


AWI

Quarterly

Summer 2002 Volume 51 Number 3





ABOUT THE COVER

Sighted off the Azores in the North Atlantic, an extremely rare 13-foot-long white sperm whale calf swims with his mother. Sperm whales are the largest toothed whales—adult males can be fifty feet long and weigh forty tons. Photographer Flip Nicklin could not determine whether this real-life baby “Moby Dick’s” eyes were pink, but the calf appears to be a pure albino. Despite his dolphin smile he’s in grave danger from his mother’s milk, which may be contaminated by absorbed chemicals, heavy metals, and other noxious substances, as a result of ocean pollution. Other threats come from ship strikes, being caught in entangling fishing nets, and whaling. The Japanese kill sperm whales today under the guise of “scientific research,” but whale meat and oil end up for sale in Japan. In May 2002, Japan hosted a remarkably contentious meeting of the International Whaling Commission, established in 1946 to regulate commercial whaling. (See story pages 4-5.)

DIRECTORS

Marjorie Cooke
 Roger Fouts, Ph.D.
 David O. Hill
 Fredrick Hutchison
 Cathy Liss
 Christine Stevens
 Cynthia Wilson

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens, *President*
 Cynthia Wilson, *Vice President*
 Fredrick Hutchison, CPA, *Treasurer*
 Marjorie Cooke, *Secretary*

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Marjorie Anchel, Ph.D.
 Gerard Bertrand, Ph.D.
 F. Barbara Orlans, Ph.D.
 Roger Payne, Ph.D.
 Samuel Peacock, M.D.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

Aline de Aluja, D.M.V., *Mexico*
 Ambassador Tabarak Husain, *Bangladesh*
 Angela King, *United Kingdom*
 Simon Muchiru, *Kenya*
 Godofredo Stutzin, *Chile*
 Agnes Van Volkenburgh, D.V.M., *Poland*
 Alexey Yablokov, Ph.D., *Russia*

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Ava Armendariz, *Publications Coordinator*
 Amy Conklin, *Editorial Assistant*
 John Gleiber, *Assistant to the Officers*
 Diane Halverson, *Farm Animal Advisor*
 Christopher J. Heyde, *Research Associate*
 Lynne Hutchison, *Executive Secretary*
 Cathy Liss, *Executive Director*
 Nell Naughton, *Mail Order Secretary*
 Greta Nilsson, *Wildlife Consultant*
 Viktor Reinhardt, D.M.V., Ph.D.,
Laboratory Animal Advisor
 Jennifer Rinick, *Research Assistant*
 Adam M. Roberts, *Senior Research Associate*
 Wendy Swann, *Research Associate*
 Ben White, *Special Projects Consultant*

Take a Bite Out of the Toothfish Trade

Since AWI first reported on the serious conservation implications of the international trade in Patagonian Toothfish last winter, a concerted global effort has taken hold to curtail the commercialization of this fish, often marketed under the name, “Chilean Sea Bass.”

It is estimated that overfishing and illegal catches could push the Patagonian toothfish to extinction in five years. As well, countless thousands of sea birds including albatrosses and petrels die cruelly each year in this long-line fishery.

Almost 10,000 metric tons of Chilean Sea Bass were imported into the United States in 2000, but the National Environmental Trust (NET) reports that as much as 80% of the catch may be from pirate fishers operating outside the law.

Two campaigns are underway to save the species: a consumer boycott and a listing under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). The NET has begun a “Take a Pass on Chilean Sea Bass” campaign, urging restaurants to stop serving the otherwise popular fish. Already, high-end restaurants in New York and Washington have pledged to stop serving Chilean Sea Bass. More than 500 chefs across the US are on board. Todd Gray of the Equinox restaurant in Washington, DC, told the Environmental News Service, “Not serving Chilean Sea Bass is the right thing to do. Our guests strongly support us because they agree that it’s not worth sacrificing an entire species for our short term appetites.”

As the campaign continues, the Government of Australia has announced that it will propose listing the toothfish on Appendix II of CITES. Such a listing will not ban commercial trade but will require that proper export permits accompany each shipment, certifying that each catch is legal. According to Dr. David Kemp, Australia’s Federal Minister for the Environment and Heritage, “it is my view that what is at stake here is important enough to warrant the use of every available tool. A CITES listing is another string to the bow, another part of the effort.” CITES Parties will meet in Santiago, Chile this November.

YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Don’t order Chilean Sea Bass, and if you see it listed on a restaurant menu, urge the restaurant manager to remove it. 🐾



Animal Welfare Institute

QUARTERLY

Summer 2002 Volume 51 Number 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MARINE ANIMALS

- Take a Bite Out of the Toothfish Trade...2
- Japan Stymied on Home Turf: IWC 2002, *by Ben White*...4-5
- New Book by Whaler Exposes Cheating...5
- Corral the Coral Trade...20

WILDLIFE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- Environmental Crime—the Globe's Second Largest Illegal Enterprise?...6
- Australia Serves up Increased Kangaroo Exports...7
- Koalas Must be Protected...7
- The Killing Fields of Loliondo, *by Meitamei Ole Dapash*...8-9
- Elephants Still Under the Gun, *by Adam M. Roberts*...10-11
- Jose Lutzenberger, a Man of Principle and Wisdom...19

LABORATORY ANIMALS

- NABR's Misinformation Cripples Animal Welfare and Scientific Integrity, *by Christopher J. Heyde*...14-15

FARM ANIMALS

- AWI's Pig Husbandry Program Sets a National Standard...16
- Considering Cruel Chicken Confinement...17
- Animal Factories Don't Want You to See Their Cruelty...17
- Congress Wants the Humane Slaughter Act Enforced...17
- 15,500,000 Laying Hens at Stake...18

A SPECIAL CHIMPANZEE

- Moja the Artist, *by Dr. Roger and Deborah Fouts*...13

AWI PUBLICATIONS

- Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals*...15

BOOK REVIEWS

- Wild Orphans*, *by Adam M. Roberts*...12
- My Fine Feathered Friend*, *by Christine Stevens*...18



Adam M. Roberts/AWI

Zebra and other animals were killed with AK-47s while drinking from natural dams in Loliondo. (See story pages 8-9.)



Gerry Ellis

One of the rescued wild elephant orphans, Icholta, takes a cool mud bath. (See story page 12.)



Diane Halverson/AWI

Chefs and environmentalists endorse AWI's criteria requiring that pigs be allowed to behave naturally. (See story page 16.)



AP Photo/Katsumi Kasahara

A whale threatened Kaikyo Messe, the venue of the 54th annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission in Shimonoseki, southwestern Japan, Friday, May 24, 2002. Ben White of the Animal Welfare Institute constructed this image of a sperm whale himself as a protest against Japanese and Norwegian attempts to resume commercial whaling. He was inside the whale on the final day of the IWC meeting.

Japan Stymied on Home Turf: IWC 2002

BY BEN WHITE

The combative tenor of the 54th annual conference of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) was set the day before the opening gavel struck on Monday, May 20 in the whaling city of Shimonoseki, Japan. Just off the bullet train from Tokyo, I was met by a huge and raucous demonstration of thousands of ultra-right Japanese nationalists circling the streets in 160 big, black busses with loudspeakers blaring from their roofs. In a deafening call-and-response, one speaker would shout through his microphone, then 159 others would shout into theirs. Advocating the full scale resumption of commercial whaling, the demonstrators played martial music from World War II days and chanted “Greenpeace Go Home.” The group embraces modern Shinto and believes that the Emperor of Japan is a deity. Ironically, Old Shinto is an ancient religion that believes that streams and forests and, presumably, whales are sacred.

As it turned out, irony was the one constant of a topsy-turvy week. I never would have thought that a pivotal meeting in a whaling center would result in:

JAPAN

- failing to win a resumption of commercial whaling through the adoption of a toothless “revised management scheme”;
- blocking whaling by opposing the US/Russian proposal for an aboriginal subsistence quota of bowhead whales for the Inuits;
- failing to win acceptance of its bid, submitted every year since 1984, to allow four coastal towns to take 50 minke whales a year in a commercial hunt—Japan said it would allow the hunting anyway under the heading of “scientific whaling”;
- failing to win a simple majority in its annual request for a secret ballot to hide its bought votes, despite its recruitment of four new countries to vote its way this year (Benin, Gabon, Mongolia, and Palau);
- failing in its effort to force the acceptance of Iceland into the commission (Iceland is insisting that it be able to join with a reservation on the moratorium on commercial whaling, even though it voted for the moratorium before quitting the IWC ten years ago);

- succeeding in blocking the adoption of a new South Pacific Sanctuary, a success tempered by the adoption of sanctuaries by New Zealand, Australia, and other Pacific nations within their own waters (extending 200 miles); and

THE UNITED STATES

- losing, in the most dramatic IWC slap at the country since 1972, the Alaskan Inuit bowhead quota—aboriginal subsistence whaling quotas are almost always agreed to by consensus (this time the bowhead quota was held hostage by the Japanese linkage with its own perennially rejected request for a commercial coastal whaling allotment of 50 minke whales; its message was 100% political jousting: if we don't get what we want, you don't get what you want);
- giving in on the hotly contested issue of increasing St. Vincent/Grenadine's annual quota of humpback whales from two to four, despite its repeated illegal slaughter of mother and calf pairs (a deal struck in a private commissioner's meeting appeared to give St. Vincent its quota if the US and Russia got their bowhead quota, but once the St. Vincent quota was approved, the whalers reneged);
- seeing its two primary skeletons in the closet—Makah whaling and low frequency active (LFA) sonar—openly questioned in the plenary. Mexican commissioner Andres Rosental, who emerged at this conference as the whales' strongest champion, objected both to the Makah being granted whaling rights without demonstrating nutritional need and to the joining of the US and Russian request to take gray whales, avoiding the Makah quota passing muster on its own. The safety of LFA was brought up by the members of the scientific committee and their concerns passed on by their chairwoman. In response, alternate US commissioner Mike Tillman gave a deadpan reading of a statement attesting that the effect of LFA on marine mammals will be minimal.

THE CONSEQUENCES

Even though the IWC has long been derided justifiably as the whalers' club, its mandate is actually both to conserve whales and to facilitate whaling, a mandate that could be argued is self-contradictory. Those wanting whales protected are looking, as always, beyond the 48-member IWC to the meeting this fall of the 158-member Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). The concern is that if the IWC is seen to be losing its grasp on its ability to regulate and control ("allow") whaling, then CITES could step in to approve the "down listing" and trade of certain species of whale. Indeed, over the past several years the increasingly combative Japanese delegation appears to follow a strategy of tying the IWC in knots so it can then go to CITES and say that the IWC isn't working.

This year, with the Japanese intransigence at the meeting being so dramatic, the argument will be easier to make at CITES that it is the Japanese who are obstructing progress

within the IWC, and that they should not be rewarded by superseding the responsibilities of the IWC and allowing whale meat trade while there is a commercial moratorium in place.

The issue that might make the whole argument on whaling moot is the increasing awareness in Japan that much whale meat and almost all dolphin meat (often labeled as whale meat) is contaminated heavily with mercury and other heavy metals. Having suffered a disastrous bout of mercury contamination in Minamata Bay in the 1970s, Japanese consumers are very concerned with food safety. For the first time, 30% of the whale meat obtained through Japan's "research whaling" went unsold last year. An April poll published in the *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper reported that only four percent of those polled ate whale meat "sometimes." The same paper headlined an article, "Changing Tastes May Sink Whaling Fleet," pointing out that despite the posturing and arguing within the IWC, if the Japanese people stop buying whale meat, the industry will collapse.

Just a month before the conference, the Japanese government took the unprecedented step of ruling that the meat from five sperm whales could not be sold as human food because it contained 1.47 parts per million of mercury, more than three times the legal limit. To dramatize this action, I made a fifteen-foot tall, sperm whale costume. Working with the Japanese group Safety First! I was able to get a permit to walk my whale to the front of the IWC venue on the last day of the conference. One side of the whale read "WARNING MERCURY," and on the other side was the Japanese translation (the four *kangi* literally said "Silver-Water-Crises-Rough Adventure"). As I approached the conference center inside the costume, the crowd of media peeled away from the entrance and surrounded me. One of the photographs wound up on page two of the May 28 *New York Times*, illustrating an article entitled "Yuk, No More Stomach for Whales."

One critical outstanding question remains: Will the US allow the Alaskan Inuit whalers to go after bowhead whales next spring even if the IWC has not given its permission? 🐾

New Book by Whaler Exposes Cheating

In a bombshell dropped on the eve of the IWC meeting in Shimonoseki, Japan, a longtime coastal whaler wrote a book called the "Rise and Fall of Japan's Coastal Whaling." The book exposes systematic and rampant cheating by whaling companies, the tendency of Fisheries Agency's inspectors to turn a blind eye to the underreporting of numbers of whales caught, and the exaggeration of the size of immature whales killed.

The seventy-five year old author, Isao Kondo, told the *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper, "I didn't mean to expose any secrets from the whaling days of old. I just thought I ought to record what actually happened." 🐾

Environmental Crime— the Globe's Second Largest Illegal Enterprise?

The earth is full of criminals, some of whom act alone, some of whom act in an organized fashion, teaming with villainous, nefarious characters. The drug trade looms as the largest illicit industry on earth with two groups of profiteers vying for second place: those who peddle arms and those who commit “environmental crimes.” The latter bunch, whose blood money nets in the tens of billions of dollars annually, were the subject of a conference hosted by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London: “International Environmental Crime: The Nature and Control of Environmental Black Markets.” Environmental criminals are degrading our environment and robbing us of natural resources.

The organizers of the workshop broadly described five main areas of environmental crime, which comprise the lion's share of illegal activity: illegal wildlife trade, fishing, logging, trade in ozone-depleting substances, and hazardous wastes. Numerous treaties exist to control this illegal global commerce: the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, the Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the

Montreal Protocol and the Basel Convention, to name a few.

Environmental criminals are driven by the high profit/low risk nature of their scheming. Smugglers, traders, and their profiteering networks are becoming more and more sophisticated in their efforts to outdo the governments trying to rein them in. Debbie Banks of the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) noted, “environmental criminals are better informed and prepared to outwit the authorities and any trade controls that are put in place. They know how to exploit loopholes in the laws and permit systems. Their knowledge of trade routes and transport systems means they can adapt quickly if enforcement authorities do catch up with them.”

Frances M. Ole Nkako, the Project Coordinator for the Kenya Wildlife Service's Bushmeat Identification Project added that sophisticated crime networks are aided by government enforcement agencies lacking the political and financial backing to do their jobs well. Captain Gert van der Merwe of the South Africa Endangered Species Protection Unit concurred, adding that environmental crimes are not deemed as a priority for the police, that staff in many

African countries are trained inadequately, and that the many governments in question are rife with corruption.

The wildlife trade is a well-known problem, especially to readers of the *AWI Quarterly*, whether it's the trade in elephant ivory, rhino horn, tiger bone, bear gallbladders, whale meat, or live exotic birds for the pet industry. Increasingly, pirate fishing of species such as Patagonian toothfish, described on page 2 of this issue, is on the rise. Illegal logging takes its toll, destroying vital habitat for wild species. Captain van der Merwe notes, for instance, that the Cape Parrot in South Africa is critically endangered owing in part to “The destruction of indigenous yellow-wood forests which lead to high prices for the birds, and smuggling.” There are also serious problems with illegal international trade in ozone-depleting substances such as chlorofluorocarbons, as much as 20,000 tons of which EIA estimates were produced and traded from developing countries on the black market annually in the late 1990s.

There is plenty of blame to go around for the proliferation and expansion of environmental crimes. There are also clear strategies toward reducing this illegal activity. International trade should be monitored by appropriate global treaties with specific recommendations and support offered to individual countries. National governments should provide their agencies the financial backing and training to enforce these treaties. Furthermore, they must demonstrate the necessary political will to pass adequate legislation with penalties in place that give the judiciary a strong hand in deterring environmental crime. Consumers must be educated on the perils of wildlife crime and the need to abstain from purchasing wildlife and wild products, including illegal timber. When we purchase black market goods or products potentially acquired illegally, we, too, become accessories to environmental crime. 🐾



A US government storeroom of confiscated endangered wildlife items, from big cat skins to polar bear hides and elephant ivory.

Australia Serves up Increased Kangaroo Exports



Nicola Beynon/Humane Society International

Eastern grey kangaroos box at a wildlife park in Tasmania.

Conservation groups are ready to mount a legal challenge to the Australian government's announcement that its national kangaroo quota would leap to 7 million, an increase of more than one and a half million animals. Australia has been exporting kangaroo meat for over 40 years, today to 21 countries. Exports to Europe have increased predictably of late as a result of the European mad cow food scare.

Some in the Australian government question the legality and scientific validity of the quota increase. Richard Jones, a long-time friend of kangaroos and an Upper House member from New South Wales, told Australia's *Daily Telegraph* newspaper, "I find it astonishing that the minister has approved the quota, given its size and the fact that there has never been any

scientific research to determine how many grey kangaroos can be killed without affecting the population."

There are also significant welfare concerns regarding kangaroo killing. Though the Australian government advocates a "sudden and painless death," Nicola Beynon of Humane Society International—Australia, contends, "There is no effective way to monitor and police methods of killing and prevention of cruelty through injuries to animals or abandonment of Joeys. The naïve expectation is that shooters wait for only certain types of kangaroos to stand still, in a certain position and distance from a still vehicle so they can take a perfect aim. The reality is that every shooter is pressured to take a certain number of kangaroos in whatever way possible to cover costs and demand." 🐾

Koalas Must be Protected

In April, *The Financial Times* newspaper reported that the future of koalas is the subject of a heated conservation debate across Australia. After recovering remarkably from the fur trade that pushed them to the brink of extinction early in the twentieth century, koalas now are at risk from brushfires, road deaths by automobiles, and attacks by people's pets and feral animals. Most significant, however, are habitat destruction and human development, which squeeze koalas from their forest homes. As the *Financial Times* story reports: "The koala problem then is twofold—lack of places to live and speed of population growth. Building developments and agricultural practices have isolated areas of suitable native bush that have become the equivalent of islands where koala populations have increased unchecked."

In southern Australia, koalas are blamed for literally eating trees to

death. The Australian Koala Foundation (AKF), however, contends that disease is killing the trees. Deborah Tabart, AKF Executive Director, portrays the koala as a scapegoat in the destruction of trees in Kangaroo Island: "Habitat fragmentation, insufficient fire regimes, grazing, logging, farming and edge effects have contributed to the death of trees on Kangaroo Island. It is ridiculous to blame the koalas for the damage people have done."

Solutions to the koala conflict must be sought that do not involve indiscriminately killing these eucalypt-



Koala Preservation Society of NSW Inc.

Taree Bo Bo was rehabilitated by the Koala Preservation Society in New South Wales, Australia and released to the wild.

tus-loving tree-dwellers. One current action is sterilization, by vasectomizing males. Some koalas are being relocated to less-crowded areas. A more appropriate, long-term solution is to limit land clearing and promote the planting of new trees. As Ms. Tabart notes, "There are not too many koalas—there are too few trees." 🐾



Cheetah are among the vulnerable species in the Loliondo area that are hunted as trophies.

The Killing Fields of Loliondo

BY MEITAMEI OLE DAPASH,
THE MAASAI ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE COALITION

*Is this what you call civilization? Killing innocent animals?
Well, nature will have to judge you by your actions.*

—Kailol Ole Pere, Olosira Lukunya/Loliondo resident

An ecological crisis is looming in Loliondo, an area of Maasai ancestral lands in the northern part of Tanzania along the common border with Kenya. Tanzania has become an enormously important destination for trophy hunters from Europe, North America, Asia, and the Middle East. Regrettably, Tanzania does not recognize Maasai traditional land rights or their right to full access and control of natural resources.

The Ortello Business Company (OBC), a hunting company from the United Arab Emirates (UAE), operates in the Loliondo Game Controlled Area in northern Tanzania with a license that permits hunting of wild game and trapping of live animals to be flown to the UAE. It appears that OBC has a long-term agenda for exploiting the high concentration of wildlife in Loliondo.

According to residents of Loliondo, OBC illegally uses fire to control the movement of wildlife within and around the Loliondo hunting concession. The Maasai Environmental Resource Coalition (MERC) has learned that fires usually are started at the beginning of the prime hunting season to

coincide with the great ungulate migration, including wildebeests, zebras, elands, hartebeests, giraffes, and buffaloes. OBC ignites fires along the common border area to prevent animals from crossing into Kenya, where commercial hunting is banned and instead forces them to retreat to hunting areas. The halted migration of large herds of plains game also attracts increased numbers of carnivores—lions, cheetahs, leopards, hyenas, hunting dogs, and jackals. This provides OBC with an opportunity to capture large cats—particularly the much favored lion, cheetah, and leopard—and transport them to UAE.


OBC also employs baiting, a hunting practice that circumvents the need for long searches for wildlife, especially big cats and hyenas. A common form of baiting used by tourist hunters entails using carcasses to lure animals into traps. In Loliondo, in addition to carcasses, OBC digs artificial watering holes and small dams to lure large numbers of mammals and even birds for easy shooting. According to Loliondo residents, OBC relies heavily on small dams during the dry season to entice large numbers of thirsty animals. Local guides keep watch and radio to OBC when animals head in the direction of the dams. The hunters take cover before the animals arrive and then strike with machine guns.

Night hunting is not a new practice in the world of hunting, but it too is gaining popularity in some parts of Tanzania. In Loliondo, MERC learned that OBC uses powerful spotlights mounted on vehicles to locate animals at night. Blinded and confused, animals stagger in front of vehicles, making them easy targets. This appears to be an exercise in

shooting for fun or practice rather than trophy hunting.

Although Tanzanian law only allows tourist hunters to kill males who are no longer active reproductively, OBC personnel and guests shoot and capture animals young and old, male and female, lactating and pregnant. Some of the species that the Maasai say they have seen captured include: lion, leopard, cheetah, impala, baboon, vervet monkey, gerenuk, giraffe, hyena, warthog, and bird species, particularly ostrich. In some cases, dead animals are transported in lorries to nearby non-Maasai communities and sold as bushmeat, potentially encouraging poaching and an illegal market for such flesh. Despite the fact that Tanzanian law forbids foreign tourist hunting companies from utilizing game for commercial purposes, OBC workers take advantage of official hunts to kill animals for their own consumption and sale in the neighboring communities. Maasai do not eat wild game.

The Maasai of Loliondo have for a long time accused OBC of grave human rights abuses and environmental violations. They have described acts of intimidation, harassment, arbitrary arrest and detention, and even torture by OBC officials and security forces, as well as by Tanzanian police and military in the name of OBC; brazen violations of grazing and land rights; and wanton environmental destruction and extermination of wildlife. They have seen leaders who once opposed OBC's practices corrupted and bought-off. They have witnessed OBC officials trying to convert Maasai to Islam, with further instruction to abandon Maasai culture.



MERC

Giraffe are killed illegally for their meat and their neck sinews, which are used in making bows to shoot arrows. They are also captured live for export.



Ben Dykes/Born Free Foundation

Indiscriminate hunting may have caused the decline of topi and other antelopes in the area.

The Government of Tanzania should sanction an independent investigation team to examine the numerous complaints about OBC's practices in the field and their impacts on human rights, wildlife, and the environment. This should include an examination of the role of Tanzanian security forces and government officials. The team should be composed of international and Tanzanian experts but should not include members of the Tanzanian government due to allegations of widespread corruption. During the investigation, OBC's hunting privileges must be suspended.


The killing of wildlife for sport is in itself an offense to the Maasai worldview. Maasai traditionally believe that the present generations hold all natural resources, including the land, in trust for future generations. The killing of wildlife for pleasure or commercial purposes is not permitted. Maasai believe that trophy hunting leads to greed, over-exploitation of wildlife resources, and often irreversible damage to delicate ecosystems. Today's East Africa owes much of its wildlife prosperity to traditional Maasai conservation practices. This invaluable conservation role has gone largely unappreciated—and worse, in the name of modernity, it continues to be undermined and targeted for elimination.

The Maasai tradition must survive despite foreign influences such as those of OBC. As Lemido Saunae, a Tarangire resident says, "You know, at the end of the day, they will eliminate these animals and then go back to their wealthy homelands and leave us more impoverished than when we had our animals." 🐾

shooting for fun or practice rather than trophy hunting.

Although Tanzanian law only allows tourist hunters to kill males who are no longer active reproductively, OBC personnel and guests shoot and capture animals young and old, male and female, lactating and pregnant. Some of the species that the Maasai say they have seen captured include: lion, leopard, cheetah, impala, baboon, vervet monkey, gerenuk, giraffe, hyena, warthog, and bird species, particularly ostrich. In some cases, dead animals are transported in lorries to nearby non-Maasai communities and sold as bushmeat, potentially encouraging poaching and an illegal market for such flesh. Despite the fact that Tanzanian law forbids foreign tourist hunting companies from utilizing game for commercial purposes, OBC workers take advantage of official hunts to kill animals for their own consumption and sale in the neighboring communities. Maasai do not eat wild game.

The Maasai of Loliondo have for a long time accused OBC of grave human rights abuses and environmental violations. They have described acts of intimidation, harassment, arbitrary arrest and detention, and even torture by OBC officials and security forces, as well as by Tanzanian police and military in the name of OBC; brazen violations of grazing and land rights; and wanton environmental destruction and extermination of wildlife. They have seen leaders who once opposed OBC's practices corrupted and bought-off. They have witnessed OBC officials trying to convert Maasai to Islam, with further instruction to abandon Maasai culture.



MERC

Giraffe are killed illegally for their meat and their neck sinews, which are used in making bows to shoot arrows. They are also captured live for export.



Ben Dykes/Born Free Foundation

Indiscriminate hunting may have caused the decline of topi and other antelopes in the area.

The Government of Tanzania should sanction an independent investigation team to examine the numerous complaints about OBC's practices in the field and their impacts on human rights, wildlife, and the environment. This should include an examination of the role of Tanzanian security forces and government officials. The team should be composed of international and Tanzanian experts but should not include members of the Tanzanian government due to allegations of widespread corruption. During the investigation, OBC's hunting privileges must be suspended.

The killing of wildlife for sport is in itself an offense to the Maasai worldview. Maasai traditionally believe that the present generations hold all natural resources, including the land, in trust for future generations. The killing of wildlife for pleasure or commercial purposes is not permitted. Maasai believe that trophy hunting leads to greed, over-exploitation of wildlife resources, and often irreversible damage to delicate ecosystems. Today's East Africa owes much of its wildlife prosperity to traditional Maasai conservation practices. This invaluable conservation role has gone largely unappreciated—and worse, in the name of modernity, it continues to be undermined and targeted for elimination.

The Maasai tradition must survive despite foreign influences such as those of OBC. As Lemido Saunae, a Tarangire resident says, "You know, at the end of the day, they will eliminate these animals and then go back to their wealthy homelands and leave us more impoverished than when we had our animals." 🐾

Elephants Still Under the Gun

BY ADAM M. ROBERTS

Elephant carcasses once again unceremoniously litter Kenya's national park lands. Kenya Wildlife Service Director J.M. Kioko recently reported that Somali poachers armed with AK-47 rifles "ambushed a herd of 11 elephants," massacring all but one. Said Director Kioko, "this slaughter of a family of ten elephants is the largest incident in which an entire family of elephants has been poached since KWS's establishment in 1989.... This and other previous incidents in Kenya suggest that the ivory markets are active and poachers are actively feeding the illegal trade in ivory."

In 1989, the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) voted to give elephants the highest level of protection in order to stop commercial trade in ivory. Since then, a small minority of southern African nations have conspired to repeal the ban and profit from the wanton slaughter of these amazing creatures. In 1997 they partially succeeded—CITES granted what was billed as "a one-time" sale of stockpiled ivory from Botswana,

Namibia, and Zimbabwe to Japan. In 2000, CITES weakened its protection for South Africa's elephants as well but refused to allow sale of South African ivory.

Ivory profiteers bank on the prospect that CITES may someday yield and allow an unfettered resumption of the commercial ivory trade. This drives the current killing. Sales from "government stockpiles" are dangerous because ivory from poached elephants can be laundered in with the "legal" stash. The message from any sale, even from stockpiles, is that ivory has value. When poachers and smugglers get the word that money is to be made by illegally killing elephants and illicitly trading ivory, they inevitably renew their deadly dealings.

The ivory debate is ready to explode again leading up to the next CITES meeting in November 2002 in Santiago, Chile. Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe have proposed another ivory stockpile sale and advocate an annual export quota of ivory. According to a Reuters report, Zambia is also requesting to trade in ivory despite the fact that "Zambia's elephant population has dwindled from around 200,000 in the

1970s to only 26,000 now due to rampant poaching."

These five southern African countries represent a small minority of the overall number of elephant range states, both in Africa and in Asia. The elephant range states that recognize the looming disaster from a reopened ivory trade have a strong pair of allies in the Governments of Kenya and India, a duo that is teaming up to propose that all African elephants be put back on Appendix I of CITES, thus cutting off international commercial trade in elephant products once more. Their proposal shows that "Poaching of African and Asian elephants for their ivory and the illegal ivory trade continue to pose a serious threat to most African and Asian elephant populations," and that "In most cases, existing anti-poaching efforts in Africa and Asia are no match for well-armed poachers."

The statistics from the most recent two years are alarming indeed. Elephant poaching is extensive across the animals' range. From January 1, 2000 to April 30, 2002, over 1,000 elephants were poached in the African and Asian countries of Namibia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Zimbabwe, Kenya, India, Tanzania, Angola, and Cambo-



Born Free Foundation

Elephant herds are led by a matriarch who governs the females. They mourn family members' deaths when ivory bandits kill them for their tusks.



Kenya Wildlife Service

An elephant family is murdered in Kenya's Tsavo East National Park.

dia. This includes elephant killing in conservancy lands, national parks, reserves, and wildlife sanctuaries.

Despite the current trade ban, elephant ivory is smuggled globally. Kenya and India report illegal ivory seizures from January 1, 2000 through May 21, 2002 to include 2,542 tusks and 14,648 ivory pieces or objects, weighing a total of 5,953.4 kg. These seizures are global, showing the breadth of the international illegal ivory trade: Tanzania, Chile, South Africa, Kenya, Namibia, India, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States, Zambia, Djibouti, China, Uganda, Belgium, Botswana, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Egypt, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Japan, Cameroon, Taiwan, Vanuatu, and Canada.

One report alleges that a man from Oman was arrested for trying to smuggle 60 large ivory pieces weighing approximately 400 kilograms into Thailand. A Gambian national was sentenced in March 2002 to one year and a day in a US federal prison for conspiring to smuggle 66 ivory pieces into the US from Nigeria. Four huge ivory carvings were seized in the Indian State of Kerala, including one that was nearly four feet tall. "One of the carvings was rather ironically of Ganesh, the Hindu elephant god of wisdom and success," noted Belinda Wright, Executive Director of the Wildlife Protec-

tion Society of India. Wright continued, "This case illustrates the extent of the illegal ivory trade. It is extremely alarming and does not bode well for the future of wild elephants."

Much of the blame for this trade rests with ivory consumers who fuel the market. A recent report on *The South and South East Asian Ivory Markets*, published by Save the Elephants, shockingly reveals that "Wild elephant populations in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam from 1988 to 2000 have declined by over 80%... largely due to the trade in ivory and other elephant products." The authors surveyed eight Asian countries and found over 105,000 ivory items available for retail sale.

Asian elephant experts met in Cambodia in May of 2002 and approved a resolution recommending "that all proposals that encourage directly or indirectly a re-opening of trade in ivory be discouraged and that parties to the CITES vote to continue the present international trade ban on ivory and that they do not support any down listing proposals of African elephant populations."

The clear answer is the most simple: protect all elephants completely from international trade in their parts and products, particularly ivory. The permanent cessation of the ivory market is essential to the long-term viability of the global elephant population. 🐾

WHAT DO THEY WANT?

Botswana: Trade in hunting trophies, live animals, hides, leather goods, ivory carvings, and a sale of **20 metric tons** of ivory initially, followed by an annual allowed sale of **4 metric tons**.

Namibia: Trade in hunting trophies, hides, leather goods, ivory carvings, and a sale of **10 metric tons** of ivory initially, followed by an annual allowed sale of **2 metric tons**.

South Africa: Trade in hunting trophies, live animals for re-introduction, hides, leather goods, and a sale of **30 metric tons** of ivory initially, followed by an annual allowed sale of **2 metric tons**.

Zambia: Trade in live animals and a sale of **17 metric tons** of ivory.

Zimbabwe: Trade in hunting trophies, live animals, hides, leather goods, ivory carvings, and a sale of **10 metric tons** of ivory initially followed by an annual sale of **5 metric tons**.

Kenya & India: All elephant populations, including Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, get full protection on Appendix I of CITES.




Wildlife Protection Society of India

Ganesh, the Hindu elephant god of wisdom and success.



Kenya Wildlife Service

Kenya Wildlife Service rangers carrying buried ivory tusks.



Wild Orphans

Photographs and Text by Gerry Ellis
 Welcome Books 2002
 ISBN: 0-941807-58-4; 136 pages; \$24.95

BY ADAM M. ROBERTS

Natumi, Icholta, Ilingwesi, Nyiro, Lolokwe, Salama, Laikipia, and Edie—eight orphaned baby elephants who collectively became known as the “Orphan 8”—form the basis of Gerry Ellis’s delightful book *Wild Orphans*. Ellis uses over 100 of his brilliant color photos to depict the early development of these babies, from rescue through rehabilitation to release in the wild.

Baby elephants may be orphaned when their mothers are gunned down by poachers’ bullets, when they are deemed “problem” animals, or when they inadvertently get stuck in wells or other watering holes. The lucky survivors are taken to Dr. Daphne Sheldrick’s Wildlife Trust orphanage outside Kenya’s capital, Nairobi, where they most lovingly are cared for around the clock. Dr. Sheldrick notes in her Foreword to the book that “elephants are worthy of, and need, human compassion and understanding,” and “that they must be handled with sensitivity and care rather than brutality.”


The youngest child or the most learned scientist should appreciate Ellis’s heart-warming pictures and simple accompanying text, which tell a story of utter compassion. When they arrive, elephant babies may be emotionally distressed, physically injured, dehydrated, sunburned, or cut by snares. The caretakers at the orphanage show what Ellis simply describes as “endless patience” in caring for them. The elephants’ human adoptive parents play with them (physical contact for which the elephants yearn) and introduce them to the shallow pools that provide them with a welcome, cool-

ing mud bath. The babies’ surrogate mothers feed them milk from a bottle hidden behind a blanket draped between the trees, thus emulating the feeling of being under a mother’s body while drinking. The caretakers even sleep alongside their elephantine children, waking with them often throughout the night.

Ultimately, the orphans reach an age that they can be released to the wilds of Tsavo National Park. Ellis returned to see “his” elephants in Tsavo nearly a year after their release and greeted them with the astonishment of a human parent: they were heavier—some 200 pounds rounder—and had begun sprouting their precious ivory tusks. Ellis notes: “When I saw Natumi with her thumb-size tusks poking out from her upper jaw, I felt the joy a parent must feel when their child sheds baby teeth for those of adulthood.”

Of course, these “adult teeth” put elephants at great peril across Africa. The ivory trade cut the continent-wide elephant population in half leading up to the 1989 decision by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species to protect elephants and stop the international commercial ivory trade.

Ellis is acutely aware that elephants are still under the gun by ivory poachers: “But it is Natumi’s new tusks that worry me most about her future. As she matures and those elegant sweeping tusks grace her profile, their price tag will grow to a bounty of several hundreds or thousands of dollars. Although Tsavo is protected, poaching still goes on within the park. Only the vigilant refusal of people around the world to buy ivory offers her any true security.” 🐾



Caretaker Benson and elephant Natumi share an expression of humor and joy.

Gerry Ellis

Moja the Artist

BY DR. ROGER AND
DEBORAH FOUTS

Moja enjoyed looking at herself in a mirror in fancy dress. She loved climbing, swinging, running, and playing peekaboo. Her favorite foods included onions and farina. As of Thursday, June 6, 2002, Moja no longer will be able to take advantage of these simple life pleasures. All of us at the Chimpanzee and Human Communication Institute (CHCI), Central Washington University, were devastated to learn that Moja died suddenly, at age 29, after being ill for only two days. She is the only chimpanzee to die at CHCI.

All of the chimpanzees at CHCI have been as upset as the humans. Tatu signed HURT and CRY to us, and Dar has been signing CRY as well. Washoe has seemed very introspective and has sat looking for a long time into the night enclosure area where Moja died. Washoe, abducted from the African jungle to become part of the American space program, was the first nonhuman primate to learn to speak sign language. She also helped Moja grow up when she first came to our facility.

It took Moja about a year to adjust to life at CHCI, mostly as a result of Washoe's oversight. Once she "came

out," there was no question that she was the chimpanzee who did not know how to act like a chimpanzee. She was described this way in *Next of Kin*: "Moja was easy to engage if one brought along the right fashion accessories. She was extremely conscious of her appearance, and there was nothing Moja loved better than putting on an old dress, shoes, and makeup and studying herself in the mirror. She insisted on red dresses, but she wasn't choosy about her footwear. The irrigation boots we wore to clean the cages made her just as happy as party shoes. After she was dressed she would ask us to brush her long hair, which could keep her entertained for hours." One person told us that while driving by he was so distracted by the sight of Moja in a scarlet negligée swinging around the top of the outdoor enclosure he drove up on the curb!


As far as we know Moja was the first chimpanzee to employ representational art. When she was in Reno and she'd done a drawing, her human companion thought she was wasting paper because it wasn't filled up. So the paper was returned to her and she was asked to DRAW MORE, to which she replied FINISHED. After this exchange went back and forth for awhile she was asked what she had drawn and she replied BIRD. The schemata she used then was the same one she



continued to use later when she drew pictures of birds.

Moja was the first chimpanzee of a second sign language project by Drs. Beatrix T. and R. Allen Gardner and she was born in captivity at the Laboratory for Experimental Medicine and Surgery in Primates (LEMSIP). Hence, her full name was Moja Lemsip ("Moja" is the Swahili word for "first").

In the wild, chimpanzees can live into their forties, but in captivity, many die between ten and fifteen years of age. Although our lives were enriched by knowing Moja, chimpanzees do not belong in captivity. Captivity is not good for them. Our species has yet to learn that lesson. 🐾



Left: Painting by Moja entitled "Name This."

Above: Moja's drawing of the wings of a bird in flight transformed this human sketch of a banana given to her by a visitor.

NABR's Misinformation Cripples Animal Welfare and Scientific Integrity

BY CHRISTOPHER J. HEYDE

According to the US government's primary animal protection law an estimated 25 million birds, rats and mice being experimented on each year in US research facilities are no longer considered "animals." In 1970, Congress amended the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) to ensure decent care and treatment for *all warm blooded animals* used for experimentation, testing and teaching. This year, however, one US Senator took it upon himself to weaken the AWA by excluding birds, rats and mice from the Act. Birds, rats and mice, who comprise approximately 95 percent of all animals used in research, have now been denied protection under the law (see Winter 2001 *AWI Quarterly*).

In one of his last acts as a Senator, Jesse Helms (R-NC) handed the National Association for Biomedical Research (NABR) an objective it has pursued since its founding by the president of the world's largest laboratory animal breeder, Charles River Laboratories, over 20 years ago—the evisceration of the AWA. NABR and its preceding organizations (the National Society for Medical Research and the Association for Biomedical Research) have opposed every piece of legislation to protect animals in laboratories introduced in Congress.

Through a campaign of misinformation and hysteria, NABR convinced Helms to ignore overwhelming scientific, Congressional, judicial, public and international support for the protection of these animals. Apparently, Helms and his supporters disregarded the only scientific survey conducted on the subject by scientists Harold Herzog of Western Caro-



This was the 259th rat to receive an injection to the brain—not a single virus had appeared and as the researcher put it, "it's not working."



The necks of these mice and 21 others were crushed with a metal cage-card holder in violation of UNC policy and NIH guidelines. One mouse was found paralyzed and alive in the dead-animal cooler.

lina University and Scott Plous of Wesleyan University, in which 73.9 percent of researchers who were polled supported the inclusion of rats and mice under the AWA and 67.9 percent supported inclusion of birds. An informal survey conducted by Dr. Harry Rozmiarek, Chief Laboratory Animal Medicine Veterinarian at the University of Pennsylvania also shows the overwhelming support of laboratory animal veterinarians. Several researchers present at NABR's national conference in May of last year reported that a poll, by show of hands, revealed that the vast majority of those in attendance supported inclusion of birds, rats and mice under the AWA, but the Association quickly denied any such survey took place.

NABR convinced Helms that Congress never intended the AWA to provide protection to these animals despite 30 years of clear legislative intent, the law itself, and judicial affirmation of that law. Former US Senator Bob Dole, who supported the 1970 amendment to the AWA and sponsored its 1985 amendments, wrote in support of including birds, rats and mice under the Act stating "that the AWA applied to 'all warm blooded animals,' we certainly did not intend to exclude 95 percent of the animals used in biomedical research laboratories."

As Helms stood on the Senate floor and professed that there was no need for AWA protection, multiple reports of animal mistreatment and abuse surfaced at major research institutions/universities, shining more light on the urgent need for USDA oversight. Reports from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), University of Connecticut and the University of California at San Francisco detail horrendous apparent violations of National

Institutes of Health guidelines. In fact, videotape recorded between October 2001 and April 2002 and released by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals shows a UNC-CH researcher using scissors to cut the heads off conscious, unanesthetized young rats before removing their brains. On the tape he states that he knows this is a violation of his protocol submitted to the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, but ignores it for his convenience. The video also shows an apparent lack of adequate veterinary care with numerous moribund rodents left suffering until they died. Repeatedly, mice, who were supposed to have been killed, were found alive in the dead animal cooler and a staff person describes how he found “a whole slew of rats” alive in the cooler.

At the University of Connecticut rats were found dead and dying in a room that was 94°F. Chickens were left without proper air circulation and suffocated. In April 2001, two of four crates of newly received mice were damaged and open with mice dead and missing. An employee at the University of California in San Francisco anonymously reported “For the third time in just over one month, live mice were found in the dead animal freezer, indicating improper euthanasia technique (failure to follow CO₂ narcosis, with physical method such as cervical dislocation).”

The numbers of birds, rats and mice being used in research is expected to grow exponentially with use of transgenics and other new avenues of research. Now, more than ever, protections are needed to ensure humane treatment of the tens of millions of animals used for experimentation, and to prevent scientific fraud as a result of poor care, neglect or abuse of the animals. One would hope that the scientific research community and Congress would realize that NABR is not representing the interests of scientific advancement or humane animal care, but is in fact detrimental to both. 🐾



PETA


Protocols at the UNC forbid tumors larger than 2 cm, however, it was common to find mice whose tumors were much larger.

CORRECTION: In the 2002 Spring Quarterly, the photograph that appeared with “Forcibly Breaking the Maternal Bond” was taken by Peter Hamilton.

COMFORTABLE QUARTERS *for Laboratory Animals*

Edited by Viktor and Annie Reinhardt
Animal Welfare Institute, Ninth Edition, 2002
ISBN: 0-938414-02-X; 114 pages

AWI has completed a publication of a new edition of *Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals* to promote the humane housing and handling of the millions of animals used each year in research facilities. Edited by AWI’s scientific advisor, Dr. Viktor Reinhardt and his wife, Annie, this is AWI’s ninth edition of the book, which was first



published in 1955. We provide copies free on request to scientific institutions, members of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees, veterinarians, and architects. It is available to others at cost price, \$5.00.

This volume is an essential tool to ensure that each species used in biomedical research or testing is housed appropriately and cared for with the greatest attention to the animals’ welfare. As Professor David Morton, Head of the Centre for Biomedical Ethics at England’s University of Birmingham, notes in his Foreword, “attempting to meet [animals’] needs and avoiding adverse mental or physical states, such as boredom, frustration, pain, distress, can only be to the benefit of both the animals and science.”

The new edition comes out at a pivotal time in the quest to achieve humane treatment of animals in laboratories—a time when Congress has legislated the biologically and scientifically indefensible notion that rats, mice, and birds are not animals deserving minimal care under the law. As the Reinhardts aver in their Introduction, “We see no scientific, ethical or logical justification for this seemingly arbitrary justification.”

This comprehensive 114-page book includes chapters on comfortable quarters for mice, gerbils, rats, hamsters, guinea pigs, rabbits, cats, dogs, primates, pigs, sheep, cattle, horses, chickens, amphibians, and reptiles. 🐾

AWI's Pig Husbandry Program Sets a National Standard

A modest collaboration that began in 1997 between the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) and one family farmer has, in 2002, become a national program with nearly 200 farmers adhering to AWI's Humane On-Farm Pig Husbandry Standards. Although the standards were developed to preserve the welfare of pigs, they appeal to an array of organizations with diverse interests.

Nowhere was this more apparent than in Manhattan, on May 9, 2002, when America's leading chefs and environmentalists gathered to endorse AWI's standards. The press event, held at Blue Smoke/Jazz Standard, included an overview of AWI's standards and footage contrasting sow factories with humane farms. Paul Willis, a farmer from Niman Ranch, one of the nation's leading purveyors of products from humane family farms, and Bill Niman, co-founder of Niman Ranch, testified that AWI's standards are the best for both animals and farm families. Leaders from Waterkeeper Alliance, Slow Food USA, Chefs Collaborative, Earth Pledge Foundation and Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE) announced why they endorse AWI's standards. These groups recognize the importance of protecting pig welfare, but they see additional merit in the standards: protecting water quality, revitalizing a culture of traditional, sustainable family farms and protecting the effectiveness of antibiotics in human and veterinary medicine. Chef Michael Romano made an impassioned statement:

"Good morning! I am Michael Romano, one of the proprietors of Blue Smoke/Jazz Standard, and along with my partners, Danny Meyer, David Swinghamer, Paul Bolles-Beaven, Richard Coraine, as well as our Executive Chef Ken Calaghan, please allow me to welcome you wholeheartedly to our new restaurant. We are very pleased to host this breakfast.



Union Square Cafe

Michael Romano, chef-partner at Blue Smoke/Jazz Standard in NYC, chooses humane products.

"It strikes me that what you all are about here is some terribly important work....I took a wonderful visit to the Iowa home of Paul Willis and his family. I was very impressed not only by the gracious hospitality of my hosts, but also by the pigs we met out in Paul's fields. And I use the word 'met' intentionally because it felt like a genuine meeting, a connection even, with animals living as they were meant to live.

"You know...I decided, and I wish more

May 9th Statement Excerpts

"It is a pleasure for us at Earth Pledge to support AWI's initiative and to endorse the standards that will help consumers know how the animals they are eating have been treated. I applaud AWI and Niman Ranch for offering us opportunities to buy food that is good for us, good for the environment and good for the animals as well." —Leslie Hoffman, Executive Director, Earth Pledge Foundation

"By signing on to AWI's standards, GRACE is saying consumers do have a choice. Co-ops and companies like Niman Ranch are springing up all over the country, where independent family farmers are raising animals humanely, respecting the environment, and are offering healthy, high quality meat. GRACE is proud to stand here today with the future of our food." —Diane Hatz, Communications and Marketing Director, GRACE

"We can't do this work alone. The issues are very complex and not simply reduced down to easy terms like organic or natural...Busy in our kitchens cooking for our patrons, we look to organizations like the Animal Welfare Institute and Waterkeeper Alliance to provide us with tools upon which to base our purchasing....That is why we are happy to have AWI's protocols, to endorse them and to distribute them to our members." —Peter Hoffman, National Chair, Chefs Collaborative

"AWI's agenda is reasonable and workable—their standards require that pigs be allowed to behave naturally and be raised by independent family farmers. Waterkeeper Alliance is proud to endorse AWI's humane husbandry standards." —Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., President, Water Keeper Alliance

"...The time has come for people to start demanding information about where their food comes from and how it is raised. AWI standards will help consumers understand more and feel assured that what they are eating deserves the title of nourishment." —Patrick Martins, President, Slow Food USA

people would, that if we feel it is our right to raise animals for our consumption, then we are charged with the duty to do so responsibly, humanely, and with respect for the sentient beings that these creatures are. I thank you all for leading this good fight."

In addition to groups involved in the May 9th event, Public Citizen and New England Livestock Alliance have endorsed AWI's husbandry standards. 🐾

Considering Cruel Chicken Confinement

In May, Yale University convened a unique conference examining “The Chicken: Its Biological, Social, Cultural, and Industrial History From Neolithic Middens to McNuggets.” The raising of chickens for eggs or meat by corporate agribusiness results in terrific cruelty for the birds, threats to public health and factory workers, and the systematic degradation of the environment. The Yale conference explored these consequences and discussed examples of alternative, humane, and sustainable farming methods.

Like her wild ancestors, today’s domestic chicken is a nestbuilder. When hens were first confined to brutal cages in the 1920s, a small nesting area was built into the cage. In the 1930s, cages for individual hens were introduced—without a nest area. By the 1950s, wire cages with 3-6 birds in each, arranged in tiers, became commonplace. Cruelty became institutionalized in the keeping of hens for commercial egg production. Today, once-common small, outdoor flocks and barns with nest boxes and perches that took biology into account, allowing the birds to build nests, dustbathe, preen, stretch their legs and extend and flap their wings are a rarity. The denial of the birds’ natural behavior and movement has led to decades of suffering from osteoporosis and muscle weakness to bone breakage when hens are removed from cages, transported to slaughter, then cruelly shackled and hung for slaughter.

The Yale conference represents an admirable start toward recognizing the barbaric cruelty and suffering inflicted upon chickens by humans, hopefully with a view toward rectifying this unfathomable misery. For more information about the conference, visit <http://www.yale.edu/agrarianstudies/chicken/index.html>. 🐾



These hens, imprisoned for life in battery cages, can never fulfill their inborn nature as recorded in The Bible: “Even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings.” Matthew 23:37

Animal Factories Don’t Want You to See Their Cruelty

State legislators in Illinois and Missouri recently had a lesson in American democracy when they introduced legislation that would have taken away an important piece of basic American freedom—the public’s right to know. These legislators had hoped to deny public access to an industry impacting millions of animals and people, but their attempt was quickly quashed.

Earlier this year legislation quietly passed the Illinois and Missouri State Houses that would have made it illegal for anyone, including the press, to photograph or videotape animal factory operations for any reason. The authors of the legislation and its supporters in the state Farm Bureaus convinced other legislators that this bill was crucial to ensure the future of agricultural “research,” but in reality they wanted to deflect public attention from the atrocities being committed on animals and to the fouling of the food supply behind the closed doors of animal factories.

Fortunately what the authors of this bill feared the most is exactly what brought about its demise—public awareness. As soon as the public and the media became aware of the scheme, it failed in the Senate. Instances like this show the

importance of keeping the public informed about what is taking place in these animal factories and within our political system. However, much more needs to be done. The public should demand that the doors to these factories be thrown open to expose wanton animal cruelty and the reckless attitude of those playing with America’s food supply. 🐾

Congress Wants the Humane Slaughter Act Enforced

Although the Federal Humane Methods of Slaughter Act was enacted in 1958 to ensure that animals are rendered unconscious prior to slaughter, the enormous increase in line speed demanded by big slaughterhouses means cattle and pigs are often fully conscious when being skinned and cut up. Now, Congress is demanding that the United States Department of Agriculture enforce the law properly. A Resolution was included in the just-passed contentious farm bill calling on the Secretary of Agriculture to track violations of the Humane Slaughter Act “and report the results and relevant trends annually to Congress.” The Amendment was based on S. Con. Res. 45 introduced by Senator Peter Fitzgerald (R-IL) to prevent the torture of animals killed for food. 🐾



Vincent Laforet/The New York Times

"A FOWL-FELINE NONAGGRESSION PACT" *The Chicken meets Bruiser, a stray tomcat, for a peaceful lunch of cat food.*

15,500,000 Laying Hens at Stake

On April 22, 2002, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Director Christopher Jones proposed revocation of Buckeye Egg Farm's (BEF) 15 wastewater permits. The permits allow BEF to operate legally 125 facilities at four locations, which confine a total of 15,500,000 laying hens in battery cages. BEF also operates a hatchery and breeding barns. This unprecedented action is in response to a culmination of significant, ongoing compliance problems at all BEF facilities. "For years, citizens and the environment have suffered as a result of the company's poor management and broken promises," Jones said.

The proposed action would have become final on May 23, 2002. However, on May 22, BEF filed an appeal, and it can continue to operate while the appeal is pending. A hearing is expected in July. For the sake of the hens, the environment, and the health of the people that live near the factories, BEF should be banned expeditiously from Ohio as it has been from Germany, where Buckeye Egg Farm's owner, Anton Pohlmann, is prohibited for life from operating such an establishment because of his great cruelty to hens. (See Winter 2001 *AWI Quarterly* and Fall 2001 *AWI Quarterly*.) 🐾

My Fine Feathered Friend

By William Grimes
North Point Press, 2002
ISBN 0-86547-632-2; 85 pages; \$15.00

BY CHRISTINE STEVENS

The wonderful story told by William Grimes, a well-known restaurant critic for *The New York Times*, was indeed worthy of publication as a separate book. However, the book is profusely illustrated with cartoon-like drawings that add nothing to the charm of the original article.

In the original *New York Times* article, "It Came. It Clucked. It Conquered," a huge color portrait of "The Chicken," measuring 12" x 7.5," on the front page of *The New York Times* food section did full justice to the bluish tint in the black hen's plumage and to her golden eye.

Mr. Grimes received a tremendous amount of mail with respect to The Chicken. In his second article, "Lost: One Black Chicken. Owners Bereft," he wrote: "My mailbag filled to the bursting point with letters offering advice on the proper care and feeding of chickens, along with fascinating bits of chicken arcana....Never have so many



worried so much about one hen....The media jumped in. National Public Radio quizzed me about the chicken for one of its weekend programs....The Associated Press sent a photographer to capture the chicken's many moods. Actually, she had two moods, but this photographer got both of them."

Mr. Grimes confessed: "My life was spinning out of control. For John Reed it was the Bolshevik Revolution. For Woodward and Bernstein it was Watergate. For me, it was The Chicken, the story that surpassed the sum total of every other story I have ever written. But then it all stopped." Was it a bowdlerization of Farrar, Straus and Giroux that caused this most hilarious

and delightful passage of all to be deleted from the book?

Mr. Grimes concludes his latest article with this thought: "If anyone happens to see a fat black hen, tell her this for me. There's a light in the window, and a warm nest at the base of the pine tree." 🐾


Jose Lutzenberger, a Man of Principle and Wisdom

Dr. Jose Lutzenberger, environmental hero, family farm advocate, and opponent of multinational trade agreements, died on May 14, 2002 at 75. Dr. Lutzenberger, who had a degree in chemical engineering, worked for a German chemical company until he asked the owner of an industrial-size orchard if he wasn't afraid to eat the apples after they were sprayed with pesticides. The owner replied that he didn't eat the fruit himself but only sold it to other people. When he heard this Lutzenberger immediately resigned.

An outspoken critic of modern agribusiness, Dr. Lutzenberger penned a scathing critique in 1998 entitled, "The Absurdity of Modern Agriculture—from Chemical Fertilizers and Agropoisons to Biotechnology." In it, he railed against the unsustainable nature of modern agriculture, which employs practices that "increasingly degrade the environment and impoverish biodiversity." He noted that "In the case of mass animal rearing for meat and eggs the methods are downright destructive, much more food for humans is destroyed than is produced." Dr. Lutzenberger wrote, "And then, in the chicken concentration camps and egg factories as well as the modern pig dungeons the poor creatures live under conditions of extreme stress."

He was equally critical of unsustainable forestry practices that destroy forests, particularly in the Amazon rainforest of his native Brazil. "Today in my country, Brazil, we are flooding thousands of square kilometers of pristine rainforest to make electricity for three mills that export aluminum," he lamented. "There is hardly a patch on this Earth that we are not yet in some way exploiting or getting ready to exploit for our orgies of consumption."

As so many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) watch the expansion of free-trade zones around the world, particularly throughout the Americas, Dr. Lutzenberger assessed the impacts of these agreements: "We must realize that all these new free-trade agreements, NAFTA, GATT, and so on, were not made to benefit ordinary people. They were conceived by the powerful for the powerful. Trans-



Fundação Gaia

Dr. Lutzenberger is considered widely to be the father of Brazil's Environmental Movement.

national corporations need global markets, not only to get cheap resources from the Third World, but also to destroy within their own countries the social conquests of their workers."

In 1971, Dr. Lutzenberger helped found Agapan, Brazil's first environmental NGO and later, in 1987, started another group called Gaia (<http://www.fgaia.org.br>). In 1988, he won the Right Livelihood Award, established as an alternative to the Nobel Prize. In 1990, he accepted a position within the Brazilian government as Special Secretary for the Environment.

He will be missed greatly. His words live as a constant reminder for us to rethink the way in which we develop as a society. Dr. Lutzenberger proclaimed, "We must learn to look at Nature, at Creation, as something sacred of which we humans are only a part—or we will have no future. We need a new, actually very old, holistic ethics, an ethics of reverence for life in all its forms and manifestations." 🐾

Bequests to AWI

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

I give, devise and bequeath to the Animal Welfare Institute, located in Washington, D.C., the sum of \$ _____ and/or (specifically described property).

Donations to AWI, a not-for-profit corporation exempt under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), are tax deductible. We welcome any inquiries you may have. In cases where you have specific wishes about the disposition of your bequest, we suggest you discuss such provisions with your attorney.

Corral the Coral Trade

Beneath ocean surfaces across the globe lives a vibrant world of coral reef ecosystems, perhaps the most colorful, biologically diverse wildlife areas in the world. The reefs are home to thousands of tropical fish, invertebrates, and other species.

Coral reefs and their myriad denizens, however, are overexploited globally. According to *Reefs at Risk*, published by the World Resources Institute (WRI), over half of the world's reefs are threatened by coastal development, inland and marine pollution, and destructive fishing practices, including cyanide fishing. Cyanide is squirted at fish near reefs, temporarily stunning them for easy collection but killing the coral. Divers must sometimes hammer reefs apart to get to the fish in their crevices. Cyanide fishing has been used for decades to capture fish for the global aquaria trade and, increasingly, for restaurant markets in Asia. WRI estimates that "Selected and plucked live from a restaurant tank, some species can fetch up to \$300 per plate, and are an essential status symbol for major celebrations and business occasions."

Another major contributing factor to the reefs' demise is international trade. The United States Department of the Interior contends, "Coral reef re-

sources [coral, reef fish, live rock, etc.] traded internationally supply a wide number of markets and industries, including the seafood industry, live food fish markets, the aquarium trade, and the pharmaceutical and research industries." The trade is enormously lucrative. In one 2001 case, a California man pled guilty to conspiring to traffic in one hundred tons of coral and live rock from reefs off Hawaii with a reported value of over one million dollars.

A coordinated global effort is essential to protect coral reefs long-term. In the United States, President Clinton signed an Executive Order in 1998 "to preserve and protect the biodiversity, health, heritage, and social and economic value of US coral reef ecosystems and the marine environment." The Order established a Coral Reef Task Force to map and monitor US coral reefs, research the causes of their degradation, and develop coherent recommendations to prevent this destruction.

A similar effort is underway in East Africa, where reefs around Kenya, the Seychelles, and Madagascar are at risk from coastal development, dynamite fishing, sewage, and the souvenir trade. One goal of the African strategy is to fund the training of local people in skills to allow them to benefit financially from



NOAA

a reef-based ecotourism industry without harming the reefs themselves.

Through tourism (for snorkelers and scuba divers, for instance) and other uses, coral reefs may bring local communities revenues that climb into the hundreds of billions of dollars annually. 🐾

Above photo: Red searod rises from an underwater mountain of sponge and coral.



ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3650, Washington, DC 20027

Return Service Requested

Non-Profit Org.
**US POSTAGE
PAID**

Washington, DC
Permit No. 2300

