

Regular Meeting

Agenda Item #	3
Meeting Date	June 30, 2008
Prepared By	Jessie Carpenter City Clerk
Approved By	Barbara B. Matthews City Manager

Discussion Item	Resolution Opposing the Abusive Factory Farming Practice Of Force Feeding Ducks and Geese for Foie Gras
Background	<p>Mayor Williams requested that the attached resolution be scheduled for Council consideration and adoption.</p> <p>The resolution opposes the production and sale of foie gras, which is duck or goose liver that has been enlarged by force feeding the birds. The resolution also urges residents not to purchase foie gras.</p>
Policy	The Council may adopt resolutions which express the opinion of the Council and set forth positions in support or opposition of the City Government on a particular issue.
Fiscal Impact	N/A
Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution Opposing the Abusive Factory Farming Practice Of Force Feeding Ducks and Geese for Foie Gras Humane Society of the United States Report: The Welfare of Animals in the Foie Gras Industry
Recommendation	Council to adopt the resolution.
Special Consideration	

Introduced by:

CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

**RESOLUTION 2008-
OPPOSING THE ABUSIVE FACTORY FARMING PRACTICE
OF FORCE FEEDING DUCKS AND GEESE FOR FOIE GRAS**

WHEREAS, “foie gras,” or fattened liver, is a food item made from the livers of overfed ducks and geese. Foie gras production involves force-feeding ducks and geese by placing a tube down their throats and pumping large quantities of food directly into them, causing their livers to become diseased and swell up to ten times the normal size; and

WHEREAS, many experts from around the world have concluded that force-feeding causes pain and suffering, and that this practice is detrimental to the welfare of the birds; and

WHEREAS, the state of California passed a law, to become effective in 2012, making it illegal to sell or produce foie gras, and more than a dozen countries have banned its production; and

WHEREAS, a 2004 Zogby International poll of American adults revealed that 77% agreed that the process of force-feeding ducks and geese in order to produce foie gras should be banned by law in the United States; and

WHEREAS, Whole Foods Market has indicated that it will not sell foie gras, and hundreds of restaurants nationwide have either voluntarily removed foie gras from their menus or pledged to not sell foie gras; and

WHEREAS, virtually all animal protection organizations recognize foie gras as inherently cruel, including Takoma Park-based Compassion Over Killing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the City of Takoma Park, Maryland, opposes the production and sale of foie gras; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Council encourages Takoma Park residents not to buy foie gras in order to avoid supporting this extreme form of animal cruelty.

Adopted this ___ day of _____, 2008.

Attest:

Jessie Carpenter, CMC
City Clerk



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

An HSUS Report: The Welfare of Animals in the Foie Gras Industry

Abstract

The production of *pâté de foie gras* involves force-feeding ducks and geese by placing a long tube down the birds' esophagi and pumping an unnatural quantity of food directly into their stomachs. Force-feeding induces hepatic lipidosis and causes the birds' livers to become diseased and swollen. Substantial scientific evidence suggests that force-feeding causes pain and injury from feeding tube insertion, fear and stress during capture and handling, gait abnormality due to distended livers, pathologies in liver function, and increased mortality. Force-feeding birds to produce foie gras is detrimental to their welfare.

Introduction

Foie gras, French for "fatty liver," is a food item produced from the livers of overfed ducks and geese. The majority of the world's foie gras is now made from duck livers, and approximately 80% is produced in France.¹ In the United States, there are three facilities producing livers for foie gras,²⁻⁴ slaughtering in total more than 400,000 ducks annually.⁵

Birds force-fed for foie gras can suffer from a number of significant welfare problems, including frustration of natural behaviors,⁶ injury,⁷ liver disease, lameness,⁶ diseases of the respiratory and digestive tracts,⁸ and high rates of mortality.⁶

The Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) is the European Union's most authoritative scientific body on farm animal welfare. Members include more than a dozen professors of veterinary medicine and animal science from across Europe.⁹ After a thorough investigation, SCAHAW concluded that "force feeding, as currently practised, is detrimental to the welfare of the birds."⁶

Force-Feeding

Between 10-14 weeks of age, birds on foie gras facilities begin to be force-fed by producers,¹ with ducks usually force-fed twice daily for 12-15 days and geese three times a day for 15-21 days.¹⁰ In some instances, geese may be force-fed six times per day for 13-14 days, in order to reduce the total amount of corn that is used.¹¹ When birds are kept in floor pens, capture and handling for the force-feeding procedure is stressful, as measured by an increase in corticosterone (stress hormone) levels.¹²

The procedure starts with holding a bird by the neck, drawing the animal towards the feeding pipé, thrusting a pipe approximately 20-30 cm (8-12 in) in length down the bird's throat, and initiating the food pumping process.¹³ Corn mash is pushed through the pipe and into the bird's esophagus with an auger or, in large units, via pneumatic pump. At the first force-feeding, 180 g (0.4 lbs) of food is forced into a duck. By the last feeding, the amount is increased to 450 g (1 lb), injected in as little as 2 seconds.¹⁴ Reportedly, if the corn mash becomes lodged in the bird's esophagus, a stick is sometimes used to force it down.¹⁵ This quantity of mash, injected twice daily, is much more food than ducks eat voluntarily.¹⁶

Ducks and geese are natural omnivores.⁶ The corn-based feed force-fed to birds in foie gras production is nutritionally incomplete. According to Yvan Beck, an expert on force-feeding in foie gras production: "The food given to palmipeds [waterfowl] does not cover the physiological needs of this species. It is an unbalanced diet,

designed to artificially cause hepatic lipidosis." Beck explains that if the feed were given under natural conditions, the birds would refuse it, and that the birds could not survive on this diet alone due to the deficiencies that it would lead to in the long term.¹⁷

A chemical analysis of the corn mash used at Hudson Valley Foie Gras in New York established the feed did not meet the nutrient requirements of ducks, being "too low in protein and too high in trace minerals."^{18,19} Ducks reportedly removed from a foie gras farm in California who were presented to a veterinarian for inspection were extremely ill and showed signs of malnutrition.²⁰

After the birds' livers have expanded significantly, the animals are slaughtered and the livers are removed and processed.¹

Liver Disease

The purpose of pre-force-feeding, where access to food is increased to reach higher than normal *ad libitum* consumption, is in part to cause the "onset of liver steatosis"¹ or fatty degeneration—a pathological condition characterized by the presence of abnormally large quantities of fat within cells. The concentration of fat gives foie gras its distinctive taste. The liver of a healthy duck or goose is approximately 5% fat, while the liver of a force-fed bird is about 50-60% fat.²¹⁻²³

Force-feeding causes a rapid increase in the size of birds' livers. Estimates of this change in size vary between six and greater than ten times its original, healthy weight.^{11,23,24} The process changes the biochemical composition of the organ and results in impaired hepatic function.^{25,26}

From the SCAHAW report:

The most obvious change [resulting from force-feeding] is the increase in the number of large fat globules visible in the cells. A limited increase in the presence of fat globules in liver can occur in normal liver in certain conditions but no normal animal has steatosis of the liver to the extent which occurs in all force fed birds. During the force feeding period, liver function is impaired.²⁷

In a sworn affidavit before the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, Bruce Feldmann described the liver disease of three ducks he examined who were reportedly taken from a California foie gras farm: "[T]hese animals suffered from various diseases, including hepatic lipidosis and possibly hepatic encephalopathy, which were brought on directly by the force feeding process they were subjected to."²⁸

When functioning normally, the liver processes fats and filters toxins.²⁸ Hepatic encephalopathy is damage to the brain caused by toxins in the blood that are not filtered as they would normally be by a healthy liver.²⁹

Ian Duncan, Emeritus Chair in Animal Welfare at the University of Guelph, states: "Force feeding quickly results in birds that are obese and in a pathological state, called hepatic lipidosis or fatty liver disease. There is no doubt, that in this pathological state, the birds will feel very ill."³⁰

In surveys cited in the SCAHAW report, 25 pathologists from various countries were asked their opinions of the condition of force-fed livers. Most stated the condition of foie gras livers was pathological. SCAHAW stated that "because normal liver function is seriously impaired in birds with the hypertrophied liver which occurs at the end of force feeding this level of steatosis should be considered pathological."³¹

Defenders of foie gras production sometimes argue force-feeding replicates a natural behavior of wildfowl before migration:¹ Ducks and geese increase their food intake in order to produce fat to fuel their long flights. However, wild ducks and geese go through a very specific set of annual physiological adaptations triggered by changes in day length in order to adjust for increased fat metabolism at this time. Even if they were to be physiologically prepared for migration during the force-feeding period, birds do not eat larger-than-normal

meals as they assimilate energy reserves for migratory flights; rather, they eat many small meals throughout the day.³² Further, the Muscovy duck, from whom most ducks raised for foie gras are derived, does not migrate.³³ SCAHAW concludes: "Hence, whilst the domestic goose might well be adapted to store food before migration, it is less likely that a cross between the domestic duck and the Muscovy duck, the Mulard, has such a potential for food."³⁴

Moreover, normally, fat is not stored in the liver but synthesized in the organ and then stored in adipose tissue and muscles.³⁵ The livers of migrating birds never more than double in size.³⁶ Force-feeding is therefore not analogous to the behavioral and physiological process in which pre-migratory birds engage.

Fear

Behavioral evidence suggests that force-feeding causes fear.³⁷ Ducks show signs of aversion to force-feeding³⁸ and may not voluntarily enter a feeding pen. One study, for example, compared responses of force-fed and non-force-fed ducks to a feeding pen. In general, the non-force-fed ducks went from the home pen into the feeding pen willingly. In contrast, the force-fed ducks had to be driven out of the home pen.³⁹ SCAHAW concludes: "Since the feeding pen was attractive to the birds which were not force-fed, the results indicate that the force feeding pen was not attractive to the force fed ducks and that the procedure might involve an aversive component."³⁹

Injuries

A variety of injuries can occur during force-feeding: injury from handling caused by the tubing of the force-feeding funnel; trauma caused by injecting high-temperature corn mash; inflammation of the neck resulting from too forcible an introduction of the pipe to the throat; bruising or perforation of the esophagus when the pipe is inserted; or asphyxia caused by food improperly forced into the trachea.⁷

Duncan explains: "[T]he regular insertion of a feeding tube down the esophagus several times a day will inevitably lead to damage of the esophagus. When the esophagus becomes damaged, then the painfulness of every force feeding episode will be exacerbated."³⁰

In a declaration submitted to the San Joaquin County District Attorney, Laurie Siperstein-Cook states: "It has been shown on necropsy that the esophagus [*sic*] of force-fed ducks exhibit scarring from the repeated trauma from the wide metal tubes that are pushed down the esophagus during the force-feeding process. Rough handling by the workers doing the force-feeding would exacerbate this trauma to the mucosal surface of the esophagus."²⁸

SCAHAW reports:

Most injuries caused by tissue damage during handling or tube insertion would result in pain. The oropharyngeal area is particularly sensitive and is physiologically adapted to perform a gag reflex in order to prevent fluids entering the trachea. Force feeding will have to overcome this reflex and hence the birds may initially find this distressing and injury may result.⁴⁰

The working group was informed that ducks at the end of the force feeding period can have serious injuries to the oesophagus or, more usually, having [*sic*] clear evidence of tissue damage in the oesophagus. It seems likely that birds have sufficient damage to oesophagus tissue, caused by the force feeding process to have been painful to the birds.⁴¹

Ducks used in foie gras production are prone to broken bones. The SCAHAW report states: "Different lesions can be observed on carcasses. The most frequent are bone fractures. They occur on wing bones, mainly the humerus."⁴² The report continues by explaining that the prevalence of bone fractures due to handling at slaughter for Mulard ducks is between 30-70%.⁴³ Scientists postulate that the problem of broken bones could be

due to changes in homeostasis caused by force-feeding of an abnormal diet, which could affect metabolism of calcium and phosphate and subject birds to osteopathy, "making their bones more fragile or even more painful."⁴⁴

Greg Harrison, Diplomate of the American Board of Veterinary Practitioners and the European College of Avian Medicine and Surgery agrees: "The lack of sufficient protein, vitamins and minerals (calcium) leads the young birds' rapidly growing bones to be structurally flawed (osteodystrophy). This leads to bending and breaking (rickets)."⁴⁵

Lameness

Some force-fed birds are unable to stand. SCAHAW found that force-fed birds with "expanded livers had difficulty in standing and their natural gait and ability to walk were severely impaired." This is assumed to be because of the gross changes in body anatomy caused by the force-feeding. The great expansion of the liver seems to force the birds' legs out to the side, placing undue stresses on the birds' leg joints.³⁷

Feldmann examined two ducks reportedly from the California foie gras operation and noted: "The legs of both ducks also appeared swollen, and the bottoms of the feet were encrusted with ulcerated calluses. It appeared that the act of walking (or attempted walking) caused the ducks considerable pain, and they therefore avoided it when possible."⁴⁶

Siperstein-Cook also found foot and leg disorders and declared that ducks kept on wire surfaces "will develop foot sores that lead to the infection called bumblefoot. This is a painful condition that can progress into the joint of the foot causing pain and difficulty walking."²⁸ Bumblefoot has also been found in ducks reportedly from New York foie gras operations.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹

Bone and skin disorders linked to the nutritional deficiencies in the diet of force-fed birds may exacerbate the problem. Harrison explains:

[Nutritional] imbalances also lead to a skin disorder known as hyperkeratosis (thinning, flaking, excess callus formation, slow healing). The bone pain combines with the lethargy from the toxins and leads to further immobilization of the bird. This lack of exercise leads to poor circulation in the feet. These factors combine with the hyperkeratosis to allow ulcers to form on the bottom of the feet. These become infected, red and swollen. Pain and bacterial toxins further complicate the situation.⁴⁵

Other Diseases

Force-fed birds suffer from a variety of diseases. One poultry handbook states:

Force-fed animals are fragile animals, and the accidents or illnesses during the course of this operation are many and varied: anoxemia, due to insufficient aeration; toxemia, which is an intoxication of the blood; cirrhosis of the liver; candidosis, which is provoked by a yeast which profits from esophageal inflammations (due to the feeding tube, for example); feeding tube injuries, caused by clumsiness, which can go as far as the bursting of the crop; "blue thigh", due to internal muscular hemorrhages provoked by a deficiency in vitamin K and poor manipulation of the animals.⁵⁰

A guide to diseases of waterfowl notes: "The digestive pathology of the goose and the duck in the midst of force-feeding contains distinct causes linked to the operation of force-feeding, to latent parasitism and to bacterial or fungal infections." Diseases suffered by force-fed ducks and geese include "[i]njuries; bowel obstruction; indigestion; tympanism; parasitism; amidostimosis; epomidostimosis; spirurosis; enteritis; intestinal indigestion; fibrosis of the liver; hypoglycemic coma; bronchial obstruction."⁸

In the section on enterotoxemias, the guide notes: "The determining causes are of nutritional origin. The excess of starch creates a diminishing intestinal pH; it results in an unbalanced microbial intestinal flora favoring the implantation and multiplication of toxin producing germs; clostridia, colibacillus, salmonella...."⁸

Conditions that are rare in healthy birds can become common in force-fed birds: "Mycosis of the digestive tract, caused by *Candida albicans*, can occur frequently in some classes of poultry but not in geese. An exception is force-fed birds, where inflammation of the oesophagus may be caused by the insertion of the corn dispenser. This inflammation can then provide a port of entry for *Candida albicans*."⁵¹ In one study, candidosis was observed in up to 6% of birds.⁴¹ The necropsy of a duck apparently taken from the foie gras farm in California revealed lesions in the esophagus where bacteria and yeast had proliferated.²⁰

Thermoregulatory and respiratory disorders are also common. After force-feeding, ducks pant intensely to vent the excess heat generated by their forced over-consumption of grain: "The problem of thermoregulation which translates into the increase in the open beak frequency is therefore directly linked to force-feeding."⁵² When ducks are kept in individual cages, in which they cannot spread their wings, they are prevented from cooling themselves and consequently pant more and consume more water during the force-feeding period.¹² Some ducks allegedly from New York's Hudson Valley Foie Gras died of aspiration pneumonia, a painful condition resulting from food being pushed into the birds' lungs during the force-feeding process.⁴⁷ Necropsy reports also showed that other ducks alleged to be from the same facility were severely congested, demonstrated signs of bronchiolitis and aspiration pneumonia, and had food material in their lungs.^{48,53}

Veterinary inspection of force-fed ducks reportedly from a California foie gras farm revealed signs of infection, neurologic damage, and impaction of the crop and esophagus with undigested food.²⁰

SCAHAW notes the "effects of force feeding are lethal when the procedures are continued"⁵⁴ and found that "[t]he mortality rate in force fed birds varies from 2% to 4% in the two week force feeding period compared with around 0.2% in non force fed ducks."⁵⁵

Housing

In addition to the serious health issues resulting from force-feeding, birds raised for foie gras production also suffer as a result of their confinement on typical foie gras facilities. Ducks and geese are web-footed birds who primarily live in water. In nature, they are social animals and spend much of their time foraging and maintaining their plumage by bathing and preening.⁵⁶ In foie gras production, however, the birds are housed at high densities and prevented from engaging in natural behaviors.

Both pen and cage systems provide only 900-2,500 cm² (1.0-2.7 ft²) per duck or 3,300 cm² (3.6 ft²) per goose.¹³ A group cage holds four to five ducks or three geese. The walls and floor are made of wire mesh, and the front is composed of metal bars, allowing access to a water trough placed outside the cage. It has no roof and the birds are restrained one at a time for force-feeding. A group pen holds 12 to 15 ducks or 9 geese, and has wire mesh walls and slatted floors. Water is available from a trough placed inside the pen.⁵⁷

Birds raised for foie gras are unable to forage for food and are denied water in which to swim and clean their plumage.⁶ The absence of opportunities to engage in these instinctual behaviors is likely to cause frustration and stress.⁵⁶ Waterfowl are strongly motivated to bathe in water. In an experiment designed to assess their level of motivation, ducks lifted heavily weighted doors in order to gain access to a pen with bathing water. They performed this behavior at least as often as they lifted the weights in order to access a pen with food,⁵⁸ suggesting that the internal drive to swim is as strong as the drive to eat.

On some farms, birds are housed in near darkness, in an attempt to keep them calm. Sonoma Foie Gras in California reportedly keeps its birds in darkened sheds for the two-week force-feeding period.⁵⁹ Darkness likely impairs normal exploratory behaviors and physical exercise.⁴⁰

Conclusion

Expert opinions and an extensive scientific literature have found that force-feeding ducks and geese for foie gras production causes significant welfare issues, including disease, injury, and increased mortality. Animal welfare scientist Christine Nicol, Professor of Animal Welfare at the School of Veterinary Science at the University of Bristol, states: "My view on the production of foie gras is clear and supported by biological evidence. This practice causes unacceptable suffering to these animals....It causes pain during and as a consequence of the force feeding, feelings of malaise as the body struggles to cope with extreme nutrient imbalance, and distress due to the forceful handling. The most extreme distress is caused by loss of control of the birds' most basic homeostatic regulation mechanism as their hunger control system is over-ridden."⁶⁰ From the SCAHAW review:

The Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare concludes that force-feeding, as currently practised, is detrimental to the welfare of the birds....[T]he management and housing of the birds used for producing foie gras have a negative impact on their welfare. It should be noted that these are the only farm animal that are force fed and in some countries this procedure is prohibited.⁶¹

Opinion leaders and the public have reflected these scientific findings. During an interview, Pope Benedict XVI (then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger) said: "Certainly, a sort of industrial use of creatures, so that geese are fed in such a way as to produce as large a liver as possible, or hens live so packed together that they become just caricatures of birds, this degrading of living creatures to a commodity seems to me in fact to contradict the relationship of mutuality that comes across in the Bible."⁶² Social conservative, author, commentator, and political figure Patrick Buchanan said on The McLaughlin Group, "Look, on the foie gras, I think this is manifest cruelty to animals, it seems to me. And it is a brutal thing. And I think I would certainly ban that type of thing being done in this country."⁶³ A 2004 Zogby poll reportedly found that 77% of U.S. adults believe the process of force-feeding ducks and geese to produce foie gras should be banned.⁶⁴

This reaction has been translated into policy. In 2004, the California legislature banned the production and sale of force-fed *pâté de foie gras* in the state on animal welfare grounds.⁶⁵ In 2006, the city of Chicago followed suit, banning the sale of foie gras in restaurants and groceries.⁶⁶ Production has also been banned in more than a dozen countries, where force-feeding has been deemed a violation of national animal welfare laws. These countries include Argentina,⁶⁷ Denmark,⁶⁸ Finland,⁶⁹ Germany,⁷⁰ Israel,⁷¹ Italy,⁷² Norway,⁷³ Poland,⁷⁴ and the United Kingdom.⁷⁵

References

1. Guémené D and Guy G. 2004. The past, present and future of forcefeeding and "foie gras" production. *World's Poultry Science Journal* 60:211-22.
2. Sonoma Foie Gras. www.artisanfoiegras.com/about/. Accessed January 23, 2008.
3. Hudson Valley Foie Gras. www.hudsonvalleyfoiegras.com/about/hvfg.html. Accessed January 23, 2008.
4. LaBelle Farm. www.bellabellagourmet.com. Accessed January 23, 2008.
5. Letter dated March 23, 2006, from C. A. Gargano, Hudson Valley Foie Gras, to Public Authorities Control Board.
6. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
7. Beck Y. 1994. Force-feeding of palmipeds and foie gras production: the global review of a choice made by society. *Licence Interfacultaire en Environnement, Faculty of Sciences, Free University of Brussels*, pp. 39-40. Stroud A, trans.
8. Comiti A. 2006. Rebuttal to the claim by INRA researchers that force-feeding is not harmful to the bird's health and liver, citing: Vilate D. 1989. *Manuel pratique des maladies des palmipèdes*. Nouvelles Editions de Publications Agricoles, pp. 133-9. Comiti A, trans.
9. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). Members. ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scah/members_en.html. Accessed January 8, 2008.

10. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, pp. 19-20). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
11. Buckland R and Guy G (eds.). 2002. Goose Production. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. fao.org/docrep/005/Y4359E/y4359e00.HTM. Accessed April 30, 2007.
12. Guémené D, Guy G, Noirault J, Destombes N, and Faure JM. 2006. Rearing conditions during the force-feeding period in male mule ducks and their impact upon stress and welfare. *Animal Research* 55:443-58.
13. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 21). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
14. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 20). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
15. Finn P. 2000. To Hungarian professor, what's good for the goose is good for the goose liver industry. *The Washington Post*, January 31.
16. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 28). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
17. Council of Europe. 1996. Report on force-feeding by Belgian experts. Permanent Council of the European Convention on the protection of farmed animals (T-AP), 32nd Meeting, Strasbourg, October 8-11, p. 49. Trevaune K, trans.
18. Letter dated March 20, 2006 from Paul Sirols of Dairy One Cooperative, Inc., Ithaca, NY, to Holly Cheever, DVM.
19. Cheever H. 2006. Sworn affidavit by Holly Cheever, DVM, before the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets (Albany, NY, May 8).
20. Feldmann BM. 2006. Sworn affidavit by Bruce Feldmann, DVM, before the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets (Albany, NY, April 8).
21. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, pp. 39, 42). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
22. Molee W, Bouillier-Oudot M, Auvergne A, and Babile R. 2005. Changes in lipid composition of hepatocyte plasma membrane induced by overfeeding in duck. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part B* 141:437-44.
23. Gabarrou JF, Salichon MR, Guy G, and Blum JC. 1996. Hybrid ducks overfed with boiled corn develop an acute hepatic steatosis with decreased choline and polyunsaturated fatty acid level in phospholipids. *Reproduction Nutrition Development* 36:473-84.
24. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, pp. 60, 39), citing: Babile R, Auvergne A, Dubois JP, Benard G, and Manse H. 1998. Reversibilité de la stéatose chez l'oie. 3ème Journées de la Recherche sur les Palmipèdes à Foie Gras, October 27-28, pp. 45-6. ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
25. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 40). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
26. Bogin E, Avidar Y, Merom M, et al. 1984. Biochemical changes associated with fatty liver in geese. *Avian Pathology* 13:683-701.
27. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 61). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
28. Siperstein-Cook L. 2004. Declaration submitted to San Joaquin County District Attorney dated February 20.
29. Olsen GH and Orosz SE. 2000. *Manual of Avian Medicine* (St. Louis, M.O.: Mosby, Inc., p. 175).
30. Duncan IJH. 2004. Statement against force-feeding of ducks and geese. February 4.

31. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 41). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
32. Berthold P. 1993. *Bird Migration: A General Survey* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, p. 93).
33. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 25). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
34. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 26). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
35. Zanusso J, Réminon H, Guy G, Manse H, and Babilé R. 2003. The effects of overfeeding on myofibre characteristics and metabolical traits of the breast muscle in Muscovy ducks (*Cairina moschata*). *Reproduction Nutrition Development* 43:105-15.
36. Beck Y. 1994. Force-feeding of palmipeds and foie gras production: the global review of a choice made by society. Licence Interfacultaire en Environnement, Faculty of Sciences, Free University of Brussels, p. 55. Stroud A, trans.
37. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 34). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
38. Faure JM, Guémené D, and Guy G. 2001. Is there avoidance of the force-feeding of ducks and geese? *Animal Research* 50:157-64.
39. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 33). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
40. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 35). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
41. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 46). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
42. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 45). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
43. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 45), citing: Bénard P, Bengone T, Bénard G, Prehn D, Tanguy J, Babile R, Grimm F. 1996. Démonstration de la réversibilité du gavage chez le canard à l'aide de tests d'exploration fonctionnelle hépatique. Deuxièmes journées de la recherche sur les palmipèdes à foie gras. Bordeaux, CIFOG, INRA, ITAVI, CTCPA Ed., pp. 45-8. ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007
44. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 44). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
45. Harrison GJ. 2006. Sworn affidavit by Greg Harrison, DVM, before the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets (Albany, NY, May 25).
46. Letter dated September 26, 2003, from B. M. Feldmann to San Joaquin County District Attorney.
47. Stone W. 2005. Progress report on Mulard ducks (2), WPU Case #05-38-07A&B, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, December 2.
48. Kincaid AL. 2003. Necropsy report by Anne Kincaid, DVM, of Antech Diagnostics, Lake Success, NY. January 24.
49. Schlafer DH. 2005. Necropsy report by Donald Schlafer, DVM, of Cornell University College of Veterinary Medicine, Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, Ithaca, NY. October 4.
50. Comiti A. 2006. Rebuttal to the claim by INRA researchers that force-feeding is not harmful to the bird's health and liver, citing: Periquet JC. 1999. *Les oies et les canards*. Editions Rustica, p. 105. Comiti A,

- trans.
51. Buckland R and Guy G (eds.). 2002. Goose Production. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Animal Production and Health Paper 154, chapter 14. fao.org/docrep/005/Y4359E/y4359e00.HTM. Accessed April 30, 2007.
 52. Comiti A. 2006. Rebuttal to the claim by INRA researchers that force-feeding is not harmful to the bird's health and liver, citing: Faure JM, Guy G, and Guémené D. 2000. Comportement exprimé par le canard mulard en fonction du mode de logement pendant la période de gavage (Hybrid duck behaviour according to housing during force feeding). Actes des 4e Journées de la Recherche sur les Palmipèdes à Foie Gras, Arcachon, October 4-5, pp. 42-5. Comiti A, trans.
 53. Kincaid AL. 2002. Necropsy report by Anne Kincaid, DVM, of Antech Diagnostics, Lake Success, NY. December 27.
 54. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 62). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 55. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 49). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 56. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 27). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 57. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, pp. 21-3). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 58. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, p. 31). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 59. Brown PL. 2003. Foie gras fracas: haute cuisine meets the duck liberators. The New York Times, September 24.
 60. Letter dated February 3, 2004, from C. Nicol to Lauren Ornelas, Viva USA, opposing foie gras production methods.
 61. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW). 1998. Welfare aspects of the production of foie gras in ducks and geese. For the European Commission (December 16, pp. 65-6). ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/international/out17_en.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2007.
 62. Ratzinger J (Pope Benedict XVI). 2002. God and the World: Believing and Living in Our Time. A Conversation with Peter Seewald. (San Francisco: St. Ignatius Press), p. 78.
 63. Patrick Buchanan on The McLaughlin Group. Taped October 7, 2005; broadcast October 8-9, 2005. mclaughlin.com/library/transcript.asp?id=487. Accessed July 23, 2006.
 64. California Senate Rules Committee. 2004. SB 1520 Bill Analysis, May 6. http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/03-04/bill/sen/sb_1501-1550/sb_1520_cfa_20040506_152512_sen_floor.html. Accessed January 11, 2008.
 65. California Senate. 2008. Senate Bill No. 1520, January 10. http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/03-04/bill/sen/sb_1501-1550/sb_1520_bill_20040929_chaptered.pdf. Accessed January 10, 2008.
 66. Committee on Health, City Council of Chicago. 2005. Amendment of Title 7, Chapter 39 of Municipal Code of Chicago by Addition of New Sections 001 and 005 Prohibiting Sale of Foie Gras by Food Establishments, October 25. www.ward49.com/site/files/322/35116/155427/214511/foie_gras.pdf. Accessed January 11, 2008.
 67. Argentina. 2003. Resolution 413/2003, August 20. www.senasa.gov.ar/contenido.php?to=n&in=1033&ino=1033&io=5369. Accessed January 10, 2008.
 68. Denmark. 1991. Act on the Protection of Animals, June 6. <http://faolex.fao.org/docs/texts/den64193.doc>. Accessed January 10, 2008.
 69. Finland. 1996. Animal Protection Act, April 4. <http://faolex.fao.org/docs/texts/fin11662.doc>. Accessed January 10, 2008.
 70. Germany. 1972. Animal Protection Law, July 24. http://bundesrecht.juris.de/tierschg/_3.html. Accessed January 10, 2008.

71. Supreme Court of Israel. 2003. Foie Gras Verdict, August. Shalev N and Wolfson Y, trans. <http://chai-online.org/en/compassion/foiegras/foiegras.pdf>. Accessed January 10, 2008.
72. Italy. 2001. Legislative Decree, March 26. www.ambiente.it/imprisa/legislazione/leggi/2001/dlgs146-2001.htm. Accessed January 10, 2008.
73. Norway. 1974. The Welfare of Animals Act, December 20. Nordli L and Karlsrud LK, trans. www.dyrebeskyttelsen.no/english/law.shtml. Accessed January 10, 2008.
74. Poland. 1997. Animal Protection Act, August 21. www.internationalwildlifelaw.org/PolandAnimalProtectionAct.html. Accessed January 10, 2008.
75. England. 2000. Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations, August 14. <http://faolex.fao.org/docs/html/uk20834.htm>. Accessed January 10, 2008.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation's largest animal protection organization—backed by 10 million Americans, or one of every 30. For more than a half-century, The HSUS has been fighting for the protection of all animals through advocacy, education, and hands-on programs. Celebrating animals and confronting cruelty. On the Web at humanesociety.org.