

The Editor

Questions about Furs

SIR: As a well known Island business, Carol and Mary Stores' continuing newspaper and television campaign aimed at promoting the sale of genuine fur garments in Hawaii is at best disappointing. Earlier this year, when the items were first offered for sale, a story prepared by Star-Bulletin writer Pierre Bowman (Jan. 29) quoted the stores' fur buyer as stating that "there's been a kind of hunger for beautiful furs . . ." and that "women now see the kind of things they've always loved and adored".

I, for one, am willing to wager that the majority of today's women would love and adore the furs more if they were still attached to their original owners—lynx, beaver, fox, muskrat and others. The sale of wild animal furs may well be legal if they are not derived from species officially listed as "endangered"; however, the more important question seems to be — is it moral and ethical?

Is such a company justified in providing the cash incentive that promotes the inhumane killing of gentle wildlife creatures by crushing their legs in steel traps? And aside from the emotional issue of unnecessary cruelty, is it moral and ethical for a company to deal in such products when we are all becoming more aware of how pressures from man are destroying the earth's remaining wildlife populations?

During writer Bowman's interview, the stores' fur buyer claimed that 85 per cent of the hides used by Revillon Corp. (the supplier) are from "commercially-raised animals". If this is in fact the case, why then is it necessary to continue trapping wild animals for the other remaining small 15 per cent? And if the fur industry, Revillon Corp., specifically, is indeed becoming "very conservation conscious" as it was stated, perhaps answers to the following questions could be provided for both Hawaii's public and the owners of Carol and Mary Stores.

That is: 1. Does Revillon now manufacture or sell, or have they ever manufactured or sold at any of their world-wide outlets garments made from tiger, ocelot, jaguar, leopard, gazelle, vicuna, cheetah or any of the numerous other animals considered to be "endangered" with extinction? and

2. Has Revillon or any of their suppliers or agents ever been convicted or had wildlife products confiscated in connection with any international, national or state law or agreement designed to help protect endangered wildlife species?

If Revillon expects to permanently establish an outlet through Carol and Mary for their merchandise, certainly they have a responsibility to answer these simple questions. Those trapped wild animals whose furs make up Revillon's 15 per cent may not now be listed as "endangered", but if the same destructive exploitation patterns are again followed by the fur industry, they soon will be.

Linda R. Evans