HSUS and between competing animal rights organizations. HSUS is doing everything in its power to silence me, including filing a civil lawsuit against me. I was even advised by my health insurance company that HSUS had tried to cancel health insurance for myself and my nine-year-old son with asthma," an apparent reference to White's son by a previous marriage.

"I myself am under a doctor's care for a medical condition which I contracted while on a mission for the Society in Indonesia," Wills said. "Make no mistake: when it comes to the treatment of people, the word 'humane' does not apply to HSUS."

Wills complained that HSUS, "with assets of over \$50 million, does not help or support the D.C. animal shelter, which is in danger of closing from lack of funds. The salaries and lifestyles of top executives at HSUS I agree are outrageous," he added, "but that is not my salary or my lifestyle. If money is missing from the Humane Society ledgers, they should look elsewhere for it. The allegations which have been raised against me are false," Wills insisted, adding that instead of hearing his side of the various matters, "HSUS has responded with a summons in a civil action. I am in the process with my attorneys of preparing a defense and countersuit in several forums that I assure you will reach the highest levels of the Humane Society's management. I am confident," Wills embellished, "that I will be vindicated in the courts, but in that process many of the confidential informants who have assisted my investigations into animal rights abuses may be compromised or their lives endangered."

Concluded Wills, "People who care about animals should look closely where they donate their hard-earned dollars, and make sure the money is going to the animals and not to permit top executives to lead the lifestyles of the rich and famous."

Wills, known for his Porsche 944, love of nightlife, and reputed \$100,000 salary at Michigan Humane, made \$93,000 a year in salary and benefits at HSUS.

Lifestyles

Indeed, the lifestyles and activities of HSUS executives — Wills included — have attracted the attention of many investigators in recent months. California deputy attorney general Peter Schack tersely confirmed that his office is actively reviewing HSUS financial filings and witness depositions, but explained that he is not allowed to discuss any case that might be in preparation. A small army of private detectives and researchers were more forthcoming, calling, faxing, and e-mailing to introduce themselves and share tips. Three work for competing mass media. One represents a personal debtor. Four work for other major animal protection groups. And one, Simon Ward of Zimbabwe Trust [incorrect; read: Africa Resources Trust] readily admitted interests directly opposed to those of the humane movement, having previously worked a decade [five years] for the Japanese whaling industry [Institute of Cetacean Research] — and was willing to be quoted [untrue]. Ward described his employer as "a non-governmental organization in an African country," which "has come under fierce attack from, among others, HSUS, for selling hunting licenses to groups such as Safari Club International. I have been instructed," Ward admitted, "to gather any and all information I can that may be used to discredit HSUS."

Ward established that the Paul Irwin associated with the Pennsylvania Trust, a major private bank, is not the same person as the Paul Irwin of HSUS — as *Animal People* suspected, in reporting in October an allegation from a Capitol Hill source that Paul Irwin of HSUS is involved in private banking, a form of financial dealing with no accountability to the general public. "Paul Irwin of HSUS is rumored to be involved in private banking in some way," Ward confirmed. "However, research confirmed only that he was involved," having been listed in Moody's Banking Directory several years ago as one of the directors of the Theodore Roosevelt National Bank. "In the current edition of Moody's." Ward added. "this bank is no longer listed. and the

telephone has been disconnected. The last listing of the bank gave its address as 1201 New York Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. It is assumed it was a private bank because its total assets were just \$13-14 million. In this regard," Ward suggested, "a possible clue appears in *HSUS News*, fall 1995, in the section dedicated to news from the HSUS affiliate Earthkind. An article on ecotourism begins with a reference to one Tweed Roosevelt, but makes no connection between him and HSUS, nor gives any explanation why his views should appear."

HSUS News identified Tweed Roosevelt as "spokesman for sustainable tourism, president of the Roosevelt Education Foundation, and the great-grandson of Theodore Roosevelt." With that, Ward flew off to San Diego, to examine the files on HSUS and the subsidiary National Association for Humane and Environmental Education compiled by biomedical researcher Pat Cleveland. At deadline, Ward hadn't again been heard from. But a thick envelope anonymously mailed from Florida coincidentally contained an account of a recent Earthkind fiasco, together with supporting documents.

Yellowstone

"The Yellowstone Project cost HSUS \$275,000 in a matter of a few months in 1993," the account stated. "Dr. Robert Crabtree," of Bozeman, Montana, "proposed a new ecotourist business to do research, and HSUS through Earthkind agreed to provide \$150,000, all to be returned by the third year. If Earthkind dropped out before the third year, the idea reverted to Crabtree. Hoyt placed his longtime secretary in charge, Janet Frake, who had no experience in overseeing or analyzing new business ventures. Crabtree prepared a first-year budget showing \$450,000 income from tuition and a deficit from first-year operations of \$121,000 — in other words, a spending plan of \$571,000. It was in the form of a large sheet pasted together from computer printouts, and he submitted it to HSUS soon after starting the business. He said he got it back with an initialed approval. No one at HSUS ever admitted to approving it, but Crabtree supposedly still has it."

Continued the story, "Using the 'approval,' Crabtree began spending according to the plan. He hired lots of local help to lead the tours and bought computer equipment. Invoices were approved in Bozeman and sent to Washington D.C. for HSUS to pay, which they did."

Crabtree purportedly projected breaking even at 150 participants, but only 32 signed up by July.

"When the light public response was finally learned," the account went on, "HSUS tried to stop the program, but Crabtree felt he had an enforceable contract and wanted to continue, resisting HSUS demands to fire employees and cancel tours. By September, when the Earthkind board met, more than \$200,000 had been spent, and another \$75,000 was estimated to be needed to get HSUS out. A number of hired people in Montana were threatening to sue HSUS, and there were complaints from people who had bought non-refundable air tickets to cancelled tours.

"Crabtree salvaged the operation, and still operates," now under the name of Yellowstone Ecosystem Studies.

Neither Crabtree nor HSUS responded to messages of inquiry, but the gist of the account seemed to be confirmed both by the enclosures and other information *Animal People* had on file.

Mail

Animal People was not able to either confirm or refute an electronic message from a well-reputed direct mail professional who asserted that, "Irwin has been secretly doing business with the company that you know kicks back fundraising money to executives," as described in our October editorial. Through a variety of subsidiaries, this firm does business with many of the animal protection groups that spend the highest percentage of their budget on direct mail, but we haven't yet unraveled the whole skein, nor are we sure yet that some competing organizations know that they are in effect represented by the same organization, under different business identities. According to this direct mail professional, "Irwin has tested the Netherlands fundraising market. You see, incorporated in the Netherlands, as you must be to raise funds there, nobody in the U.S. can track the money. Irwin arranged all of that. Now, heading HSI, he is in charge of it all. Nice plan. How much front money has HSUS put into HSI? That is the money used to raise gigantic money overseas. The Netherlands, Germany, and France are all semi-virgin targets, with four times the returns we get in the U.S. You can get rich four times quicker, and with a \$150,000 investment can net \$1.5 million the second year. Then the sky's the limit. The foreign governments won't audit for five years, giving time to build the mail before spending money on programs."

Neither Irwin nor anyone else at HSUS responded to multiple faxed inquiries, which included a photocopy of the original message, less only the transmission code which might have jeopardized the source. The speculation about potential direct mail returns in Europe is supported by the experience of the International Fund for Animal Welfare, Greenpeace, the Dolphin Project, and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society over the past five years.

The potential extent of HSUS involvement is indicated by HSUS funding transfers to HSI over the past several years: \$212,091 in 1993, \$410,760 in 1994.

HSUS Isn't Talking

(Animal People, November 1995)

WASHINGTON D.C. — At deadline the Humane Society of the U.S. had neither confirmed nor denied a report reaching *Animal People* from an HSUS source that the board of directors, responding to a petition signed by 41 staffers, agreed over the Columbus Day weekend, October 7-9, to prosecute David Wills, 48, for allegedly embezzling at least \$16,000 from an expense account purportedly used to pay informants in cruelty cases — and to negotiate the termination of both HSUS president Paul Irwin and Humane Society International president John Hoyt. According to the unconfirmed report, Hoyt, the top HSUS/HSI officer since 1970, is to retire soon with a "golden parachute" severance. Irwin, hired in 1975, is to depart after the appointment of a successor. Three members of the HSUS staff would seem to be candidates: Dennis White, former head of the American Humane Association's Animal Protection Division, who recently left AHA after 19 years; John Kullberg, head of the American SPCA for 14 years, 1977-1991; and David Ganz, head of the North Shore Animal League for six-plus years, 1986-1993. The HSUS board is also supposed to have begun looking into various financial arrangements involving Irwin, Hoyt, and HSUS/HSI, which provided them benefits beyond their official compensation (salary plus pension contributions) of \$195,288 for Irwin and \$210,611 for Hoyt, as of fiscal year 1993.

At press date, however, *Animal People* sources at all levels of HSUS/HSI said they still hadn't been officially informed of any board or executive decisions — and none acknowledged either

signing or knowing about a petition, leaving the possibility that *Animal People* had received a planted rumor, perhaps designed to identify leaks.

Yet another report, reaching *Animal People* hours before press time, held that Hoyt and Irwin were not terminated, but were instead voted big raises, as happened in the wake of 1988 and 1991 Jack Anderson exposes about their compensation. The source didn't have information pertaining to Wills.

A top source at HSUS explicitly told *Animal People* that Wills was fired on August 11, but Wills officially remains "on administrative leave."

All *Animal People* knows for sure is that in the two weeks before the Columbus Day weekend board meeting in Seattle, labor relations attorney Joel Bennett of Washington D.C. and colleague Laurie Phillips interviewed a number of people on behalf of the HSUS board, including some *Animal People* sources, about alleged sexual harassment and embezzling by Wills. Questions were asked not only about Wills' tenure with HSUS, but also about similar allegations that arose during his time as executive director of the New Hampshire Humane Society, 1972-1978; the Michigan Humane Society, 1979-1989; and the defunct National Society for Animal Protection, 1989-1991. Certain sources denied events described to confidants on repeated occasions over the past seven or eight years — and reliably witnessed in some cases — because of concerns for personal security.

Two days before one of the two dates *Animal People* was given for the board meeting, an anonymous caller ordered copies of our October edition for all board members. The October "Watchdog" column detailed Wills' history of questionable associations; his proximity to missing money at other humane societies; and his role as Hoyt's longtime protege and rumored eventual successor. The caller asked that the copies be rushed by courier to board member Anita Coupe's hotel in Seattle — but was apparently not Coupe herself. An invoice for the courier charge was promptly paid with a U.S. postal money order made out on behalf of "B. True."

The Booby Hatch

The case was meanwhile described in lesser detail by *U.S. News & World Report*, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, CHAIN Newsletter (a California-based magazine for humane officers), an Associated

Press article syndicated on October 1, most major Alaskan media, and other publications ranging from daily newspapers to dogsledding periodicals. Many accounts reached Washington D.C. in time to have been seen by members of the audience at an October 2 address Hoyt delivered to a World Bank gathering. Hoyt's address was titled, reminiscent of his former career as a Baptist and Presbyterian minister, "Ethics and Spiritual Values and the Promotion of Environmentally Sustainable Development." Throughout late September and early October, *Animal People* received calls from new sources offering stories of Wills allegedly using donated funds to entertain himself (and Hoyt in some versions) at a Michigan bar called The Booby Hatch; to buy Franklin Mint gold and silver ornaments; and to engage in other pursuits unrelated to helping animals.

Longtime Wills foe Barbara Schwartz, a New Hampshire horse and collie fancier/breeder, added spice with an account of attending Central High School in Detroit in the mid-1950s with Audrey Rose, the former MHS board president who hired Wills and later resigned after finding out he had faked his resume; her husband Irving Rose; Sonny Bloch, an HSUS board member from January 1991 until early 1995, who is now in federal prison awaiting trial for allegedly helping to defraud 280 investors out of \$21 million, and is reportedly also under investigation for statutory rape; and Ivan Boesky, another financier [sic] with a checkered past. Bloch and Boesky, Schwartz said, got their start in finance by running poker games. She suggested that Wills might have met Bloch in Detroit and introduced him to Irwin and Hoyt, who have reputedly done much decision-making over the years at a weekly poker game with other HSUS executives.

"But Wills did do some good things for animals," several callers insisted, citing his abolition of decompression chamber euthanasia at both NHS and MHS.

944 Porsche

Current MHS executive director Gary Tiscornia didn't hedge his few but quite specific words. "Whether or not Wills liked Corvettes," as reported in October, Tiscornia said, "he left here driving a 944 Porsche," a much more costly vehicle.

Tiscornia joined MHS in August 1983, under Wills, but quit in protest of Wills' management in February 1989. A straight shooter who remembers with admiration that his father stood up to an organized crime shakedown. Tiscornia was brought back on

June 19, 1989, at the same board meeting that accepted Wills' resignation after funds were discovered to be missing from the MHS accounts. Former bookkeeper Denise Hopkins was convicted of embezzling \$65,000; up to \$1.6 million was never accounted for. Insurance covered \$50,000 of the loss, Tiscornia said, and Hopkins is supposed to make some restitution, but though now out of prison and gainfully employed, he added, she has not made any payments.

Tiscornia also confirmed that shortly after Wills' departure, the Teamsters Union made an unsuccessful attempt to organize at MHS. Two of Wills' alleged associates were involved in the Teamsters: John Burge, nephew of Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa and former business agent for Teamsters Local 124, who was convicted in 1991 of taking kickbacks from trucking companies at Detroit's Metro Airport in exchange for insuring labor peace; and Rolland McMaster, Hoffa's longtime aide, who was convicted of a similar charge nearly 30 years earlier. Burge was also president of Atlantic Western Personnel Leasing Corporation, in which McMaster and another reputed Wills associate, Dean Turner, were executives. Wills intimated to then-NSAP volunteer Sandra LeBost, when Atlantic Western went bankrupt in March 1990, that he had lost an investment in the company of \$40,000. LeBost on June 30 of this year won a mediation judgement of \$42,000 in settlement of unrepaid loans to Wills, but has not yet received the money.

Turner's mother, TV personality Marilyn Turner, was questioned about the Atlantic Western case by a Michigan grand jury. She and her husband John Kelly served on the board of MHS, resigning when Wills did and joining him on the board of NSAP. Kelly also served on the board of HSUS when Wills folded NSAP to join HSUS.

Another of Wills' longtime associates, Deday LaRene, was attorney for reputed Detroit crime boss Vito Giacalone and his son Billy-Jack Giacalone during a 1975 grand jury probe of Jimmy Hoffa's still unsolved disappearance. LaRene and Giacalone plea-bargained sentences for concealing income from the IRS in December 1993. They were first charged with conspiracy and tax evasion, but key witness Albert Allen vanished on the eve of the trial and U.S. Justice Department lawyer Theodore Forman was convicted of leaking grand jury documents including witness lists to LaRene. Now disbarred, LaRene and his wife Joan Witt — a Wills employee at NHHS, MHS, and NSAP — both currently work for HSUS.

LaRene's main job in recent months seems to have been negotiating a deal to take over the Washington D.C. animal control contract, relinquished by the Washington Humane Society at least in part because the city was slow to pay for contracted services. HSUS pulled out, however, on September 18.

"There was no one specific thing that did not allow this marriage to occur," HSUS spokesperson Wayne Pacelle told *The Washington Post*, but the Post said HSUS informed the city that it would not go ahead to build a proposed "\$10 million state-of-the-art shelter," because HSUS could not "own absolutely" the building site, leased by the city from the federal government.

Other sources indicated that HSUS seized on a handy excuse to get out of having promised more than it could deliver. HSUS policy since it was founded in 1954 has been to avoid doing hands-on animal care.

As *Animal People* went to press, the city-owned shelter run by WHS since 1980 was being prepared for shutdown, and Washington D.C. appeared likely to be without animal control at the stroke of midnight on Halloween. Volunteers were reportedly patching together a service similar to the one Legislation In Support of Animals provided when New Orleans left animal control unfunded from January through June 1990.

Intimidation?

Whether or not anyone who was purportedly harassed and/or compromised by Wills actually had reason to fear that testimony to Bennett and Phillips might be leaked, someone did anonymously sandbag Michigan Anti-Cruelty Society chief investigator Michael Killian during the week before the HSUS board meeting.

Faxed to *Animal People* and some of our sources was a flyer headlined "Kill 'Er' ian." The flyer described how on November 24, 1982, then-Lincoln Park police officer Killian joined in pursuit of Benjamin Davis, 36, a father of three, who had run a red light. Killian shot Davis twice in the back and buttocks, then handcuffed him as he died. Police policy called for firing Killian when in 1985 he was convicted of manslaughter, but instead he was discharged with a disability pension of \$17,584 a year.

"Michael Killian's cost for this human life," the handbill stated, "was \$825 in court costs, five years on probation, and psychiatric therapy. He was released from probation on January 15, 1992."

The Davis family was in 1986 awarded \$1.6 million — and another \$1.6 million in 1989 when Mission National Insurance Company of California, which held the Lincoln Park policy, paid \$500,000 on time but was four days late paying the balance. Mission National then went bankrupt. Lincoln Park taxpayers were assessed \$80 apiece over a two-year period to cover the penalty.

Wills hired Killian as a cruelty investigator in July 1988. "I can verify that he was employed by MHS through April 1991," said Tiscornia. "In accordance with a former employee's right to privacy, I am not able to share any further information."

MACS board president Linda Tuttle told *Animal People* that Killian joined MACS in April 1991. "We didn't know about the shooting," she said. "We got an anonymous call about it three or four months later. He told us he'd taken early retirement from the Lincoln Park police department to spend more time with his horses." Tuttle said Killian's job performance has been "pretty good," despite some friction with the board and senior staff, and that the flyer would be discussed at a November 8 board meeting.

Tuttle suggested that the handbill might have been connected with the October 1994 seizure of 169 allegedly neglected dogs and 25 cats from breeders Richard and Nancy Yuhasz of Deerfield Township. "This is absolutely the worst case of cruelty I've ever seen," Killian told media soon after the raid.

But another possibility was that Killian might have been misidentified as an *Animal People* source for information about Wills and Wills' Detroit associates, targeted for discrediting, and made an example of. If the flyer was faxed in response to the Yuhasz case, there was no reason it should have come to *Animal People*. Nor was there a clear reason why it went to some of the other recipients.

"If Mike goes down as result [sic] of this and it hurts MACS," said Tuttle, "the only ones who are going to suffer are the animals." MACS, which has no paid administration, serves the Detroit inner city. An architect is currently donating services toward renovation of the shelter, including expansion of the cat care

facilities. Tuttle said her husband, an attorney and general contractor, would donate much of the labor.

"We could move to a more economically promising area," Tuttle said, "but here in Detroit is where we're needed."

A Whale of a Tale from Inside HSUS

(Animal People, October 1995)

WASHINGTON D.C. — Fired on August 11, according to one Humane Society of the U.S. senior executive and numerous staff, HSUS vice president for investigations and legislation David Wills remains officially "on administrative leave," amid an apparent board-level power struggle.

Animal People sources within HSUS indicate that HSUS president Paul Irwin and some board members want Wills out; John Hoyt, president of Humane Society International and Wills' longtime patron, purportedly wants to keep him. HSI is the umbrella for HSUS and numerous affiliates.

HSUS/HSI board chair O.J. "Joe" Ramsey is said to be heading a probe of accusations that Wills misused funds and sexually harassed subordinates. A corporate attorney in Sacramento, California, Ramsey has served on the HSUS board since 1975; his arrival roughly coincided with that of Irwin.

Ten days after the September edition of *Animal People* detailed complaints against Wills by many current and former HSUS staffers, we received a letter from Washington D.C. media lawyer Stuart Pierson, charging we had made "defamatory and false statements about Mr. Wills" by "asserting that Mr. Wills was fired."

But hours before our September edition went to press, our HSUS senior executive contact told us, "They're calling it something else, but he's fired."

"Is he being paid?" *Animal People* asked.

"The pay he's receiving is his severance," we were told.

Pierson on behalf of Wills also demanded that *Animal People* should "immediately correct ... other such assertions concerning Mr. Wills" without specifying what Wills thought was in error

We requested particulars of Wills, both through Pierson and through HSUS, but received none. We also repeatedly requested particulars of Hoyt and Irwin, but likewise received no answers.

Errors

We were told of two errors in our coverage by Sandra LeBost, of Royal Oak, Michigan, who is now trying to collect \$42,000 Wills owes her in settlement of her claim that he failed to repay funds and valuables borrowed from her in connection with starting the short-lived National Society for Animal Protection in mid-1989. One error was misidentifying as a mediation judge Circuit Court Judge Steven Andrews, who signed the motion for judgement in LeBost's favor. Andrews ratified the recommendation of three independent mediators. The other error, according to LeBost, was that the mediators recommended that Wills should pay \$15,000, not \$21,000, to plaintiffs William and Judith McBride, in a parallel case originating from loans made in 1991. Wills apparently plans to contest that case, contending the McBrides entrusted him with funds as investors, not as lenders.

Animal People also discovered that the reason a house couldn't be found at the address Wills gave the court in the LeBost case was an apparent slip by either Wills or the recording clerk: Wills reportedly said he lived at 2614 Chain Bridge Road in Washington D.C., but actually lives at 2416 Chain Bridge Road.

Otherwise, the only claims of error in our coverage reaching us by deadline came from California animal rights activist Sherry DeBoer, who claims to have introduced Wills to his present wife. DeBoer took issue with our reporting that "in June, Hoyt and Irwin, both former clergymen, presided over a lavish Mexican wedding for Wills and Lori White, former wife of PETA president Alex Pacheco, now a volunteer for the Washington Humane Society."

Cheap Wedding?

According to DeBoer, the wedding, on the roof of an apartment building in Puerto Escondido, was held in Mexico because "Lori couldn't afford a wedding like that in Washington D.C.," even though, "it was anything but lavish," featuring "wilted gladiolas." The only guests, DeBoer insisted, were Hoyt; Irwin; Humane Society of Canada executive director Michael O'Sullivan; Congressional representative Charles Wilson (D-Texas), White's former employer; Jill Roonev. her current employer: veterinarian

Hugh Wheer and his wife Cynthia; a Mexican veterinarian and his wife; and DeBoer plus her date. "Lori made her own dress," DeBoer said. "It was a typical funky animal rights people occasion. There was one dinner, after the wedding, and it was nothing lavish, with a very cheap cake with cheap frosting. We all had cats and dogs eating off our plates," because, DeBoer recounted, the wedding party spent their four days in Puerto Escondido rescuing strays. She also said they hired a team of carriage horses for four days, to give them the time off.

Animal People questioned DeBoer closely about the itinerary, because as she repeatedly outlined it, no one in the party did any sightseeing in Mexico City or spent any time there, either on the way down or on the way up. They did stay overnight in Mexico City, DeBoer allowed, on the way back, but "We all stayed in the hotel next to the airport. We bought big baskets to sneak in all the animals we were taking back." DeBoer said the rest of the party flew back to Washington D.C. early in the morning, while she had to wait another seven hours to catch her flight to northern California.

Willy/Keiko

The itinerary was important, as in the August 15 appeal to membership, O.J. Ramsey — purportedly probing the use of HSUS funds in connection with the wedding — wrote, "Just recently, Paul Irwin, HSUS president, visited 'Willy' at the Reino Aventura theme park in Mexico City. I asked Paul to make this field visit immediately, and to prepare a special report to all HSUS members and donors. Although we had originally intended for the Report (sic) to come directly to you from Paul in Mexico, unavoidable postal delays made it necessary to forward it through our headquarters in Washington D.C."

The accompanying 450-word report, dated August 8, enclosed in a replica Mexican envelope, consisted almost entirely of facts about the orca star of the 1993 hit film *Free Willy!* already published thousands of times in hundreds of media. "I can provide additional details, if needed," Irwin wrote, "upon my return to Washington D.C."

Possibly Irwin went back to Mexico in August. But he certainly didn't provide any additional details to us, in response to our inquiries. Neither did Earth Island Institute and Free Willy/Keiko Foundation president David Phillips either confirm or deny Ramsey's assertion that "HSUS is working with the Free Willy

Foundation to help raise the \$10 million needed" to complete new quarters for Keiko at the Oregon Coast Aquarium.

"And, when we release 'Willy' to his original family group off the coast of Iceland," Ramsey continued, "hopefully some time next year, he will be the first whale ever to be freed."

Preceding that appeal, HSUS had evidenced only peripheral involvement in Keiko's situation. Earth Island Institute has been the lead organization behind the Free Willy/Keiko campaign ever since EII was generously plugged at the beginning and end of the Free Willy! video.

Iceland says no

Moreover, said Johann Sigurjonsson of the Marine Research Institute of Iceland, "The government of Iceland has repeatedly decided in recent years not to permit reintroduction of killer whales into Icelandic waters who have been subjected to animal life in distant parts of the world for prolonged periods of time. This is because such a reintroduction could lead to the transfer of foreign bacterias or other infectious agents with unknown consequences for the local ecosystem or individual animals, and because of the uncertainty regarding how an animal kept in captivity for most of his life would survive in the wild."

While Free Willy/Keiko campaign leaders have claimed, "Experts are scanning the waters off Iceland to try to find the family he was taken from at the age of two so they can be reunited," Sigurjonsson stated that, "Anyone conducting research on killer whales off Iceland needs a permit. To my knowledge, the appropriate authorities in Iceland have not been contacted, nor have they issued any permits to conduct such studies." More recent statements from the Free Willy/Keiko campaign assert that "Vocal and DNA analysis will begin in October in Iceland to locate Keiko's family." Just how the investigators will analyze wild orca DNA without capturing some orcas has not been explained.

Meanwhile, though no captive orcas have been returned to the wild as yet, many smaller captive whales have been released: 380 through 1994, according to Ken Balcomb of the Center for Whale Research, who is reportedly leading the search for Keiko's family. Of the 380, 32 were dolphins from marine parks similar to Reino Aventura. HSUS was even involved in the release of the dolphins Rocky, Missie, and Silver, who in 1991 were transported from the

defunct Brighton Dolphinarium in England to a seapen off the Turks and Caicos islands in the Caribbean, rehabilitated, and released with much fanfare.

Hungry Dolphins

"I have been trying to research the fate of these animals," British marine mammalogist John Dinely posted to the MARMAM online forum on September 8. "It appears that this is unknown, although it is known that Silver had to have medical aid and food supplementation two weeks after his release."

Balcomb claims Silver was seen and identified by marking in early 1994.

Ramsey's appeal made no mention of three former U.S. Navy dolphins who were transported from San Diego to the Sugarloaf Dolphin Sanctuary in the Florida Keys in December 1994, to be prepared for release by Ric O'Barry of the Dolphin Project. As Sugarloaf and O'Barry became embroiled in a nasty public dispute with former partners in the simultaneous rehabilitation of three dolphins from the Ocean Reef Club in Key Largo, HSUS seemed to back away.

"They don't send us money, they don't come down here — I don't know what their role is," O'Barry complained to *Animal People*. "They were here when the cameras were here, and I haven't seen them since. The Navy dolphins are now ready to go free. I want to release them soon, without a permit because I don't think I need one, but I can't release them if HSUS still has a proprietary interest in them."

On September 13, O'Barry faxed to HSUS vice president for wildlife John Grandy, "SOS — We need help in the care and feeding of the ex-Navy dolphins. What exactly are your responsibilities, from your point of view? I continue to prepare them for release back into the wild. Buck, Jake, and Luther are excellent candidates, and I am confident this project will be successful. If you choose not to help us feed the animals, please let me know as soon as possible. I will look for help from other groups."

As *Animal People* went to press on September 18, O'Barry hadn't received an answer.

Wills & Hoyt

Meanwhile, the *Animal People* telephone rang often as readers and people who heard about the David Wills situation through the grapevine called to describe their own experience with him. According to a perhaps apocryphal account circulated through the HSUS internal grapevine since the mid-1980s, Wills, apparently a native of Baltimore, became involved in humane work in the very early 1970s when he walked up to a table where longtime HSUS staffer John Dommers was soliciting funds, asked what Dommers was about, and observed, "Sounds like a pretty good scam." Dommers reputedly introduced Wills to John Hoyt.

Hoyt, with little evident background in humane work, became HSUS president in 1970, giving up a 13-year career in the ministry. Irwin, apparently a ministerial acquaintance, followed Hoyt to HSUS about five years later. Ordained a Baptist in 1957, Hoyt preached in Allen Park, Michigan, until 1960, when he moved to the First Presbyterian Church in Leroy, New York. He then served as senior minister at the Drayton Avenue Presbyterian Church in Ferndale, Michigan, until 1968, when he earned his doctorate in divinity and assumed a post as senior minister at the First Presbyterian Church in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

New Hampshire

The story in the grapevine for at least six years holds that Wills came from a broken home, had a juvenile record for breaking-and-entering, and a troubled early marriage, and that Hoyt saw him as a redemption prospect — and surrogate son, as Hoyt had four daughters but no sons. But in January 1990, Wills told *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton that he had no police record. The only trouble he was ever in, he said, was that "When I was 19 years old, I faked a resume. I've been punished for that many times," he continued. "So I'm not a perfect person. So what?"

Horse and collie fancier/breeder Barbara Schwartz of Holland, New Hampshire, remembers what seems to be that resume incident. Wills arrived with Hoyt's recommendation to head the Nashua Humane Society in 1972, she told *Animal People*. Reputedly just divorced in Maryland, he was said to be the youngest person ever to head a U.S. humane society, and quickly won a reputation as both a lady's man and an aggressive fundraiser. "He practically blackmailed the city into building a new animal shelter," Schwartz said, "with piped-in music and not enough dog runs." But she allowed that the shelter was needed. Schwartz and other dog fanciers "tangled with Wills pretty early," Schwartz continued. In 1978, according to her files, Wills moved

to put local Docktor Pet franchise owner James McKay on the board of directors. Wills reputedly sent people who came to the shelter seeking purebreds to McKay's store. The local dog fancy objected, obtaining a letter from Hoyt to the effect that putting a pet store owner on the NHS board might constitute an inadvisable conflict of interest. The fanciers also "got Wills' resume and checked it out," said Schwartz. "He claimed to have a masters degree in journalism from the University of Maryland. False. He claimed to have worked for the Washington D.C. Humane Society. False."

On October 9, 1978, Schwartz stated, the fanciers confronted Wills at a meeting. "Wills boasted he was the king of the killers," Schwartz went on, "and claimed he could do euthanasias faster than anyone else. That didn't scare or amaze us. We had all culled puppies and were used to it."

Soon thereafter, according to Schwartz and other longtime New Hampshire dog fanciers who were involved with NHS, Wills departed, just ahead of the threat of a statutory rape charge. NHS money turned out to be missing. How much money? Schwartz estimated "probably about \$10,000." Others whom *Animal People* interviewed claimed it was more like \$2 million, an unlikely figure for an organization the size of NHS, especially at that time. Wills declined the chance to comment again on the allegations, but in January 1990 his recollection was that he took on the local breeders over pet overpopulation, showing them the reality of euthanasia.

Wills and Schwartz continue to tangle. In 1992, Schwartz said, Wills attended a meeting of the U.S. Combined Training Association, sanctioning body for the Olympic three-day equestrian competition, which includes dressage, endurance, and stadium jumping. "He said he'd have the three-day competition thrown out," Schwartz remembered. "My daughter was involved in that event. I was put on the committee to meet with Wills and review the HSUS objections to it. He never showed up."

On September 6 of this year, HSUS president Paul Irwin urged International Olympic Committee president Juan Antonio Samaranch to cancel the three-day event scheduled for the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta because, "We have concluded that it is simply not possible to hold an Olympic three-day competition in the seasonal heat and humidity of Atlanta without recklessly endangering the lives of the horses."

Equestrian competition experts worldwide consider the HSUS position silly. The majority of Olympic equestrian competitors and their mounts have traditionally come from hot, humid climates: Latin America, southern Europe, and the southern U.S.

Michigan

Whatever happened in Nashua, Wills left behind a woman with whom he'd been living, believed by some fanciers to have been a second wife, and in 1979 became executive director of the Michigan Humane Society, again with Hoyt's recommendation, bringing along Nashua assistant Joan Witt. The Nashua nastiness was apparently unknown to the MHS board until 1982. Then, Schwartz recalls, "He was on local TV with a blind collie, attacking breeders, and said he got her from me. I'm from Michigan. My friends and family saw that broadcast. My uncle, now deceased, was a lawyer. We sued Wills, and eventually won about \$15,000, which I donated to charity." Schwartz said the collie actually came from NHS, and had never been one of hers.

A Detroit TV station aired a report on Wills' Nashua history in 1983, but MHS sources believe the threat of legal action deterred other media from delving deeply into it — as did Wills in the 1990 interview, claiming the TV report was based on bogus information supplied by Schwartz.

Wills' friends in Detroit included then-attorney Deday LaRene, now disbarred and working for the HSUS. LaRene's wife at the time was then-MHS attorney Sienna LaRene. Wills and the LaRenes were close almost from the day Wills arrived in Detroit, says Sandra LeBost, then and now an MHS volunteer. They shared a love of fast cars: LaRene had Ferraris, Wills a Corvette. When the LaRenes divorced, Deday married Joan Witt, who preceded him into an HSUS post; Wills and Sienna were also "a number" for a while, recalls LeBost. Even after relocating to Florida, Sienna LaRene kept her \$70,000-a-year MHS job, commuting by jet. In 1987 Wills and Hoyt proposed to merge MHS into HSUS; HSUS would have run MHS as a model shelter network, and would have gained hands-on involvement that might have aided fundraising. The terms resembled those of the deal HSUS proposed earlier this year to take over the Washington D.C. animal control contract from the Washington Humane Society — a deal reportedly negotiated by Wills and LaRene, put on hold when Wills was put on executive leave, and apparently scrapped in mid-September.

The MHS/HSUS merger was shelved in 1988, about the time syndicated columnist Jack Anderson published a three-part series detailing how HSUS gave Hoyt a rent-free house, loaned Irwin funds with which to buy beachfront land in Maine, and paid both Hoyt and Irwin salaries in the middle six figures, at a time when six-figure salaries in humane work were still scarce — although Wills told *Animal People* editor Merritt Clifton in September 1989 that MHS had paid him \$100,000.

Retaliation

Frustration that the merger fell through may explain Hoyt's otherwise inexplicably harsh reaction when Clifton, then news editor for *The Animals' Agenda*, called to get his response to the Anderson columns. Instead of sharing his side of the story, Hoyt called *Animal People* publisher Kim Bartlett, then editor of *The Animals' Agenda*, and threatened economic retaliation if any article about the Anderson columns appeared. When the article appeared on schedule, Hoyt cancelled an HSUS subsidy to *The Animals' Agenda* of \$5,000 a year; apparently arranged the termination of funding from the Elinor Patterson Baker Trust, reputedly controlled by HSUS; and later, after follow-ups appeared, cancelled HSUS advertising in *The Animals' Agenda*.

HSUS staff have been officially forbidden to speak to either Clifton or Bartlett ever since the 1988 episode — but many call and write anyway.

Missing Money

As *Animal People* reported in our July/August edition, Wills on June 15, 1989 proposed to the MHS board that they should form a "National Center for Animal Protection" along similar lines to the National Society for Animal Protection, which Wills founded on his own in August 1989, with a start-up gift of \$10,000 presented by Hoyt at a public ceremony.

Meanwhile, on June 19, 1989, Wills resigned from MHS, along with board members Paul Henecks, Robert Sorock, and TV personalities John Kelly and Marilyn Turner, as the board became aware of a deficit eventually estimated at \$1.6 million. Kelly and Sorock, also on the HSUS board, joined Wills, Hoyt, Turner, Sienna LaRene, Joan Witt, and Julie Morris, now director of shelter outreach for the American SPCA, as members of the NSAP board.

In November 1989, former MHS bookkeeper Denise Hopkins was bound over for trial in connection with the missing MHS funds. She was eventually convicted of embezzling \$60,000. Wills testified that Hopkins admitted to him that she had forged documents pertaining to a \$450,000 trust account, a \$250,000 line of credit, and a pay raise for herself of \$10,000 a year. Staff writer John A. Basch of the Macomb Daily reported on November 15, 1989, that "Wills is himself under investigation. Part of the continuing investigation centers on that \$250,000 line of credit, which allegedly was secured with forged documents and forged signatures of humane society board members. During cross examination, Wills admitted that some of the credentials listed on his resume were 'lies,' and said that he also lied about a felony conviction for breaking and entering."

Still *Animals' Agenda* news editor in January 1990, Clifton looked into the case at the request of Michigan subscribers. Wills and Sienna LaRene called the Basch article false and libelous, and said the Macomb Daily had published a retraction, but produced no documentation of that. Wills also said MHS "was fully covered by insurance against employee theft," and would not "lose a cent from donations." But MHS executive director Gary Tiscornia, who succeeded Wills, and then newly appointed MHS accounting manager Chuck Korotka both disputed that. They erased the deficit by instituting a longterm repayment plan for creditors, and by cutting \$500,000 a year in jobs and salaries from the MHS budget.

Censored

On January 22, 1990, Clifton filed a 400-word report with Bartlett, who cleared it for publication later that day. *Animal People* board member Patrice Greanville, then the third member of the *Animals' Agenda* editorial board, signed off on the report the next day. But at the last minute, then-*Animals' Agenda* board members Wayne Pacelle, Holly Hazard, and Don Barnes intervened to keep it from going to press. Pacelle had authored a highly flattering profile of Wills published by *Animals' Agenda* in May 1988. Wills, who became an HSUS executive after NSAP was absorbed by HSUS in 1991, influenced Hoyt and Irwin to hire Pacelle, Aaron Medlock, and Bill Long away from the Fund for Animals in April 1994. Hazard resigned from the *Animals' Agenda* board in 1991 following Clifton's disclosure that the organization she heads, the Doris Day Animal League, has never spent less than 68% of its budget on direct mail appeals — more than twice the norm for animal-related advocacy groups. Barnes

resigned from the *Animals' Agenda* board soon afterward, when he was caught forging Clifton's name and signature on an incendiary memo to Hazard.

The unpublished *Animals' Agenda* report didn't include the most explosive material Clifton obtained during the 1990 investigation: statements of MHS staff alleging Wills had sexually harassed and physically intimidated them. Asked about the allegations, Wills acknowledged having sexual relations with subordinates, but denied that harassment or coercion was involved. Those allegations were not mentioned because the sources, claiming fear for their physical safety, refused to go on record.

Jimmy Hoffa

Yet another Jack Anderson expose, mentioning Wills and the MHS deficit, failed to head off the 1991 absorption of NSAP by HSUS. On August 9, 1991, the Detroit Free Press mentioned that NSAP board member Marilyn Turner, wife of NSAP and HSUS board member John Kelly, had been questioned by a grand jury probing a defunct employee leasing firm called Atlantic Western. Atlantic Western collapsed in March 1990, leaving workers in eight states responsible for millions of dollars in unpaid medical insurance claims.

Turner, the Free Press said, was asked "about payments that Atlantic Western made to a TV production company she owns. Turner's son Dean," a former pro hockey player, "was one of Atlantic Western's original owners," the article continued. President of Atlantic Western was John Burge, nephew of longtime Teamsters Union boss Jimmy Hoffa. Burge, a former Teamsters official, was convicted on October 2, 1991 on seven counts of taking bribes from trucking companies in 1984-85 to insure labor peace. The Atlantic Western assistant chief executive and labor consultant was Rolland McMaster, Hoffa's longtime closest associate, who served five months in jail in 1966 for taking employer kickbacks.

Neither Dean nor Marilyn Turner was mentioned again in connection with the Atlantic Western case, and Kelly was never mentioned. But another Wills associate had a link to Jimmy Hoffa from a different direction. Among Deday LaRene's many noted clients, also including the late Michigan Ku Klux Klan grand dragon Robert Miles, were Vito Giacalone and his son, Billy-Jack Giacalone. Vito was identified as a member of the Mafia in Congressional testimony as far back as 1963. and in 1987 was

named by the FBI as one of the eight members of the ruling council of organized crime in Detroit.

LaRene began representing the Giacalones in 1975, when they were called before a federal grand jury probing the disappearance of Jimmy Hoffa earlier that year. Hoffa vanished — while nominally in federal custody — shortly after testifying to another federal grand jury which was investigating Mafia activity in New Jersey.

On September 16, 1992, both Giacalones and LaRene were indicted for conspiracy and tax evasion. On June 16, 1993, under the headline "Missing key witness holds up federal trials," the Free Press reported that, "Albert Allen, of Warren, a key witness in the cases against Vito Giacalone and attorney Deday LaRene, hasn't been seen since April, according to court documents." Allen was officially believed to be in hiding. The Free Press archives don't tell whether he ever turned up.

The case never did go to trial. Instead a probe of LaRene's influence in the U.S. attorney's office moved ahead. On November 23, 1993 a jury cleared U.S. Justice Department lawyer Theodore Forman of obstruction of justice, but convicted him of criminal contempt, the Free Press reported, "for disclosing secret grand jury materials." Wrote Free Press staffer Jim Schaefer, "Forman admitted copying more than a thousand pages of documents, including names, addresses, and phone numbers of witnesses — and funneling them in 1992 to reputed organized crime leader Vito Giacalone, who was being investigated along with his attorney, Deday LaRene, in an Internal Revenue Service case. Forman's mother, Helen Formanczyk of Grosse Point Park, ran up large gambling debts. Her husband could not pay them off" after she was convicted and sentenced to 11 years in prison for delivering 1.2 kilos of heroin in a bid to erase the debts. "The Mafia," Schaefer went on, "through a longtime friend of Forman's, implied the debts would be forgiven if the 30-year-old tax lawyer helped Giacalone."

Forman's attorney, Steve Fishman, claimed no one was harmed by the leak of information.

On December 21, 1993, LaRene took a plea bargain. According Detroit News reporter Brenda Ingersoll, "In return, the government agreed not to prosecute him 'concerning his potential exposure in other investigations.' Those investigations included an obstruction of justice probe into the theft of

confidential Justice Department reports involving Giacalone. The reports were found in Giacalone's office with LaRene's fingerprints on them."

Vito Giacalone accepted a similar plea bargain a few days later. He began serving a three-year prison term in June 1994.

Wills testified for LaRene at his sentencing hearing on May 4, 1994. "To see him put away for a year where he cannot use his brain for the betterment of society," Wills proclaimed, "is an egregious miscarriage of justice."

LaRene served the year anyway, joining HSUS upon his release.

Ron Schmidt

In 1988, about the time Michigan Humane board members were becoming alarmed by rumors of missing money, Wills set up an elite fundraising team called "The Challengers" in a downtown office, under newly hired director of development Ron Schmidt. Within months, however, Wills dismissed Schmidt and dismantled "The Challengers." Schmidt went back to his old job as development coordinator for CareGivers, a Detroit in-home social service organization — but many people involved with MHS remember that before he did, when he knew he was about to be fired, Schmidt asked other staffers what they might know about Wills' alleged use of recreational drugs. Schmidt intimated to certain sources that he might have plastic pen cylinders from Wills' desk which had been used as cocaine straws. No source *Animal People* has located seems to know whether Schmidt ever took that purported evidence to police or a prosecutor, but he reputedly did take a list of related allegations to members of the board.

Schmidt left Detroit in 1990 to become director of development at Tufts University, outside Boston. On October 17, 1992, 31 days after LaRene and the Giacalones were indicted, Schmidt was found dead in his Stoneham home. "Because Schmidt had terminal cancer," the Boston Globe reported on October 23, 1992, "police initially did not consider his death suspicious." But an autopsy revealed Schmidt had died from repeated blows to the head. Police and other investigators didn't search the house for clues until October 22, five days after the killing. Middlesex District Attorney's office spokesperson Jill Reilly said they found no hint of either a motive or a suspect. Apparently no one inquired — at the time — into Schmidt's involvement in the case

of the missing MHS money, or asked if Schmidt had been named in the grand jury documents turned over to LaRene. *Animal People* did learn that some law enforcement agencies may be asking such questions now, albeit perhaps only because they were asked if they had asked them.

The Schmidt family posted a reward of \$5,000 for information leading to the conviction of the killer, then boosted it to \$10,000 a year later. Despite calling a number of people with the same names as family members, *Animal People* was unable to locate any family member to ask if leads had surfaced.

Animal People did pick up a suspicion among some sources that Schmidt's death had perhaps not been vigorously probed because he was openly gay.

Apart from "Who done it?", the big question remains: why murder a person who was going to die soon anyway?

Wills, Hoyt, and Irwin were asked by fax on September 11 if they knew or cared to comment about the Schmidt case, but did not respond.

Follow the money

The flamboyance of the allegations involving Wills and friends overshadows the unanswered questions about the extent of HSUS/HSI financial dealings with former financial radio talk show host H.I. "Sonny" Bloch, recipient of the HSUS' James Herriot award in 1989 and a member of the HSUS board from January 1991 until early 1995. Bloch is now in federal prison awaiting a series of trials, beginning with a federal court suit alleging that Bloch helped to defraud at least 280 investors from 33 states of a total of \$21 million. In a parallel case, Bloch faces eight counts of tax fraud, perjury, and obstruction of justice. He fled to the Dominican Republic in March 1995, but was extradited back to the U.S. on May 26 to stand trial. He is reportedly also under federal investigation for alleged statutory rape, which would indicate that the case — in which charges have not been filed — involved transporting a minor across state lines.

After the September issue of *Animal People* appeared, describing Bloch's situation, Irwin is said to have gathered the HSUS staff for a terse briefing. "He said, 'Sonny Bloch is still our friend,'" *Animal People* was told. Attendees were also warned against speaking to the media. A memo some recipients attributed to

Wayne Pacelle backed up the warning by stating that anyone who talked to *Animal People* would be fired.

Animal People received a tip from a respected Capitol Hill source that Irwin had personally participated in transactions involving both Bloch and football great John Riggins; that Irwin and Riggins together held a controlling interest in a private financial institution; and that HSUS funds might have gone through that institution. But an involvement of the Paul Irwin of HSUS with Riggins, reputedly an ardent hunter, sounded unlikely. Irwin didn't respond to inquiries. Financial experts *Animal People* consulted were unable to turn up details on the affairs of such an institution.

But *Animal People* did find a pair of Philadelphia News [read: Philadelphia Daily News] articles, published on July 1 and September 1, 1986, describing how, "The Trustees' Private Bank, a bank so private that it has no cash and no tellers, has just launched the Pennsylvania Trust Company." Vice president in charge of trusts administration for the new institution was one Paul Irwin, recruited from Glenmede Trust along with Richardson T. Merriam, a behind-the-scenes power in Pennsylvania Republican politics. Glenmede Trust manages the estates of millionaires and the eight Pew family charitable trusts, whose assets were then estimated at \$2.2 billion. Best known for supporting biomedical research, the Pew Trusts have also assisted some animal welfare charities.

Pennsylvania Trust would do "trust and investment management for high net-worth individuals."

Could Paul Irwin of HSUS both help run a bank for the ultra-rich and run HSUS? It would seem a tall order. But again, Paul Irwin of HSUS didn't say yes or no, and *Animal People* so far hasn't turned up any information that either clearly confirmed or eliminated the possibility.

One Nonprofit's Woes

(U.S. News & World Report, October 2, 1995; by Edward T. Pound))

Some scandals involve sex or money. This one involves both. The Humane Society of the United States, one of the best-known animal-protection organizations in the country seems an

unlikely place for such happenings. But a top executive there was placed on administrative leave last month after three employees accused him of embezzling thousands of dollars. Two of the employees, both women, said the executive sexually harassed them.

The Washington-based society says outside investigators have been hired to probe the allegations against David Wills. He strongly denies the charges. Wills, 43, runs the society's cruelty investigations and directs its international operations.

Current and former Humane Society employees say the claims against Wills are only part of the problem. In interviews, they complained that the charity's \$24 million budget was being drained by excessive fund-raising costs, fat salaries and big expense accounts. Robert Baker, a Humane Society consultant and former chief investigator, says: "The Humane Society should be worried about protecting animals from cruelty. It's not doing that. The place is all about power and money."

Top executives deny those accusations. They are well paid, however. The chief executive, John Hoyt, makes \$197,000 a year. The president, Paul Irwin, earns \$186,000 annually and travels extensively, about 100,000 miles a year.

Hoyt and Irwin have been close to Wills. They attended his wedding at a seaside Mexican town in June. Irwin, a practicing minister, officiated. Hoyt and Irwin say they were on business there at the time. Neither has been implicated in any of Wills's alleged improprieties.

Undercover, Society officials are sensitive about possible fallout from the Wills mess. Small donors are the group's financial backbone. It has nearly 2 million contributors nationwide. The organization, which is not affiliated with local humane societies, has campaigned recently against the slaughter of whales, dolphins and elephants.

Wills was the man the society's leadership turned to when a tough job was at hand. Friends say he often traveled overseas on undercover assignments and handled cash payments to informers who helped expose animal cruelty.

The charges against Wills are contained in discrimination complaints filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in Washington. Both Cristobel (Kittv) Block and

Virginia Bollinger worked for Wills. They allege that he repeatedly forced his attentions on them. Along with a third Wills aide, Kimberly Roberts, they accused him of stealing funds earmarked for society projects and falsifying expense-account reports. Bollinger said Wills took girlfriends to dinner and identified them in expense reports as "biologists." Roberts detailed her claims in an 11-page statement. She said she uncovered "strong evidence of the embezzlement" of at least \$16,500 from society projects this year. She claimed there were other "questionable" expenditures by Wills, including "large cash sums," allegedly used for informers.

Top executives of the Humane Society declined to comment, except to say the charity's board was "disturbed" by the charges. The executives have ordered an "objective and thorough investigation."

Is it time for Helen Jones of ISAR to retire?

(Animal People, October 1995. Helen Jones was a major player in the setting up of the HSUS.)

CLARKS SUMMIT, Pennsylvania — Dave Sickles says he moved to northern Pennsylvania, at his own expense, on the promise of an "executive level position" starting August 1 with the International Society for Animal Rights. But when he reported for duty, Sickles says, ISAR founder and president Helen Jones told him he wouldn't be hired, because there was purportedly nothing for him to do.

Yet, Sickles continues, there was plenty for him to do in the weeks preceding his purported hiring date, when he fulfilled ISAR assignments as a volunteer. Once in late June, Sickles avers, he bought a case of white wine on Jones' instructions at a local liquor store, using an ISAR charge card. On several occasions, Sickles asserts, he witnessed Jones having "five glasses of wine for lunch." As a volunteer, he says, he shared office space with "sixty or seventy cats, many of whom were sick or dying." And Sickles claims he saw other signs of bizarre behavior by Jones, including bouts of fear of venturing outside, called agoraphobia, that were so severe she could scarcely cross the street.

Sickles says he submitted a bill of \$1,000 for moving expenses to Jones, who reimbursed \$350. Sickles says he may sue Jones for the rest — and meanwhile he's going on the record with what he

saw, he states, because he strongly believes something should be done about it.

Sickles acknowledges that Jones might in turn sue him, "but what's Jones going to sue me for?" he asks. "My dog? I gave up everything to come to Pennsylvania."

Sickles' testimony might be taken as just bad-mouthing, except that *Animal People* has received comparable testimony for years from many other people currently and formerly associated with ISAR. On May 21, for example, *Animal People* received a note from an insider who described a cash flow crunch and added, "ISAR is much worse than you could ever imagine. Believe me! Helen Jones is much more than a hard-drinking woman!"

On September 5, this person confirmed Jones' receipt of questions from *Animal People* concerning Sickles' allegations and the similar allegations of others. We have received no official response. But we did receive a later message from a person within ISAR who said, "I know who your source is. Make sure LM and her followers put documentation in your hands before you open your mouth. Otherwise, knowing ISAR's legal counsel, you will be in for a long legal battle."

Figuring out who "LM" might be led to many other sources, including Lynn Mannheim, an activist associated with Jones in both New York City and Pennsylvania off and on for more than 20 years. But Mannheim et al just confirmed information already received from many others.

The *Animal People* investigation of claims that Jones may be an alcoholic, and an animal collector actually began on October 10, 1991, when former ISAR employee Amie Hamlin told both editor Merritt Clifton and publisher Kim Bartlett that she was fired, after six and a half months, for insisting that several sick cats in the ISAR office should receive veterinary care. Hamlin wanted someone to help the cats. In November 1991, she canvased the halls at the Decade for the Animals conference in Washington D.C., approaching Jones' longtime acquaintances with a handwritten affidavit, begging them to use their influence for the cats. Apparently none did. Though Hamlin seemed sincere, her complaints were apparently taken by most listeners as sour grapes over job loss. No one wanted to confront Jones, who was also at the conference.

Our dossier grew as we learned of many others who had come and gone quickly under similar circumstances, including several of substantial reputation: Steve Siegel, former New York director of Trans-Species Unlimited; Susan Regan, recognized for work with PETA and the Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights; and Betsy Swart, now Washington D.C. director for Friends of Animals.

The most significant departure was probably the January 1992 resignation of Nancy Anne Payton, Jones' well-respected assistant since 1981. Previously with the Massachusetts SPCA, and now with the Florida Wildlife Federation, Payton initially refused to discuss her reasons for leaving. But she spoke out to *Animal People* at last in September 1994, after further allegations reached us from ISAR staff about large numbers of animals — both cats and dogs — going without veterinary treatment in Jones' care.

Animal collector?

"Helen Jones is an animal collector," Payton stated. "I left there because I had become an enabler, both with the animal-collecting and with the drinking."

Both Payton and Sickles say Jones in their presence repeatedly rationalized personal use of funds donated to ISAR by insisting that the money is given to her, to be spent as she sees fit. Payton particularly objected to Jones' use of a costly suite at the Shelburne Murray Hill hotel on trips to New York, "while I'd stay in a \$52-a-night room at a smaller hotel around the corner. "I didn't mind staying in the smaller place," Payton continued, "if it was saving money to help animals, but I didn't see why she needed the suite."

The last straw for Payton, she confirmed in a second interview on September 9, 1995, came when former ISAR board members Paul Stiga and Mary Leah Weis failed in an attempt to remove Jones from day-to-day operations, under terms which would have left her with her title, official status, and much of her \$68,250-a-year salary. Both Stiga and Weis were ousted from the board, which now includes Jones; her longtime attorney, Henry Holtzer; his wife, Ericka Holtzer; Carol Michael Wade, of Jupiter Beach, Florida; and Alvin Van Pelt Hart, a retired Episcopal priest from New York City. Holtzer, now living in Santa Fe, New Mexico, reputedly confers with Jones often by telephone, but none of the board spend much time in Clarks Summit.

At least one departed ISAR staffer won a judgement against ISAR. According to a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Board of Review decision rendered on May 9, 1994, former ISAR computer department manager Rosemary Ketchur was unjustly forced to resign and unfairly denied unemployment benefits in December 1993. Among the findings of fact in that case: "On November 29, 1993, claimant returned to work after the Thanksgiving holiday and discovered her working area was moved to the upper level. Claimant's desk was two and a half feet from a large drafty window. In the office were 20 cats, two dogs, seven litter boxes for the cats to relieve themselves, and paper on the floors for the dogs' feces. On occasion the cats would urinate on the working area, resulting in an unsanitary working environment."

Animal People learned that allegations similar to those of the past five years reached national animal protection leaders, who did nothing, almost a decade ago, in connection with the ouster of Jones and her two older sisters from the board of the Lackawanna County SPCA, which they helped found and run. According to Lorraine Bernardi, then the LCSPCA president, shelter manager Margaret Jones, the middle sister, now deceased, had become "too ill, physically and emotionally, to continue in her job. Helen thought that shielding her was doing her a favor."

Recalls Payton, "They had a shelter in Scranton in Nay Aug Park, near the now closed Nay Aug Zoo. It was a questionable operation. I was put on the board, but I quit soon afterward. The shelter was not hooked up to a sewer. They were dumping the stuff down an old mine shaft. There was no telephone, and no adoptions. Eventually it was closed and bulldozed. The Helen V. Brach Foundation helped fund the opening of a new shelter in Waverly, and Helen Jones was finally ousted from the board soon afterward."

The apparent conspiracy of silence reflects Jones' stature as one of the grand dames of the animal protection movement. Now 70, Jones was first identified with animal protection at the national level in connection with the American Humane Association. Unhappy with AHA, she in 1954 contributed substantially to the founding of the National Humane Society, now known as the Humane Society of the United States. But within five more years, Jones broke with the NHS to start yet another group, the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare. Publishing full-page ads in nationally circulated newspapers, and staging perhaps the first

protest at the White House on behalf of animals on July 10, 1966, Jones and the NCSAW were instrumental in securing passage of the 1966 Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, forerunner of today's Animal Welfare Act.

Eight years later Jones renamed her organization the International Society for Animal Rights — the first national group to identify itself with animal rights.

ISAR in 1992 commenced Homeless Animals Day, observed each August. Candlelighting ceremonies outside animal shelters were initially a pretext for shelter-bashing in many communities, but then shelters themselves became involved as sponsors. Now, testifies Vicky Crosetti, executive director of the Knox County Humane Society in Knoxville, Tennessee, "It's a boon to our adoption program, because it makes people aware that we have animals who need homes."

Because of Jones' prominence, a scandal involving her could have national repercussions.

In the Pennsylvania coal mine country surrounding Clarks Summit, animal protection people well remember how the walls fell in on Jones' longtime friend Ann Millen just three years ago — and it's only a matter of time, they say, before the same thing happens to Jones herself.

In November 1992, Scranton authorities raided Millen's Agency for Animal Welfare, finding two dozen dogs in Millen's custody at a kennel that had been condemned for zoning violations under previous ownership several years before, plus 41 caged cats in the home of Millen's longtime associate, Denise Matyewicz.

What's Best for Willy?

The following appeared in the "Letters" section of Animal People, September 1995. It was contributed by Jim Bonde of Marine World Africa USA, Vallejo, California.

While I favor of [sic] moving Keiko the killer whale out of Mexico City and into a better situation, it is obvious that Warner Brothers opted for the easy, politically correct solution rather than what is in the best interest of Keiko. Their decision to turn him over to Earth Island Institute and the Oregon Coast Aquarium was public

relations damage control at its best — or worst, from Keiko's perspective.

Although I'm sure the Oregon Coast Aquarium is a fine institution, Keiko would have been much better off going to a facility that had other killer whales for possible future companionship, with experienced husbandry personnel who recognize that training, although frowned upon by most animal activists, is one of the key activities that helps maintain the mental and physical well-being of cetaceans in oceanariums.

Keiko helped make over \$100 million for Warner Bros., and he deserves better. What's worse, Earth Island Institute's Free Willy/Keiko Foundation is politicizing his future for their own agenda, ignoring the fact that from a scientific standpoint, Keiko is probably one of the poorest candidates for release among all the cetaceans in North America. Everything they're doing is predicated on the short-term goal of dumping him into the ocean and declaring victory. They have not addressed his long-term needs if he remains in captivity.

There is a serious ethical question as to just how much fundraising the Free Willy/Keiko Foundation should do under the banner of releasing an animal to the wild without disclosing the fact that few if any of the serious realities of release have been addressed.

The first reality is obviously his condition. What is the origin of his papilloma virus? Even if his symptoms are cured, will he still carry it? Is it from the Atlantic? Has he been living with species not native to the North Atlantic? Without answers, they could be raising money to do the equivalent of sending a Pilgrim with small-pox to the New World.

People whom one would think should know better, such as the Center for Whale Research and the Humane Society of the United States, consistently downplay the risk of inter-ocean disease transmission, further evidenced in their appeals for the release of the Vancouver Aquarium's two killer whales, Finna and Bjossa, into Icelandic waters, even though they've both been exposed to aspergillosis from the Pacific Ocean.

The second obvious problem with Keiko's release is Iceland itself. They have said they don't want him — a comment one should take seriously, coming from a whaling nation. There is a longstanding and often noble precedent for defying governments

in the name of environmental or animal welfare, but this is not just the will of the government: it is the feeling of an entire nation's commercial fishing fleet. Whether approaching a herring boat for a handout or swimming quietly alone in his sea pen, I suspect Keiko would always be in danger. Killer whales in the Pacific Northwest still occasionally show up with bullet holes, even though they are highly protected. Common sense would tell us that Iceland is far more dangerous. How much money would you donate to send a dolphin back to Iki Island or a child back to Sarajevo?

Whenever we raise questions like these, we are shouted down by activists who say that we oppose Keiko's release because it will be the start of a public opinion groundswell to release all captive cetaceans (including all captive-born animals, according to Mark Berman of Earth Island Institute).

The truth is that marine mammal professionals whole-heartedly support valid programs to return animals to the wild, and have long recognized the need to conduct studies to do so. We are hampered in our efforts to help the Chinese river dolphin in part because we just don't know enough about them to be sure that we'd be doing more good than harm in trying to collect, breed and release them into stabilized habitats. In contrast, the San Diego and Los Angeles Zoos have been successful so far with helping California condors through release programs because of years of scientific research, including work with Andean condors, coupled with husbandry knowledge gained from the age-old art of falconry.

The science of reintroducing animals to the wild is of critical importance to the future well-being of endangered and threatened populations. It is too important a tool for global wildlife management to be trivialized, sentimentalized, politicized and just plain botched in the name of animal liberation.

Triple Trouble for Humane Society of US

(From Animal People, September 1995)

WASHINGTON D.C. — August 10 dawned bright for the Humane Society of the U.S., as newspapers across the country carried a photo of HSUS director of legislative affairs Wayne Pacelle and Senator Rick Santorum (R-Pa.) decrying puppy mills at a press conference held the day before to announce that Santorum and

14 other Senators had jointly signed a letter to Agriculture Secretary Daniel Glickman, seeking stiffer enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act.

Then someone noticed that the letter Santorum sent was markedly different from the letter sent by 110 House members and three Senators in the same cause — and the effect of Santorum's letter was to undercut the House letter, whose signers were rallied by Rep. Glenn Poshard (D-Ill.).

The Poshard letter, circulated to potential signers on June 27 and delivered to Glickman on August 8, asked for Glickman's "strong support" in imposing ten specific new standards for puppy and kitten breeding facilities: "Increase basic cage size for companion animals permanently housed in the facilities; improve flooring within the primary enclosures by requiring plastic-coated wire of a specific width; increase the size and the material of the resting surface for each animal in a primary enclosure; require constant access to potable water for all animals housed in the facility; limit the number of times/frequency breeding stock can be bred over a certain time period; strengthen the sanitation requirements for the primary enclosure; eliminate the ability to tether animals; reexamine temperature guidelines; require more specific daily exercise of animals at the facilities; exclude 'another dog' as acceptable exercise."

The requests for specific regulations were based on the findings of an internal review of USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Regulatory Enforcement Animal Care activity, which found that the present regulations leave so much to the judgement of facility owners and veterinarians as to be unenforceable against all but the most egregious abuse. Apparent violations of basic care standards often can't be prosecuted because the regulations allow the alleged offenders to hold that they are following professional advice.

Santorum, Poshard, and humane groups were to present the letter to the media on August 9.

"Unfortunately," American Humane Association legislative director Adele Douglass wrote in an alert to members, "the *Washington Post* chided Senator Santorum for wanting stronger puppy mill regulations, especially since, as a Republican, he is traditionally anti-regulation. We believe that the *Washington Post* blurb, combined with pressure from the American Kennel Club and the American Veterinary Medical Association, resulted in a

change in the original letter's content. On August 4, just days before the letter was to be sent to the USDA, Senator Santorum's letter was changed to ask for enforcement of current regulations only."

AKC Cuts Letter's Demands

Congressional and Senatorial aides who spoke to *Animal People* — some of whom called before their offices were asked for comment — confirmed that this is exactly what happened: after 124 other legislators had already signed on, Santorum huddled with AKC lobbyist Jim Holt, AVMA lobbyist Pamela Abney, and Pacelle, deleting the requests that cage sizes be increased, water be always available, tethering be banned, temperature guidelines be re-examined, flooring follow specific material requirements, and the number of times an animal may be bred be restricted, and putting the onus on the USDA to enforce the existing regulations that it had already found to be unenforceable.

Balking, Poshard, the 110 members of the House, and Senators Paul Simon (D-Ill.), Carol Mosely Braun (D-Ill.), and Paul Wellman (DFL-Minnesota) sent the original letter — but the damage was done, in that Santorum and HSUS drew national publicity for ostensibly seeking tougher USDA-APHIS-REAC enforcement, even as Santorum's rewritten letter sent the message to Congress that efforts to help APHIS-REAC get the regulatory tools it needs won't get Republican support in the Senate.

Also at the Santorum/Pacelle press conference, APHIS staffer Cynthia Eck was left to lament that the USDA lacks the authority to regulate either pet stores or breeders who only sell directly to the public, and that lack of personnel limits APHIS to inspecting the 4,600 federally licensed breeders and dealers only once a year, on average.

Santorum had seemed a strange sponsor for a crackdown on puppy mills: a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, with little if any record in support of pro-animal legislation, from Pennsylvania, which state senator Stewart Greenleaf described in 1993 as "The puppy mill capitol [sic] of the world." Greenleaf was author of an unsuccessful state bill to police puppy mills, many of which are located in the northern and western parts of the state — Santorum's base of support as a member of the House, 1991-1994, and in his 1994 election to the U.S. Senate.

While the AKC position on puppy mill regulation is consistent with the organization's position as the voice of the dog breeders, the AVMA and HSUS positions were somewhat more surprising. No one at HSUS was talking, on the record, but *Animal People* was given to understand by well-placed persons that Pacelle opted for the highest possible profile on the issue, instead alignment [sic] with other humane groups and the signers of the Poshard letter, as some HSUS staff purportedly favored.

Abney, of the AVMA, told *Animal People* that, "I feel that if those facilities required to be licensed were licensed and inspected, with follow-through enforcement (of existing regulations), then the majority of problems seen with commercial breeding facilities would disappear. If USDA-APHIS-REAC were to allocate time and resources toward properly enforcing the current regulations, the welfare of the animals would rapidly improve. However, if USDA was forced to labor through a cost-benefit analysis pending the introduction of new regulations, there would be far less resources to enforce the current regulations. Moreover, if the regulations were found to be wanting after proper enforcement, then the specific deficiencies could be addressed directly."

While the House has passed a bill requiring cost-benefit analysis of new regulations, which Santorum strongly favors, the bill has not cleared the Senate, and even if passed by the Senate, is almost certain to be vetoed by President Bill Clinton. Abney's response further overlooked that APHIS-REAC has already declared a lack of essential resources and has reported on specific regulatory deficiencies; that's what occasioned Poshard's letter in the first place.

So advised, AVMA assistant director of scientific activities John Boyce reiterated that, "Dr. Abney and I, along with several of our colleagues, are attempting to represent the official position of the AVMA on this issue, namely that our first priority should be to see that USDA receives adequate funding to allow proper enforcement of existing animal care regulations.

Yet not one word in the Santorum letter even hinted at making more funding available to the USDA.

That left another possible explanation: specific regulatory requirements applied to breeding facilities might also be applied, as a basic care standard, in various pending state efforts to regulate boarding kennels —a common sideline of veterinary

clinics. The veterinary community is sensitive to regulation of boarding kennels right now due to a series of tangles with the American Boarding Kennel Association over alleged conflict of interest in regulations which require facilities to be approved by a veterinarian or have a "veterinarian of record." ABKA officers in Connecticut and North Carolina recently persuaded state agriculture authorities to suspend veterinary approval requirements, because veterinarians could potentially protect a monopoly on providing boarding service by refusing to approve kennels run by non-vets.

Perhaps significantly, the Santorum letter includes in place of the Poshard letter's request for a specific requirement that dogs get daily exercise, the phrase "Exercise guidelines, as determined by the attending veterinarian, must be followed." Thus, if a vet runs a breeding kennel, he could do about exercise whatever he/she pleases.

VP David Wills Fired

The puppy mill flap was just one headache for HSUS president Paul Irwin and Humane Society International president John Hoyt, whose organization is the umbrella for HSUS and several affiliated organizations. On August 9, they were obliged to put HSUS vice president David Wills on administrative leave. On August 11, after rumors about the circumstances raced through the animal protection community, Wills was fired.

Just weeks earlier, in June, Hoyt and Irwin, both former clergymen, presided over a lavish Mexican wedding for Wills and Laurie White, former wife of PETA president Alex Pacheco, now a volunteer for the Washington Humane Society. Some sources told *Animal People* that Pacelle and Ark Trust Genesis project assistant Kirsten Rosenberg, who were married at about the same time, were wed at the same ceremony.

Wills' departure came as HSUS/HSI board members questioned the use of HSUS/HSI funds to pay wedding-related costs and cover Wills' personal debts. Insiders told *Animal People* that Wills had drawn significant loans against his \$70,000-plus salary, had taken a female subordinate abroad without prior authorization, had submitted expense accounts including business lunches and other meetings that never took place, and had transferred a female staffer to longtime friend Pacelle's office in an [sic] purported attempt to keep people with knowledge of his personal affairs from comparing notes. Details of some of the alleged

transactions were recorded by current and former employees, who also alleged sexual harassment by Wills at various times over a three-year period. Several serious charges were detailed in a 21-page affidavit, while further charges, by other plaintiffs, may be included in affidavits yet to be filed.

On August 9, an e-mail message to HSUS staff announced that Wills' duties as director of companion animals and investigations would be temporarily handled by John Kullberg, president of the American SPCA 1979-1991, and head of the HSUS Wildlife Land Trust since October 1994.

Earlier in the summer, Wills accepted the June 30 recommendation of circuit court mediation judge Steven N. Andrews of Oakland County, Michigan, that he should pay \$42,500 restitution and damages to Sandra LeBost, of Royal Oak, Michigan, who allegedly loaned Wills \$28,311 and her father's gold watch, with a claimed worth of \$10,000, and was not repaid, when Wills left his former post as executive director of the Michigan Humane Society to form the National Society for Animal Protection in mid-1989. Wills headed NSAP, now dormant, for two years before taking his HSUS job.

A mediation judge is believed to have recommended that Wills pay \$21,000 to William and Judith McBride, of Ortonville, Michigan, who allegedly loaned Wills \$20,000 in May and June, 1991, and were also not repaid. That case, however, will apparently go to court. Meanwhile, a presettlement probe of Wills' ability to pay the recommended sums reported that according to the Washington D.C. registrar of deeds, the street address Wills furnished to the court apparently does not exist.

Wills' fall from grace after several years as Hoyt's heir-apparent left in doubt the positions of Pacelle and lobbyists Aaron Medlock and Bill Long, whom Wills recruited from the Fund for Animals in April 1994. Also in question was the further association with HSUS of DeDay LaRene, a longtime Wills pal who joined HSUS to do community service after spending a year in federal prison for helping Joey Giacalone conceal \$410,000 from the IRS. LaRene had represented Giacalone since a 1975 grand jury probe of the disappearance of former Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa, and in 1988 represented Robert Miles, Michigan grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan. Yet another HSUS staffer believed likely to be packing was Joan Witt, LaRene's wife, who followed Wills from a humane society post in Nashua, New Hampshire, first to MHS and then to HSUS.

Animal People was told by senior persons within HSUS that negotiations over a possible HSUS takeover of the Washington D.C. animal control contract, begun by Wills, will continue. The Washington Humane Society contract expired in May. The major obstacle to the deal is purportedly the intention of WHS to keep responsibility for anti-cruelty enforcement, granted to it by Congress, which administers Washington D.C.

Stumbling Bloch

At deadline *Animal People* was still investigating whether either HSUS or HSUS senior officers took investment advice from financial radio talk show host I.H. "Sonny" Bloch, and if so, what the result was. Bloch, 58, was associated with HSUS for at least a decade, first as host of a TV program about pets and later, from 1991 until spring 1995, as a member of the HSUS board of directors. Bloch is now in federal prison in Manhattan, awaiting multiple trials, beginning with a federal court suit filed in Newark, New Jersey in December 1994 by 280 investors from 33 states, alleging Bloch fraudulently induced them to invest \$9.38 million in a worthless wireless cable system.

A longtime resident of Tampa, Florida, Bloch fled to the Dominican Republic in March 1995, purportedly to avoid "persecution" by federal agents who were probing accusations of financial misdealings and statutory rape. Bloch declared his innocence.

Statutory rape charges have apparently not been filed to date. However, on May 26, as Bloch was still broadcasting daily from Santo Domingo, the Securities and Exchange Commission charged him and four others with bilking investors of \$3.8 million by selling \$21 million worth of memberships in firms set up to buy three radio stations. Later that day, Dominican authorities arrested Bloch at request [sic] of the FBI and returned him to the U.S.

Then, on July 7, federal prosecutors in Manhattan indicted Bloch on eight counts of tax fraud, perjury, and obstruction of justice, regarding his financial dealings from 1991 through 1993 with Broadcast Management Corporation, the producer of his financial talk show, which aired on 170 stations from 1980 until earlier this year.

HSUS Raids the Fund for Animals

(Animal People, May 1994)

WASHINGTON D.C. — No one at the Humane Society of the U.S. was talking — not on the record — but spring maneuvers apparently intended to consolidate political influence both internally and externally may give the group a very different profile on Capitol Hill. Events of note included the March 15 resignation of Kenneth Inglis, considered the most militant animal rights activist on the board of directors; the hiring of North Shore Animal League president David Ganz, apparently to raise funds in connection with a new HSUS government relations arm, including a political action committee; and the wooing away of virtually the whole political apparatus of the Fund for Animals, including national director Wayne Pacelle, attorney Aaron Medlock, and Ohio lobbyist Bill Long, who had represented both the Fund and HSUS in recent months.

The actions were seen by Washington D.C. insiders as a coup for HSUS president Paul Irwin and a poker-playing clique also including vice presidents John Grandy and David Wills. Pacelle was apparently brought into the game through Wills, with whom he was recently sharing an apartment, and Pacelle then recruited Medlock, a former roommate as well as Fund colleague. Pacelle is expected to be titular head of the HSUS PAC, with Medlock in charge of national lobbying and Long in charge of state lobbying.

HSUS A Boys' Club?

The formation of the political arm appears to isolate HSUS executive vice president Patricia Forkan, who was hired away from the Fund some years ago, and had been in charge of governmental affairs. The job titles expected to be given to Medlock and Long would seem to supersede those of HSUS senior lobbyist Martha Glenn and state legislative coordinator Ann Church.

Forkan was once seen as Irwin's chief rival for the top spot at HSUS upon longtime president John Hoyt's death or retirement. However, Irwin succeeded to the presidency in 1991, when Hoyt moved up to head Humane Society International, an umbrella created for HSUS and foreign operations, including the newly formed Humane Society of Canada, which recently opened an office in the Toronto financial district.

Friends of Pacelle and Wills said they were told that the two were being "groomed on the fast track" to succeed Hoyt and Irwin, implying that Forkan is out of the picture.

Why? "Because she's a woman. Because she's not one of the boys," explained one insider. "Don't you get it? Irwin is squelching the one department at HSUS that has been controlled and staffed mainly by women."

That allegation may have been supported by an electronic bulletin board posting, attributed to former HSUS public relations officer Helen Mitternacht, that circulated about Washington D.C. after her departure several months ago: "God help any woman who still works for HSUS."

The Players

Inglis told *Animal People* that his resignation had nothing to do with the other moves, but it may have had the effect of neutralizing Pacelle, long considered an animal rights radical, if Pacelle had any notion of building a board constituency behind the chief executives' backs — as he was accused of during his association with *The Animals' Agenda* magazine.

Medlock, an attorney, was reputedly instrumental in the 1986 takeover of the New England Anti-Vivisection Society by the Fund and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. Then an aide to former NEAVS president Robert Ford, he has been named by other takeover participants as the insider who relayed essential information to the Fund and PETA. Medlock later worked for the Fund in Washington D.C., from March 1992 until August 1993, then rejoined the Fund, after a brief hiatus in San Francisco in January 1994, working from Boston as a newsletter editor.

Pacelle, formerly Fund founder Cleveland Amory's anticipated successor, shared a Boston apartment and office with Medlock in 1988-1989, after joining the Fund as executive director, following a brief stint on the staff of *The Animals' Agenda*. Retitled national director when he relocated to Washington D.C., Pacelle had become the Fund's most visible representative. He concurrently served five years on *The Animals' Agenda* board. In 1992 he engineered the firing of news editor Merritt Clifton, which brought the subsequent resignation of editor Kim Bartlett. Bartlett is now the publisher and Clifton the editor of *Animal People*. Pacelle apparently also arranged the 1993 ouster of Patrice Greanville, who had worked for the magazine in various

capacities since its founding. Ironically, Bartlett and Greanville had hired Pacelle as their assistant editor at *The Animals' Agenda*, and recommended Pacelle to Amory.

While Pacelle and Medlock have higher profiles, the most intriguing of the HSUS additions was that of Ganz, president of NSAL from the 1986 death of his predecessor, Alex Lewyt, until March 1, 1993. Unpopular with the staff, Ganz quit after board president Elizabeth Lewyt fired his wife. He was then paid \$216,000 a year, approximately twice as much as his successor, attorney John Stevenson. HSUS apparently hired him to raise megabucks — which is what he reputedly did best at NSAL. Because donations to a PAC are not tax-deductible, a PAC does not operate under the same rules governing the use of funds as a humane society or educational charity, and can in effect spend as much upon direct mailing to raise more funds and influence legislation as it can get. It is believed that the new PAC will seek a constituency with a relentless direct mail offensive, in line with Pacelle's long-stated goal of building "a National Rifle Association of the animals rights movement."

The Fund for Animals

Pacelle told Amory of his impending departure on the evening of April 1. "He said he could give us six more weeks," growled Amory. "He said he had a number of speaking engagements to do for us, and could stay until May 15. I told him, 'You're done now. You can speak wherever you like, but you're not speaking for us.' I told him that if he needed a desk for a week, he could use a desk at our office, but he wasn't going to be paid. HSUS has quite a record with the Fund," Amory continued. "You know, I was a cofounder of HSUS, and then I left to start the Fund in 1974 because they wouldn't take a strong stand against hunting. They hired away Patty Forkan, who was our first executive director. Then they took away our Washington D.C. director, Lewis Regenstein. Now they took Wayne. They ought to pay us for training their staff for them. They know we can't get into a bidding war when they offer our people two and three times the salary they're making here," which would put Pacelle's HSUS salary at circa \$70,000 a year.

"The thing I'm afraid of now," Amory continued, "is that next they'll get me. I've never paid myself anything, and Marian Probst," longtime executive secretary to Amory, "has never taken any salary from the Fund either, so it wouldn't be hard for them to offer us more. But we've never believed money is what this

work is about," Amory continued. "Our philosophy has always been to pay our people what they need. Anything more goes to the animals. We've never believed in paying high salaries, and we don't want the kind of people who want high salaries."

Amory rewarded national outreach director Heidi Prescott, Pacelle's assistant in the Washington office, with a promotion to head the office. Prescott was originally included — unawares — in Pacelle's plan for a mass defection, according to confidantes, but balked upon finding out about it, forgoing a big pay raise.

"I'm not an admirer of HSUS," Amory added. "They've always been primarily a direct-mail operation, and what's known in animal rights circles as a credit-grabber. I think Wayne will find that his association with Irwin, Wills, and Grandy is not as productive as he imagines it will be."

Good Riddance

As to the Fund, Amory said, "All programs will continue, but you'll see the whole Fund involved now. It won't be just quotes in the media coming from one person. I think our focus will be broader, but the emphasis on hunting will continue. I don't degrade the efforts Wayne made," Amory explained, "but I think sometimes things like this happen for the best."

Pacelle's tactical judgement was often under question. One issue was his obsession with challenging hunter harassment laws. Pacelle, then a Yale undergraduate, rose to prominence in 1986 through a successful constitutional challenge to an arrest for hunter harassment during a protest of a deer hunt in the Yale-New Haven forest. Only four states then had hunter harassment laws. Four years after Pacelle made hunter harassment a primary issue at the Fund, 48 states had hunter harassment laws. Three were overturned by lower courts, but all three were reinstated either by higher courts or through legislative amendments. Meanwhile an NRA recruiting drive mounted in response to Pacelle's campaign signed up 300,000 new members.

Other issues within the Fund included Pacelle's centralization of authority, and his open desire to drop the semi-autonomous state representatives and sanctuary network that have been the strength of the Fund for twenty years — including the Black Beauty Ranch. Located near Tyler, Texas, the Black Beauty Ranch is the Fund's signature project, home of numerous animals

rescued through Fund intervention in abusive and exploitive situations.

"The sanctuaries and state representatives will be flourishing long after we're gone," Amory promised from the Black Beauty Ranch. "Black Beauty now has more animals and is in better shape than ever. Chris and Mary Byrne," who took over management of the sanctuary in 1990, "have done a terrific job," Amory said, citing the recent socialization of Tara, a 40-year-old Asian elephant who spent 29 years in solitary confinement at the now closed Prospect Park Zoo in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. At Black Beauty she shares facilities with Conga, a 20-year-old African elephant whom the Fund already had.

"They're amazing together," Amory concluded, clearly happier talking about animals than about people. "They're close to the same size, and they've become the best of friends."

Zimbabwe: Driving Wildlife to Extinction An Investigative Report on the Crisis Facing Elephants and Rhinoceros in Zimbabwe

On October 7, 1993, HSUS/HSI published the following report on wildlife management in Zimbabwe. Following this report is a response from the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management of Zimbabwe, pointing out the principal errors and misleading information contained in the HSUS/HSI report.

INTRODUCTION

There are perhaps no better examples of the myriad problems faced by wildlife in Africa today than those of the African elephant and African black rhino in Zimbabwe. Civil unrest, drought, poaching for the lucrative international trade in wildlife parts, poverty, corruption, human destruction of wildlife habitat, increasing human populations, a growing national debt, unwillingness to cooperate with neighboring countries to protect and manage shared wildlife populations, a collapsing economic infrastructure, and a government that wants to exploit wildlife for hard currency are but some of the factors that have influenced the way that wild animals are viewed and managed in Zimbabwe.

In light of continued attempts by the Government of Zimbabwe to promote wide acceptance of consumptive use of wild animals

especially its support for the legalization of the international trade in elephant ivory and rhino horn, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and Humane Society International (HSI) sent an investigation team to Zimbabwe in May and June 1993. That investigation, months of preparation and follow-up work, and years of work with the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora form the basis of this report.

BACKGROUND: RHINOCEROS

There are three species of Asian rhinos and two species of African rhinos. The horns of rhinos are made of a densely packed hair-like substance, and are used by rhinos to defend themselves and their young from predators, and to push through the bush while foraging. Unfortunately, horns are also useful to some people: Rhino horns taken from poached rhinos are exported to Asian countries, such as Taiwan and China, where they are ground and used in traditional medicine. Some horns are also exported to Yemen where they are carved into ceremonial dagger handles.

All five rhinoceros species have very low population sizes (Fig. 1; not included here), the result of decades of poaching for their horn and severe habitat destruction. The worldwide population of rhinos has undergone a reduction of 90 percent in just over two decades, and now only about 10,000 rhinos of all five species are left in the wild. But the African black rhinoceros has recently been the object of the most intense poaching pressure. The worldwide population of black rhinos has been slashed by 96 percent in the past two decades, from about 65,000 in 1970 to only 2,300 today. Zimbabwe, thought to be a stronghold for black rhinos, lost 1500 in just the past year.

In 1977, all five rhino species were placed on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Species on Appendix I are banned from commercial international trade among the 120 nations of CITES. Despite protection from legislated international trade, the illegal trade in horn thrives in some Asian countries where it is sold as a valuable commodity now, and is stockpiled as an investment for the future. When the last rhino is killed, the value of horn stockpiles will be immense.

Even now, rhino horn sold in Asia can be worth as much as \$10,000 per kg for African horn, or \$60,000 per kg for rarer Asian horn. By comparison, the price of gold is about \$11.416

per kg. A rhino horn dagger can sell for as much as \$30,000 in Yemen. And, predictably, as rhinos have become rarer, the retail price for horn has skyrocketed. In 1979, African horn sold in Asia for \$550 per kg, while Asian horn sold for \$9000 per kg. In 1985, African horn sold in Asia for about \$1500 per kg, while Asian horn sold for about \$24,000 per kg. Now the prices are several times higher and still increasing.

Taiwan and China have recently come under international pressure for allowing rhino horn trade to continue unabated in their countries. In September 1993, CITES' governing body, the Standing Committee, asked all nations that have signed the trade treaty to consider banning wildlife trade with Taiwan and China. Also in September, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt recommended to President Clinton that the U.S. impose trade sanctions on products from China and Taiwan.

While both Taiwan and China have recently outlawed the trade in rhino horn, undercover investigations have been able to easily find horn for sale in both countries, indicating that the laws are not implemented or enforced. These countries have significant stockpiles of horn, worth tens of millions of dollars. In an effort to stamp out rhino horn trade, CITES has recommended that all nations destroy rhino horn stockpiles.

Zimbabwe is also defying CITES by maintaining its government rhino horn stockpile. At the March 1992 CITES meeting, Zimbabwe proposed that the international rhino horn trade should resume, stating that money derived from the sale of their stockpiled horns could be used for protecting rhinos. But the only way to stop rhino poaching is to destroy the market for horn once and for all, not to stimulate the market by legalizing the sale of rhino horn. If the market for horn is not destroyed now and forever, it is unlikely that rhinos will survive to the year 2000.

BACKGROUND: ELEPHANTS

Between 1979 and 1989, the world's population of African elephants was slashed by more than half, from 1.3 million to less than 600,000. The cause was the legal trade in elephant ivory, and poaching of elephants for their ivory, for which the legal ivory trade provided a cover. At first, CITES set up a complex monitoring system that, in theory, would have made it impossible for ivory from poached elephants to enter trade. However, elephants continued to be poached in large numbers. Some estimated that 90% of the ivory in the 1989 "legal" trade actually

originated from poached elephants. The monitoring attempt was a complete failure which demonstrated the futility of trying to control trade in such a lucrative substance which is easily obtained from largely unprotected wild animals. The only solution was for CITES to ban the international trade in ivory, which was instituted in early 1990. By 1990, most African nations had either lost all of their elephants, or had only a fraction of the elephant numbers present only 10 years earlier.

Despite the decline and disappearance of elephant populations across the African continent, Zimbabwe (along with South Africa, Botswana, Malawi, and Namibia) proposed to reopen the legal international ivory trade at the 1992 CITES meeting. This proposal was soundly rejected by CITES, with other African nations leading the opposition. They know that they cannot protect their elephants from the uncontrollable ivory trade and that the only way to ensure the elephants' survival is to continue the ban on the international trade.

As with rhino horn, Zimbabwe holds vast stores of ivory, mostly collected from government-sanctioned elephant culling operations, which kill thousands of elephants every year. Zimbabwe claims that it has too many elephants, and that it must cull the elephants in order to protect habitat from being destroyed by them.

THE HSUS/HSI INVESTIGATION

The African Black Rhinoceros in Zimbabwe

At the March 1992 CITES meeting, Zimbabwe claimed to have approximately 2000 black rhinos and 370 white rhinos. Zimbabwe used these figures as justification for its CITES proposals to allow trade in black and white rhino horn to resume. Yet the HSUS/HSI investigation team obtained April 1993 population estimates from an internal government document entitled "Matusadona Plan for Intensive Protection", which indicate that Zimbabwe has only 296 black rhinos and 198 white rhinos (Figs. 2 & 3; not included here).

Zimbabwe's most visible rhino protection program has been to dehorn all of its rhino, with the idea that poachers will not kill rhinos without horns. However, twelve dehorned black rhinos and 82 dehorned white rhinos have been killed as of April 1993 (Figs. 2 & 3). The HSUS/HSI investigation team observed the dehorning of four black rhinos and concluded that the highly invasive and stressful dehorning is doing nothing to protect

rhinos from poachers. In fact, the small amount of horn that remains after dehorning is still enough for poachers to make some money. A stump can weigh as much as 1 kg, depending on how long ago the rhino was dehorned, which is worth a year's wage, about \$200, to a poacher. The horn of the rhino eventually regrows, and those dehorned only two years ago already have five or six inches of horn, more than enough to attract poachers.

This is just one of many possible explanations of why dehorned rhinos are poached. Because of thick brush and an ingrained fear of rhinos, the poachers may kill first and check for horn later. Or rhinos may be killed out of spite or frustration when a poacher has tracked a rhino and tried in vain to obtain horn. However, the most intriguing explanation is that Asian dealers are banking on the extinction of the rhino and are encouraging poachers to kill any rhinos, with or without horn. When the last rhino is killed, rhino stockpiles will be priceless.

If dehorning is not a good poaching deterrent, then why is Zimbabwe continuing to dehorn its rhinos? Because dehorning allows the government of Zimbabwe to get the horn before the poachers do. Some 3 tons of rhino horn are stored in the Zimbabwe's government warehouses. If Zimbabwe ever succeeds in convincing the international CITES community to legalize the international rhino horn trade, Zimbabwe will have a financial windfall. Another reason Zimbabwe continues to dehorn its rhino is the public attention it attracts. Researchers, authors of books and magazine articles, tourists, film crews, and others who want to witness rhino dehorning, bring valuable foreign currency into Zimbabwe. Safari hunters are eager to pay thousands of dollars to dart a rhino and remove its horn. Some conservation organizations, anxious to stop the decline of the black rhino, pay the government of Zimbabwe to dehorn its rhinos. The government of Zimbabwe, which collects money from these well-meaning sources, does not spend a dime of its own on the inhumane and useless dehorning program.

Tragically, the translocation of rhinos to conservancies is just as ineffective as dehorning in protecting rhinos. The game ranches (which comprise the conservancies), and the hunting camps that operate safaris on these ranches, do not have the security, equipment, manpower or money needed to protect the rhino. The local people, whether employed as field hands or game guards, are seldom, if ever, integrated into the process. Deep racial resentment exists, allowing them to be "bought" with money or coerced by intimidation. The game ranchers are

amateurs when it comes to protecting the wildlife on the ranch. This often makes it easier for poachers to operate under the cover of the commotion that surrounds the conservancies. The constant traffic of visitors and employees makes it easier for the poachers to slip in and out undetected. Finally, like dehorning, the relocation of rhinos to conservancies by the government, and the management of rhinos on conservancies, are basically "entertainment" spectacles driven by politics, and powered by financial incentives. The ranchers use the presence of rhinos as an incentive for trophy hunters to hunt on their ranch, where they can see rhino while hunting for other species. Some ranchers hope to establish a viable population of rhinos on their ranches and to someday offer hunting safaris for rhinos.

In reality, rhinos on conservancies are not even safe from those who should protect them. Two rhino killed recently at the Midlands Conservancy were shot with a .303 caliber rifle — the standard issue for local Zimbabwe police and military police. Further, after interviewing several ranch workers on the ranch where the rhino were killed, it was clear to the HSUS/HSI investigation team that these rhinos were killed by Zimbabweans. One rancher convinced the government to relocate thirteen rhino to his farm last year; all thirteen were killed within eight months. It was later discovered that one of his own "scouts" was involved. In conclusion, 1) Zimbabwe has far fewer rhinos than it has claimed; 2) neither dehorning nor translocation to conservancies are providing any real protection for rhinos; 3) Zimbabwe's rhino "protection" programs are little more than a way to attract foreign currency; and 4) Zimbabwe is stockpiling horns from dehorning operations in the hopes that their efforts to legalize the international horn trade will pay off.

The African Elephant in Zimbabwe

Like the rhino, the African elephant is a victim of the Zimbabwe Government's plan to exploit its wildlife.

The HSUS/HSI investigation team obtained a price list of wildlife offered for sale by the Zimbabwe Government (Annex I; not included here). Prices are broken down into three major categories: Live animals, hunted animals, and "sundries" (parts, such as tusks and other teeth). Zimbabwe offers elephant calves, the result of government sanctioned culling operations, for US\$2,500 for export to foreign zoos, and as adult male elephant to a hunter for US\$7,500. Live elephants are offered to private conservancies and game farms (where they may be hunted).

Adult male lions are offered to dealers for US\$1,000, zebras for US\$450, hippo teeth for US\$15/kilogram, and hunters my kill a leopard for US\$1000.

Zimbabwe manages its elephants, like its other wildlife, for consumptive use. Aerial surveys, population estimates, official government pricing of ivory, and management practices are designed to provide a lucrative source of foreign currency for the Government.

The Zimbabwe Government kills thousands of elephants each year, justifying the slaughter by claiming that there are too many elephants and that they are destroying the habitat. But, the HSUS/HSI investigation team uncovered evidence that these claims are not supported by game scouts or independent ecologists.

Minutes from a meeting of Zimbabwe's National Parks and Wildlife Management Department, wherein staff discussed the proposed culling of 2,000 elephants from the Zambezi Valley (Annex II; not included here), reveal that game scouts did not support the Parks department claims that there was an elephant population problem, and that elephant-caused habitat "damage" was not a concern, except in a few isolated areas where an elephant group congregated. Other revealing aspects of those minutes are the allegations by ground staff game wardens that the 1988 elephant population estimates were too high and the resulting cull unwarranted.

One ecologist working at Hwange National Park stated that an October 1992 aerial survey by the Zimbabwe National Parks and Wildlife Department estimated that there were 37,000 elephants in Hwange. The ecologist stated, "Hwange is 14,000 square kilometers. That's three (damn) elephants per square kilometer in the Park. Are these people nuts?" Hwange has introduced pumping stations to maintain artificial water holes so that tourists can see animals year-round. In explaining how the research department came up with such unrealistically high elephant population estimates, the ecologist stated, "The (people) fly over the water holes, between 4:00 and 6:00 PM, and count all the elephants who come in to drink. And then (they) extrapolate for the whole damn park. It's incredible. There is no cross-reference, no ground checks, no habitat analysis. Hwange could handle four times as many elephants as it currently supports. Hwange has deep ravines and strong Mopani tree

growth (Mopani trees comprise a large portion of an elephant's diet) and frankly, not that many elephants."

The ecologist explained further that the official margin of error for elephant population estimates based on aerial surveys is plus or minus 95 percent. The ecologist elaborated that, "... if the airplane flies over the water-hole at 2:00 PM in the heat of the afternoon they'll see no elephants in the park and extrapolation will yield zero elephants for the population. If you fly over at the heaviest concentration periods, when animals are known to come to water in the cool of the evening, you'll get 37,000 elephants from extrapolation. But the truth is not even half of that." The ecologist finally concluded that, "All scientific surveys are suspect in this country because they have a number they want to take (by culling) and the survey has to justify that number." In other words, the population figures are predetermined for economic purposes.

There is simply no reliable evidence that elephants are so abundant that they are destroying their habitat beyond what is normal for herbivores of that size. Ecologists and others told the HSUS/HSI investigation team that government-sanctioned lumber operations and fire have taken a far larger toll on wildlife habitat than elephants could ever have.

Elephant population sizes are grossly over-stated by the Zimbabwe Government to justify killing elephants for economic purposes. Elephants are being culled to feed crocodiles, to sell baby elephants to foreign zoos, and to stockpile ivory and elephant hides for a future legalized trade in the lucrative elephant parts.

The HSUS/HSI investigation team uncovered an internal Zimbabwe government document (Annex III; not included here) which provides details of a government deal to sell elephant meat to crocodile farmers. Zimbabwe can essentially circumvent the ban on the international trade in elephant parts by feeding elephants to crocodiles and making money from the crocodile skins that can be legally sold in international trade.

The Government of Zimbabwe keeps the ivory tusks from its elephant culling operations, stockpiling it until they are successful at reopening the international ivory trade. Over 30 tons of ivory is stored at the National Parks headquarters, 95 percent of it acquired since the ivory ban went into effect in

early 1990. This means that the vast majority of the stored ivory is from the thousands of government-culled elephants.

Zimbabwe has accused the international community of robbing them of significant income from ivory sales, income which they argue could be used to help fund wildlife protection. In 1989, the year before the international trade in ivory was banned, Zimbabwe sold 6726.46 kilograms of ivory for Z\$1,784,333 (about US\$297,388). This figure is insignificant compared to the \$US83 million that the Government of Zimbabwe reported earning from its National Parks in 1992, without international ivory sales. However, if the international ivory trade is worth so little to their national budget, then why is the Government of Zimbabwe interested in legalizing the international ivory trade? A high ranking deputy minister in the Zimbabwe government, as well as a second independent source, told the HSUS/HSI investigation team that the actual money obtained for the 1989 ivory sale was over Z\$8 million (about US\$1.3 million). What happened to the missing 1 million dollars? It probably is lining the pockets of corrupt Government bureaucrats.

Zimbabwe wants to legalize the international ivory trade because, they have asserted, wildlife must pay their way. But wildlife are paying their way, and for a lot of other unrelated activities as well.

Most of the US\$83 million that Zimbabwe earned from its National Parks in 1992 is not going back into operation of the Park or protection of its wildlife. The 1993 budget for national parks is US\$6 million, of which US\$5 million provides "overhead", and only US\$1 million is spent on paying, feeding, supplying, and transporting the wildlife protection division. To return less than 10 percent of the earnings back to operations of the Parks, and less than 2 percent into actually protecting animals in the Parks, is reprehensible. The truth is that the Government of Zimbabwe is not willing to invest in its own wildlife, and instead relies on attracting enough attention to get foreign non-governmental organizations to fund the Parks' operation, while most of the revenue derived from the Parks is diverted to unrelated activities and does not go back to the local people, the animals, or the Parks.

The monetary value that Zimbabwe places on its wildlife, its ivory stockpiles, and its attempts to reopen the international ivory trade have not been ignored by poachers. In Hwange National Park, more elephants were killed in 1992 than in any of the previous six years (Fig. 4: not included here). Several persons

contacted by the HSUS/HSI investigation team indicated that everyone is hoarding tusks in anticipation of a relaxing of the CITES ban on the international trade in ivory. One source stated, "... the illegal trade can't fill one one-hundredth of the demand. Plus, Poon (a major ivory and rhino horn dealer) is buying up all the poached (ivory and horns) anyhow, and sitting on it. Everyone knows when the ban is lifted, ivory will go for one and one-half to three times more than now, maybe more." Stockpiling makes economic sense. Another source stated, "The only sure way to get the corrupt ministers and the military out of the game is to ban the (trade in ivory and rhino horn) forever. Then make all these governments burn the (ivory and rhino horn)."

Ironically, while Zimbabwe begs the international community to help it protect its rhinos and elephants, the activities of the Government are encouraging poaching.

In conclusion, 1) Zimbabwe's estimates of elephant population sizes are grossly over-stated and predetermined to justify government-sanctioned elephant culling operations; 2) Zimbabwe is cashing in on elephants now — by selling meat from culled elephants to crocodile farmers, by selling elephant calves to foreign zoos, and by selling adult elephants to game farms where they may be hunted; 3) Zimbabwe is stock-piling ivory from culled elephants for future sale, if they can succeed in convincing CITES to legalize the international ivory trade; 4) Elephants and other wildlife in Zimbabwe's National Parks earn huge income for the Government of Zimbabwe, only 10% of which is put back into Park operation and animal protection; and 5) Zimbabwe's ivory stockpiles, and CITES proposals to legalize the international ivory trade, are encouraging elephant poaching and stockpiling of ivory by dealers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Dehorning rhinos is not an effective anti-poaching deterrent. Zimbabwe should cease this inhumane and ineffectual technique immediately.
- 2) Translocating rhinos to conservancies and game ranches is not an effective anti-poaching deterrent. Zimbabwe should translocate rhinos to Intensive Protection Zones, areas in the country far from rivers and unprotected borders, surrounded by scouts and equipment until the populations recover.

3) Stockpiling rhino horn and elephant ivory is only perpetuating the myth that the ivory and horn trade will reopen, which is encouraging poachers to kill rhinos and elephants, and dealers to stockpile these lucrative substances. Zimbabwe should destroy all stockpiled rhino horn, as recommended by CITES, and destroy all stockpiled ivory as Kenya has done.

4) Zimbabwe's elephant population estimates are grossly exaggerated and predetermined to support elephant slaughter for economic purposes. Zimbabwe should call for an independent estimate of its elephant populations, and cease all elephant culling.

5) Zimbabwe's proposals to legalize the international ivory and rhino horn trade at CITES meetings serves only to fuel the speculation that a market will open, which in turn fuels poaching of Zimbabwe's wildlife. Zimbabwe should refrain from making CITES proposals that would result in a legalized trade in elephant and rhino parts.

6) Zimbabwe should designate a significant portion of the income earned by its National Parks back into operation of the Parks and into providing protection for the animals that live there.

Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D.
David K. Wills

POST-SCRIPT

(Harare, Deutsche Presse-Agentur) On September 10, 1993, Zimbabwe's minister of the environment, Herbert Murerwa, admitted that his Government's plan (sic; ed.) to dehorn its rhino as a poaching deterrent had failed. Murerwa also announced that it has adopted a "crisis plan" to move its rhino into small, heavily guarded areas called "Intensive Protection Zones" (IPZs) where it will be easier to combat poachers.

The HSUS/HSI has congratulated the President of Zimbabwe (Annex IV; not included here) for making this decision. The HSUS/HSI has also pledged support for verifiable efforts to move rhinos to IPZs.

Zimbabwe: At the Leading Edge of Conservation

The following report was issued on November 20, 1993, by the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management of

Zimbabwe, in response to the HSUS/HSI report "Zimbabwe: Driving Wildlife to Extinction" (see above). The following report was endorsed by: The Africa Resources Trust, the CAMPFIRE Association, the Wildlife Society, the Zambezi Society, the Zambezi Association of Tour and Safari Operators, the Zimbabwe National Conservation Trust, and the Zimbabwe Trust.

Introduction

The document entitled "Zimbabwe — Driving Wildlife to Extinction", produced by the Humane Society of the United States and the Humane Society International (HSUS/HSI), is full of falsehoods and inaccuracies.

Normally, publications of this quality are ignored, but the way in which this report is being used may adversely affect rhinoceros and elephant conservation, not only in Zimbabwe, but elsewhere, and a response is appropriate.

The principal aim of this rebuttal is to highlight the many incorrect statements and to juxtapose these with the verifiable truth. However, another characteristic of the report is the way that perfectly accurate information is presented in a manner that creates the impression that wildlife management in Zimbabwe has sinister motives. It is therefore appropriate to introduce this response with an unequivocal statement of Zimbabwe's conservation philosophy and policy. The Zimbabwe Government

1. Grants legal authority to landholders to manage and benefit from their wildlife;
2. Encourages the sustainable use of wildlife to give it a high financial value (Strictly regulated, this use may be consumptive as well as non-consumptive).

This approach does represent a departure from traditional preservationist approaches to conservation in Africa. It springs from the recognition that the main threat to wildlife in Africa is not over-exploitation (though it is important to some species), but the loss of the wild lands that comprise its habitat. Land is increasingly scarce in Africa and, throughout the continent, expanding rural populations face a choice — keep wild habitats or clear them away for agriculture. Of course, to hungry people, this has not proved much of a choice. By giving wildlife an economic value the balance can be tipped the other way. In

Zimbabwe both commercial farmers and rural folk have, of their own volition, chosen to keep wild lands and its wild animal populations. Why? Because they make more money from wildlife than they do from crops.

Zimbabwe is at the leading edge of conservation in Africa. As a reflection of this, it is clear that while East African elephant populations have declined dramatically, the Zimbabwe elephant population has increased. Many believe that Zimbabwe's one conspicuous failure, in which black and white rhinos have been decimated, occurred precisely because Zimbabwe accepted a preservationist approach towards these species. Had these animals had a legal value to the rural poor on whom their survival depended, they might not have been killed illegally and unsustainably.

This background may explain the motivation behind the HSUS/HSI document. Since these organisations are fundamentally concerned with animal welfare, and not conservation, it is understandable that they are opposed to the consumptive use of animals, whatever the benefits. Since Zimbabwe is at the leading edge of conservation through sustainable use, it is in the interests of HSUS/HSI to denigrate Zimbabwe's achievements.

(1)

HSUS/HSI

"Civil unrest, drought, poaching for the lucrative international trade in wildlife parts, poverty, corruption, human destruction of wildlife habitat, increasing human populations, a growing national debt, unwillingness to cooperate with neighboring countries to protect and manage shared wildlife populations, a collapsing economic infrastructure, and a government that wants to exploit wildlife for hard currency are but some of the factors that have influenced the way that wild animals are viewed and managed in Zimbabwe."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. There has been no civil unrest in Zimbabwe since the Unity Accord of December 1987. The US Embassy advises its citizens that Zimbabwe is one of the most stable nations in Africa.

False. Zimbabwe closely cooperates with its neighbours in wildlife matters. Zimbabwe and Mozambique are working together to coordinate wildlife management in the south of Zimbabwe.

Zimbabwe and Botswana have recently completed simultaneous counts of their shared elephant population and are developing a joint management plan for the species in line with the IUCN's draft guidelines for sustainable use.

Zimbabwe has been exchanging information on cross-border poaching incidents with Zambia's Anti-corruption Commission for many years and has tried to enter into a bilateral extradition arrangement with Zambia. Zimbabwe has made the appropriate designations so that this arrangement is functional, but unfortunately Zambia has failed to reciprocate so far.

Zimbabwe is a founder member of SACIM, a legal treaty signed by Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, and Zimbabwe to manage elephants and coordinate trade in their products.

Zimbabwe has recently held high-level meetings with South Africa to coordinate wildlife management.

(2)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe, thought to be a stronghold for black rhinos, lost 1500 in just the past year."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. A report by TRAFFIC International shows that the last comprehensive survey, in 1989, indicated a population of 2138 black rhino. In 1991, based on reports of poaching levels, Zimbabwe offered population estimates ranging from 1,400 to 2095. From the results of the dehorning exercise Zimbabwe tabled a new estimate (probably the most detailed in Africa) of 430 animals in November 1992. This has subsequently been reduced to about 350 - 400. So about 1700 have been lost in four years and 30 - 70 in the past year.

(3)

HSUS/HSI

"When the last rhino is killed, the value of horn stockpiles will be immense."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

This is pure speculation and dependent on some sort of "conspiracy theory". The forces driving the price of horn are poorly understood.

(4)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe is also defying CITES by maintaining its government rhino horn stockpile."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. CITES Resolution Conf. 6.10 only recommends that rhino stocks (sic; ed.) be destroyed, and then only when supporting contributory funds from external sources are provided.

Zimbabwe is under no international legal obligation to comply and believes that there would be no conservation benefit from doing so. Similar stocks are held by most other African and Asian countries that have, or used to have rhino.

(5)

HSUS/HSI

"But the only way to stop rhino poaching is to destroy the market for horn once and for all"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Speculation. The HSUS/HSI are welcome to their opinion, but this is pure speculation. CITES has been unable to stop the illegal trade after almost 20 years of a complete trade ban. Zimbabwe and several countries in southern Africa (which are home to over 90% of Africa's remaining rhino) believe that the reintroduction of legal international trade in rhino horn could stop poaching. A growing body of literature and editorial comment supports the suggestion that this approach may be valid and needs investigation.

(6)

HSUS/HSI

"Between 1979 and 1989, the world's population of African elephants was slashed by more than half, from 1.3 million to less than 600,000."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. The estimates of elephant numbers used in 1989 to call for a ban on the ivory trade were blatantly inaccurate and widely disputed, and yet HSUS/HSI continue to use these figures as if they are fact. Elephant population declines were exaggerated. Re-estimates of Zaire's elephant populations, using new techniques.

resulted in 300,000 elephants disappearing overnight — reassessed as having never existed in the first place. But these animals were included in the estimate for Africa's total. Kenya's 1989 estimate of 16,000 jumped by over 60% to 26,000 in just 3 years following the ban as a result of "improved" census methods. Nevertheless, considerable numbers of elephants do appear to have been lost in several countries of central and eastern Africa.

(7)

HSUS/HSI

"The cause (of the decline) was the legal trade in elephant ivory, and poaching of elephants for their ivory, for which the legal ivory trade provided a cover."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. A major and ongoing cause for the decline of the African elephant is habitat loss. Before the worst spate of poaching, Kenya may have had 160,000 or more elephants. Do HSUS/HSI really believe that a return to this figure is possible — that there is room enough for this many elephants now?

(8)

HSUS/HSI

"Despite the decline and disappearance of elephant populations across the African continent"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. Elephant populations are not declining across the African continent. Even at the time of the ban elephants were stable or increasing in South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe and possibly other countries.

(9)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe ... proposed to reopen the legal international ivory trade at the 1992 CITES meeting. This proposal was soundly rejected by CITES"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. This reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the position of ivory trade under CITES. In fact, legal international ivory trade remains open as a number of countries. Zimbabwe

included, are excluded from the ban as a result of the Reservations (an opt out clause). These countries may legally trade in ivory with each other or with non-CITES countries (of which there are about 50) at any time. The final joint proposal from Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe, submitted for consideration by the Parties to CITES in 1992, proposed to downlist some populations of the African Elephant to CITES Appendix II, but specifically excluded ivory from trade. Had it been accepted, the southern African Reservations on the elephant would have been dropped and there would truly have been an international ban on the ivory trade. The proposal was not rejected by CITES. It was withdrawn by the proponents after an assessment of its chances of success.

(10)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe holds vast stores of ivory, mostly collected from government-sanctioned elephant culling operations, which kill thousands of elephants every year."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. There has been no elephant population reduction exercise approaching 1000 animals since 1988, when 2861 were taken off. From 1988 until 1991 only 436 elephants were removed. In 1992 a few hundred were culled during the drought, but over 700 were captured and moved to new areas opened up to elephant as a result of new consumptive wildlife use policies. In fact, several thousand elephants should have been taken off to save forests and woodlands from the damage caused by overpopulation, but the Wildlife Department's budget, cut as a result of the drought, did not stretch to these activities.

(11)

HSUS/HSI

"At the March 1992 CITES meeting, Zimbabwe claimed to have approximately 2000 black rhinos and 370 white rhinos."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. This is correct, but it was stated at CITES that Zimbabwe feared that all of its rhino could be lost before the next Conference of the Parties. It is notoriously difficult and expensive to count rhino, especially black rhino. Revised estimates were made possible by the dehorning program and show a horrific rate of poaching (despite Zimbabwe's

internationally renowned effort to combat the poaching tide in which at least 167 poachers have been killed and 89 captured with the loss of four departmental staff).

(12)

HSUS/HSI

"At the March 1992 CITES meeting, Zimbabwe claimed to have approximately 2000 black rhinos and 370 white rhinos. Zimbabwe used these figures as justification for its CITES proposals to allow trade in black and white rhino horn to resume."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. Zimbabwe has never used the number of rhino in themselves to justify trade in horn. The principal argument is that conventional methods of conservation are failing in Africa and Zimbabwe believes that wild species must be made more valuable to Africa's rural folk so that they can gain legal benefit from their existence.

(13)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe's most visible rhino protection program has been to dehorn all of its rhino."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Arguably, the most visible action has been the killing of over 167 poachers in a protection strategy that has patently not been successful. Dehorning was introduced as a last-ditch, emergency measure.

(14)

HSUS/HSI

"dehorning is doing nothing to protect rhinos from poachers."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. With respect to rhino dehorning as a conservation strategy, the following is relevant:

a) Rhino horn regrows and for dehorning to be effective it has to be repeated every 12 months. Over 70% of the dehorned rhino that have been killed so far had about 18 months of regrowth — equivalent to the natural horn of a juvenile rhino.

b) Dehorning is part of a cost-benefit conservation strategy. Dehorning reduces the benefits to the poacher, but the costs (anti-poaching activities) must be kept high. Unfortunately, largely as a result of fiscal constraints resulting from the drought, Zimbabwe's Wildlife Department ran out of funds to maintain field operations in key areas. From January until May no patrols were able to operate in remote areas. In that time a large number of dehorned rhino with 18 months of regrowth were poached. The benefits were low, but the costs had been reduced to zero.

c) There is evidence that poachers have refrained from killing dehorned rhino in Hwange and Matopos when they had the clear opportunity to do so.

(15)

HSUS/HSI

"If dehorning is not a good poaching deterrent, then why is Zimbabwe continuing to dehorn its rhinos? Because dehorning allows the government of Zimbabwe to get the horn before the poachers do."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Rhino are not dehorned so that the Zimbabwe can get the horn, but to make the rhino unattractive to poachers and deny them their reward. The stockpile is simply a bi-product of this management strategy.

(16)

HSUS/HSI

"The government of Zimbabwe ... does not spend a dime of its own on the inhumane and useless dehorning program."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. Zimbabwe invests heavily in its wildlife conservation (more heavily in terms of GDP than the USA), including rhino protection and dehorning. The Zimbabwe Government provides personnel, field allowances, vehicles and aircover for the whole Parks and Wild Life Estate, which covers more than 12% of the country. The budget allocation for the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management in 1993 was approximately US\$6.0 million. It is notable that HSUS/HSI have spent little or none of their considerable funds on rhino conservation. In their own report

they offer of US\$5000 to Zimbabwe (sic; ed.). The reported income of HSUS in 1989 was in excess of US\$13 million.

It is a matter of opinion as to whether dehorning is inhumane. International wildlife veterinarians and biologists have judged that the process is not unduly intrusive, but animal rights groups certainly do hold the opinion that the rhino would be better dead than subjected to this form of management. As to the effectiveness of dehorning, Zimbabwe believes that dehorning is a highly effective conservation measure when adequate funds are available for complimentary anti-poaching activities.

It should be noted that one of the authors of the HSUS/HSI report was a member of a working group, formed by the CITES Animals Committee to identify measures that needed to be taken for in situ rhino conservation. Amongst other things, the group identified both sport hunting and "the acceptance of dehorning safaris" as immediate, viable options.

Finally, dehorning is standard and a necessary humane measure when rhino are captured from remote areas, where they cannot be protected, and moved to Conservancies, or the Intensive Protection Zones for which the HSUS/HSI offered financial support (Appendix IV of their own report).

(17)

HSUS/HSI

"Tragically, the translocation of rhinos to conservancies is just as ineffective as dehorning in protecting rhinos."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. HSUS/HSI seem to have confused Conservancies with game ranches. Conservancies are groupings of privately owned game ranches that are committed, under Government guidance, to rhino conservation. There are also several individual ranches that have rhino, but these are not part of the overall conservancy strategy. A report recently published by the TRAFFIC network stated that "the privately owned Save and Bubiana Conservancies in Zimbabwe are potentially the best models in Africa." The three established conservancies (Save, Bubiana and Chiredzi River) have not experienced any rhino poaching for over two years and their founder stock, introduced during 1986-1988, has increased between 38% and 86%.

(18)

HSUS/HSI

"The game ranchers are amateurs when it comes to protecting the wildlife on the ranch."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Private game ranches have dramatically increased in number in Zimbabwe in recent years, as the sustainable use of wildlife has managed to displace cattle on an economic basis. Ranches and their staff vary greatly in their experience of wildlife management. The Conservancies employ professional staff to protect their rhino.

(19)

HSUS/HSI

"the relocation of rhinos to conservancies by the government, and the management of rhinos on conservancies, are basically "entertainment" spectacles driven by politics"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. Rhino Conservancies in Zimbabwe are a well-planned conservation measure that is supported by all mainstream international conservation organisations including the WWF and the World Conservation Union (IUCN). They follow, and hopefully improve upon, the model developed in Kenya.

(20)

HSUS/HSI

"1) Zimbabwe has far fewer rhinos than it has claimed; 2) neither dehorning nor translocation to conservancies are providing any real protection for rhinos; 3) Zimbabwe's rhino "protection" programs are little more than a way to attract foreign currency; and 4) Zimbabwe is stockpiling horns from dehorning operations in the hopes that their efforts to legalize the international horn trade will pay off."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False/Misleading. 1) Zimbabwe has always been the first to acknowledge rhino losses. Accurate estimates of rhino numbers have been provided since the dehorning programme was introduced in 1992. 2) Both dehorning and Conservancies are effective conservation measures when employed with sound in situ conservation measures. 3) Zimbabwe's rhino protection programmes are, and have been, well planned and effective when

adequately funded. It must be remembered that countries such as Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia had already lost almost all their rhino by the early 1980s. Zimbabwe managed to stem the poaching tide for 10 years while funding allowed. 4) Zimbabwe certainly is stockpiling horn and maintains that conventional approaches to rhino conservation are doomed to failure, and if they are not revised, believes that the rhino will be driven to extinction in the wild. The best way to deal with the rhino horn trade may be to reintroduce a sustainable, legal supply. Zimbabwe is calling for this option to be discussed and fully researched.

(21)

HSUS/HSI

"Zimbabwe manages its elephants, like its other wildlife, for consumptive use."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Zimbabwe manages its elephants and other wildlife ecologically and sustainably to give economic incentives for conservation. Uses may be consumptive or non-consumptive. The value of this approach is evident as only in Zimbabwe and a few other countries with similar policies did elephant populations increase while those of other nations declined. Similarly, in Zimbabwe the amount of land set aside for wildlife is increasing while it is drastically diminishing in countries which follow animal protection policies.

(22)

HSUS/HSI

"Aerial surveys, population estimates, official government pricing of ivory, and management practices are designed to provide a lucrative source of foreign currency for the Government."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. The impression given here is that surveys and population estimates are designed to produce biased results. This is particularly offensive to the many professional ecologists who have been involved in Zimbabwe's wildlife management programmes. The motivation for surveys varies. In some cases it is to monitor population trends or distribution to assist protective activities. In other cases, estimates allow sustainable off-takes to be calculated to provide benefits to local people, private landholders and/or the Government, including important

foreign currency. It is notable that many of Zimbabwe's surveys and wildlife population estimates are undertaken by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

(23)

HSUS/HSI

"Minutes from a meeting of Zimbabwe's National Parks and Wildlife Management Department, wherein staff discussed the proposed culling of 2,000 elephants from the Zambezi Valley, reveal that game scouts did not support the Parks department claims that there was an elephant population problem,"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Zimbabwe counts elephants according to the internationally and scientifically accepted method — stratified aerial sampling. It is commonly found that this methodology is misunderstood by game scouts and many others. As a result, the results are often disputed by those "on the ground". Unfortunately, ground surveys, however systematic cannot compare with aerial surveys for accuracy. It is significant to note that the documents used by HSUS/HSI state that all heads of station recommended "mini-culls", in one case of 80 elephants.

(24)

HSUS/HSI

"One ecologist working at Hwange National Park stated ... "The (people) fly over the water holes, between 4:00 and 6:00 PM, and count all the elephants who come in to drink. And then (they) extrapolate for the whole damn park. ... Hwange has deep ravines and strong Mopani tree growth"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. This ecologist clearly knows nothing about the way Zimbabwe counts its elephants and is completely unqualified to comment. The following errors are made: (i) Elephants are not counted at waterholes in the afternoon. Transects are flown across the whole Park, mostly in the mornings to provide standardized sample counts. (ii) Hwange is about the flattest place in Zimbabwe and has no deep ravines. Mopane woodland covers only about 22% of the Park — ironically the mopane around Sinamatella is particularly badly damaged.

(25)

HSUS/HSI

"the official margin of error for elephant population estimates based on aerial surveys is plus or minus 95 percent"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. The margin of error is not $\pm 95\%$. The estimates have 95% confidence intervals, which in 1992 were 22%. In other words the official 1992 estimate of approximately 36,000 elephants for Hwange National Park, with confidence intervals of 22%, means that it is possible to be 95% confident that the true number of elephants falls between 28,000 and 44,000.

(26)

HSUS/HSI

"If you fly over at the heaviest concentration periods, when animals are known to come to water in the cool of the evening, you'll get 37,000 elephants from extrapolation. But the truth is not even half of that."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. The Wildlife Society counts elephants and other animals that come to water holes during a 24 hour period. In 1992, the observers counted 12,000 elephants at about 110 water holes in a small portion of the National Park. The true number is clearly much larger than this and this ground verification adds confidence to the estimates from aerial survey.

(27)

HSUS/HSI

"All scientific surveys are suspect in this country because they have a number they want to take (by culling) and the survey has to justify that number."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. Zimbabwe's wildlife surveys are recognised as amongst the best in Africa, and in any case a large portion of the country's surveys are undertaken by the World Wide Fund for Nature. In 1992 the CITES panel of experts which visited Zimbabwe reported that there was no reason to doubt the number of elephants in Zimbabwe.

(28)

HSUS/HSI

"There is simply no reliable evidence that elephants are so abundant that they are destroying their habitat beyond what is normal for herbivores of that size."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. Elephants are not destroying their habitat beyond what is normal for herbivores of their size, but the normal rate at their current densities is too high and will change woodland to grassland, changing whole ecosystems and reducing biodiversity. Tree losses of 20% and more have been measured even when elephants were only at average densities of 1/km². Fire and drought are contributory in some circumstances and act together in a complex manner. Zimbabwe is determined to maintain its woodlands and forest which take centuries to regenerate and reduces elephants consistent with the precautionary principle.

(29)

HSUS/HSI

"which provides details of a government deal to sell elephant meat to crocodile farmers. Zimbabwe can essentially circumvent the ban on the international trade in elephant parts by feeding elephants to crocodiles and making money from the crocodile skins that can be legally sold in international trade.

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading. The HSUS/HSI report presents a document dated 1986, 7 years old. The regular feeding of elephants to captive crocodiles ended in 1988 and in any case, the elephants were part of a scientifically derived offtake quota to protect woodlands. Very occasionally, some of the meat from elephant culling is still fed to crocodiles when this is judged to be the most efficient option. Crocodile ranches were established by the government as the lynch-pin of crocodile conservation in Zimbabwe, giving wild crocodiles a conspicuous economic value. This approach is so successful that there are probably more wild crocodiles than ever before. The programme is approved by CITES, WWF, IUCN and has been copied throughout Africa.

(30)

HSUS/HSI

"Over 30 tons of ivory is stored at the National Parks headquarters, ... the vast majority of the stored ivory is from the thousands of government-culled elephants."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Misleading/false: There were nearly 31 tonnes of ivory in stock as of August 1993 and the amount in store increases continuously, as it does throughout Africa. South Africa, Namibia, Tanzania, Sudan, Uganda and Ethiopia, to name a few, all have significant ivory stockpiles. The August stock in Zimbabwe comprised only 3119 tusks (just over 1500 elephants). Most was from natural mortality and problem animal control. More than 30% belonged to rural communities under the CAMPFIRE programme.

(31)

HSUS/HSI

"A high ranking deputy minister in the Zimbabwe government, as well as a second independent source, told the HSUS/HSI investigation team that the actual money obtained for the 1989 ivory sale was over Z\$8 million (about US\$1.3 million). What happened to the missing 1 million dollars? It probably is lining the pockets of corrupt Government bureaucrats."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

Unsubstantiated. Who are these people? All ivory sales are audited and accounted for in minute detail. If HSUS/HSI believes it has genuine information of fraud or corruption they are challenged to present it to the Zimbabwe authorities and the CITES Secretariat.

At the same time, the HSUS/HSI could provide details of their "investigation" undertaken prior to the 1992 CITES Meeting where, by their own admission, they appear to have broken Zimbabwe's wildlife laws by using firearms within a National Park.

(32)

HSUS/HSI

"Most of the US\$83 million that Zimbabwe earned from its National Parks in 1992 is not going back into operation of the Park or protection of its wildlife."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. In 1992, the gross earnings of the wildlife industry throughout Zimbabwe (including tourism) was about Z\$650 million (approximately US\$100 million). Only about Z\$14 million accrued to Government, but the Government gave the wildlife department a budget of Z\$36 million. It is notable that the IUCN

has recently reported that Zimbabwe spends about 0.60% of its GDP on protected areas and wildlife — the USA spends 0.15%.

(33)

HSUS/HSI

"Several persons contacted by the HSUS/HSI investigation team indicated that everyone is hoarding tusks"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. This is the ultimate slide into cant and nonsense; it is clearly impossible for everyone to be hoarding tusks. Indeed, there is no evidence that anyone is hoarding tusks (other than the Government).

(34)

HSUS/HSI

"Ironically, while Zimbabwe begs the international community to help it protect its rhinos and elephants, the activities of the Government are encouraging poaching."

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

False. The Zimbabwe government is not asking for help to protect its elephants, but to reduce their populations. This year the US Fish and Wildlife Service has provided assistance to move elephants from Gona-re-Zhou National Park and the assistance is appreciated. Zimbabwe is certainly asking for help in protecting rhino, and is grateful for all the help it receives. However, there is a widely held point of view that the international community has an obligation to help having taken the responsibility of preventing Zimbabwe from managing its rhino as it sees fit.

It is not clear why the government of Zimbabwe is encouraging poaching. Over 160 poachers have been killed in recent years which would hardly seem encouraging. Most of the poachers killing elephant are from Zambia, so it is hard to see how they would benefit from a resumption of legal ivory trade from Zimbabwe. These arguments are the bread and butter of animal protection groups.

(35)

HSUS/HSI

"RECOMMENDATIONS"

ZIMBABWE GOVERNMENT

The recommendations from HSUS/HSI are noted, as is the obvious competence in their formulation. They are taken in the spirit they were offered.

Dog Bite Prevention Campaign Pairs Post Office with Animal Rights Organization

HSUS Uses Post Office to Build Mailing List

(NAIA News, newsletter of the National Animal Interest Alliance, July-August 1995; for subscriptions to NAIA News, call (513) 753-6800, or fax (513) 753-3733)

By Norma Bennett Woolf

"Don't let your dog bite the hand that serves you!" headlined the US Post Office/Humane Society of the US campaign to reduce dog bites inflicted on 2700 mail carriers each year.

"Spay or neuter your dog — unneutered dogs are more likely to bite!" topped the list of steps a dog owner should take to be responsible.

The Post Office effort for National Dog Bite Prevention Week included bulk mailing of a postcard to mailboxes throughout the country, a postcard that featured the HSUS logo and the offer of HSUS information about responsible dog ownership. The partnership with HSUS came about, according to Post Office spokesman Mark Saunders, because the agency has worked with the organization on internal bite prevention projects in the past and is the repository for dog bite statistics in the US.

Dr. Jeff Sacks of the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, said that there is no official agency to collect dog bite statistics, and Dr. J. Michael Cornwall, creator of a prevention program for school children, said that HSUS collects the statistics from CDC — the same place he gets them.

Most dog bites are not from strays, he said, but from a person's pet, and people are unlikely to report their own pet to the county health department or the police; many bites, especially those that do not need medical attention, are never reported. However, health departments in cities and counties do report dog bites to

their states, and CDC gets that information even though it is incomplete.

The most reliable dog bite statistics come from surveys done on injuries, Sacks said. The last such national report was done in 1986; another is being completed now and will be available in several months. These surveys ask about injuries received during a particular time period, and respondents include dog bites in their answers. Sacks estimated that there were about four million dog bites last year, about 750,000 resulting in work time loss of at least a half day.

Neutered vs Unneutered Dogs as Biters

The HSUS claim that intact dogs are more likely to bite has some validity, according to Sachs [sic]. He and a colleague did a comparison of biting and non-biting dogs that indicated that intact male dogs that had been chained outside were more likely to bite than other dogs. Such narrow results do not warrant placing "Spay or neuter your pet" at the top of a list of suggestions for preventing dog bites. However, the exhortation does play into the HSUS agenda of banning the breeding of purebred dogs and castigating breeders for producing and selling puppies while adult dogs die in animal shelters.

Saunders said that the list of items under the heading "How to be a responsible dog owner" was printed in random order, that the promotion of sterilization was not intended to be perceived as more important than the last item, which reads "Obedience training can teach your dog proper behavior and help you control your dog in any situation." He said that he is unaware of the HSUS drive to end the breeding of purebred dogs and that HSUS has information that indicates that intact dogs bite more often than sterilized dogs.

The Post Office has 275,000 letter carriers, Saunders said, 45,000 of them on rural routes. About one percent of those carriers will be bitten in a given year. He said that the PO connection with HSUS is completely separate from the organization's agenda on other animal issues — which include lobbying against the breeding of purebred dogs, the infamous "Breakfast of Cruelty" campaign against bacon and eggs, and crusades against hunting, furs, greyhound racing, and the Iditarod dog sled race.

The Trojan Horse of Animal Protectionism: The Battle Over Curriculum (A Scientist's Perspective)

(Coalition for Animals and Animal Research/San Diego [CFAAR/San Diego] Newsletter, March 1994. CFAAR/San Diego is a non-profit, pro animal research group of physicians, veterinarians, scientists, students, research staff and concerned citizens, who are interested in educating the public about the use of animals in research and teaching, and about the regulations that govern the humane treatment of research animals. For more information write to: PO Box 22441, San Diego, CA 92192. Patrick Cleveland is president of V&P Scientific Inc., a San Diego enterprise developing immuno and genetic assays.)

By Patrick H. Cleveland, Ph.D.

Our Future Will Be Determined by the Children

Virtually every medical advance has used animals in some stage of the research or testing. Thus whether medical progress continues at the same pace in the next century depends upon an informed public supporting the continued use of animals in responsible research and testing. Let us hope that the children of today make their decision tomorrow using a moral value system that distinguishes between humans and animals and between animal welfare and animal rights.

In the war for the hearts and minds of America's students many battles are being waged to indoctrinate our children with a new moral value system. This new moral value system states that animals should be given the same consideration and respect as given humans and that it is morally wrong for humans to use or kill animals. This new moral value system has come to be known as animal rights. Animal rights groups are making a major thrust to get their moral value system accepted into the school curriculum.

Confrontation

Some groups have taken a direct approach and clearly label their curriculum as animal rights. They mislead students about issues of animal abuse. Adrian Morrison, the National Institutes of Health Director of Animal Research Issues summed up their approach best when he said "Everyone has the right to believe a

wrong, though, is the promotion of beliefs among the untutored by dishonest presentations of the ways animals are used by humans. Such tactics have, in fact, been used to discredit biomedical research using animals — tactics that were a necessary prelude to the current campaign against biology education: Convince people that animals are badly used in one sphere and reap carry-over benefits from this 'softening-up' process when you focus on another arena."

Deception

Other animal rights groups have elected a devious approach — a secret battle. They disguise their goals and methods by disavowing the methods of the militant animal rights movement. Instead of animal rights they call their curriculum humane and environmental education. They avoid the term animal rights but teach the same value system. Most educators are unaware of this deception. Teachers welcome humane education as a means to prevent violent behavior in some students and environment curriculum as means to develop a sensitivity to the environment. Over 20,000 teachers nationwide have bought into this program. Have their efforts in the schools been successful? Several different student polls have shown steady gains for the acceptance of animal rights as a philosophy. The most alarming of these was a 1993 national Gallup poll which demonstrated that 60% of American teenagers "support animal rights" including bans on all laboratory and medical tests that use animals. How have they been able to produce such a striking change in attitude?

HSUS

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) with its 1.5 million members calls itself the nation's largest animal protection organization. Few people know that the HSUS's animal protection philosophy is not animal welfare but an animal rights philosophy that says it is morally wrong for humans to use or kill animals and that they have been guided by that philosophy since 1980. Furthermore HSUS has set as its goal, the abolition of animals in laboratory research and education. In recent years the HSUS elected to call themselves "animal protectionists" to disassociate their group from the bad press that the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) have brought to the animal rights movement. HSUS shares the same animal rights philosophy and goal of abolishing the use of animals in laboratory research with militant animal rights groups

but they differ in the tactics and time table for reaching that goal. Their tactic is to slowly but progressively wean society away from using animals.

In order to avoid the extremist label they have deliberately sought to project a "moderate" image and hide the animal rights message under animal protectionism and the guise of humane and environmental education. Many of HSUS's projects are laudable and could be described as animal welfare. They work very hard to keep that image. Corporate donations and the respect of the education community are dependent upon that image. However, their hidden agenda is to get people to give animals the same respect they give humans. What better method to accomplish a change in societal values than by incorporating it into a nationwide elementary school curriculum on humane and environmental education?

NAHEE

Is HSUS a Trojan Horse being covertly carried into the citadel of elementary education? HSUS has endeavored to establish themselves as The Authority in humane and environmental education. Indeed they have won several awards for *KIND News* and had the Adopt-A-Teacher program placed in the 1992 Environmental Success Index. One of their field representatives was appointed to the prestigious National Environmental Education Advisory Council of the Environmental Protection Agency. To help establish this reputation HSUS has created a separate youth education division, The National Association for Humane and Environmental Education (NAHEE). NAHEE had a 1992 budget of \$940,000 and fourteen full time staff (an increase of 30% over the 1991 budget). The goals for NAHEE were articulated in the 1992 HSUS annual report: "... NAHEE strives to ensure that humane attitudes become a viable part of mainstream education and environmental perspectives." "NAHEE continues to monitor and evaluate new children's books, children's magazines and newspapers, as well as all major elementary and secondary teaching magazines and newspapers to encourage the promotion of humane values in publications other than our own." Indeed, they have been successful in influencing other publications as evidenced by a series of three grossly misleading articles biased against using animals in medical research which appeared in the 9 million circulation *Weekly Reader* and its companion for middle schools, *Current Science*. NAHEE's influence even extends beyond the USA as they have sent their educational materials to 13 foreign countries.

It is clear that they have been acknowledged as The Authority and are being warmly welcomed through the educational gates of Troy by unsuspecting teachers and administrators who thought they were getting "humane and environmental education" but end up with those elements mixed with a subtle animal rights message. It is a message that says humans must respect animals and it is wrong for humans to kill, capture or use animals for any reason. A message that elevates respect for animals to the same plane as respect for humans. This is a brilliant tactic as respect and consideration for animals are the hallmarks of animal welfare. They have reduced the difference between animal rights and animal welfare to the degree of respect and consideration given animals, thus blurring the difference between the two.

KIND NEWS - KIND TEACHER

NAHEE's primary effort is directed at publishing and distributing a classroom newspaper covering laudable humane and environmental themes laced with a heavy dose of respect for animals, endangered species and an emphasis on not harming animals — Kids in Nature's Defense (*KIND News*). *KIND News* is published at three reading levels for children in grades one through six and is read by more than 600,000 children in 20,000 classrooms nationwide. *KIND News* does not cover controversial animal rights issues. However the accompanying teachers guide (*KIND Teacher*) brings up animal rights issues without identifying them as such. *KIND Teacher* indoctrinates the children by having the teacher lead discussions on the use of animals in dissection, the use of wild animals in laboratory research, the use of animals in product safety testing, the keeping of wild animals in zoos and circuses, the capture and sale of wild birds, hunting, trapping and rodeos. *KIND Teacher* also promotes the students to form "KIND Clubs" and engage in club projects. The nature of the project and the agenda is determined by the club and club president. Given HSUS's emotional and strongly held position on these issues can we expect a balanced presentation?

Student Action Guide

NAHEE's newspaper for middle and secondary students The HSUS Student Action Guide is more direct as they openly seek to promote activism by forming Earth-Animal-Protection clubs. These clubs target a number of animal rights issues including laboratory animal research, product safety testing, dissection, animals in science fairs. zoos. animals in entertainment. hunting.

trapping and dolphin safe tuna. The students are referred to HSUS to obtain specific misleading materials on these issues as well as animal research and so called alternatives to animal research.

California's Environmental Education

Given this background I was concerned when I learned through the 1992 HSUS annual report that "Materials published by NAHEE, such as *Sharing Sam*; and lessons from *KIND Teacher*, had been incorporated into *A Child's Place in the Environment*, California's new environmental education curriculum guide. The guide promises to have a substantial impact since one out of nine children in the U.S. attends school in California. In addition the guide will inevitably serve as a model nationwide."

NAHEE & Animal Rights in California's Public School Curriculum

In 1993 I obtained a late stage draft of the first grade edition of the guide *Respecting Living Things* from the California State Board of Education. Fortunately the guide had not been finalized and was still in draft form. I was surprised to find that 3 out of the 9 guide reviewers were affiliated with NAHEE and one NAHEE field representative was on the guide committee. The guide had a pronounced animal rights bias as half the recommended resources at the end of several units were animal rights books such as *The Animal Rights Handbook*, *67 Ways to Save the Animals* by Anna Sequoia and *Animal Rights International*, *The Animals Agenda* and *Going Green. A Kid's Handbook to Saving the Planet*. These resources contained grossly misleading and dishonest presentations of how animals are used by humans and in some cases gory pictures of animals that are totally inappropriate for first graders. Furthermore over half the resources listed as "organizations concerned with Humane Treatment of Animals" turned out to be animal rights organizations such as the HSUS, NAHEE, The Fund for Animals, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), and the Animal Protection Institute of America. The guide also suggested additional names of humane organizations listed in the book *67 Ways to Save the Animals*. There were 77 organizations listed there and all 77 were identified by the author as "animal rights organizations".

Respect = Sacred Reverence for Animals

A common theme that ran through the unit on Respecting Living Things was that animals were anthropomorphized and respected to the point that they were elevated to the same plane as humans. Animals were held in such reverence they were equal to humans. Another theme that was repeated many times was that out of respect for the animals they should not be captured and taken into the class room for study, — the theme "Look Learn and Leave Alone" was inviolate. It was even stressed in the teacher preparation section not to capture animals (including insects) for class room study. The source of these themes is hard to determine. Were they placed there by the guide's author? How much influence did NAHEE have on the author or this curriculum? It is interesting to note that one poem that NAHEE contributed titled *Are You A Good Kind Lion* contained a line that is the heart of the disguised animal rights message "Don't hurt the animals for any reason". Would that message tell first graders that it is morally wrong to eat animals?

Balance

Working with the California Biomedical Research Association we took our concerns to the California State Board of Education. We were successful in deleting all the animal rights organizations and books as resources prior to the guide's publication in 1994. We also were successful in deleting the NAHEE poem *Are You a Good Kind Lion*. Furthermore the prohibition against capturing animals for class room examination was replaced with a discussion on the proper methods of capturing and caring for animals.

Although our partial success was heartening, this episode graphically illustrates how close animal rights activists came to having their philosophy accepted as part the [sic] nation's largest and most influential humane and environmental educational curricula. The educational community needs to be alerted to the hidden agenda of "animal protection" organizations.

Local Humane Societies, WHEEA & Animal Rights in Schools

Another source of concern is the local humane societies that have been hijacked and taken over by animal rights activists. They have also developed educational curricula with animal rights propaganda and have been taking it into the schools for many years. A group that is often affiliated with HSUS and NAHEE is the Western Humane and Environmental Educators' Association (WHEEA). WHEEA is comprised of education officials from at least 21 western humane societies or SPCA. Most of these societies are

located in California. WHEEA provides a frame work for these educators to network and share classroom material on animal rights along with humane and environmental themes. For example March 16 & 17, 1994 WHEEA held their annual meeting in San Diego. The keynote speaker was Kim Sturla of the Fund for Animals — a national animal rights group. Also two HSUS representatives were there promoting the *KIND News* and Adopt-A-Teacher programs. The WHEEA news letter, The Packrat is a bulletin board for animal rights educational material from a large number of animal rights groups such as: the American Anti-Vivisection Society, Animals Agenda, Animal Legal Defense Fund, Animal Rights Information Service, Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, Fund for Animals, HSUS, Last Chance for Animals, NAHEE, PETA, PETA Teachers Network, Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and the United Coalition of Idditarod Animal Rights Volunteers.

Most humane societies have one or more education officers who go to schools and teach children about proper pet care, humane treatment of animals, endangered species and environmentalism. Because most teachers perceive the local humane society to be an animal welfare organization they are welcomed by the schools. WHEEA members take advantage of this relationship to introduce an animal rights message along with their regular presentations. For example the Peninsula Humane Society of San Mateo CA publishes an informative unit on endangered species, however at the end of the unit they urge the students to read animal rights books, join animal rights organizations, write politicians about animal rights issues, sign petitions about animal rights issues, boycott specific companies that do product safety testing on animals and boycott products made from animal skins, fur or other parts. They also provide grossly misleading information on animal research.

Animal Rights and New Age Religion

If the Catholic church had set out to indoctrinate public school children with a new moral value system imbedded in a humane and environmental curriculum, there would have been a huge outcry and controversy. A religious cult is indoctrinating public school children but there is little outcry or controversy because the religious overtones and the value system have been masked, the religion is called New Age, the value system is animal rights.

Thomas Berry an "Ecotheologian" and the "Spiritual Guide" for HSUS's Center for Respect of Life and Environment was one of the

several of the speakers at HSUS's 1992 annual meeting who focused on New Age themes of total reverence and respect for animals and the environment because the spirit of god was in the whole universe equally. Although totally open about the spiritual and religious aspects of their movement in the annual meeting, HSUS is careful not to present its *KIND News* as part of a religious movement. Bernard Palmer in his book *What Are They Trying to Do to Us? The Truth about the Animal Rights Movement and the New Age* illustrates how the animal rights movement takes on the fundamental tenets of New Age religion. Furthermore Rod and Patti Strand make a similar observation about the religious nature of the animal rights movement in their book *The Hijacking of the Humane Movement*. Both these books make the case that the energy that propels the movement is the faithful volunteers spreading the gospel of respect and sacred reverence for animals.

What Can You Do??

Get involved!! Give a copy of this article to your friends. See if your school subscribes to *KIND News*, check your school's curriculum on humane and environmental education. Find out if local humane societies are invited to give presentations. Do those presentations contain animal rights propaganda? Ask to see the material and the teacher's guide. Alert your children's school teachers, administrators and school board about animal rights messages being hidden in humane and environmental curriculum. Volunteer at your local school. If animal rights is discussed make sure that a balanced discussion of the issue is presented. Check the school's library for books presenting both viewpoints.

Encourage your professional society, institution or employer to support educational programs that present the use of animals by society in a balanced manner. The Massachusetts Society of Medical Research (MSMR) has produced such a program: *People & Animals: United for Health Teaching Curriculum*. Contact MSMR at 1440 Main St., Waltham, MA 02154-1649 for more information.

Humane Society's Perfect World

(By Craig Medred, Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 19, 1992)

The natural order of things is that the weak or the stupid become extinct, and maybe by those standards it is time for the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race to quietly fade away

I come to this conclusion after considerable thought and a discussion with David Wills of the Humane Society of the United States.

Wills is a guy who talks so silky smooth he ought to be on television hawking religion instead of trying to liberate animals from the oppressions of man, but it is the latter to which he has devoted himself.

And it is in that capacity he has cozied up to the Iditarod Trail Committee and made regular buddies out of four-time Iditarod champion Susan Butcher and her husband, David Monson.

Why, Wills even went on up to Fairbanks this year to attend a sled dog symposium and retract his much-reported statement of a couple of years ago that "in a perfect world, there would be no Iditarod."

Mushing magazine said Wills assured the symposium that the Humane Society is "moderate and fights for animal 'protection', rather than animal 'rights'. He said the society is not vegetarian, not antivivisection and not anti-hunting ..."

That is what he said, and mushers apparently bought it.

"My mind has been set to rest about the Humane Society's goals," Burt Bomhoff, executive director of the Iditarod Trail Committee told Mushing.

Poor Burt. He Believed.

The truth of the matter is that there is absolutely no reason to believe the Humane Society has backed off an inch from the belief that "in a perfect world there would be no Iditarod."

Now I'm not going to call Wills a liar, but the Humane Society of the United States — the organizer and promoter of the anti-trapping Shame of Fur campaign — is quite publicly an anti-hunting group, no matter what Wills said in Fairbanks.

"The Humane Society of the United States, considered at least as effective as the Fund for Animals, is working toward attaining total closure to hunting on the 90-million-acre national wildlife refuge system," the *Los Angeles Times* reported in January of this year.

The Humane Society has gone to court in a futile effort to block deer hunting on at least one wildlife refuge on the East Coast. And here is what Humane Society wildlife specialist Susan Hagood had to say about hunting in the Albany, New York, newspaper:

"Basically, to kill for recreation, to kill for fun, almost by definition is cruel."

The Philadelphia Inquirer reported that the Humane Society was leading efforts to block a hunter harassment bill in New Jersey. Hunter harassment — following hunters through the woods yelling, screaming and otherwise acting childish — is one of the main techniques humaniacs have employed in an effort to discourage hunting Outside [sic].

Wills couldn't very well have missed all this. He and Hagood both happen to work out of the same Washington, D.C., office.

But it wasn't what Wills told mushers in Fairbanks — or even their naive or money-grubbing, God-we-might-lose-a-sponsor-if-we're-not-nice acceptance of it — that convinced me the Iditarod should give up and fold the tent.

No, it was something Wills said himself:

"I would have liked to have seen that (1991) race halted. If I had been the person in charge, I would have liked to have seen the racers held. ... I'm not interested in the character of the race."

Remember 1991?

That was the year Rick Swenson of Two Rivers walked his dogs through a storm between White Mountain and Nome to claim an unprecedented fifth championship. It was a bold move reminiscent of what Libby Riddles of Teller did in 1985 to become the first woman to win the Iditarod.

Some would argue that Riddles made the Iditarod by persevering through the 1985 storm. Certainly she put the race on the national stage. It gained notoriety and mystique.

That mystique rests in the inherent drama of mushers and dogs battling the weather and the wilderness. Wills might not care about the character of the Iditarod, but the character is the race.

Stop the Iditarod on account of weather or cold — the Humane Society would like rules doing both — and you kill the mystique. You make the race a parody of itself, a joke instead of a challenge.

Worse than that, though, you drive a spike through the heart of the mystique, and when the mystique goes so does the Iditarod's marketability. Timberland and Dodge Trucks aren't pouring all that money into the Iditarod in a desire to outfit those millions of mushers out there.

They are dumping in the money because they want to be identified with the Iditarod challenge. No weather, no tough-going, no challenge, no major sponsors. It's that simple.

The silver-tongued Wills never outlined any Humane Society strategy for me (In fact, I got the distinct impression he didn't even like answering my questions.), but what that organization is up to here is clear. Get a little concession here, a bigger one there, and then when the opponent is weak, launch the Blitzkrieg.

Kill the Iditarod's mystique, and then — with the sponsors already losing interest — launch the full-frontal attack. I can almost hear the words coming from Wills's lips:

"Well, you know, we tried for years and years to work with these people, and they made some changes, but dogs still keep dying in the race and that is cruel. It's got to end."

Cleveland Amory, the dean of the animal-rights activists, outlined just this sort of strategy pretty well in a *Los Angeles Times* story a couple of years ago.

Animal rights activists are destined to fail with a blanket attack on hunters in California, Amory said, but they can win by picking their opponents apart. Get a trapper here, a bear hunter there, a few duck hunters, some wing shooters, etc.

It's a process aptly described as being pecked to death by ducks.

In the case of the Iditarod, Wills is the chief duck, although chief snake might be a better description. When I finally got him cornered on what the Humane Society was really after (Ever try to herd a snake? It ain't easy.), here is what he said:

"I think they have to run a race without (dog) fatalities."

And that, quite frankly, is impossible.

Butcher, who nearly everyone agrees is the best long-distance musher in the world and certainly one of the most humane, has lost three dogs — that I know of — in the Iditarod.

Every time, she was traumatized, but she came back to race again. Why? Because accidents happen, but life goes on. Wills, of course, doesn't share this philosophy. He is enamored of the animal rights point of view, although he tries to softsell it in Alaska or when talking to Alaskans.

His assistant, Steve Dickstein is much more frank.

"We have a problem with any race that has the possibility of bringing harm to an animal," Dickstein said.

If the Iditarod can't run a race without injury (and not even human marathons are run without injury) or death, then there should be no race, Dickstein said: "So be it."

That pretty accurately reflects the Humane Society view.

Wills, who is pedaling the concept that the Humane Society is an "animal protection" group instead of an "animal rights" group, argues that the Humane Society is nowhere near that zealous in its goals, but he did confess he considers dogs like children, and we all know we wouldn't put our children in harness and yell "Hike!"

Of course not.

But let's face it: Dogs aren't children no matter how you look at it. As much as I love dogs — and I've been worrying over, nursing and mollycoddling one of mine for over a week now because of injuries he suffered when a Rottweiler bit him in the head — I'd never equate any dog with my daughter.

Truth is, people who equate animals with humans, a la "a dog is a rat is a boy", have a serious problem with mental equilibrium. You should stay away from them. Just as the Iditarod should stay away from the Humane Society.

What the Iditarod should do here is tell the Humane Society to drop dead. and then to write two simple new rules that would

prove to the world that the race really cares about dogs more than competition.

These rules would:

1. Reduce the maximum team size to 16 dogs. The 20-dog teams most mushers start the race with are basically out of control. That is largely the reason so many dogs die in accidents between here and McGrath. A drop to 16 dogs would seriously cut down on injuries and deaths in the early going. It might also give lighter women mushers an even greater advantage in the competition, but so be it. Besides, there's more publicity for Alaska when a woman wins this race.

2. Stipulate that any musher who has a dog die — for any reason — will be required to take a 24-hour stop at the next checkpoint, and any musher who has two dogs die in the race over a five-year period will be suspended from competition for one year. This is harsh, but not unreasonable. Swenson, the race's only five-time winner, has never had a dog die in his 20 years of racing.

Wills, I should note, said there is no need for the first rule. Top mushers — whom he refused to name — assured him they are in control of those 20-dog teams where the leaders regularly go out of sight when rounding bends. Or so he said.

And the rule on dog deaths, he added, is unnecessary because no dog should die.

Or at least that's his version of why these two rules that would truly mean something to the dogs are unnecessary. Personally, I think that when he said this he was talking out of the same side of the mouth he used to tell mushers that the Humane Society is not anti-hunting.

It seems to me pretty obvious that the Humane Society isn't pushing for rules that would maintain the Iditarod as we know it and provide for better dog care along the way.

No, the Humane Society is obviously more interested in that perfect world. You know the one, right? The one where, in Wills' words, "there would be no Iditarod."

And if Iditarod mushers are too stupid to see what is happening, or too weak to stand up to it then maybe the Iditarod deserves to go the route of the dinosaurs.

But be humane and do it quick. Please.

A Discussion — Rights for Animals

(HSUS A4 flyer, 1990)

Rights for Animals — The Past Ten Years

The Humane Society of the United States has long been in the forefront of advocating the recognition of rights of and for animals. At its national membership conference held in San Francisco in 1980, the membership of The HSUS formally resolved to "pursue on all fronts ... the clear articulation and establishment of the rights of all animals ... within the full range of American life and culture."

In the past ten years, the term "animal rights" has been overused, and, in the process, the concept has become muddled. "Animal rights" is used as a general rallying cry for all manner of animal advocates. In the hands of the media, it is often applied indiscriminately to any action or organization seeking to protect or enhance the status of animals. Unfortunately, the term has also become closely identified with those who see the need to resort to violence and illegal means to further their cause. Overuse and careless use has led not only to confusion and imprecision but also to a loss of perspective as to how much work lies ahead before animals acquire rights in a practical and legal sense.

Animal Rights: In Philosophy

When we say that animals have rights, we mean that, as a philosophical principle, animals should be included within the same system of moral protections that govern our behavior toward each other. Animals, as living, sentient beings, have intrinsic worth irrespective of their usefulness to human beings and have essential physical and behavioral requirements that, if denied, can lead to privation, stress, and suffering. Such essential requirements include adequate nutrition, an environment suited to their natural and essential behaviors, and the need not to be subjected to unnecessary physical pain or psychological torment. In the philosophical sense, the rights of animals are derived not from legal statutes but from the same principles of justice and fairness that are the foundation of human rights

The concepts behind animal rights are important because they help us focus on the intrinsic needs and worth of animals. This approach is different from loving animals, being kind to them, or speaking merely in terms of human obligations to animals. When we speak of "being kind to animals," we are really talking about the states of mind or motivations that are gratifying to human beings. What the animal-rights approach does is to shift our focus away from human-oriented motivations and gratifications toward the intrinsic worth and needs of animals and, moreover, leads us to reconsider and grapple with the moral and philosophical justifications for the whole range of uses and exploitations of animals to which human beings are accustomed.

Thinking about animal rights is also important because it emphasizes, and indeed springs from, a realization, heightened by the environmental movement, that all life exists in an essential unity and interdependence. This realization at once qualifies any strict hierarchical distinctions between one species and another and compels caution in our civilization's habits of thoughtless consumption of land, natural resources, and animal life.

Nonetheless, because animals do not have equal power or capabilities with human beings, and never will have, and because any rights animals have in philosophy, or will have in law, will be conferred by human beings and spring from human value systems, the age-old ethic of compassion toward and protection of animals, which is the foundation of the humane movement, is also the fundamental wellspring of ideas about animal rights.

It is undeniable, however, that within the animal-protection movement now for over ten years, the ideas behind animal rights have served to partially redefine and partially affirm the ethical dimensions of animal protection and have served as a catalyst in shaping and reshaping the approaches, policies, and goals of many organizations, including The HSUS.

Animal Rights: The Legal Concept

As a practical legal concept, a "right" is the inherent capacity to invoke the assistance of the state (through the courts, for example) in controlling the behavior of others in order to enhance or protect one's interests. Viewed in this light, "animal rights" is not useful as a legal tool at present because the constitutional and statutory frameworks are simply not in place. Domesticated animals, for example, are classified in law as

tangible personal property, like furniture or cars. They are provided protections by the law against grosser abuses at the hands of those who "own" or have power over them. But they are viewed as having no inherent capacity to invoke the protection of the state, and their entire legal status is underpinned by constitutional doctrines that deny them recognition as "persons."

Access to the courts is such a powerful right and would pose so revolutionary a threat to the established order that it will probably be among the last of animal rights to be recognized, requiring statutory, even constitutional, changes.

However, access to the courts by animals, through their advocates and representatives, could be improved through an evolutionary expansion of the standing doctrines of *ius tertii*, or the right of third parties to sue on behalf of those who cannot but who have legally cognizable interests to protect, a doctrine illustrated now by parents suing on behalf of minor children and by legal guardians representing comatose or otherwise incompetent persons. Criminal prosecutions brought by the state must be supplemented, or supplanted, by actions brought by private citizens or organizations to obtain court injunctions against exploiters of animals. (North Carolina already allows such civil-injunction suits.) Such measures would partially fulfill the critical goal of getting litigation into a format where someone with ready access to the judicial system is representing the animal and its interests and only the animal and its interests.

In cruelty cases brought under the anticruelty laws, animals must be treated more as the beneficiaries of enforcement actions and not merely as evidence of human guilt or innocence. Accordingly, the goal of anticruelty enforcement must be redirected toward proceedings that decide what disposition of the case is in the best interest of the animals involved, whether or not convictable behavior has been committed by human beings. Custody proceedings must be decoupled from criminal proceedings. Again, a ready-made model can be found in child-custody proceedings, which parallel but are independent of criminal proceedings against parents for child abuse, and in which the court decides, based on the best interests of the child or children involved, whether the child should stay with the parents or be removed to better surroundings. Independent custody proceedings for domesticated animals would entail a recognition by the law that the public has a special interest in the protection of animals that overrides any private property interest, just as all minor children are ultimately wards of the state at law.

A Paradigm for Animal Rights

There is another sense of "rights" that is at once legalistic and of practical use: rights can be viewed as interests that are perceived as being worthy of being balanced against competing interests to see which is of overriding value. The injection of a balancing test into every debate wherever animals' interests are at stake holds the potential for the development of a whole host of rights for animals. In many cases the animals' interests are clearly weightier but need to be asserted as independent, cognizable interests. For example, rabbits are used to test the eye-irritancy of new cosmetics. Yet our interest in new eyeliners and facial creams is frivolous compared to the suffering test rabbits endure. Therefore the animals' interest not to be subjected to unnecessary pain should outweigh the human interest in self-adornment. Similar is the case of the person who wants to take a monkey from the wild to keep caged as a pet. The human interest in keeping an exotic pet is trivial compared to the animal's interest in being able to maintain its natural behavior in its natural habitat. Similarly, in some states, dogs that are caught chasing livestock are seized and put to death as a matter of course by animal wardens, while a more correct weighing of the dog's interest in life would urge a different, nonfatal solution to the problem of protecting livestock.

In other situations, the balancing of interests presents closer cases: whether animals should be used as food, for example. But it is the concept of an interest that is worthy of being weighed, or rather that is perceived as being worthy, that generates the germ of a right, and therein lies the avenue toward a broad realization of animal rights.

Moreover, the concept of a right as a balanceable interest is one that respects reasonable and necessary human interests. Even within the context of human rights, no right is absolute, and every human right, no matter how fundamental, is liable to be outweighed by a stronger interest. Free exercise of religion, guaranteed by the First Amendment, is commonly outweighed by other interests, including the need to protect animals from cult sacrifices and the state's need to ensure the education of children and to enforce a variety of laws that may conflict with religious practices. One person's freedom of speech must be balanced against the right to have another person's good reputation preserved.

There are no absolutes in human rights, and there can be no absolutes in animal rights. But the new balancing of competing animal and human interests, which the past ten years of public debate and agitation has promoted, provides the machinery for progress toward recognition of the rights of animals.

Therefore, in all available forums, animal advocates must continually assert the notion that animals' fundamental interests deserved to be weighed against competing human interests before use or exploitation of animals is permitted or continued. Recognition of legal rights will follow.

Help Us Help the Animals

Animals cannot help themselves — they must depend on people who care to fight for them. The Humane Society of the United States represents more than one million people who care. The HSUS fights for animals through educational, legislative, investigative, and legal means.

Millions of dogs and cats are suffering as homeless, unwanted strays. Farm animals are being subjected to cruel intensive farming methods. In research laboratories, animals are used and abused in painful experiments that are, too often, badly planned and pointless. Dozens of wild animals are on the brink of extinction in America because of habitat destruction, hunting, trapping, pollution, and other intrusions of man.

The HSUS is committed to the goal of ending animal suffering. It has more programs than any other animal-protection organization, working to protect pets and domestic animals as well as wildlife.

The HSUS is a nonprofit organization supported solely by the contributions of individuals like you. Money donated is put into action on the front line right away. The animals need us now. Join the Humane Society of the United States today! Membership is \$10 a year. All contributions are tax-deductible. Send a self-addressed, stamped envelope and ask for our list of informational publications on this and other animal protection problems.

Questions on Humane Society Finances

(by Jack Anderson and Dale van Atta, Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1991)

WASHINGTON — John Hoyt, president of the Humane Society of the United States, once told the society's animal lovers how they could become more humane: "We begin, I suggest, by living more simply, more sparingly."

Hoyt lives in a \$310,000 house bought by the Humane Society, using money that donors gave for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

The California Attorney General's Office is now taking a look at that perk and other curious financial decisions made by the national animal protection agency based in Washington, D.C.

After reviewing documents about the way the Humane Society is managed, the California attorney general wrote a terse letter to the society stating that, in his opinion, the charity had "engaged in a course of conduct" that "violated" the charity trust laws of California. Much of the money for the national society is raised in California.

The Humane Society sent a letter of response claiming its problems had been ironed out, but the deputy attorney general told our associate Jim Lynch that his opinion hasn't changed. In 1988 we reported on an internal investigation into Humane Society finances. The first of two internal reports said that a series of "self-dealing" transactions by the charity had benefited Hoyt and the society's vice president and treasurer, Paul Irwin. The big-ticket item was Hoyt's house, which the society bought and lets him live in rent-free.

Since our initial reports, six members of the Humane Society board were not invited to stay on when their terms expired. One former member told us that all of the rejects had questioned the way the Humane Society spent its money.

After our first reports in 1988, instead of cleaning house the Humane Society hired consultant for advice on how to handle "negative press." The consultant suggested that the society should have responded to our initial questions two years ago. Apparently that advice fell on deaf ears. The Humane Society's attorney did not respond to our questions this time around either.

The latest rub at the Humane Society is the hiring of David Wills as vice president for investigations. In 1987, when Wills was running the Michigan Humane Society, Hoyt tried to convince his board that the national society and the Michigan society should be merged. The national society is not tied to the many hard-working, independent state and local humane societies, and the merger with one state agency didn't make sense to the board, so it was vetoed.

Two years ago Wills left the Michigan agency in a financial condition that is still under investigation. Wills has since admitted that he lied about his education background on his resume, which helped him to get that job. Hoyt then hired him, and one former board member told us that Hoyt is grooming Wills to be his successor.

The National Charities Bureau in New York — a watchdog group that makes sure charities put their money where their principles are — does not give the Humane Society of the United States a thumbs up. "We still have some questions about their financial reporting," the bureau spokesman Dan Langan told us.

Hoyt's house is not the only thing that smells bad in the books. The California attorney general is also looking into money the society paid to Irwin, the treasurer, to help fix up ocean front property in Maine. Then there is the little matter of trips Hoyt's wife made on the charity's tab and other perks for Hoyt and Irwin.

If California decides the Humane Society stepped out of line, it could seize the money collected in California and spend it directly on animal care.

Where Charity Begins at the Top

(by Jack Anderson and Joseph Spear, Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1988)

Top dogs in the animal-rights business have rallied around the Humane Society of the United States since we hinted at how much money there is to be made in the top ranks of animal charities.

We reported that national Humane Society President John Hoyt and Treasurer Paul Irwin were reaping far more compensation for

their work than even their board members knew. Last year, in lieu of a portion of his compensation, the Humane Society bought Hoyt a \$310,000 home in Maryland. It also allowed Irwin to write himself \$85,000 in checks for another real-estate venture, which was later considered by the board to be a loan.

The Humane Society gets its money with heart-tugging pleas to donors that "The animals need it now," and contributions will be "put into action on the front line immediately."

The questionable financial transactions for Hoyt and Irwin prompted the Humane Society board to hire two Washington law firms to conduct separate investigations of the dealings.

But, presidents of two of the wealthiest animal organizations in the country wrote letters defending Hoyt and complaining that we were out of line to question the dealings.

Frederick J. Davis, president of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, defended Hoyt: "I am confident that future disclosures of all the facts will document his integrity."

John F. Kullberg, president of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, wrote there was nothing unusual about Hoyt's salary. Kullberg said the average salary for the president of a nonprofit organization is about \$119,000, although he was careful to add a "disclaimer," that his salary is less than Hoyt's and "I am not given a house to live in."

We reported that Hoyt's and Irwin's compensation did not stop with their salaries. In all, their salaries and benefits amounted to more than \$139,000 and \$114,000, respectively.

Maybe our report on the money to be made in animal charities hit too close to home. Davis and Kullberg run wealthy nonprofit organizations themselves. A 1983 report published by an Ohio animal-rights group, Mobilization for Animals, noted that Davis' Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, was the wealthiest animal-welfare group in the country, with more than \$40 million in assets. Kullberg's American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was in ninth place with \$6 million in assets. Hoyt's Humane Society of the United States placed fourth with assets of more than \$11 million.

Peter Paul, a San Francisco journalist, recently finished a four-year study of charities in the United States and abroad. His upcoming book, "Easy Pickings," includes a chapter on animal organizations. Paul told our associate Jim Lynch, "I tell people if you want to get rich, get into AIDS, animal rights or missing children."

Paul thinks Humane Society literature should include a disclaimer that the national society is not connected with local humane societies that must raise their own funds to run animal shelters and other projects.

'Excessive' Pay at Humane Society

(by Jack Anderson and Joseph Spear, Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1988)

Protecting animals from abuse is the urgent business of the Humane Society; an internal dispute over a financial scandal is equally pressing business.

In the past nine months, the board of directors of the national Humane Society in Washington has hired two law firms to conduct independent investigations of its finances. Both probes revealed that the two top officers of nonprofit charity receive significant compensation in addition to their salaries.

The law firm of Harmon and Weiss concluded that "excessive compensation payments" that were not authorized by the Humane Society's full board, "threaten the status of (the society) as a charity under the federal tax law and appear to constitute a wasting of its assets." The second report, by attorney Jacob A. Stein, agreed that mistakes were made, but said they were not criminal and did not threaten the society's tax-free status.

The Humane Society's Internal Revenue Service forms for 1987 indicated that President John Hoyt received \$95,000 and Vice President-Treasurer Paul Irwin received \$80,000 from the organization for their services. But those IRS filings failed to include other benefits to Hoyt and Irwin.

Over the past four years, Hoyt and Irwin also have received money from two affiliates of the Humane Society — the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education and the National Humane Education Center — without the knowledge of the Humane Society's full board

Since 1985, the NHEC, which is controlled by the Humane Society, has paid Hoyt \$55,000 and Irwin \$38,000. The NAAHE paid Irwin \$10,000 during the past two years.

Those payments, according to the investigations, involved transfers between various bank accounts by Irwin, the treasurer.

Stein reported, "The reason for channeling of the payments through the two corporations is that the salaries of Mr. Hoyt and Mr. Irwin were to be concealed from other organizations. The problem with it all is that it was concealed from the full board of (the Humane Society)."

When the payments appeared in the 1987 IRS Form 990, they were not credited to Hoyt or Irwin, but rather called "payments to annuitants." The board never approved them.

The board also pays \$12, 822 a year in insurance premiums for Hoyt and \$9,635 for Irwin. The insurance premiums and other benefits boosted Hoyt's compensation to \$139,622 and Irwin's to \$114,325 last year, according to Stein's report.

But those figures do not include two other financial transactions that we reported in an earlier column. In May 1987, the Humane Society bought Hoyt's house for \$310,000, and now allows him to live there rent-free. The Humane Society's IRS filing said the rent was worth \$600 a month, but the Harmon and Weiss report placed the rental value between \$2,500 and \$3,000 a month.

In communications to their board and the investigating law firms, Hoyt and Irwin have maintained that they did nothing wrong. Neither responded to our repeated requests for interviews."

Dubious Deals in the Humane Society

(by Jack Anderson and Dale van Atta, Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1988)

The Humane Society of the United States solicits your donations with a tug on the heart strings — "the animals need us now" — and a promise that your money will be "put into action on the front line immediately."

But the nonprofit charity, based here, does not advertise everything that happens on the "front line." For example, the society bought its president a \$310,000 home in Maryland last year. And the society's treasurer wrote himself \$85,000 in checks last year as reimbursements for lease payments and improvements on ocean-front real estate in Maine.

Recent investigations reveal that the Humane Society's board of directors never authorized these and other dubious financial deals arranged by its officers — deals that could threaten the tax-exempt status of the society.

The situation has until now been kept from the public, but board members first learned about it late last year. In December, the board formed an audit committee and ordered an independent investigation of the books.

In April, the Washington law firm of Harmon and Weiss completed a critical preliminary report spotlighting the "self-dealing" transactions that benefited Humane Society President John Hoyt and Vice-President-Treasurer Paul Irwin.

The law firm found that on May 4, 1987, the society bought Hoyt's house in Germantown for \$310,000. Hoyt had lived there since 1970 and still lives there, but now rent-free. The society provides the house for its president in lieu of a portion of his compensation.

In October 1987, the society gave Irwin \$85,000, allegedly to reimburse him for payments he made on the lease of 11 acres of ocean-front land and restoration of a cabin in Phippsburg, Maine. A three-person committee approved the expenses for Hoyt and Irwin without asking the majority of the board, although the society's bylaws require the board to set the president's compensation, according to the Harmon and Weiss report.

Hoyt and Irwin maintain the two purchases were for the good of society. Hoyt's home purportedly will be used by future presidents. The organization was to have an interest in the ocean-front property, but the board has since decided to consider the \$85,000 as a loan and Irwin must pay it back, a source in the society told our associate, Jim Lynch.

Hoyt, Irwin and the society's lawyer did not respond to repeated requests for interviews.

The Harmon and Weiss report alleges that the society has prepared and filed "false documents" with the federal government. The society and certain directors could face civil penalties because of those documents, and possible criminal penalties "for aiding and abetting in Hoyt's and Irwin's understatement of income," according to the report.

Not surprisingly, the board hired a lawyer, Jacob A. Stein, in April for a second opinion. Stein handed over his report in July. He verified many of the Harmon and Weiss findings but reached different conclusions. Stein recommended some changes in procedure, but said nothing criminal had taken place and the Humane Society's tax-exempt status was not in jeopardy.

What You Should Know About: Animal Welfare Fraud

(The following article was published by the organisation Trans-Species Unlimited, and distributed at the 1988 annual conference of the HSUS. The author is no longer with the organisation, and the organisation itself was renamed in 1991 as Animal Rights Mobilization (ARM) and merged with the Rocky Mountain Humane Society in Denver, Colorado.)

"I do not like the seal hunt, nor do I like sealers. However, I would rather shake the bloody but honest hand of a Newfoundland sealer than grasp the greedy and dishonest hands of those who pretend to be something they are not." Paul F. Watson, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society

The Welfare Legacy

What is animal rights and what is animal welfare? To understand the difference, it is necessary to view the contemporary animal rights movement against the backdrop of the traditional animal welfare movement. In the latter tradition, it is only overt cruelty which is opposed. The assumption that it is morally acceptable to use animals for our own purposes is rarely if ever called into question. Moreover, although there was a brief upsurge of radical anti-vivisection activity in England at the end of the 19th century, the mainstream animal welfare movement, as it has existed for the last 100 years, has focused almost exclusively on cruelty to dogs and cats, and to a limited extent, to wildlife, while ignoring the large scale, institutionalized abuses of laboratory and farm

animals. This tradition has persisted up to the present day; the legacy which it has left us is one of hypocrisy, conservatism, and bureaucratic inertia.

Worse yet, in the last thirty years particularly, animal protection has become big business, and many large national animal welfare organizations are demonstrably more concerned with ensuring their own economic growth and prosperity than with liberating animals from human oppression.

The animal rights movement, as we know it today, emerged out of fundamentally different concerns. Animal rights advocates believe that it is morally wrong, not only to wantonly abuse, but also to selfishly use other animals for their own purposes. From this perspective, subjective preferential concern or affection for a particular species is entirely irrelevant to the main issue, which is one of justice. Just as the rights of ethnic minorities do not depend upon our subjective likes and dislikes, so the rights of animals do not depend upon our being "animal lovers." Hence, the animal rights movement focuses primarily upon abuses which affect the largest numbers of animals, and objects equally to all forms of animal exploitation. As a liberation movement whose aim is social justice, the animal rights movement is by its very nature, activist, progressive, and conscientious in its use of financial resources.

Birth of the Movement

Despite this fundamental divergence in outlook, early animal rightists understandably looked to the established animal welfare groups for guidance in seeking an end to animal suffering and exploitation. In the early days of the movement, activists' efforts were bent toward trying to radicalize the Old Guard organizations and to enlist them in more progressive projects. Seldom was the sincerity of their concern for animals called into question, and it was widely presumed that every possible effort should be made to work with them in a spirit of cooperation and unity. In these early days, the fledgling animal rights movement had a few glorious, blazing victories which filled activists with a false sense of power and optimism.

This first stage of high hopes and naivete soon gave way to a second period of disillusionment, frustration, and anger. In this period, activists began to come to grips with the fact that victories for animals were not always so easy to achieve, particularly when the animal exploitation industries began to

wake up to the fact that a movement was forming which directly threatened their livelihoods. Grass-roots activists also quickly began to feel the strain of lack of time and financial resources. Personal sacrifice began to take its toll on activists' spirits.

This second stage was what might be called the beginning of the grass-roots struggle. That struggle is, of course, first and foremost a struggle against the entrenched power and resources of the animal exploitation industries. But it is also an internal struggle, which directly affects, in the profoundest possible ways, the primary struggle against animal exploitation. The two struggles are, in fact, intimately interconnected and the success of the one will largely determine the success of the other.

The internal struggle is a struggle against Animal Welfare Fraud. In this second historical stage of the animal rights movement, activists ran up against the profoundly disconcerting reality of practices and policies by large national animal welfare organizations which directly threaten the very survival of the grass-roots movement. The naive optimism, openness and confidence in the sincerity of those who profess concern for animals began to be shattered by the sobering realization of the insidious hypocrisy, corruption, and deceit which today cripples the animal rights movement.

The Current State of the Movement

The single most significant feature of the animal rights movement today is the gulf between multi-million dollar national animal welfare organizations, which have a stranglehold on the pool of public funding for animal protection, and the scores of mostly local, volunteer-based grass-roots organizations who are struggling to survive in the face of the national groups' superior fund-raising capabilities and unethical practices.

The grass-roots movement, in short, is saddled with two struggles: the struggle against animal exploitation and the struggle against those who exploit animal exploitation for their organizations' own perceived benefit. The single greatest challenge which the animal rights movement currently faces is accordingly to document, expose, and denounce Animal Welfare Fraud, to dry up the source of funding to large national organizations, and to rechannel those resources into the grass-roots movement where they will have maximum impact for the animals.

This, in turn, is only possible if the general public comes to recognize and understand Animal Welfare Fraud and to perceive the serious threat which it poses to the animal rights movement.

Hypocrisy and Corruption

Many animal welfare groups are themselves directly or indirectly involved in promoting animal suffering and slaughter. Although public outcry has in some case led to a policy of divestment, until recently many large national organizations (including anti-vivisection societies) had investments in corporations directly responsible for the perpetuation of animal suffering, such as pharmaceutical companies. Some of these organizations still retain such investments.

Other organizations condone or actively promote the slaughter of "food" animals. While advocacy of vegetarianism is a cornerstone of the animal rights movement, virtually no national animal welfare organization has taken a clear and unequivocal stand against the eating of animals, and the vast majority of these organizations' staff are meat-eaters.

There is also the question of wastage of vital resources on extravagant salaries and other frivolous amenities. The large national organizations seem to have forgotten that this is a movement for social justice, while the animal welfare "movement" is a profitable business. The presidents of the Humane Society of the U.S. and the Animal Protection Institute, for example, each earn about \$100,000 a year — more than the Vice President of the United States. How many grass-roots activists would that \$100,000 hire? The grass-roots movement is crippled by lack of full-time activists, freed from the burden of making a living. How many contributors who donate money in good faith to help the animals know that their contributions are used in part to line the pockets of corporate welfare executives?

And how many contributors know that many large animal welfare groups continue to hoard vast monetary resources which lie idle while animals continue to suffer? The Massachusetts SPCA, for example, currently has assets (i.e., money not used to help animals) of \$67,000,000. Meanwhile, virtually all grass-roots groups face a continual financial crisis in their efforts to meet the most immediately pressing needs of their campaigns.

Bandwagoning: Tricks of the Trade

The most serious way in which large animal welfare organizations undermine the animal rights movement, however, is through their unethical treatment of less wealthy, more progressive groups. As the public becomes increasingly impatient with the cautious and conservative tactics of the animal welfare organizations, these groups have begun to realize that they must try to be perceived by the public as involved in direct action, or they will start losing support and funding. Since the large groups have virtually no experience in outreach or mobilizing people for action, the easiest way of achieving this is by cashing in on the grass-roots groups' efforts. Here are some of the techniques which have been developed to "bandwagon" with little legal risk:

Maximum Milking: One of the main tricks used is to get minimally involved in a campaign or event and then to milk that involvement for all it is worth. With professional fund-raising writers and advertising firms at their disposal, many large groups have learned how to reap maximum benefits from this technique, knowing full well that the general public is in no position to critically evaluate a group's real degree of involvement in an issue, particularly when the group is able to publish a glossy news story about it. Thus the group will delegate one staff person to attend a protest and take photographs and then announce that the group "joined other animal advocates" for the protest. No mention is usually made of the groups who were actually responsible for funding and organizing the event.

The Coalition Hoax: Another convenient ploy is the "coalition hoax." Often, big groups jump at the chance to join in a coalition effort for it means a free ride: no work, but a big payoff. This trick has two forms: either they contact the grass-roots group organizing the coalition and ask to be included, or they initiate the coalition themselves and bank on grass-roots groups to do all the work. All too often, naive grass-roots activists from local groups are delighted to get the "help" of nationally-known organizations and discover only too late that they get little help and no recognition for their efforts.

In cases where large organizations form "coalitions" and do not get the support of grass-roots organizations, invariably nothing concrete ever gets done, although sometimes vast amounts of money are expended on "studies" or "materials."

Cult of the Experts: The third major fund-raising strategy is to encourage the idea among grass-roots groups and activists that the most effective thing they can do to ensure the credibility and

success of their campaign is to "call in the experts," i.e. the staff of large national organizations. Because this ploy has had such success, so-called experts and movement "leaders" from large national groups are repeatedly put in the limelight at conferences, protests, rallies, and other events which are organized by grass-roots activists. Although they usually contribute nothing substantial to the campaign or event and do none of the work, their appearance at the microphone guarantees that their organization will receive primary billing for the event. The "cult of the experts" is another trick whereby minimal expenditure of effort ensures maximal exposure for the organization and increased opportunities for fund-raising on other groups' efforts.

But why is the question of credit so important? For one simple, economic reason: if a group pours all of its limited resources into a campaign and gets no recognition for its efforts, then it receives no public support and cannot continue to work for the animals. The dishonest fund-raising tactics of the large national organizations directly threaten the very survival of the grass-roots animal rights movement. Until the general public comes to recognize who is doing what for animals, and begins to rechannel its donations into the hands of the activists, the grass-roots movement will remain crippled and ineffective.

Discouraging Activism

In addition to its usefulness as a credit-grabbing device, the "cult of the experts" serves to undermine the grass-roots movement in another way. It is a means deliberately used by large national organizations to discourage activism. The big groups have an economic stake in convincing the public that they are incapable of acting on their own, but need to call in the experts. The message that repeatedly goes out from the national groups is that the organization has everything under control — IF you send them a check today! Rather than seeking to empower individual activists to act on their own, the national groups actively discourage such involvement through the cult of the experts.

The reason is simple: they know that once people start to take the initiative to act on their own, they will realize that they are capable of achieving victories for animals, and will begin to question why the large groups accomplish so little with so much. They will also begin to channel their resources into their own local activism rather than exporting it out of their local community to the national headquarters of the large

organizations. Many of the large, wealthy organizations want to keep grass-roots activists feeling incompetent and powerless so as to sustain the maximum fund-raising capability.

How You Can Stamp Out Animal Welfare Fraud

1. Become a Critical Donor: Before you donate to a group, critically assess what the organization stands for, how it makes use of its resources, and what it has actually accomplished for animals in terms of those resources. Demand a financial statement with specific information on salary levels and amounts spent on fund-raising and "membership development." Find out if the organization uses most of its income for active campaigns or stockpiles much of it in bank accounts. Look critically at the group's fund-raising mailings. Do the contents educate you about animal issues and broaden your consciousness? Do they tell you specific things you can do to help relieve animal suffering? Or are they empty fund-raising appeals which waste vital resources by doing nothing more than asking you for money? Look beyond the rhetoric and glossy pages of publications and appeals to determine whether the organization is merely talking about abuses or actually stopping abuses. Measure any achievements claimed against the financial resources the organization has available.

2. Exercise Your Donor Power: If your critical evaluation of an organization leads you to the conclusion that it does not meet the criteria for support outlined above, do not contribute to it, and explain to others who donate to animal groups why you do not contribute to it.

Don't forget that support for organizations is not limited to financial donations, but also includes the purchase of their products and the use of envelope stickers and other advertising items which promote the organization. If you conclude that the group is unworthy of your financial support, then do not support in these other ways, either.

3. Educate Others about Animal Welfare Fraud: Use the contents of this leaflet to alert others to the crippling effect Animal Welfare Fraud has on the animal rights movement. Help others learn to see through the rhetoric and hype of glossy publications and to critically evaluate what an organization is actually doing for animals.

4. Join the Grass-Roots Movement: The most important thing that you can do to stamp out Animal Welfare Fraud is to join the animal rights movement. On the most elementary level, you can do that by only contributing to groups which meet the criteria of genuine commitment to animal rights outlined above, and which have a proven record of austerity and efficient use of financial resources. Trans-Species Unlimited suggests that you contribute to your most effective local group, and to one or two of the most effective national groups, which promote and encourage local grass-roots activism.

But it is equally important to become actively involved to as great an extent as your personal lifestyle permits. Find out from the local group you support what else you can do to help. If you live near one of Trans-Species Unlimited's offices, join the working group associated with that office. If a TSU office is not immediately accessible to you, you can still join our national network of key contact people throughout the country who play an indispensable role in helping us to implement our national campaigns in their own areas.

H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet

(The following information was distributed by the Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud — a coalition of two organisations: Trans-Species Unlimited and Vegetarian Events — at the 1988 annual conference of the HSUS.)

Dear HSUS supporter,

Welcome to the 1988 annual conference of the Humane Society of the U.S.! This packet of supplementary information is designed to acquaint you with some important facts about the HSUS of which you may be unaware.

It was prepared by the Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud, a loose network of grass-roots activists who are working to expose, document, and combat the unethical practices described in the enclosed leaflet, "What You Should Know About Animal Welfare Fraud." Such practices undermine and cripple the animal rights movement, and ultimately betray the animals whose interests we are entrusted with upholding.

The Humane Society of the U.S. is not the only organization guilty of animal welfare fraud, but in the opinion of the Coalition it is one of the most flagrant violators, and perhaps the most detrimental, in that it is depleting more donor resources than any other animal organization. Organizations such as the HSUS masquerade as part of the animal rights movement but, in fact, they are entirely outside it, and are run more like big businesses than as vehicles for the achievement of social justice for animals. There are three principal components of animal welfare fraud: financial extravagance and corruption, hypocritical positions on the issues, and exploitation of grass-roots groups through credit-stealing and misrepresentation of campaigns. Each of these problems is explained and documented with particular reference to the HSUS in the following sections.

The Coalition believes that contributions made in good faith to animal organizations ought to be used with maximum efficiency to achieve the purpose for which they were intended: the liberation of animals from suffering and slaughter.

The Coalition believes further that organizations seeking to achieve social change and transformation of public consciousness are obligated to base their policies and positions on a clearly-defined, consistent set of ethical values, and to adhere to those values in their campaigns and educational efforts.

Finally, the Coalition believes that no meaningful social change has ever been effected without popular, grass-roots support, and that the vitality and strength of grass-roots organizations is therefore essential to the success of the animal rights movement.

On all three counts, the net impact of the HSUS (and the overwhelming majority of the large national, animal welfare organizations) is, in the opinion of the Coalition, far more detrimental than beneficial to the movement, to grass-roots organizations, and to the animals themselves. The following documentation provides a brief defense of this claim with respect to the HSUS. More detailed documentation concerning the HSUS and other organizations, as well as a "Donor's Guide," based upon clear criteria of adherence to animal rights principles, is available through the Coalition.

Donors to HSUS and other large national organizations which are guilty of the practices outlined in the following pages are encouraged to rethink how their donor dollars may be best

spent, and to consider rechanneling their money into the animal rights movement, where it will have maximum impact for the animals.

Financial Extravagance and Corruption

As the enclosed recent expose by nationally-syndicated columnist Jack Anderson [see "'Excessive' Pay at Humane Society" and "Dubious Deals in the Humane Society"] makes clear, the Humane Society of the U.S. is not only guilty of squandering vast financial resources on astronomical salaries for its top executives, but attempted to conceal the actual salary level of its president, John Hoyt, from groups like the Coalition critical of this extravagance. As the article makes clear, the HSUS purchased Mr. Hoyt's luxurious \$300,000 home from him in order to reduce his salary level, while allowing him to continue living in the house rent-free.

Other top HSUS executives draw similarly outrageous salaries. As long as five years ago, no less than six other HSUS employees were drawing salaries ranging from over \$46,000 to over \$72,000. During this five year period, Mr. Hoyt's salary has skyrocketed from slightly over \$100,000 a year to almost \$140,000 a year. Similar dramatic rises in salary level may be presumed for other top HSUS executives.

Like most other large national organizations, the HSUS pours a substantial proportion of its vast resources (over \$10 million for 1987 alone) into recruiting more members and raising more money. No less than 30% (almost \$3 million!) of HSUS' 1987 income went into membership development and fund-raising.

As a result of these practices, the National Charities Information Bureau, which monitors non-profit organizations for responsible financial practices lists HSUS as failing to meet its "Basic Standards in Philanthropy" in the category of expenses, which includes program, management, and fund-raising expenses. According to the Bureau, "Compliance with the standards ... is considered essential by the NCIB."

HSUS also stockpiles vast resources which are unused for animal protection. As of 1987, almost \$10 1/2 million of unrestricted funds were sitting idle in cash, investments, and other assets.

In spite of this vast wealth, HSUS tries to raise even more funds by charging exorbitant prices for its educational materials and in

general refuses to provide materials at cost or for free to grass-roots groups and individual activists. This has even gone so far as to charge for the order form to order materials!

Hypocritical Positions on Animal Issues

The hypocrisy of large national organizations like the HSUS is revealed nowhere so clearly as in the positions adopted on issues and the choice of campaigns, which are determined not primarily by what is most effective in reducing animal suffering but by what is most effective in raising funds.

This is evident most recently in the newly-launched "Shame of Fur" campaign, whose theme and graphics were taken directly from the anti-fur materials of the Dutch Anti-Bont Comite. Many of the other concepts were taken from Trans-Species Unlimited's Campaign for a Fur-Free America. For example, more than two and a half years ago Trans-Species prepared a Coordinator's Manual for its anti-fur campaign which has been widely used by participating groups throughout the country. In the manual, the strategy being adopted was explained in detail. An explicit comparison was drawn to the anti-smoking campaign and the key concept of "Fur-Free Zones" was developed. In HSUS' anti-fur campaign materials, President John Hoyt describes the HSUS campaign as parallel to the anti-smoking campaign and the material urges HSUS supporters to establish "no furs allowed areas."

In the thirty odd years that the HSUS existed, it had never tackled the fur issue as such, focusing instead on the narrow topic of leghold traps. But during the last two and a half years, through the efforts of grass-roots organizations, the issue of fur as such has become a "safe" issue, i.e., working on it is no longer likely to alienate conservative donors. Thus the HSUS campaign is born, in competition with already existing national fur campaigns which it is based upon.

Another conspicuous example is the HSUS' "breakfast of cruelty" campaign. According to the latest information available to the Coalition, a grand total of 3 of HSUS' 70 odd employees were vegetarians! Imagine anything more ludicrous than HSUS staffers coming in to work on the "breakfast of cruelty" campaign after wolfing down a breakfast of bacon and eggs. The Coalition even has reliable information that the HSUS national office is regularly visited by a vending truck selling "organic meat." And at the

conference you are attending fish are still not accorded the moral right by the HSUS not to be eaten.

Such blatant opportunism is apparent to an even more shocking degree in the attached two letters from HSUS President John Hoyt, sent to two different self-declared donors whose views on the sinking of the Icelandic whaling ship by the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society were opposite of one another. This clearly demonstrates that the President of the HSUS is fully prepared to adopt polar opposite positions on major animal rights issues when it is financially advantageous to raise funds for the HSUS. Hoyt was unaware when he wrote the letters that one of the persons to whom he was writing was deliberately "testing the waters" to see whether in fact the HSUS had a genuine position on the issue or responded solely on the basis of fund-raising considerations.

[Text of two letters as follows]

December 22

Dear [blacked out]

Thank you for your note of December 3 and a copy of your excellent letter to Paul Watson. It was, indeed, a daring and masterful bit of James Bond on behalf of the great whales.

Great to see you in Miami Beach. Next year, let's get away for lunch one day so we can become better acquainted. I would enjoy that very much.

We are most appreciative of your remembering The HSUS in your will. I will look forward to receiving a numbered file copy as indicated.

Best wishes for a joyous holiday season and a very healthy new year.

See you in Phoenix.

Sincerely,
John A. Hoyt

February 27, 1987

Ms. Louise Jayne

Dear Ms.

Thank you for your letter of January 28 and your inquiry regarding The HSUS attitude regarding the sinking of ships in Iceland by the Sea Shepherd Society.

I am unequivocally opposed to any and all acts of violence in the pursuit of efforts to protect animals from abuse and suffering. As I wrote in my President's Perspective in the Winter 1987 issue of The Humane Society News (copy enclosed) " we cannot and shall not condone

violence or the threat of violence against others as a responsible means of achieving protection for animals. Indeed, we condemn such violence and those who would perpetrate it in the pursuit of otherwise noble objectives. For justice can never be served by injustice, nor can the protection and welfare of animals be secured at the price of injury or abuse to others."

I shall be pleased to discuss the work and program of The Humane Society of the United States with you in greater detail if you desire, either by mail or in person.

Sincerely,
John A. Hoyt

Exploitation of Grass-Roots Groups

Without question, the most destructive aspect of the behavior of organizations like the HSUS is the deliberate and systematic policy of exploiting grass-roots groups for fund-raising purposes. This takes many forms but the basic formula is the same: find a good campaign or project of a grass-roots group, get minimally "involved" in it and reap the maximum benefits for fund-raising from your own members and the general public by reporting on it in your organization's publication and even sending out fund-raising mailings on it.

The number of organizations who have suffered at the hands of the HSUS in this regard are legion, but a couple of conspicuous examples are enclosed of highly effective grass-roots groups whose campaigns have been usurped by the HSUS.

Since groups cannot function without money and money is available only if donors recognize the groups' role in campaigns and feel impelled to support them, the unethical credit-stealing, "bandwagoning," and misrepresentation of their own efforts by large, affluent organizations like the HSUS directly threaten the very survival of the grass-roots groups which are the heart and soul of the animal rights movement.

[The report then documents six cases in which HSUS is accused of "ripping off" the campaign ideas of others, or claiming success for itself when credit is due elsewhere. Among the documents presented in the following, dated July 21, 1982, from Shirley McGreal, chairwoman of the International Primate Protection League in London.]

Dear Fellow-Litigant in the IPPL/PETA/ALEA et al case,

The International Primate Protection League was very disturbed to read recent claims by the Humane Society of the United States to be involved in our suit for custody of the IBR monkeys. This is especially irritating since HSUS is not a litigant in this case, to the best of my knowledge, and in fact, it declined an invitation to join the suit at its initiation. As usual, the names of other litigants are conveniently omitted so that, again, it seems like HSUS is the only group helping the IBR monkeys.

At the time when we all joined this suit, we were in serious risk of being counter-sued for libel and harassment. All organizations could have been sued, as well as individual members of our Boards of Directors. The individual plaintiffs could also have been sued, and were especially vulnerable due to their Maryland residency. We all showed guts in signing on. Now, with the conviction of Taub, the danger is less, and other groups which perceive the publicity and fund-raising value of this suit, may well wish to join.

IPPL would like to propose that no group in the suit add other litigants without the approval of all current plaintiffs. A vote would be taken on the merits of any application to join. Further, if any group should join, we should work out a contract with them stating that, in any publicity generated by their participation, all groups should be mentioned with the date of their joining the suit. As it is, the Baltimore Sun article included a claim that a non-party was a party, and ignored the existence of the real plaintiffs. IPPL feels that retractions should be requested from both the *HSUS News* and the Sun.

Comments would be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,
Shirley McGreal, Chairwoman, IPPL

8) ORGANISATION

Humane Society of the United States

Headquarters: Legally, the head office is at 2100 L Street, NW, Washington DC 20037; Tel.: (202) 452-1100; Fax: (202) 778-6132. The publications division and a few big wigs are still there, but most of the staff have now moved to Gaithersburg, Maryland, where costs are lower; Tel.: (301) 258-3004. Call Washington and you will be seamlessly connected to Maryland. CEO John Hoyt is said to maintain offices at both addresses. I could not obtain the address for the Maryland office. However, since it is in Gaithersburg, it cannot be Hoyt's old house in Germantown which he sold to HSUS in 1987 (see "Dubious Deals in the Humane Society"). At the time of the sale, Hoyt's Germantown home was reportedly to be put at the disposal of future HSUS presidents.

Founded: 1954

Annual budget: \$23,265,940 (1994)

Funding sources: Membership (50%), gifts (40%), foundation grants (3%), investment income and others (7%) (from *Public Interest Profile*, 1992-93, Foundation for Public Affairs)

Staff: Over 200 professionals (source: HSUS spokeswoman)

Constituency: According to an HSUS spokeswoman, paying members (\$10+/year for voting rights and newsletters) and "contributors" combined totalled about 2.5 million as of October 1995.

Internal Revenue Service status: (501)(c)(3)

Publications: The following are HSUS's major publications. For a comprehensive, free list, write to: Publications Catalog, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037. *Shelter Sense*, 10 times a year, for animal shelter workers; *Animal Activist Alert* (quarterly); *HSUS News* (quarterly); *Close-Up Report* (irregular series, each issue focusing on one area of animal rights abuse).

REGIONAL OFFICES

The following information is compiled from several sources, with some data going back to 1991, and others totally up to date. There may therefore be inaccuracies, particularly in the light of the following statement in the September 1995 edition of *Animal People*: "HSUS field reps are reportedly now being asked to work from their homes, without secretarial service. Several regional

posts are vacant, and the HSUS service regions are apparently being realigned to cut the number of regional reps."

Great Lakes Regional Office (IN, OH, MI, WV)
745 (725?) Haskins Street
Bowling Green
OH 43402-1696
Tel.: (419) 352-5141

South Central Regional Office (AR, AZ, CO, LA, NM, OK, TX, UT)
Director: Dennis White
6262 Weber Road
Suite 305
Corpus Christi
TX 78413
Tel.: (512) 854-3142

New England Regional Office (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT)
630 Oakwood Ave.
Suite 213
West Hartford
CT 06110
Tel.: (203) 434-1940

Southeast Regional Office (AL, FL, GA, MS, SC)
Director: Laura Bevan
3165 McCrory Place
Suite 215
Orlando
FL 32803
Tel.: (904) 386-3435

West Coast Regional Office (CA, OR, NV, WA)
Director: Charlene Drennon
5301 Madison Ave.
Suite 202
PO Box 417220
Sacramento
CA 95814
Tel.: (916) 344-1710

North Central Regional Office (IL, KY, MN, NC, TN, WI)
Director: Phil Snyder
2015 175th Street
Lansing
IL 60438
Tel.: (312) 474-0906

Northern Rockies Regional Office (ID, MT, ND, SD, WY)
Director: Dave Pauli
490 North 31st Street
Suite 315
Billings
MT 59101
Tel.: (406) 255-7161; Fax: (406) 255-7162

Mid Atlantic Regional Office (DE, NJ, NY, PA)

Bartley Square
270 Route 206
Flanders
NJ 07836
Tel.: (201) 927-5611

Midwest Regional Office (KS, IA, NE, MO)
Director: Wendell Maddox
306 East 12th Street, #625
Kansas City
MO 64106
Tel.: (816) 474-0888

DIVISIONS/AFFILIATES

National Humane Education Center

Shares a common governing body with HSUS. No other information could be found on this organisation.

National Association for Humane and Environmental Education (NAHEE)

Address (March 1991): Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423-0362.
Tel.: (203) 434-8666
Established: 1973, as the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE).

Chairman: John Hoyt. Shares a common governing body with HSUS.

Budget: \$940,000 (1992).

Staff: 14 full time (1992).

The HSUS's humane education division, aimed at youths. NAHEE runs the Kids in Nature's Defense (KIND) Club and publishes *KIND News*, a monthly newsletter distributed to elementary schoolchildren across the country through its Adopt-A-Teacher program (see "HSUS and Education"). *KIND News* is published at three levels: *KIND News Primary* (grades one and two), *KIND News Jr.*, and *KIND News Sr.* *KIND News Primary* is also published in Spanish as *KIND News Internacional*. According to HSUS's 1994 annual report, readership of *KIND News* increased from 650,000 children in 1993 to 790,000 in 1994.

Other publications include *HSUS Student Action Guide*, *HSUS Student Network News*, *Guidelines for the Study of Animals in*

Elementary and Secondary School Biology, Breaking the Cycle of Abuse (English and Spanish) and *Alternatives to Dissection*. It also helped to develop *The Responsible Use of Animals in Biology Classrooms, Including Alternatives to Dissection*, published by the National Association of Biology Teachers.

A function of two of these publications is to recruit students into HSUS. This is admitted explicitly and unashamedly in HSUS's 1994 annual report: "NAHEE continued to promote student membership in The HSUS and the formation of student clubs through dissemination of the *HSUS Student Action Guide* and *HSUS Student Network News*."

Center for Respect of Life and Environment

Established: 1988, as successor to the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems.

Director: Michael Fox, HSUS vice-president for Bioethics and Farm Animal Protection. Shares a common governing body with HSUS. Board also includes "ecoth theologian" Thomas Berry (see "HSUS and Religion").

Publications include: *Earth Ethics* (quarterly newsletter); *St. Francis of Assisi, Animals, and Nature*; *Animal Welfare and Nature: Hindu Scriptural Perspectives*; *Speaking for the Earth: Nature's Law and the Aboriginal Way*.

The CRLE is headed by the flamboyant and controversial Michael Fox, HSUS's vice-president in charge of Bioethics and Farm Animal Protection, and reportedly was established for the express purpose of allowing him to promote these views without detracting from the mainstream animal welfare image of the HSUS. According to John Hoyt, the Center was established to let Fox "direct some of his views in a channel that was an arm's length removed from the HSUS. He sometimes makes statements on biomedical research and other things that don't always reflect our view" (as quoted in "Beyond Cruelty", by Katie McCabe, *Washingtonian*, Feb. 1990). (For examples of Fox's radical views, see "Fox, Michael.)

Since 1991, CRLE has functioned as the higher-education companion to NAHEE. According to HSUS's annual report for 1994, in that year CRLE staff "responded to more than fifteen hundred requests for information related to careers and educational opportunities working for animals and the environment and for information on steps faculty and students

can take to 'green' their colleges by making them more environmentally responsible.

CRLE also runs the Theological Education to Meet the Environmental Challenge (TEMEC) program, which provides "technical assistance and support to theological institutions that are implementing curricula that bring together a concern for the environment and a concern for social justice and humane, sustainable practices." Among the projects conducted under TEMEC in 1994 were three national conferences "that brought together leading theologians and religious scholars to explore effective responses to environmental challenges.

Humane Society International (HSI)

Established: 1991

President: John Hoyt

HSI is the international arm of HSUS, with offices in Canada (Toronto), Australia, Columbia, Mexico and the European Community (Germany). It has no members, and is supported primarily by funding from HSUS. In 1993, HSUS provided \$212,091, followed by \$410,760 in 1994.

In announcing the formation of HSI to HSUS members, John Hoyt implied the areas in which it would be involved most, all. established fund-raising issues: "Animal-protection activities can no longer be viewed in the context of national boundaries. Whether it is the slaughter of elephants in Africa, the capture and export of exotic birds from Central and South America, the destruction of dolphins and other marine mammals by the fishing industry internationally, or the suffering of dogs and cats in developing countries of the world, we are of necessity involved."

HSI has since expanded also into targeting animals slaughtered for food, and animals used for work and recreation.

On the cat and dog front, HSI has been particularly active in Mexico and Costa Rica, where it can get "exclusives" in exposing cruelty, unbothered by competition from local humane societies in the U.S.

HSI's European director, Betsy Dribben, resides in Bonn, but spends four days a month in Strasbourg following plenary sessions of the European Parliament. Dribben's main concerns are dolphins. driftnets. seals and whales. i.e. marine mammals.

However, she is seldom seen in Brussels, but it is almost certain that HSI has ready access to information from the European Parliament Intergroup on Animal Welfare, which is situated there. This organisation is widely believed to have been set up by the International Fund for Animal Welfare, and certainly its first president, from 1983-87, was an IFAW man. IFAW is still suspected of being the major hidden sponsor of this body, but in its literature the main sponsor is given as the World Society for the Protection of Animals, of which HSI president John Hoyt is vice-president. Many of the projects which HSI has been involved in in Latin America are acknowledged in *HSUS News* as being in cooperation with WSPA. It is also worth noting that former Intergroup president MEP Anita Pollack, from Britain, was a keynote speaker at HSUS's 1994 national conference, and is featured in the "Interview" section in *HSUS News* (winter, 1995). Another interesting footnote from Europe is that Dribben reportedly worked with the notorious Sam LaBudde on bringing the "dolphin-safe" tuna scam to the attention of the Intergroup on Animal Welfare (*HSUS News*, fall 1991; see "LaBudde, Sam").

HSI (Australia), which opened in August 1994, is interesting for the people heading it. As reported in *HSUS News* (winter, 1995), its executive director is Michael Kennedy, and its marketing director is Verna Simpson. Kennedy was senior policy adviser for WWF (Australia) from 1990, while Simpson was managing director of Mailex International, a large direct-mail operation, and from 1981 to 1986, financial director for the Fund for Animals (Australia), the local branch of the animal rights group which has supplied so many other executives to HSUS back in the U.S.

One of the likely benefits to HSUS of setting up HSI is that it allows it to tap into the rich fundraising markets of continental Europe and elsewhere for direct mailing campaigns. The International Fund for Animal Welfare, Greenpeace, the Dolphin Project, and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society have all reportedly done well in Europe in the past five years, and HSI may well now be following suit.

According to a direct mail professional quoted in the December 1995 edition of *Animal People*, current HSUS president, and soon-to-be HSI president, Paul Irwin had been testing the water:

"Irwin has tested the Netherlands fundraising market. You see, incorporated in the Netherlands, as you must be to raise funds there, nobody in the U.S. can track the money. Irwin arranged all of that. Now, heading HSI, he is in charge of it all. Nice plan. How much front money

has HSUS put into HSI? That is the money used to raise gigantic money overseas. The Netherlands, Germany, and France are all semi-virgin targets, with four times the returns we get in the U.S. You can get rich four times quicker, and with a \$150,000 investment can net \$1.5 million the second year. Then the sky's the limit. The foreign governments won't audit for five years, giving time to build the mail before spending money on programs."

In 1994, HSI was responsible for organising the Species Survival Network "to lobby on behalf of wildlife protection (*HSUS News*, winter 1992)."

EarthKind

EarthKind (USA) and EarthKind (International) share common governing bodies with HSUS.

The aim of EarthKind has been summed up by John Hoyt as follows:

"EarthKind is more than an organization; it reflects a bold new attitude which recognizes that concern for the Earth and a compassion for all those creatures which inhabit it are absolutely inseparable. The name itself united environmental issues — Earth — with a concern and compassion for its inhabitants — Kind. EarthKind also represents a way of thinking, acting, and living. The fundamental mission and purpose of EarthKind is to help people become 'Earthkind,' to structure their priorities and agendas to give substance to a philosophy whose time has come (*HSUS News*, winter 1993)."

In less flowery terms, EarthKind sections in each *HSUS News* are usually prefaced by: "EarthKind, the global environmental arm of the HSUS, works to protect biodiversity and endangered ecosystems and promote humane, sustainable development." (See also EarthKind's "Statement of Principles" below.)

So what is it really? The forerunner of EarthKind was founded in Britain in 1955 by the late Michael Fryer. It adopted the name EarthKind in about 1990, at the exact time HSUS was starting its move into the international arena with an eye on environmental issues.

Presumably with an eye for an opportunity, EarthKind (USA) was formed in 1991 as an affiliate of HSUS, while the founder organisation became EarthKind (UK). Between them they then formed EarthKind International, with Hoyt as both president and chairman. Other directors are listed in *HSUS News*, fall 1994, as: HSUS vice-presidents Jan Hartke and Murdaugh Madden,

Margaret Cooper, Lee Tiller and Niall Watson of EarthKind (UK), and Viatcheslav Slouzhivov of EarthKind (Russia).

Hoyt is also president and chairman of EarthKind (USA), with a board consisting of HSUS president Paul Irwin, HSUS vice-presidents Jan Hartke (sometimes referred to confusingly as EarthKind president) and Murdaugh Madden, and HSUS director Judi Friedman.

In the years since Hoyt came on board, EarthKind has been expanding seemingly along the lines of a franchise. Other branches are now to be found in Russia, Brazil, Romania and Sri Lanka. EarthKind (Russia) was set up following the collapse of the Iron Curtain, reportedly at the initiative of Hoyt (*HSUS News*, fall 1994). EarthKind (Romania) was set up October 1993, but is described in the same issue of *HSUS News* simply as a "nonprofit, nongovernmental, independent, and non-political organization". Its president is Angheluta Vadineanu, who also holds UNESCO's Cousteau chair of ecology and environmental management.

Other milestones in the apparently rapid growth of this organisation include the development of "close working relationships with individuals in the World Bank, the Peace Corps, the U.S. Agency for International Development, the International Executive Service Corps, and other organizations," and the sponsoring of a conference with the IMF in Washington D.C. for a discussion "focused on energy-efficiency technologies and renewable energy, reduction of pollution associated with transportation, and potential solutions to municipal-waste problems (*HSUS News*, summer 1995)."

As for what EarthKind has actually achieved in the field, there is a lack of independent reports on which to base such an assessment, and HSUS is notorious for blowing its own trumpet, often without cause, in its own publications, making them unreliable sources. Interested parties can find a vaguely worded list of EarthKind's claims of victory in *HSUS News*, winter 1993.

EarthKind's "Statement of Principles" as approved in March 1992 and reported in *HSUS News*, winter 1993:

"Believing that the fate of planet Earth and its vast diversity of living organisms is being threatened with destruction and extinction as never before in history, we acknowledge our responsibility and affirm our commitment:

"To preserve the biological support systems upon which all life depends, including but not limited to forests, topsoils, coral reefs, and wetlands.

"To promote attitudes and policies which will seek to prevent the abuse and suffering of all living creatures and protect them from becoming threatened or endangered.

"To stabilize the growth of the human population so that it will not exceed the carrying capacity of the land or displace other forms of life.

"To choose a renewable energy path that will not destroy the forests, pollute the waters, degrade the atmosphere, or endanger wildlife.

"To support an agricultural system that is sustainable, equitable, and humane.

"To be conscientious in our dietary practices, ever mindful that our eating practices can have a major impact on both human and animal suffering as well as environmental degradation.

"To do everything possible to promote pollution prevention by reusing, repairing, and recycling wherever possible."

Yellowstone Fiasco

The only report I could find on an EarthKind (USA) project other than coverage in HSUS publications appears in the December 1995 edition of *Animal People* (see "Humane Society of the U.S. Settles Affairs Without a Wills"). According to this report, in a few months in 1993 HSUS lost \$275,000 through EarthKind on the so-called "Yellowstone Project".

Dr. Robert Crabtree of Montana proposed a new ecotourist business and offered it to EarthKind. EarthKind agreed to provide \$150,000, all to be returned by the third year. If Earthkind dropped out before the third year, the idea reverted to Crabtree. Crabtree prepared a first-year budget showing \$450,000 income from tuition and a deficit from first-year operations of \$121,000 — in other words, a spending plan of \$571,000 — and submitted it to HSUS soon after starting the business. He claims he got it back with an initialed approval.

Using this approval, Crabtree began spending on local help to lead the tours and computers, and sent invoices for payment to HSUS.

Crabtree had projected that the project would break even with 150 participants, but by July only 32 had signed up. When HSUS learned of the light response, it tried to halt the program, but Crabtree felt he had an enforceable contract and wanted to continue, resisting HSUS demands to fire employees and cancel

tours. By September, when the Earthkind board met, more than \$200,000 had been spent, and another \$75,000 was estimated to be needed to get HSUS out. A number of hired staff in Montana were threatening to sue HSUS, and there were complaints from people who had bought non-refundable air tickets to cancelled tours.

Crabtree salvaged the operation, and still operates, now under the name of Yellowstone Ecosystem Studies.

International Center for Earth Concerns

No information could be found about this organisation.

Interfaith Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature

Directors include John Hoyt.

Address: 4290 Raintree Lane, NW, Atlanta, GA 30327

According to the blurb inside the 1990 publication *Replenish the Earth — The Bible's Message of Conservation and Kindness to Animals*:

"The Interfaith Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature is composed of people of various religious faiths who are interested in the preservation of God's creation; that is, the natural environment and the other creatures with which we share this planet. It is our belief that the health of the earth's ecology, and the welfare of humanity, are inextricably linked."

This blurb is followed by something not typically seen in religious treatises but certainly characteristic of the HSUS: an appeal for tax-deductible donations.

HSUS Wildlife Land Trust

Established: October 1994 to protect "wild animals by preserving their habitats and providing them sanctuary in those habitats."

Head: John Kullberg, president of the American SPCA 1979-91. Shares a common governing body with HSUS.

According to *HSUS News*, Fall 1995, the trust received \$50,000 from the Fashion Accessories Benefit Ball held in May 1995 in New York:

"The donation will support the establishment of permanent wildlife sanctuaries closed to recreational hunting and commercial trapping. Since its inception [the Trust] has accepted sanctuary properties in New Hampshire, New York, and Arkansas. Properties in Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Dakota, Maine, and Tennessee are also being considered. An initiative is being considered in Amazonia, Brazil, that may result in a partnership between the HSUS Wildlife Land Trust and Pro Natura Brazil — an organization that promotes sustainable economic uses of natural resources — to protect one hundred and seventy thousand acres in the heart of Brazil's Amazon rain forest."

9) MEMORABLE QUOTES

By Them

- "Man is the most dangerous, selfish, and unethical animal on earth." — Michael W. Fox, vice president, HSUS, as quoted in Robert James Bidinotto, "Animal Rights: A New Species of Egalitarianism," *The Intellectual Activist*, September 14, 1983, p.3.
- "Human beings aren't superior to the other animals, we're just different." — Michael W. Fox, vice president, HSUS, as quoted in Katie McCabe, "Beyond Cruelty," *Washingtonian*, February 1990, p.192.
- "At a public forum, Michael W. Fox of the Humane Society of the United States was asked whether there were any circumstances in which he would accept animal experimentation. He replied, 'Just to ask that question indicates you are a speciesist and probably a sexist and a racist. Such labeling inevitably precludes dialogue.'" — from *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest*, by James Jasper and Dorothy Nelkin, Macmillan, 1992; ISBN 0-02-916195-9.
- "[I]f we could shut down all sport hunting in a moment, we would." — Wayne Pacelle, when national director of the Fund for Animals, as quoted in Bert Lindler, "Animal-Rights Activist Pacelle: 'I'm an Impassioned Agitator,'" Associated Press, Dec. 30, 1991.
- "Having hunters oversee wildlife is like having Dracula guard the blood bank." — Wayne Pacelle, when national director of the Fund for Animals, as quoted in William G. Tapply, "Who Speaks for People?" *Field & Stream*, June 1991.
- "Though we are not opposed to the legitimate and appropriate utilization of non-human animals in the service of human beings, such utilization give [sic] man neither the right nor the license to exploit or abuse any animal in the process." — HSUS, Oct. 7, 1995, at <http://www.charities.org/humanem.html>
- "The Humane Society should be worried about protecting animals from cruelty. It's not doing that. The place is all about power and money." — Robert Baker, HSUS consultant and former chief investigator, quoted in "One nonprofit's woes", *U.S. News & World Report* Oct 2 1995

- "Only a few of the million you kill would have bitten you." — Michael Fox, HSUS vice-president, expressing opposition to the use of bug sprays; in *Returning to Eden*, Fox publication.
- "We begin, I suggest, by living more simply, more sparingly." John Hoyt, recipient of a six-figure salary, to HSUS members, on how they could become more humane; quoted in *Washington Post*, Feb. 20, 1991; see "Animal Aid Society Chief Lives the Good Life").
- "I certainly did not relish chopping off the head of a chicken, and I very much dreaded the day when my grandfather would butcher a pig or a calf; but death for those animals was quick and painless and until then they had lived in natural settings and comfortable quarters." John Hoyt explaining why it's alright to kill the animals he chooses to eat; *Animals International*, autumn 1992. This quote should be used the next time HSUS joins in the cry for yet more humane standards of killing by whalers.
- "The HSUS is a nonprofit organization supported solely by the contributions of individuals like you. Money donated is put into action on the front line right away. The animals need us now. Join the Humane Society of the United States today!" From the 1990 HSUS fundraising flyer "A Discussion — Rights for Animals." In its 1990 annual report under assets, HSUS reported having \$7,864,028 in "Cash and Cash Equivalents", of which \$5,497,949 was in "Unrestricted Funds".

By Us

- "They [HSUS] don't do anything for animals. It's all fundraising and advocacy." Patti Strand, National Animal Interest Alliance, personal communication.

By Animal Rightists

- "I'm not an admirer of HSUS. They've always been primarily a direct-mail operation, and what's known in animal rights circles as a credit-grabber." Cleveland Amory, co-founder of HSUS and since 1974 chairman of Fund for Animals; *Animal People*, May 1994.

- "The hypocrisy of large national organizations like the HSUS is revealed nowhere so clearly as in the positions adopted on issues and the choice of campaigns, which are determined not primarily by what is most effective in reducing animal suffering but by what is most effective in raising funds." *H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet*, distributed by Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud at the 1988 HSUS annual conference.
- "The Humane Society of the U.S. is not the only organization guilty of animal welfare fraud, but ... it is one of the most flagrant violators, and perhaps the most detrimental, in that it is depleting more donor resources than any other animal organization." *H.S.U.S. Annual Conference — Supplementary Information Packet*, distributed by Coalition Against Animal Welfare Fraud at the 1988 HSUS annual conference.
- "Make no mistake: when it comes to the treatment of people, the word 'humane' does not apply to HSUS." Former HSUS vice president for investigations David Wills to the National Press Club, Nov. 16, 1995, after learning that HSUS had filed a civil lawsuit against him and tried to cancel his health insurance; as quoted in *Animal People*, December 1995.
- "The so-called Humane Society of the United States has never fed, sheltered, rescued, or neutered animals outside of a handful of high-profile disaster relief and demonstration projects. Yet the chief executives have become multi-millionaires." Merritt Clifton, editorial, *Animal People*, December 1995.

10) ON-LINE ACCESS TO HSUS

COMPUSERVE

HSUS has had its own forum on Compuserve since 1992. At the time Compuserve announced its inauguration, forum topics included Animal Experimentation, Earth and the Habitat, Animal Shelters & Pet Care, and Legislation & Law.

WORLD WIDE WEB

HSUS shares a home page on the World Wide Web with a variety of other American charities, but the HSUS part is almost useless. Anyway, the address is:

<http://www.charities.org:humanem.html>

Following is a verbatim transcript (including all the spelling mistakes, bad punctuation, bad English, etc.) of what was found on Nov. 11, 1995. There is just one interesting line which I have underlined and placed in the "Memorable Quotes" section, because I don't really understand it:

The Humane Society of the United States has a constituency of 2.1 million; maintains its headquarters in Washington, D.C., and, maintains ten regional offices [sic; there are actually nine], including a humane and environmental education division, and international arm (Human Society International), and three affiliates.

The primary and motivating concern of The Humane Society of the United States is the prevention of cruelty to all living creatures, primarily and foremost animals and indirectly human beings as well. The Society's beliefs are based upon its conviction that "life possesses an inherent value and is this deserving of consideration.

The HSUS's programs and campaigns strive to improve conditions for domestic as well as wild animals and wild areas. By achieving these goals, The Society enriches and enhances life for humans as well.

The Society is mindful that man has been uniquely endowed with sense of moral values. For this reason, we believe he is responsible for the welfare of those other creatures with whom he shares the Earth and upon which he encroaches. This responsibility, The Society believes, must be shared by all people. It does not matter if they benefit from the use of such domestic animals or the life of other creatures. As the dominant intelligent life on Earth, humans are accountable as a species. Though we are not opposed to the legitimate and appropriate utilization of non-human animals in the service of human beings, such utilization give man neither the right nor the license to exploit or abuse any animal in the process.

The Society is dedicated to the elimination of suffering of animals through educational, legal, legislative and investigative means. Its tools are leadership, education and action, using such institutional legal convention means as are most poignant and effective.

The Society's ultimate goal is to promote animal and environmental protection and to bring about a new respect for all living creatures to create a truly "humane society."

11) BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marquardt and La Rochelle: Marquardt, Kathleen, La Rochelle, Mark, *Animal Scam*; ISBN 0-89526-598-6.

Arnold & Gottlieb: *Trashing the Economy*, Arnold, Ron and Gottlieb, Alan; ISBN 0-939571-17-X.

Strand and Strand: Strand, Rod and Patti, *The Hijacking of the Humane Movement*. To order: 800-633-5385.