7 THINGS YOU DIDN’T KNOW ABOUT HSUS (THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES)

1. THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES (HSUS) IS A “HUMANE SOCIETY” IN NAME ONLY, SINCE IT DOESN’T OPERATE A SINGLE PET SHELTER OR PET ADOPTION FACILITY ANYWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES. During 2006, HSUS contributed only 4.2 percent of its budget to organizations that operate hands-on dog and cat shelters. In reality, HSUS is a wealthy animal-rights lobbying organization (the largest and richest on earth) that agitates for the same goals as PETA and other radical groups.

2. BEGINNING ON THE DAY OF NFL QUARTERBACK MICHAEL VICK’S 2007 DOGFIGHTING INDICTMENT, HSUS RAISED MONEY ONLINE WITH THE FALSE PROMISE THAT IT WOULD “CARE FOR THE DOGS SEIZED IN THE MICHAEL VICK CASE.” The New York Times later reported that HSUS wasn’t caring for Vick’s dogs at all. And HSUS president Wayne Pacelle told the Times that his group recommended that government officials “put down” (that is, kill) the dogs rather than adopt them out to suitable homes. HSUS later quietly altered its Internet fundraising pitch.

3. HSUS’S SENIOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDES A FORMER SPOKESMAN FOR THE ANIMAL LIBERATION FRONT (ALF), A CRIMINAL GROUP DESIGNATED AS “TERRORISTS” BY THE FBI. HSUS president Wayne Pacelle hired John “J.P.” Goodwin in 1997, the same year Goodwin described himself as “spokesperson for the ALF” while he fielded media calls in the wake of an ALF arson attack at a California veal processing plant. In 1997, when asked by reporters for a reaction to an ALF arson fire at a farmer’s feed co-op in Utah (which nearly killed a family sleeping on the premises), Goodwin replied, “We’re ecstatic.” That same year, Goodwin was arrested at a UC Davis protest celebrating the 10-year anniversary of an ALF arson at the university that caused $5 million in damage. And in 1998, Goodwin described himself publicly as a “former member of ALF.”
HSUS RAISED A REPORTED $34 MILLION IN THE WAKE OF HURRICANE KATRINA, SUPPOSEDLY TO HELP REUNITE LOST PETS WITH THEIR OWNERS. BUT COMPARATIVELY LITTLE OF THAT MONEY WAS SPENT FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE. Louisiana’s Attorney General shuttered his 18-month-long investigation into where most of these millions went, shortly after HSUS announced its plan to contribute $600,000 toward the construction of an animal shelter on the grounds of a state prison. Public disclosures of the disposition of the $34 million in Katrina-related donations add up to less than $7 million.

AFTER GATHERING UNDERCOVER VIDEO FOOTAGE OF IMPROPER ANIMAL HANDLING AT A CHINO, CA SLAUGHTERHOUSE DURING NOVEMBER OF 2007, HSUS SAT ON ITS VIDEO EVIDENCE FOR THREE MONTHS, EVEN REFUSING TO SHARE IT WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. HSUS’s Dr. Michael Greger testified before Congress that the San Bernardino County (CA) District Attorney’s office asked the group “to hold on to the information while they completed their investigation.” But the District Attorney’s office quickly denied that account, even declaring that HSUS refused to make its undercover spy available to investigators if the USDA were present at those meetings. Ultimately, HSUS chose to release its video footage at a more politically opportune time, as it prepared to launch a livestock-related ballot campaign in California. Meanwhile, meat from the slaughterhouse continued to flow into the U.S. food supply for months.

ACCORDING TO A 2008 LOS ANGELES TIMES INVESTIGATION, LESS THAN 12 PERCENT OF MONEY RAISED FOR HSUS BY CALIFORNIA TELEMARKETERS ACTUALLY ENDS UP IN HSUS’S BANK ACCOUNT. The rest is kept by professional fundraisers. And if you exclude two campaigns run for HSUS by the “Build-a-Bear Workshop” retail chain, which consisted of the sale of surplus stuffed animals (not really “fundraising”), HSUS’s yield number shrinks to just 3 percent. Sadly, this appears typical. In 2004, HSUS ran a telemarketing campaign in Connecticut with fundraisers who promised to return a minimum of zero percent of the proceeds. The campaign raised over $1.4 million. Not only did absolutely none of that money go to HSUS, but the group paid $175,000 for the telemarketing work.

RESEARCH SHOWS THAT HSUS’S HEAVILY PROMOTED U.S. “BOYCOTT” OF CANADIAN SEAFOOD—ANNOUNCED IN 2005 AS A PROTEST AGAINST CANADA’S ANNUAL SEAL HUNT—IS A PHONY EXERCISE IN MEDIA MANIPULATION. A 2006 investigation found that 78 percent of the restaurants and seafood distributors described by HSUS as “boycotters” weren’t participating at all. Nearly two-thirds of them told surveyors they were completely unaware HSUS was using their names in connection with an international boycott campaign. Canada’s federal government is on record about this deception, saying: “Some animal rights groups have been misleading the public for years ... It’s no surprise at all that the richest of them would mislead the public with a phony seafood boycott.”
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The Bitter Taste of Animal Activism
A Short Course in Animal Rights Strategy

Question: What do dog breeders, cattle ranchers, deer hunters and draft horse enthusiasts all have in common? (Cue game-show waiting music while we contemplate.)

Answer: They are all under attack by animal rights groups—as is anyone who owns, works with, exhibits, researches, eats, or otherwise uses animals in any way.

The campaign waged by the animal rights movement is global, prolonged, continuous and all-inclusive. During the last 50 years the movement has made significant inroads into American life and culture, bringing “Meatless Mondays” and “Humane Education” into our school systems, ensuring that 80-90% of our pets are now sterilized before they reach sexual maturity, influencing the steady decline of participation in hunting, bringing significant pressure to bear on scientists conducting lifesaving medical research and successfully hampering animal agriculture by targeting sound, broadly-accepted, expert-endorsed animal husbandry practices via the legislative process. Animal rights specialties and concentrations are now routinely offered in schools of veterinary medicine and law, and attempts have been made to confer upon animals legal status fully equal to that of humans.

Whether we personally see these developments as good or bad, there is no denying the impact on our lives. Each of the examples given illustrates a dramatically altered reality, for all of us—whether we are looking for our next purebred dog, buying meat, eggs or dairy to feed our families, praying for a cure for a loved one’s devastating medical condition or discovering that our favorite hunting spots are now fenced and posted.

Tactically, in every animal use context (medical research, recreational hunting and fishing, circuses and zoos, food production, etc.), the animal rights movement seeks to identify an effective wedge issue or group—a “foot in the door” if you will. Such activities and issues are relatively easily marginalized. They look for an easily demonized activity or setting. Those who earn a living in partnership with their animals are often singled out, as profit is easily shamed—especially profit made “on the backs of poor, helpless animals” until they are “worn out, used up and discarded.”

Any subset of the larger group that has relatively few participants involved, in an activity or discipline about which there is little public knowledge, may serve as a wedge. Activists and followers are able to propagandize against the target group with little to no push-back.

Members of the larger peer groups, somewhat understandably, prefer to believe that those “other” people and pursuits really are a bit suspect, rather than consider that they themselves could suffer the same arbitrary and baseless attacks, simply in different "clothing." Animal rights activism’s leaders look for these weaknesses to exploit, much as any predator goes after the vulnerable, knowing that the rest of the herd will opt for self-preservation and flee.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Adapted with permission of author and publisher. This material is excerpted from an article on the horse carriage controversy by Candace Wray, originally published in The Draft Horse Journal, March 2014, and edited above by Elaine Hanson. Permission is granted to use this material for educational purposes provided credit is given to the author and publisher.