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INTRODUCTION

In 1983, whalers trapped a young male orca in a net off the coast of Iceland.\(^1\) Ignoring the frantic cries of his family, the whalers hauled the young orca out of the ocean and separated him from his family at just two years old.\(^2\) The whale became known as Tilikum.\(^3\)

Tilikum was placed in an enclosed and barren “holding tank” until he was moved to a Canadian marine park.\(^4\) In holding, Tilikum could do little but float aimlessly in his concrete prison, bored and alone.\(^5\) After a year in these conditions, Tilikum was finally freed of his holding tank and flown across the sea to the “rundown” Sealand of the Pacific facility in British Columbia.\(^6\) Alongside two female orcas, Tilikum learned to jump out of the water and perform tricks for food in front of adoring crowds.\(^7\) At night, the three whales were locked into a cramped “module” for up to “fourteen hours” without any light or view of the sky.\(^8\) His two female tankmates spent much of that time scratching and biting Tilikum’s skin to the point where he would be covered in bloody toothmarks by park reopening each morning.\(^9\) Several years passed with the same repetitive routine, until 1991 when Sealand trainer Keltie Bryne slipped into Tilikum’s tank.\(^10\) She would be “the first of three” deaths attributed to Tilikum during his thirty-three-year captivity.\(^11\)

In 1992, Tilikum once again found himself removed from his tank and flown thousands of miles to what would be his new

\(^2\) See David Kirby, *Death at SeaWorld: Shamu and the Dark Side of Killer Whales in Captivity* 49 (2012); see also Blackfish (CNN Films Manny O. Productions 2013) [hereinafter Blackfish].
\(^3\) See Johnson, supra note 1.
\(^4\) Id.
\(^5\) See id.
\(^6\) Id.; see Kirby, supra note 2, at 49.
\(^7\) See Johnson, supra note 1; Kirby, supra note 2, at 49–50.
\(^8\) See Kirby, supra note 2, at 50.
\(^9\) See id. at 49–50.
\(^10\) Johnson, supra note 1.
\(^11\) Id.; see also Blackfish, supra note 2.
and final home – a marine park known as SeaWorld Orlando.\textsuperscript{12} There, Tilikum would become the centerpiece of SeaWorld Park & Entertainment, Inc.’s (“SeaWorld”) captive breeding program, with fifty-four percent of all SeaWorld’s orcas sharing at least some of his DNA.\textsuperscript{13} Tilikum, however, is most famous for his reputation of aggressive behaviors in response to the stressors of captivity, which resulted in two additional fatalities, including the death of the very experienced and beloved trainer Dawn Brancheau.\textsuperscript{14} Following the death of Brancheau, Tilikum spent much of the final years of his life in captivity as he did his early years – alone and in isolation.\textsuperscript{15}

Tilikum’s tragic story is perhaps the most famous of all captive orcas, but it is just one of many. Through the documentary film \textit{Blackfish}, Tilikum’s story brought to light the disturbing and cruel conditions and treatment discussed herein that plague all orcas living in captivity.\textsuperscript{16} Despite increasing public and scientific awareness of their harsh treatment, SeaWorld continues to operate its orca program, which largely falls outside the reach of existing welfare and anticruelty laws. Using SeaWorld as a case study, this Note will argue that existing federal and state legislation fails to protect captive orcas from cruel and harmful treatment while in captivity.

Part I of this Note will address the gaps in federal and state animal welfare and cruelty legislation relevant to captive orcas. Part II will discuss the enactment of the Preventing Animal Cruelty and Torture Act of 2019 (“PACT Act”), the first federal animal cruelty statute.\textsuperscript{17} Part III will use SeaWorld as a case study to test the effectiveness of the PACT Act in criminalizing animal cruelty at the federal level. Finally, Part IV will discuss ways in which Congress could amend the PACT Act or use it as a model for a more comprehensive federal animal cruelty statute and include protections for animals suffering cruel and inhumane treatment in captivity.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} See Johnson, supra note 1; \textit{BLACKFISH}, supra note 2.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Johnson, supra note 1.
\item \textsuperscript{14} See \textit{BLACKFISH}, supra note 2.
\item \textsuperscript{15} See Photograph of Tilikum in Isolation, in Johnson, supra note 1.
\item \textsuperscript{16} See generally \textit{BLACKFISH}, supra note 2; see also \textit{LONG GONE WILD} (Long Gone Wild LLC 2019) [hereinafter \textit{LONG GONE WILD}].
\item \textsuperscript{17} See generally \textit{Pact Act}, 18 U.S.C. § 48.
\end{itemize}
I. RELEVANT GAPS IN FEDERAL AND STATE ANIMAL CRUELTY LEGISLATION

A. Current Federal Legislation is Ineffective at Protecting Captive Orcas

Federal legislation in the area of humane treatment and animal welfare offers minimal protection for animals used for entertainment purposes. For marine mammals, like orcas, animal welfare at the federal level is primarily governed by two statutes: the Marine Mammal Protection Act (cite: See generally 16 U.S.C. §§ 1361–1423h) and the Animal Welfare Act (cite: See generally 7 U.S.C. §§ 2131–2160). Both statutory frameworks fail to hold marine parks accountable by establishing the standards necessary for the captive animals to lead a healthy, high-quality life. Instead, as detailed below, marine parks generally must only provide their animals with the minimum basic needs required to keep them alive to comply with federal law.

(1) Marine Mammal Protection Act

Congress passed the Marine Mammal Protection Act (“MMPA”) in 1972, making the live capture and importation of “marine mammals” and “marine mammal products” illegal without a permit. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (“NOAA”) is delegated the authority to issue permits “for purposes of scientific research, public display, photography for educational or commercial purposes, or enhancing the survival or recovery of a species or stock.” NOAA may issue a permit to a public display facility for the live capture of wild orcas if the organization satisfies three requirements. Specifically, the facility must (1) “offer an education or conservation program based on industry standards,” (2) “[be] open to the public on a regularly scheduled basis,” and (3) “[be] licensed or registered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s

---

19 Id. §§ 1362(12)(A)(i), 1371(a)(1).
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service . . . per the Animal Welfare Act."\(^{21}\)

While the MMPA does regulate SeaWorld’s ability to capture live orcas for display in its marine parks, SeaWorld has not relied on live capture to replenish its “orca stock” since its captive breeding program became a success in the 1980s.\(^{22}\) Moreover, despite the Congressional goal of protecting marine mammals, the MMPA includes no provisions to ensure marine mammals are cared for and humanely treated once taken from the wild for public display.\(^{23}\) Without such provisions, the MMPA offers no help or salvation to a captive orca’s plight.

(2) **Animal Welfare Act**

The Animal Welfare Act (“AWA")\(^{24}\), passed in 1966, is the first and “only federal statute” to address the “care” and “welfare” of animals used for public display and entertainment.\(^{25}\) The AWA, however, is severely limited in both its “scope” and its “enforcement.”\(^{26}\)

The AWA authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish “standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by dealers, research facilities, and exhibitors.”\(^{27}\) Facilities like SeaWorld are considered “exhibitors” and, as such, are subject to the AWA.\(^{28}\) For the United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) to grant SeaWorld a license to display orcas under the AWA, SeaWorld must satisfy all welfare regulations established under the statute’s section 2143.\(^{29}\)

---

\(^{21}\) Id.


\(^{23}\) See id. at 503–504; see generally 16 U.S.C. §§ 1361–1423h.


\(^{27}\) 7 U.S.C. § 2143(a)(1).


\(^{29}\) See id.; see generally 7 U.S.C. § 2143.
The USDA promulgated the standards for the care of marine mammals, which are detailed in 9 C.F.R. Subpart E. Both the AWA and the USDA guidelines only require captive marine mammals be provided with their most basic needs, such as food, water, “shelter,” and “sanitation.” These minimum standards hardly scrape the surface of all the needs that “highly intelligent species,” like orcas, require to maintain a high quality of life. Furthermore, the USDA regulations fail to address enrichment needs for species like orcas, which these species require to maintain adequate psychological health. The minimum guidelines the USDA has developed are often so “vague” that they allow for too much “subjective interpretation.” For example, feeding standards require food “be of sufficient quality and nutritive value to maintain marine mammals in a state of good health.” These guidelines offer no specific nutritional requirements, leaving the interpretation of the “good health” standard up to individual facilities. In the wild, orcas maintain a relatively varied diet of fish, seabirds, seals, sea lions, turtles, and even other whales. Captive orca diets, on the other hand, are limited to frozen fish. Given the ambiguous nature of the USDA regulations, the people who will initially evaluate whether frozen fish satisfies the feeding standards of the AWA are SeaWorld’s own marine biology experts and veterinary staff – employees whose job security largely rests on providing SeaWorld the answers it wants to hear.

31 See 7 U.S.C. § 2143(a)(2)(A); see also Grech, supra note 26, at II.A.i.
32 See also Grech, supra note 26, at II.A;i; see also 7 U.S.C. § 2132(g) (definition of animals included under the AWA).
35 9 C.F.R. § 3.105(a) (2021).
36 See id.
The USDA regulations also establish the size requirements for orca pools,\textsuperscript{39} which rely on four main criteria: (1) “minimum horizontal dimension,” (2) “depth,” (3) “volume” of water, and (4) “surface area.”\textsuperscript{40} Even when minimum pool size standards are met, or even exceeded slightly, concrete tanks can never simulate the vast expanse of the ocean nor provide the space orcas require to “move and behave as they would in the wild.”\textsuperscript{41} Wild orcas can swim upwards of one hundred miles every day in “straight lines.”\textsuperscript{42} In captivity, however, orcas must swim in endless circles around their tank.\textsuperscript{43} This is not only an unnatural swimming pattern but also fails to allow the orcas sufficient exercise and can lead to negative health effects.\textsuperscript{44}

The USDA regulations for the handling of captive animals prohibit the “[d]eprivation of food” for training purposes.\textsuperscript{45} Captive orcas, however, are completely reliant on human trainers for their food.\textsuperscript{46} There are no fish swimming alongside the orcas in their tanks to feed on when they grow hungry.\textsuperscript{47} Trainers rely on food as a positive training reinforcement, as they have limited other means to encourage the orcas to perform.\textsuperscript{48} As such, while it may be unintentional, food deprivation is in fact an integral part of a captive orca’s daily life.

The AWA offers no guidelines in relation to the breeding of captive animals.\textsuperscript{49} Captive breeding programs, therefore, fall outside federal regulation entirely.\textsuperscript{50} While SeaWorld has pledged

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{39} Tierney, supra note 28, at III.B. (describing the regulations’ requirements that pools must be two times “the length of an orca” and “half the length of an orca deep,” based on the size of the largest orca kept in the pool; referencing the requirement that no more than two orcas are to be kept in the same pool unless a facility designs the pool with “an additional 10,851.54 cubic feet of water” per orca).
\item \textsuperscript{40} Vigars, supra note 22, at 504; see 9 C.F.R. § 3.104(b) (2021).
\item \textsuperscript{41} Vigars, supra note 22, at 505.
\item \textsuperscript{42} See Long Gone Wild, supra note 16.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{45} 9 C.F.R. § 2.131(b)(2)(ii) (2021).
\item \textsuperscript{46} See Hargrove, supra note 38, at 40.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{48} See id. at 75.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Vigars, supra note 22, at 505; see generally 7 U.S.C. §§ 2131–60.
\item \textsuperscript{50} See Vigars, supra note 22, at 505.
\end{itemize}
to cease its captive breeding program, there are currently no federal laws preventing it from continuing the practice or guidelines to ensure artificial insemination is conducted humanely. Outside of state legislation and the potential for public outcry, there is nothing holding SeaWorld accountable for keeping its pledge.

Alongside vague statutory and regulatory requirements, the AWA also has a substantial enforcement problem. The AWA grants enforcement authority to USDA, which has “delegate[d]” its duty to enforce the AWA standards to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (“APHIS”). Although APHIS technically possesses enforcement capabilities, the agency is stretched incredibly thin, with only roughly “130” inspectors to inspect “over 8,000” licensed facilities. In addition to personnel deficiencies, the Office of Management and Budget’s (“OMB”) oversight of APHIS inhibits enforcement. If APHIS wishes to take action, it must first obtain approval from OMB, whose mission is in direct conflict with the AWA. Specifically, OMB prioritizes the financial costs of actions taken by federal agencies, not the wellbeing and humane treatment of animals.

Even in circumstances where OMB allows APHIS to perform inspections of licensed facilities, procedures for addressing violations remain severely lacking. When APHIS notes a violation during an inspection, it issues a “warning” to the facility and provides a timeline for the facility to correct the issue. APHIS, however, “does not follow up” on violating facilities to ensure they make the required changes. Instead, if the infraction remains uncorrected, inspectors “simply note the violation again during the next inspection,” and on and on the cycle continues.

---

52 See Vigars, supra note 22, at 505.
53 Jodidio, supra note 25, at 55.
54 See id. at 55–56.
55 Grech, supra note 26, at II.A.i.
56 See id.
57 See id.
58 Jodidio, supra note 25, at 56.
59 See id. at 58.
60 Id.
the AWA does not prevent license renewal to facilities “under investigation,” those with “pending” violations, or those that have already paid substantial fines in relation to repeated violations.\textsuperscript{61} Furthermore, even if APHIS went as far as to “revoke” a facility like SeaWorld’s license under the AWA, the captive orcas would still remain SeaWorld’s property.\textsuperscript{62} In that scenario, nothing prevents SeaWorld from selling its orcas to marine parks in Europe, Russia, or China, subjecting them to continued life in captivity in a facility that is even less-strictly regulated than those in the United States.

\textbf{“[B]eyond financial penalties,” the AWA statute provides little means for APHIS to force violators to adhere to existing regulations.\textsuperscript{63} Unlike most other federal environmental statutes, including the Endangered Species Act, the AWA does not include a citizen suit provision.\textsuperscript{64} Without this, private citizens struggle to meet standing requirements to sue.\textsuperscript{65} On the rare occasion where a private citizen can show standing to file a suit, courts generally give deference to the USDA and dismiss the case.\textsuperscript{66}}

\textbf{B. State Animal Welfare and Cruelty Laws are Ineffective at Protecting Captive Orcas}

Congress designed the AWA to work concurrently with state animal welfare legislation.\textsuperscript{67} Under their police power, states could enact welfare laws and standards far exceeding the AWA’s minimum care guidelines.\textsuperscript{68} The states, however, “have largely failed to act” in this area, leaving much of the job of establishing standards of care for captive animals up to the individual “zoos and aquariums.”\textsuperscript{69} The ultimate goal of zoos and aquariums is to earn a profit.\textsuperscript{70} Therefore, when the cost of high-quality care conflicts

\textsuperscript{61} See id. at 56; see generally 7 U.S.C. §§ 2131–60.
\textsuperscript{62} See Jodidio, supra note 25, at 58.
\textsuperscript{63} Vigars, supra note 22, at 505; see generally 7 U.S.C. §§ 2131–60.
\textsuperscript{64} See Grech, supra note 26, at II.A.i–ii.; Jodidio, supra note 25, at 59.
\textsuperscript{65} See Grech, supra note 26, at II.A.i.; Vigars, supra note 22, at 506.
\textsuperscript{66} See Vigars, supra note 22, at 505.
\textsuperscript{67} See id. at 506.
\textsuperscript{68} See id.
\textsuperscript{69} See id..
\textsuperscript{70} See id.
with profitability, it is unsurprising that animal care can end up compromised.\footnote{179}

In circumstances where states have passed welfare legislation, the inconsistencies from state to state ultimately provide little protection for animals owned by corporations with facilities across the country. For example, SeaWorld has marine parks in California, Florida, and Texas,\footnote{185} and all three states address captive orcas very “differently” under their individual laws.\footnote{73} Texas currently possesses no legislation detailing any minimum standards of care and humane treatment for marine mammals held in captivity.\footnote{74} California recently banned captive breeding for orcas and prohibited their use in theatrical performances, but the state still allows their use for “educational” purposes.\footnote{75} Florida imposes some permitting and inspection requirements for captive animals; however, the state provides no definition or guidance on what constitutes proper housing of marine mammals.\footnote{76}

Every state in the United States has passed some version of an anti-cruelty statute.\footnote{77} However, much like the realm of animal welfare legislation at the state level, a lack of uniformity in anti-cruelty laws exists across the United States.\footnote{78} Each statute differs in what it considers as an “animal,” in what conduct it considers as “cruelty,” and in the types of exemptions it provides.\footnote{79} Some states even exempt entire “classes of animals” from anti-cruelty protections, and only three states have statutes with zero

\footnote{73 See id.}
\footnote{74 See id.}
\footnote{75 See id.}
\footnote{76 See generally Fla. ADMIN. CODE ANN. r. ch. 68A-6 (2022) (establishing requirements for “Captive Wildlife”); Vigars, supra note 22, at 506–07 (citing provisions of the 2017 version of the Fla. ADMIN CODE ANN r., one of which has since been repealed).}
\footnote{77 GRECH, supra note 26, at II.B.}
\footnote{78 See id.}
\footnote{79 See id.}
exemptions. Additionally, local and state police departments are tasked with enforcing state anti-cruelty statutes. Typically, local police do not consider animal cruelty a high-priority crime, and as a result only the most egregious crimes are ever prosecuted.

Ultimately, even if SeaWorld could be found liable under Florida, California, or Texas’s animal cruelty statutes, little would change. Because SeaWorld owns its captive orcas, even if legislated to the point of closure, the corporation could easily transfer their orcas to one of its two remaining theme parks to escape regulation.

C. The “Blackfish Effect” and SeaWorld’s Pledge to End Orca Captivity

In January 2013, a documentary titled Blackfish premiered at Sundance Film Festival. Unknown to producers at the time, the film would go on to launch a grassroots activist movement opposing SeaWorld in what has since been referred to as the “Blackfish effect.” The film documented the story of Tilikum, the captive orca at SeaWorld Orlando who was connected to the death of three people, including experienced trainer Dawn Brancheau in 2010. The documentary looked at Tilikum’s life in captivity and interviewed orca biologists and former SeaWorld trainers in an attempt to determine the cause of Tilikum’s aggressive nature.

---

80 See id.
81 Id.
82 See id.
83 See LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.
84 See BLACKFISH, supra note 2.
87 See BLACKFISH, supra note 2.
88 See generally id. Unlike in captivity, wild orcas are not known for aggressive behavior against humans. See KIRBY, supra note 2, at 3.
Following its premiere at Sundance, the film debuted in theaters and on CNN, generating substantial publicity.\(^{89}\) Public outcry skyrocketed at the film’s depiction of the physical and psychological strains impacting orcas, including shocking footage of “live captures” and sounds of grieving mothers screaming as their calves are taken from them.\(^{90}\) Prior to the release of \textit{Blackfish}, people thought the orcas at SeaWorld were happy and had a positive relationship with the theme park.\(^{91}\) Public opinion, however, changed overnight post-\textit{Blackfish}, drastically impacting SeaWorld’s attendance, stock prices, corporate partnerships,\(^{92}\) and overall reputation.\(^{93}\) Activists and the public mobilized a movement demanding SeaWorld retire its orcas to a seaside sanctuary.\(^{94}\)

After years of public outcry and declining reputation, SeaWorld announced in March 2016 that it would terminate its captive breeding program.\(^{95}\) As such, the orcas currently in SeaWorld’s care will be the last.\(^{96}\) While this pledge represents a positive step forward toward ending orca captivity in the United States, it does little to protect the orcas currently held in captivity at SeaWorld. Furthermore, absent legislation, there is little beyond the threat of additional public outcry that will hold SeaWorld accountable in keeping its pledge.

\textit{D. Post-\textit{Blackfish} Legislation Does Not Protect Orcas Currently in Captivity}

\(^{89}\) See Zimmermann, supra note 86.  
\(^{90}\) See id.; see also \textit{BLACKFISH}, supra note 2. 
\(^{91}\) LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16. 
\(^{92}\) See id.; see also Natasha Daly, Orcas Don’t Do Well in Captivity. Here’s Why, NAT’L GEOGRAPHIC (Mar. 25, 2019), https://www.nationalgeographic.com/animals/article/orcas-captivity-welfare [https://perma.cc/49AC-476X] (stating that Southwest Airlines pulled out of its well-established partnership with SeaWorld and that the Miami Dolphins “severed ties” with SeaWorld following \textit{Blackfish}’s release); Zimmerman, supra note 86 (providing that a number of “musical acts” also canceled scheduled performances at the park). 
\(^{93}\) See generally Zimmermann, supra note 86; LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16. 
\(^{94}\) LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16. 
\(^{96}\) See id.
As the below discussion describes, in response to SeaWorld’s post-Blackfish pledges, legislators in California and Florida sought to take these promises and codify them into law.

(1) The California Orca Protection Act

In 2014, California Assembly Member Richard Bloom introduced a bill that would “end performance-based entertainment” involving orca whales, ban captive breeding programs, and ban any future import or export of orcas in California.97 The goal was to take SeaWorld’s agreement and turn it into a law prohibiting the capture and use of orcas in entertainment.98 Despite substantial opposition from SeaWorld, California Governor Jerry Brown signed the California Orca Protection Act (“CA OPA”) into law on September 13, 2016, making any future captive orca entertainment performances or captive breeding programs illegal in the state of California.99

While the CA OPA prevents any future entertainment park in California from utilizing captive orcas for entertainment purposes, the CA OPA does little to protect the orcas currently in captivity at SeaWorld San Diego, which are grandfathered in under the Act.100 As of 2016, eleven orca whales lived in captivity at SeaWorld’s San Diego.101 These orcas are young, most with decades left to live, and the CA OPA requires no change to their current living conditions.102

Additionally, while the CA OPA technically bans theatrical performances by captive orcas, the Act still allows captive orcas to be used for shows that serve an “educational” purpose.103

---

97 See A.B. 1453, 2015 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2015) (assembly bill text); see also Park, supra note 75; LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.
98 LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.
100 See CAL. FISH & GAME CODE § 4502.5(a)(1)(B); Pallotta, supra note 99.
101 Pallotta, supra note 99.
102 LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16; see CAL. FISH & GAME CODE § 4502.5.
103 CAL. FISH & GAME CODE § 4502.5(a)(1)(B); see also LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.
the enactment of CA OPA, SeaWorld transitioned their theatrical orca whale performances into “educational” “orca encounter[s].”\textsuperscript{104} In January 2020, SeaWorld introduced its latest orca production, \textit{Orca Encounter}; however, the only major changes from the previous productions are the visual elements seen by SeaWorld’s human parkgoers.\textsuperscript{105} SeaWorld revamped the stage at Shamu stadium with waterfalls, artificial boulders, and fake evergreen trees to create a more nature-based aesthetic for the \textit{human} eye.\textsuperscript{106} Nothing, however, has improved the orcas’ conditions.\textsuperscript{107} Their concrete pool is still the same size it’s always been.\textsuperscript{108} They perform the same tricks they always have.\textsuperscript{109} Nearly eight years after the 2013 “pledge,” captive orcas performing circus tricks for an adoring crowd of park visitors remains a focal point at SeaWorld parks.

\textbf{(2) The Florida Orca Protection Act}

In 2018, Florida State Representative Jared Moskowitz attempted to enact the Florida Orca Protection Act (“FL OPA”), modeled after the California Orca Protection Act.\textsuperscript{110} The intention was to ensure that “SeaWorld [was] held to its promise to end orca captivity and extend . . . important protections to other captive-

\textsuperscript{104} \textsc{Long Gone Wild}, \textit{supra} note 16.
\textsuperscript{106} See id.; \textsc{Long Gone Wild}, \textit{supra} note 16 (noting that a large view screen plays footage of wild orcas and ocean scenes to provide the tanks with an artificial connection to the vast expansive ocean).
\textsuperscript{107} Mountain, \textit{supra} note 105.
\textsuperscript{108} See id.
\textsuperscript{110} See Florida Orca Protection Act, H.R. 1305, 2018 Reg. Sess. (Fla. 2018); see also \textsc{Long Gone Wild}, \textit{supra} note 16; see Colleen Weiler, \textit{Florida Orca Protection Act Introduced in Florida State House}, \textsc{Whale and Dolphin Conservation} (Jan. 12, 2018), https://us.whales.org/2018/01/12/florida-orca-protection-act-introduced-in-florida-state-house/ [https://perma.cc/7JG8-DFBA] [hereinafter \textsc{Whale and Dolphin Conservation}].
held orcas in Florida.” Representative Moskowitz wanted to “test [SeaWorld’s] real intent” with its pledge by using its exact language, changing nothing, and turning it “into law.” Not only did the bill merely prohibit what SeaWorld already pledged not to do, but it also benefited SeaWorld by eliminating the possibility of “competition.” The FL OPA would prevent another aquarium or theme park, which had not made the same pledges as SeaWorld, from setting up shop in Florida with captive orca performances and a captive breeding program. “You would’ve thought they would’ve jumped all over that,” Representative Moskowitz stated in an interview for the film Long Gone Wild. “But no, they did the exact opposite.” SeaWorld lobbied hard against the FL OPA because its Florida facility housed its global headquarters and because it feared the negative media attention the bill’s passage could bring the company. Ultimately, the proposed bill failed in the Florida Legislature, leaving both current and future captive orcas unprotected in Florida.

II. ENACTMENT OF THE FIRST FEDERAL ANIMAL CRUELTY STATUTE

A. The Evolution and Legislative History of the PACT Act

111 WHALE AND DOLPHIN CONSERVATION, supra note 108. The FL OPA would also have provided protections for Lolita, the lone captive orca held at Miami Seaquarium in the smallest orca tank in the world. See LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.

112 See id. (“I have taken your exact pledge, word for word. I’ve changed nothing. And I’m just [going to] put it into law. That’s all I’m [going to] do. Because SeaWorld, I don’t want another company to come in and do what you’re pledging not to do.”)

113 See id.

114 See id.

115 See id.

116 See id.


118 Id.
The Preventing Animal Cruelty and Torture ("PACT") Act of 2019\textsuperscript{119} stemmed out of legislation from 1999 and 2010 that attempted to combat a growing trend of creating and circulating videos depicting graphic acts of animal cruelty and torture.\textsuperscript{120} In the late 1990s, animal crushing videos “flood[ed]” the internet.\textsuperscript{121} These crush videos primarily showed women physically “crushing” small animals (i.e., puppies, kittens, bunnies) under stiletto heels while the animals screeched in extreme pain.\textsuperscript{122} In an effort to curb the making and distribution of these disturbing videos, then-President Bill Clinton signed the Depiction of Animal Cruelty Act ("Depiction Act"), the precursor to the PACT Act.\textsuperscript{123} The Depiction Act prohibited interstate sale and distribution of any video depicting live cruelty acts, including intentional “maiming, mutilation, torture, wounding, or killing,” if those actions infringed “Federal law or the law of the State in which the creation, sale, or possession [took] place.”\textsuperscript{124}

In April 2010, the Supreme Court decided the case of Robert Stevens, who created a website selling videos of “pit bulls engaging in dogfights and attacking other animals” and subsequently challenged his 2005 criminal conviction under the Depiction Act, arguing the statute as written violated the First Amendment.\textsuperscript{125} The Supreme Court of the United States ultimately found the statute impermissibly broad and in violation of the First Amendment, noting that the language of the statute at the time
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could arguably have criminalized hunting videos. The Depiction Act was ultimately struck down as unconstitutional by an eight-justice majority. However, in a dissenting opinion, Justice Alito stated “[t]he animals used in crush videos are living creatures that experience excruciating pain.” He believed the Depiction Act was not designed as a means to “suppress speech” but instead to “prevent horrific acts of animal cruelty.”

After the Stevens opinion, Congress sought to draft a new bill that would pass the constitutional constraints set forth in Stevens and once again criminalize videos depicting extreme acts of animal cruelty. To achieve this, House Representatives Elton Gallegly of California and Gary Peters of Michigan co-sponsored the Animal Crush Video Prohibition Act of 2010 (“Crush Act”), which focused exclusively on the creation and distribution of animal crush videos. In the Crush Act, Congress identified that “[t]he Federal Government and the States have a compelling interest in preventing intentional acts of extreme animal cruelty.” After succeeding in the House “by a vote of 416-3,” and passing unanimously in the Senate, then-President Barack Obama signed the Crush Act into binding law on December 9, 2010.

B. Enactment of the PACT ACT

126 See id. at 475–76, 482. The Court explained that the Act applied “to depictions of illegal conduct extended to conduct that is illegal in only a single jurisdiction,” and that “[a] depiction of entirely lawful conduct runs afoul of the bank if that depiction later finds its way into another State where the same conduct is unlawful.” Id. at 475–76. Therefore, the Act could criminalize the sale of a video depicting conduct that was legal in the state where the conduct actually took place and was filmed. The Supreme Court pointed to hunting as an example, as hunting is illegal in the District of Columbia: “[B]ecause the statute allows each jurisdiction to export its laws to the rest of the country, § 48(a) extends to any magazine or video depicting lawful hunting, so long as that depiction is sold within the Nation’s Capital.” Id. at 476.
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While the Crush Act prohibited the “creation” and “sale” of videos depicting animal crushing, it did not criminalize the underlying acts of animal cruelty. Therefore, in the years following the Crush Act’s passage, prosecution for extreme animal cruelty acts largely depended upon state animal cruelty legislation and enforcement. Anticruelty laws vary in their classifications of what constitutes animal cruelty and the harshness of their punishments, resulting in “inconsistent” enforcement across the fifty states.

Acknowledging this gap, Congress turned its attention to enacting a federal animal cruelty statute. Congress aimed to create a statute that would prohibit extreme acts of animal abuse found to be beyond regulation under existing state anticruelty laws. Congressman Ted Deutch co-introduced the PACT Act, intending to make animal cruelty a federal crime. The bill reached the House floor in October 2019 with “301 bipartisan co-sponsors,” reflecting a substantial Congressional commitment to animal welfare. Congressman Chris Smith stated: “The PACT Act will strengthen federal penalties for those who promote and engage in the torture and abuse of animals.” The PACT Act unanimously passed through both the House and the Senate before being signed into law by President Donald Trump in November 2019.
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President Trump signed the PACT Act, Congressman Deutch celebrated the fact that animal cruelty was finally a federal crime in the United States, stating, “animal cruelty is no longer just unacceptable, it is now illegal... Americans have long stood in support of animal welfare protections, and now our national laws reflect these values.”

C. Overview of the PACT Act and its Limitations

The 2019 PACT Act amended 18 U.S.C. section 48 to criminalize certain intentional acts of animal cruelty. Under the statute, it is now “unlawful for any person to purposely engage in animal crushing in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.” The United States Code defines a “person” to “include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies.” Therefore, violators under the PACT Act are not limited to individuals. Criminal charges can be filed against corporations, such as SeaWorld, that contravene the PACT Act.

While Congressman Deutch set out to create a federal statute prohibiting animal cruelty, the PACT Act, as currently written, does not completely fulfill that all-encompassing intention. The PACT Act does not prohibit all acts of extreme animal abuse, but rather only specific acts meeting the definition of “animal crushing.” Animal crushing is defined under 18 U.S.C. section 48(f)(1) to mean “actual conduct in which one or more living non-human mammals... is purposely crushed, burned, drowned, suffocated, impaled, or otherwise subjected to serious bodily injury.” Furthermore, the PACT Act was enacted under Congress’s Commerce Clause power, limiting the Act’s reach to only animal cruelty actions “affecting interstate or foreign commerce.”
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III. SeaWorld Case Study: Could the PACT Act Provide the Answer to Protecting Captive Orcas?

With the enactment of the PACT Act, Congress intended to close the gaps in federal and state legislation regarding the treatment of animals. This section will utilize SeaWorld as a case study to analyze whether Congress accomplished this goal and to investigate whether the PACT Act provides captive orcas protection under federal law.

A. Serious Bodily Injury Element

The PACT Act’s definition of “animal crushing” includes the broad phrase “otherwise subjected to serious bodily injury.”149 The statute defines “serious bodily injury” by providing a reference to 18 U.S.C. section 1365.150 Accordingly, a violator subjects an animal to “serious bodily injury” when that bodily harm implicates “(A) a substantial risk of death; (B) extreme physical pain; (C) protracted and obvious disfigurement; or (D) protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.”151 A person need only subject an animal to injury involving one of the four sub-definitions to be found liable under the PACT Act; however, there are strong arguments, discussed below, that orca captivity satisfies all four.

(1) Substantial Risk of Death

In 1965, Ted Griffin, owner of an aquarium in Seattle, captured a young female orca from the Puget Sound with the intent that she would serve as a “companion” for the aquarium’s male orca, Namu.152 Unfortunately for Griffin, Namu and the young female could not get along, and he found himself with an orca he

149 Id. § 48(f)(1).
150 Id.
152 See HARGROVE, supra note 38, at 28; see also LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16.
needed to unload quickly.\textsuperscript{153} A newly-founded marine park in San Diego, SeaWorld, purchased the young orca from the aquarium in Seattle.\textsuperscript{154} They named her Shamu, meaning She-Namu, and she became the first captive orca to call SeaWorld home.\textsuperscript{155} Shamu did not live long, dying from an infection after just five years in captivity.\textsuperscript{156} While Shamu only lived a few short years, her name “live[s] on” in infamy: for decades, all orcas that performed at SeaWorld went by the stage name “Shamu” in an effort to “immortal[ize]” her and, by association, all captive orcas.\textsuperscript{157}

Behind the curtain, however, there exists a very stark contrast in the lifespan of captive orcas in comparison to wild orcas. In the wild, orcas typically live for upward of fifty, even up to eighty, years.\textsuperscript{158} In contrast, very few captive orcas ever live beyond the age of thirty.\textsuperscript{159} What causes such a drastic disparity in lifespan? For one, captivity itself severely compromises orca health.

Captivity puts orcas at risk of developing infections, which are rarely, if ever, documented in the wild.\textsuperscript{160} Shamu fell victim to this phenomenon,\textsuperscript{161} as she developed “pyometra,” a “hormonal imbalance that causes blood poisoning by allowing bacteria to enter the whale’s uterine lining,” which is practically never seen in wild whales.\textsuperscript{162} This infection ultimately resulted in Shamu’s early death.\textsuperscript{163} Two other orcas in SeaWorld history have died from mosquito bites, another risk to which they likely would not have been exposed in the open ocean.\textsuperscript{164} Specifically, Kanduke contracted St. Louis Encephalitis at SeaWorld Orlando, and Taku contracted West Nile at SeaWorld San Antonio.\textsuperscript{165}
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The severe boredom that orcas experience in captivity drastically exacerbates their risk of infection. In the wild, orcas swim for many miles daily and dive anywhere from one to five hundred feet multiple times per day.\textsuperscript{166} Concrete pools can hardly accommodate such expansive movement and exercise needs.\textsuperscript{167} The average dimensions of orca pools at SeaWorld’s facilities measure “approximately 86 feet by 51 feet” with a depth of just 34 feet.\textsuperscript{168} Growing tired of swimming in circles, captive orcas spend much of their day “logging,” or floating motionless in their pools.\textsuperscript{169} Such a lack of physical exercise can compromise an orca’s immune system, rendering the animal highly susceptible to infections.\textsuperscript{170} Additionally, captive orcas are known to grind their teeth on the metal gates separating their pools out of boredom, sometimes to the point of revealing the nerves.\textsuperscript{171} These activities lead to “pinholes” in their teeth, allowing “abscesses” to develop.\textsuperscript{172} Nearly a fourth “of all orcas in captivity in the U.S.” suffer from “severe” dental concerns, and “seventy percent” possess “at least some” teeth-related issues.\textsuperscript{173} Trainers must flush their teeth out with “hydrogen peroxide solution” to try to prevent infections.\textsuperscript{174} Even still, multiple orcas at SeaWorld have died from infections related to open cavities, abscesses, and drilling for dental work.\textsuperscript{175} Some orcas reach the point where living with their damaged teeth becomes so unbearable that they ultimately refuse to eat, leading to sickness and eventually death.\textsuperscript{176}

In addition to infection-related dangers of captivity, orcas also face a substantial risk of death from their artificial enclosures. Captive orcas do not swim about in “natural” seawater.\textsuperscript{177} The water in their pools is chemically treated with chlorine, ozone, and
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aluminum sulfate. The “chlorine solution” utilized in the orca pools is far more potent than everyday bleach. Ozone is used as a means to limit the orca’s exposure to bacteria; however, exposure to ozone can harm “all living organisms,” causing respiratory issues when inhaled and negatively impacting ecosystems. Aluminum sulfate keeps water “clear,” but the chemical compound is acidic enough to “burn skin” and eyes and “corrode metal.” Filtration systems work alongside chemical treatment to keep the water clean for the orcas, but even these can turn deadly when malfunctions occur. For example, an orca named Splash died of a “perforated ulcer.” His necropsy revealed “hundreds of pounds of filtration sand in his stomach.” It was later determined that the filtration system in his pool had malfunctioned and the sand used to clean the water was pumped straight into his tank.

Even just the very concept of living in a pool with walls poses a level of risk for orcas. In the open ocean, orcas are free to roam for miles upon miles, in any direction. Living in a concrete pool is a learned behavior, and some orcas adapt better than others. Splash, for example, suffered from epilepsy. During his seizures, the only assurance and protection he had from accidentally slamming into a wall or drowning was a fellow orca, Orkid. She would nudge him to the top of the pool so he could breathe and “put herself between” him and the tank walls. Other orcas, suffering from boredom and depression, have intentionally rammed repeatedly into tank walls, ultimately resulting in their
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death.\textsuperscript{189} Behaviorists who have studied these incidents have ruled them suicides.\textsuperscript{190}

\section*{(2) Extreme Physical Pain}

On average, SeaWorld’s pools are a mere “34 feet deep,” providing little depth for an up to 12,000-pound orca to submerge itself.\textsuperscript{191} On top of such shallow tanks, the pools are largely exposed to the open air with “minimal” shade for the orcas.\textsuperscript{192} As such, orcas spend much of their day with their black skin exposed to the sun in the intense heat of Florida, Texas, or California.\textsuperscript{193} Baking in the sun for days on end, orcas develop “bubbled skin” and suffer from severe sunburns.\textsuperscript{194} Trainers often need to apply black zinc oxide to the orca’s skin – both as a “protectant” and to cover up existing sunburns from the public’s view.\textsuperscript{195}

The dental procedures provided to captive orcas, to address their teeth damage from chewing on metal for their entertainment, are agonizing.\textsuperscript{196} The orcas must first be “immobilize[d]” in a medical pool, which is barely eight feet deep.\textsuperscript{197} A “block of wood” is then placed in the end of their throats to keep their jaws open while the veterinarian drills into the affected teeth.\textsuperscript{198} As a former trainer noted, “[t]he whale doesn’t know why the procedure is happening, just that the experience is painful.”\textsuperscript{199}

Food intake is extremely vital to orcas, as it not only provides their nutrition but their hydration as well.\textsuperscript{200} Orcas “hydrate by absorbing the water content of the fish they eat.”\textsuperscript{201} While SeaWorld does not punish poor performance by depriving orcas of food, food is still the “primary reinforcement” in their training.\textsuperscript{202}
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Food is a trainer’s only real method for exerting power over an orca and encouraging the behavior the trainer desires. Because of this, however unintentional it might be, orcas are “kept . . . on the verge of hunger” so that they always want to perform. With their food intake so closely controlled, captive orcas are not only often left hungry, but also dehydrated, in areas of the country that experience extreme heat.

### (3) Protracted and Obvious Disfigurement

Neither the PACT Act nor section 1365 of the United States Code define what “protracted and obvious disfigurement” means.

Black’s Law Dictionary defines disfigurement as “[a]n impairment or injury to the appearance of a person or thing,” which has been accepted by some courts. The courts that used the Black’s Law “disfigurement” definition also interpreted the plain meaning of “protracted” as “prolong[ed] in time or space,” as defined under Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate dictionary. It could, therefore, be inferred that “protracted and obvious disfigurement” under the PACT Act is likely to mean a “prolong[ed]” “impairment or injury to the appearance of” an animal.

Many orcas in captivity, particularly males, experience collapsing of their dorsal fins – a phenomenon rarely seen outside captivity. Wild orcas are free to “spend much of their time fully submerged” underwater, protecting their dorsal fins from “expos[ure] to the air and to the sun.” In captivity, orcas spend
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hours of their day “motionless at the surface of [their] pool.” With their dorsal fins above water level, there is little “support for the height and weight” of the fins, resulting in them falling over. This is exacerbated further by the fact that captive orcas must swim in circles rather than the linear patterns they use in the wild.

(4) Protracted Loss or Impairment of Mental Faculty

Captivity not only poses risks of physical injury and death, but it also substantially negatively impacts an orca’s psychological well-being. Trapping an orca in a tiny concrete tank without its family pod is not unlike subjecting a human to “incarceration.” Like humans, orcas are incredibly complex and social mammals. They are among the most intelligent beings on the planet, with the “second largest brain of any animal.” Orcas are deeply curious and utilize echolocation to “communicate” and “explore their environment.” In their barren tanks, however, there is nothing to explore and “no information coming in” when they attempt to echolocate. Captivity deprives orcas of the complex, stimulating environment of the open ocean. Instead, they spend their lives confined to a pool with nothing meaningful to do. Eventually, they just “shut down.”
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As previously discussed, captive orcas spend much of their day “logging” around motionless in their pools or swimming in endless circles. However, that only encompasses the time where they actually have free reign of their tanks. SeaWorld’s “eight-foot-deep medical pool” is regularly used as a “staging area” during orca performances. Trainers corral the orcas into the medical pool prior to each show, during shows when it is not their turn to perform a trick, and for a time after the shows. With roughly “seven shows a day” plus special encounters, the orcas can spend “hours” each day confined and unable to move entirely. Additionally, SeaWorld only operates during the hours of 9 a.m. and 10 p.m. at most, with fewer operating hours during slower periods. After hours, orcas are confined to certain pools where they have little to do except log around, anticipating the park’s reopening, when they will have performances and coaching sessions once more.

With minimal ability to spend their day swimming, and little to explore if they could, the endless boredom can wear on an orca. Captive orcas have been documented to develop disturbing and abnormal behaviors to cope with the stress of their prison-like environment. Orcas often pick at and eat the paint from the tank walls and stage areas, while others are seen “bang[ing] their heads against” the tank walls or metal gates between pools. Some orcas have rammed into the walls with such force that they ultimately kill themselves. Other orcas develop a form of bulimia where they “regurgitate food” simply to pass the time.

In addition to stress from limited space and extreme boredom, captive orcas also face many social stressors they ordinarily would not experience in the wild. Wild orcas are categorized in terms of
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“three ecotypes: resident, transient, and offshore.” Each “ecotype” exhibits different characteristics, including pod size, behavioral patterns, “language,” and diet. The three ecotypes generally reside in different parts of the world, but even in areas where they overlap, orcas rarely “interact socially with whales from other ecotypes.” In captivity, however, orcas from different ecotypes are mixed together in the same pool. Additionally, “vocalization patterns,” which are how orcas communicate with one another, are unique not just to an ecotype but to a specific “social group.” Therefore, captive orcas are not only integrated into “artificial social groups” with unknown orcas of varying ecotypes, but the groups also do not even speak the same language.

Orcas experience significant separation anxiety during their time in captivity. SeaWorld regularly moves its orcas between its three parks, routinely breaking up any makeshift familial units that do evolve. During the decades in which SeaWorld operated its captive breeding program, these transfers often resulted in the separation of baby orcas and their mothers. In the wild, orcas remain “with their mothers [for] their entire lives.” They never go off on their own to join other pods. As such, these forced separations in captivity traumatize both the mother and her calf. Mothers grieve the loss of their calves deeply, emitting gut-wrenching vocalizations that continue for days after the calf is
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removed by crane. At the height of captive breeding, female orcas were bred often, meaning mothers experienced this traumatic separation multiple times in their lifetime. For example, an orca named Katina had “five out of her seven calves” transferred away from her to other parks.

Throughout their time in captivity, these constant stressors build, and many orcas develop “zoochosis,” as well as “self-mutilation” and suicidal tendencies. Aggressive behaviors are also becoming common among captive orcas. Aggression is not typically a behavior exhibited by wild orcas. Wild orcas are “generally mild-mannered” and sociable among other orcas and among humans. In captivity, however, whale on whale aggression is commonplace, and there have been at least one
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hundred reported events related to aggression against trainers.\footnote{257} Wild orcas have miles of ocean available to separate themselves when tensions rise between whales.\footnote{258} Captive orcas, on the other hand, are trapped in their tanks with no means of escape, and tension between tankmates can lead to fatalities.\footnote{259} As stated in \textit{Blackfish}, “a result of [orcas] being thrown in with other whales that they haven’t grown up with, that are not part of their culture, is [that] there’s hyper aggression” and “a lot of killing” that has not been observed “in the wild.”\footnote{260} \textit{Blackfish}, the very film that first brought the harsh realities of orca captivity into the public light, documented the experiences of Tilikum.\footnote{261} The documentary interviewed several former SeaWorld trainers and marine behavioral experts to highlight how the stress of captivity provided a direct link to his aggressive tendencies, which ultimately led to the death of two SeaWorld trainers.\footnote{262}
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\footnote{262} \textit{See id.} (former SeaWorld trainer describing the circumstances of Dawn Brancheau’s death, stating, “[t]here’s no food left. She kept asking him for more and more behaviors. He wasn’t getting reinforced for the behaviors that he was doing correctly. He probably was frustrated towards the end.”); \textit{see also HARGROVE}, supra note 38, at 190. During a “Dine with Shamu performance,” Tilikum grabbed his trainer Dawn Brancheau “by the arm and dragged her underwater.” \textit{HARGROVE, supra note 38}, at 189–90. He thrashed her around repeatedly and held onto her body long after she drowned. \textit{Id.} at 190–91. By
B. Interstate or Foreign Commerce Requirement

Congress enacted the PACT Act under its Commerce Clause power. Therefore, any violator must engage in animal cruelty “in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.” SeaWorld is a theme park and entertainment facility that attracts “local,” “non-local domestic,” and “international” guests. Part of theme park admission includes the opportunity to see SeaWorld’s orcas perform and observe them in their tanks during non-performance times. In 2019, SeaWorld welcomed “22.6 million guests” into its facilities and generated more than $802 million in net annual revenue from park admissions, reflecting a substantial impact on interstate commerce. To further encourage out-of-state and foreign guests to visit their parks, SeaWorld works closely with travel agencies and provides “vacation packages” with local hotels. In addition to park admission, SeaWorld has an online store with shipping options to all fifty states and throughout the

the time her body was recovered, she “had been scalped, her spinal cord was severed, her ribs broken, and her left arm had been torn off.” Id. at 191. Dawn’s was one of three fatalities to which Tilikum has been linked during his 33 years in captivity. See SeaWorld of Hurt, supra note 252.


267 Fiscal year 2019 was utilized for the purposes of this analysis as it was the most recent full year not impacted by the 2020 global coronavirus pandemic.

268 SeaWorld Report 2019, supra note 265, at 3, 41; see Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. U.S., 379 U.S. 241, 256 (1964) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted) (finding that touristic activities involving the “transportation of passengers in interstate commerce” substantially affects interstate commerce).

269 SeaWorld Report 2019, supra note 265, at 12.
Much of SeaWorld’s merchandise sold is designed using the likeness of orca whales, including stuffed animals, apparel, toys, and more.\(^\text{271}\)

Furthermore, the orcas themselves sometimes become commerce. SeaWorld regularly transfers its orcas among its three United States parks.\(^\text{272}\) Additionally, SeaWorld will occasionally sell or lease its orca whales to foreign marine parks.\(^\text{273}\) For example, SeaWorld leased six of its orcas to Loro Parque, a marine park in Tenerife, Spain.\(^\text{274}\) The lease was intended to last through 2031 with options to renew; however, in 2017, SeaWorld permanently relinquished the six orcas to the Spanish marine park.\(^\text{275}\)

C. Purposeful and Conscious Intent Mens Rea

Under the PACT Act, a person must “purposely engage in animal crushing” in order to violate the statute.\(^\text{276}\) The statute does not define “purposely,” so this case study uses the Model Penal Code for analysis. Under the Model Penal Code, “[a] person acts purposely” when “it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to cause such a result.”\(^\text{277}\)

There can be little doubt SeaWorld knows their orcas suffer in captivity. Substantial scientific research has existed since the 1980s documenting the detrimental effects captivity has on orcas.\(^\text{278}\) With the release of Blackfish, SeaWorld certainly found its attention drawn to these studies, if it was not previously aware

\(^{270}\) See generally Shop by Park, SEA WORLD PARKS SHOP, https://seaworldparksshop.com/ [https://perma.cc/FRA8-NWRX].


\(^{272}\) Daly, supra note 922.


\(^{274}\) See id.

\(^{275}\) See id.


\(^{278}\) See Daly, supra note 922 (stating that SeaWorld has “documented” occurrences of orca aggression since 1988); see also Orca, supra note 37 (explaining that “stereotypic behavior[s],” developed as a stress response, have been observed by researchers since the “late 1980s”).
of them. SeaWorld provides its employees with a manual for answering questions relating to any potential negative treatment of their orcas. Included in the manual are facts misleading staff and the public that captive orcas live just as long, if not longer, than in the wild. A researcher interviewed in Blackfish stated: “Because the whales in their pools die young, they like to say that all orcas die at 25 or 30 years.” Trainers are warned against speaking out regarding any mistreatment they witness.

SeaWorld ensures that trainers watch the orcas closely at all times, reflecting an awareness of potential aggressive behavior. In fact, SeaWorld’s awareness of the potential for aggression dates back to their very first captive orca. In 1971, Anne Godsey was “asked to ride Shamu’s back” for a promotional featurette. During filming, Shamu “pull[ed] her under” the water. When trainers attempted to pull Godsey out of the tank, Shamu bit her leg and tried to pull her back into the water. Following the incident, it was discovered SeaWorld had documentation that Shamu previously harmed two other

---

279 See Long Gone Wild, supra note 16 (demonstrating that in response to Blackfish, SeaWorld launched the “Ask SeaWorld Campaign” in an attempt to discredit the film’s accusations regarding how they care for their orcas.).
280 See Kirby, supra note 2, at 96.
281 See id. at 98.
282 Blackfish, supra note 2. As discussed, the lifespan of wild orcas can reach eighty years, depending on gender. See Daly, supra note 92. In addition to lifespan, SeaWorld provides many other misleading facts, including telling the public collapsed dorsal fins are observed frequently in the wild, when the affliction is only seen in “less than one percent” of the world’s wild orca population. See Blackfish, supra note 2; see also id. (“[E]very other potentially embarrassing fact is twisted and turned and denied one way or another.”).
283 See Hargrove, supra note 38, at 220–21 (“I had been told time after time that, if I left and spoke out, I would be hurting the whales; that they would then cut back on my contact with the orcas.”).
284 See id. at 81 (“The fact that we monitored their behavior so carefully for aggression meant that something must be wrong with the conditions of their confinement. If the whales out in nature were harmless to human beings, why then did we have to be so wary of their moods in captivity?”).
286 Id.
287 See id.
individuals. Shamu was subsequently removed from participating in performances.

Like other aspects of an orca's life in captivity, SeaWorld goes to great lengths to cover up these acts of aggression. During a filming of a performance, Tilikum "lunged" at a trainer, and SeaWorld directed a trainer "to get rid of the tape" containing footage of the event. Even after the trainer edited out the aggression footage, SeaWorld management still refused to allow its existence. By the time SeaWorld acquired Tilikum in 1992, he'd already been involved in the death of an employee at his prior home, Sealand of the Pacific, in Canada. SeaWorld trainers were told Tilikum had nothing to do with the death, but they were nonetheless warned to watch him carefully. Following the death of Dawn Brancheau, SeaWorld initially told the public she "slipped or fell into the tank." It was only after eyewitnesses came forward "disput[ing]" that story that SeaWorld admitted Tilikum pulled Brancheau into the water. Despite this admission, SeaWorld still attempted to steer the story against aggression by placing the blame on Brancheau for wearing her hair in a ponytail. In the wake of Brancheau's death, the Occupational

288 Hargrove, supra note 38, at 34.
289 Id.
290 See Blackfish, supra note 2.
291 See id. ("[W]e had to destroy the tape.").
292 See id. ("[M]anagement thought there was . . . some reason to exercise caution around him . . . clearly they knew more than they were telling us.").
293 See id. Brancheau's death was not the first time SeaWorld provided conflicting information in regards to a death associated with its orcas. In 1999, a man was found "draped over the back of Tilikum." Id. The man was thought to have snuck into the park while it was closed and climbed into Tilikum's tank. Id. SeaWorld told the public the man "died of hypothermia." Id. Additionally, SeaWorld reported that it was undeterminable whether any of the "bite marks" occurred before or after his death, despite there being cameras "all over" Shamu Stadium, including "underwater cameras." Id.
294 Id.
295 See Lee Ferran & Russell Goldman, Trainer Error Caused Whale Attack, Mentor Says, ABC News (Feb. 25, 2010, 3:16 PM), https://abcnews.go.com/GMA/seaworld-trainer-error-caused-whale-attack-mentor/story?id=9952102 [https://perma.cc/SFL4-T6BY] (reporting that Thad Lacinak, "former head trainer at SeaWorld" stated: "Dawn, if she was standing here with me, would tell you that it was her mistake."). But see Blackfish, supra note 2 (indicating that many other trainers wore ponytails without incident, and there were no SeaWorld regulations or policies requiring trainers to wear their
Safety and Health Administration (“OSHA”) cited SeaWorld with two “willful” infractions “for exposing animal trainers to the recognized hazards of” working with orcas.\textsuperscript{296} Specifically, SeaWorld was cited for (1) “allow[ing] unprotected contact with Tilikum” during “drywork” and (2) “allow[ing] [trainers] to engage in waterwork and drywork performances with the killer whales without adequate protection.”\textsuperscript{297} The District of Columbia Court of Appeals found “substantial evidence” reflecting SeaWorld’s awareness of the “hazards” associated with orca aggression,\textsuperscript{298} noting that “a substantial portion of SeaWorld’s killer whale population had at least one reported incident” of aggression against trainers.\textsuperscript{299}

While it is clear SeaWorld knows the harm captivity causes the orcas in their care, the PACT Act requires a purposeful intent to cause such harm.\textsuperscript{300} SeaWorld obtained its first captive orca in 1965\textsuperscript{301} when little to nothing was known about orcas, let alone how they would fair in captivity.\textsuperscript{302} SeaWorld’s founders likely did not intend to display Shamu and her progeny for the purpose of harming the orcas. SeaWorld is a for-profit corporation;\textsuperscript{303} its goal

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item See SeaWorld of Fla., LLC v. Perez, 748 F.3d 1202, 1205 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
\item Id. (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “Waterwork” includes “any interaction” between orcas and trainers occurring in “deep[er] water,” while “drywork” includes any interactions between orcas and trainers occurring out of the water or in “slideouts” in knee-deep water at most. See id.
\item See id. at 1208.
\item See id. at 1208–09. The Court also stated that SeaWorld “trains its employees . . . to recognize . . . ‘precursors,’ which indicate that the [orcas] may act aggressively, and asserted that company’s protocols “demonstrate [its] recognition that the killer whales interacting with trainers are dangerous and unpredictable.” Id. at 1209.
\item See 18 U.S.C. § 48(a)(1)).
\item See HARGROVE, supra note 38, at 28.
\item See Kirby, supra note 2, at 3.
\item See About Us, SEA WORLD PARKS & ENT. https://seaworldentertainment.com/about-us/ [https://perma.cc/35AC-2AFU] [hereinafter About Us, SeaWorld].
\end{thebibliography}
is to sell park tickets, sell merchandise, and earn revenue. Capturing and breeding orcas with an intent to cause them harm or death would actively work against that goal. SeaWorld built its entire brand on the likeness of its orcas. They are the company’s most important “asset.” While SeaWorld clearly actively works to cover up or downplay any mistreatment occurring at its facilities, these actions are most likely driven by an intent to keep parkgoers buying tickets, not a conscious desire to harm the orcas in their care.

D. The Scientific Research Exception

Even if SeaWorld could be found to have purposely engaged in “animal crushing,” the PACT Act provides six exceptions, including once related to “scientific research.” Under this exception, the Act does not apply in “regard to any conduct . . . that is . . . medical or scientific research.” As discussed, SeaWorld is a for-profit theme park whose primary purpose is entertainment. Despite this, SeaWorld proclaims a “commitment” to “conservation” and “research.” The company asserts: “This commitment includes publishing our own research,

304 See HARGROVE, supra note 38, at 8 (“[T]he corporate ideology was . . . driven by dollars and cents.”).
305 See id. (“SeaWorld’s corporate marketing strategy turned the orcas into the pandas of the sea, commercial and cuddly.”).
306 See id. (“The whales are a company asset on the ledgers.”).
307 See BLACKFISH, supra note 2. (“The industry has a vested interest in spinning these [stories] so that the animals continue to appear like cuddly teddy bears . . . That sells a lot of Shamu dolls. It sells a lot of tickets at the gate.”).
310 Id.
311 See About Us, SEAWORLD, supra note 303; see also Melissa Cronin, SeaWorld has Even Lost the Faith of a Former Director, ACTION FOR DOLPHINS (Feb. 19, 2015), [https://www.afd.org.au/news-articles/seaworld-has-even-lost-the-faith-of-a-former-director] [asserting that despite the company’s current “educational” messaging, SeaWorld’s founder stated: “SeaWorld was created as strictly entertainment. We didn’t try to wear this false facade of educational significance.”].
sharing our parks and animals as controlled research environments, and funding and supporting projects around the world.”

SeaWorld itself has a team of scientists that conduct research with their captive whales to improve the handling of marine mammals in captivity and expand the understanding of orcas in the wild. Their research contributes to published scientific papers, though the value of this research is subject to much debate in the scientific community. Additionally, SeaWorld partners with other “research organizations,” allowing visiting researchers “access” to their facilities and their captive orcas to develop studies.

While many marine biologists question the usefulness of the research conducted at SeaWorld, the PACT Act does not provide any clear statutory language indicating such scientific research would not allow SeaWorld to fall within the exception. The Act states that “any conduct” constituting scientific research is excluded. It would be up to a reviewing court to interpret whether the validity of such research contributes to the applicability of the scientific research exception. The issue, however, has not yet been raised in the courts.

---

313 Id.
314 See id.
315 See id.
316 See HARGROVE, supra note 38, at 232 (explaining that SeaWorld is not “respect[ed]” as a research facility by many scientists in the field, and “eminent New Zealand orca scientist Dr. Ingrid Visser,” in particular, must often request SeaWorld stop “misquoting” her findings); see also LONG GONE WILD, supra note 16. Much of SeaWorld’s research is questioned in terms of its relevance and accuracy, as many of its studies center around captivity. AskSeaWorld – Research, SEAWORLD FACT CHECK, https://www.seaworldfactcheck.com/research.htm [https://perma.cc/QL9W-N5TJ]. For example, several of SeaWorld’s studies discuss captive breeding and artificial insemination. Id. Scientists are also skeptical of a SeaWorld study that focus on the “metabolism of adult male orcas,” as the research only considered Tilikum and “would have limited applicability” to wild orcas. Id. Additional concern exists regarding disparities between captive and wild orcas invalidating the usefulness of the research in the studies. See id.
317 Partners in Conservation, SEAWORLD, supra note 312 (providing that some of these research partners include OCEARCH, Humane Society of the United States, and Hubbs-SeaWorld Research Institute).
IV. THE PACT ACT COULD SERVE AS MODEL FOR A MORE EXPANSIVE ANIMAL CRUELTY STATUTE THAT INCLUDES PROTECTIONS FOR CAPTIVE ANIMALS

The above case study analyzing SeaWorld highlights the PACT Act does not fully live up to its intended purpose of preventing acts of serious animal cruelty at the federal level. As such, acts of heinous and inhumane treatment of animals in captivity can slip through gaps in the legislation. Captive animals are no different than domesticated animals and, as such, should be entitled to equal protection against acts of cruelty under the law. Corporations, like SeaWorld, own their animals just as individuals own their pets. They assume responsibility for the welfare and treatment of the animals in their care. As such, Congress should not hold them to a lesser standard than pet owners by allowing them to fall outside animal cruelty legislation. If Congress truly intended for the PACT Act to provide “a clear message that our society does not accept cruelty against animals,” then it should enact legislation ending acts of animal cruelty against all animals.

While the PACT Act does not fully realize the Congressional intent of ending animal cruelty in the United States, it does provide a good starting point for doing so. As established in the SeaWorld case study, the PACT Act covers a substantial amount of inhumane and abhorrent acts of animal cruelty. Additionally, by using its Commerce Clause powers, Congress ensured that corporations operating in multiple states fall within reach of the statute, avoiding the challenges that arise when regulating animal cruelty at the state level. Using these provisions, Congress could further amend the PACT Act or use it as a model to enact legislation that would also protect captive animals from acts of cruelty.

A. Eliminate the Scientific Research Exception

To fill in some of the gaps found in the PACT Act, Congress should consider eliminating its scientific research exception.

SeaWorld can be credited for increasing the world’s understanding of the relatively unknown orca whale species in the
While displaying orcas in captivity once provided the best means of studying these mammals, captivity has become unnecessary for the advancement of scientific research in the twenty-first century. With the evolution of technology, scientists today are capable of studying marine mammals in their natural habitat with far greater ease than at the time of SeaWorld’s founding. Additionally, scientists are less likely to choose to study orcas in captivity out of concern the captive orcas could provide misleading results. Because captive animals live in artificial environments, under significant “stress” and other unnatural conditions, studies with captive subjects can often produce results that cannot be applied to wild populations. SeaWorld’s orcas, in particular, pose problems for researchers as the corporation bred orcas from different ecotypes and inbred mothers with their sons, creating “hybrids” not found in the wild. Studies on these genetic variants provide little insight on wild orcas, which are genetically quite different. Furthermore, displaying marine mammals and having them perform circus tricks provides little educational value. Instead, it poses the risk of teaching children that it is acceptable to exploit animals for human entertainment.

Given that the scientific community no longer relies on captivity to further research, keeping the scientific research exception does little other than provide a loophole for zoos and aquariums to skirt around regulation. As stated in the Long Gone Wild documentary, “[a]s long as we call it . . . education, research, or conservation, [they] can do whatever [they want to] do.”

B. Lower the Requisite Mens Rea to ‘Knowingly’ or ‘Negligently’

---

320 See Long Gone Wild, supra note 16.
321 See Long Gone Wild, supra note 16.
322 See id.
324 See Hargrove, supra note 38, at 113, 117.
325 See Long Gone Wild, supra note 16.
326 See id.
327 See id.
328 Id.
In addition to removing the scientific research exception, to improve the PACT Act, Congress should lower the statute’s requisite mens rea from “purposely” to “knowingly,” if not “negligently.” As discussed, there is substantial evidence that SeaWorld knows its captive orcas are suffering harm in captivity. A less stringent mens rea, accounting for violators who knowingly “engage in animal crushing in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce,”329 would likely capture SeaWorld within the meaning of the Act and bring within its reach any other zoos or aquariums that subject captive animals to cruel treatment.

The Department of Justice has classified nineteen federal environmental statutes as relating to “pollution crimes” and four as relating to “wildlife crimes,”330 and many of these laws impose criminal penalties for knowing or negligent endangerment.331 Through the pollution statutes that include knowing or negligent mens rea, it is clear Congress deems it sufficient for a polluter to face criminal charges if they take actions they know could harm the environment. It follows that a person or corporation should face criminal penalties if they knowingly harm a living being. Furthering this point, studies have shown that dolphin species, including orcas,332 can recognize themselves in the mirror, suggesting that they are “self-aware” like humans.333 As such,

331 See Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(c)(1)–(3) (imposing “criminal penalties” for “negligent violations,” “knowing violations,” and “knowing endangerment”); Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(c) (imposing “criminal penalties” for “knowing[]” and “negligent[]” infractions); Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. § 668(a) (imposing “criminal penalties” for “knowingly, or with wanton disregard for the consequences of his act tak[ing] . . . any bald eagle.”).
criminal statutes designed to protect them should include the same knowing or negligent endangerment standards that Congress includes in statutes aimed at protecting human beings.

CONCLUSION

In recent years, scientists and activists have shown how harmful and cruel captive treatment of orca whales can be. This newfound information illuminates the ineffectiveness of current federal and state legislation in the area of animal welfare and anticruelty laws. Congress attempted to close this gap in legislation with the passage of the PACT Act. However, much like the AWA and other legislation before it, the PACT Act falls short of achieving Congress’s goals, and gaps in the law remain. Despite this, the PACT Act provides Congress a starting point to create a more all-encompassing federal animal cruelty statute. With the elimination of exceptions for scientific research and imposition of a lower mens rea requirement, Congress could amend the PACT Act into an anticruelty statute protecting all animals.

Tilikum died in 2017, after spending thirty-six traumatic years in captivity. Animal welfare and anticruelty laws, as written, failed him, but his story started a movement that still lives on. With such substantial public opposition to the inhumane treatment many captive animals experience, Congress should expand upon the work it begun with the PACT Act and finally end animal cruelty in the United States. After all, as Mahatma Gandhi once said, “the greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.”

---

334 Johnson, supra note 1.