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FOREWORD

The 1969 HSUS National Leadership Conference, held in Hershey, Pa., on October 3-5, was the occasion for a critical evaluation by national leaders of the most important problems currently facing the American humane movement.

The three day meeting concentrated on discussion of strategy and program aimed at progress all along the humane front. The great tasks confronting humanitarians were faced with confidence in the movement's ability to tackle them successfully.

There were major speeches by recognized experts. There were panel discussions and question and answer sessions. There were roundtable seminars on animal shelter and humane society operation. There were open meetings, counseling by HSUS staff members, and a host of other useful activities.

Throughout the entire conference there was a spirit of unity and determination that made the occasion a happy one for all who attended.

We hope that this spirit is reflected in the pages of this booklet. The booklet is published for those who were unable to attend and for use by humanitarians and humane societies everywhere. Included here are the principal speeches and resolutions adopted for positive action programs. They will repay careful study and analysis.

COLEMAN BURKE
Chairman of the Board
Report of the President

by Mel L. Morse

The founders of The Humane Society of the United States, in their wisdom proven to be more extraordinary each year, also made it necessary for you to be subjected to the corporation meeting, in which you are participating right now. Among the procedures of such a meeting you are to receive a report from the President.

As the one who is honored by this office, I am going to take a few moments of your time to give you some insight into the activities, accomplishments and aspirations of the HSUS and to present some of the frustrations. I would also like to provoke you, and others who will be reading these remarks in the published digest of the conference, into analyzing some of the programs - present and future. I feel that as your President, together with more than 30 years of total involvement in the humane movement, I should not only report to you but point out to you some of the problems as I see them from this vantage point.

I wish to make a statement on which I will expand later. The organized humane movement is being used by groups, individuals and organizations, and corporations. This use satisfies either an egotistical urge, arrogant glory seeking, or the financial profits of corporations and organizations.

But before we go into some of that I want to tell you about the leading action organization in the national humane movement. I emphasize this word action as one of the things of which the HSUS is most proud and to which I was attracted. It is an action organization. If you have been reading the News, you will have read what steps are being taken to remedy and expose some of the terrible ordeals to which animals are being subjected.

First, of course, in a sense of priority and because of the tremendous numbers of animals involved, is the problem of the gathering of animals for laboratory use. You have read about the illegal procedures whereby animals were being obtained in Ohio. Frank McMahon, upon being informed of dogs disappearing out of the public pounds in Ohio, worked with individuals and organizations in Ohio to determine just how an animal dealer could be allowed to have the keys to public pounds in Ohio and remove in the dead of night the dogs and cats, some of them household pets awaiting redemption by their owners. You have been reading additional material about this program and the HSUS prosecution of the individuals involved. Such a vast problem required action from the national office as it was beyond the scope of any single humane organization. This activity alone required many man hours and points up the crying need for expansion of the field service department of the HSUS. This is being done within the financial limits of the organization. The HSUS continues to protest loud and clear but also moves to achieve reform.

You have also seen that the HSUS has been active in trying to get better enforcement of Public Law 89-544. This has been necessary because I am convinced that without HSUS pressure on this program the effectiveness of this legislation would fall by the wayside. We have continued to urge that additional funds be made available to the Department of Agriculture for this program. We will continue to insist that the existing legislation be enforced. The cases that are being seen by HSUS personnel, and others assisting them, where animals are involved in the traffic for use in research laboratories, is absolutely shocking. I can't forget a telephone call from Herb Martin, the Executive Director of the California Branch, as he described to me the conditions he found in one such dealer's premises in California. Herb has been involved in humane work for many years but the conditions under which the animals were kept at this dealer's made him sick to his stomach and added to his, and my, sleepless nights as we became more and more involved in this animal neglect and abuse.

Individuals who work so hard to get legislation passed seem to believe that the paper on which the legislation is written is by itself a magic wand. The passage and the printing of the words that make certain actions illegal does little toward getting the matter actually under control. The passage of Public Law 89-544 has not eliminated the suffering and cruelty perpetrated upon animals enroute to the research laboratories, nor has the humane slaughter legislation eliminated cruelty in that field. We need to keep watching, exposing, and working with those whose job it is to enforce this legislation.

Those of us who are continually being exposed to this cruelty must say in a loud voice, as we see these animals disappearing beyond the laboratory doors, beyond the protection of any law or regulation, there must be a law. We must step up our program toward getting the protection needed. Humanitarians must support legislation that would give relief to these millions of animals. It would seem
that the cries of pain and suffering and, yes, neglect of these animals would penetrate the walls of these institutions where they are being held. But what is bothering us is why these cries do not penetrate the conscience of those who are confusing the issues, demanding unreasonable additions or deletions, even before a bill is considered in committee hearings. We need hearings on the Rogers bill and we then need all of those who are genuinely interested in animal welfare to bring their expressions and suggestions to the hearing table. Their voices must be heard where it will do the most good, where the matter can be resolved and then brought before the entire Congress for passage.

Another action program of the HSUS involved the mustang extermination in the Pryor Mountains. We reported this to you last year and at the conference you saw some of the evidence which led us to bring legal action against U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and other officials of the Bureau of Land Management. I am still convinced that if the HSUS had not taken this extreme action that we would not have the mustangs roaming the Pryor Mountain ranges on this day. As you know, there is at least temporary protection. We need support morally, physically, and financially to continue the fight to protect some of the wild creatures. We feel that some of our so-called wild creatures are being managed to death. I believe that we are going to have to quit calling these animals our "wildlife." In our explorations it becomes more and more apparent that man is our wildest animal.

Those of you who have been following the HSUS programs will have seen brief and continuing reports on our quest to eliminate cruelty in the taking of seals for the fur trade. Ever since the HSUS began its campaign to help the fur seal, either through a "Stop the Hunt" procedure or at least to bring some humaneness into the program, I have been amazed at the lack of understanding of the problem. We are involved in international treaties with at least four governments as well as internal United States interests and contracts. These unfortunate creatures are subjected to what I still contend to be barbaric killing methods. Incidentally, this is still called "a harvest of some of our natural resources."

In reality there is a very simple solution to this entire "harvest" and one that I am sure the seals would appreciate. People should stop buying sealskin coats and accessories. Probably this sounds too simple but that's all it would take—a refusal to purchase any product that was obtained by such cruel methods as clubbing or, as in other fur traffic, trapping. It would seem to me that such a fur or accessory would bring a chill to the wearer instead of warmth and it should bring shame, not pride.

Another of our programs has to do with the racing of lame horses. You will recall that over a year age we mentioned in the News the practice of doctoring a horse's legs so that it could run. We protested to the officials in all areas of the horse racing fraternity. A news release indicated that the trainer and the owner were not in agreement as to the ability or soundness of the horse. In the testimony after the Kentucky Derby one veterinarian stated that the "horse was the most butchered horse I ever saw—to take a horse and deliberately break him down just to win a race." An ordeal that needs much more attention is the housing of race horses in barns that are firetraps. Animals are dying torturous deaths because of a lack of adequate housing facilities at race tracks and fair grounds.

In the phase of our activities relating to the housing of animals we find that there is a greater need for advice and guidance to organizations and government authorities who are building animal shelters. Badly designed animal shelters are being built by cities, counties and humane societies that in a short time after completion are disease infested. Money has been spent on structures that are not adequate to house animals. They are classified as shelters only in the sense that the animals are indoors. Certainly in many instances they are not shelters providing the proper environment for the stray and unwanted animal. There is overcrowding with very little, if any, provision made for segregation or isolation. We must assist in this field by encouraging persons who have this responsibility to design shelters with sanitation and other provisions for the control of disease. We need to extend our field work so that this kind of assistance and guidance can be given and then be sure that we are prepared to help correct badly designed new shelters. Some shelters rebuild with new materials but encompass at the same time all the problems that were common in the old facilities.

In the United States we also see too many installations where the destruction of surplus animals is almost barbaric. We see ancient gas chambers without benefit of the engineering necessary to provide proper euthanasia. We need to do something about these things and just criticizing them is not the answer. Some of the persons involved just don't know any better. We need to educate those who are supposedly the last protector of the unwanted.

You have read of the wonderful progress of the National Humane Education Center at Waterford and I hope that you have noted that there are several innovative programs being worked out there.

A new experience has befallen me because I authored "Ordeal of The Animals." Strangely enough, quite a few people have read the book and I sincerely hope that more humane organizations will take advantage of its contents to inform the people with whom they come in contact, especially in government, where reforms must be made. All of us must take advantage of these exposures of the problems that animals face and the things that need to be remedied. However,
I want to mention the experience of having letters from all over the country forwarded to me from Prentice-Hall, publishers of “Ordeal of the Animals.” People write, telling me about cruelties they have witnessed, inviting me to view animal abuses, some of which they feel that I am in the position to correct. I have seen and been shocked because I am not conditioned to accept cruelty of any kind and I don’t intend to try to be so conditioned. I hope also that some of my fellow workers would feel strongly concerning cruel acts and performances.

What are hardest to read are the letters concerning cruelty in humane society animal shelters or public pounds. I will quote from a letter just to give you one example: “On my first visit to the SPCA there were two dead animals still in cages with live animals. After I pointed this out to the employees, they were removed. Animals which were obviously sick (extremely thin, vomiting, with diarrhea, running noses and eyes, dehydrated)—all possible and probable symptoms of one or more very contagious diseases—were caged with healthier looking animals.” The letter goes further: “I have been to other SPCA’s and seen uncrowded pens, healthy animals, adequate facilities and staff, shots and vaccines given to all entering animals who need them. These conditions seem to be the rule there. The SPCA has a long way to go before it can truly be considered a ‘friend of the animals.’” Then this question: “I would happily welcome any additional information you might have as to how these conditions at the SPCA may be alleviated.”

What is the answer? Do we condemn this SPCA, its Directors, and its personnel? Do we expose it to the community as a blot on our humane movement that need to be resolved. The name of humane society, SPCA, Animal Welfare League, or other variation of the animal welfare cause, should be protected from misuse as the bad reputation of one organization reflects on them all.

We need our training program for individuals working with animals. The start that has been made at Waterford needs to be extended. Scholarships should be provided so that persons interested in becoming involved in animal welfare can get training and be placed in humane organizations. Societies are crying for competent help and this pool of individuals is nonexistent. Humane organizations and animal control departments of government need competent, trained, humane-minded personnel involved. There is no place for callousness in an animal control function or in any phase of an animal control program. If you doubt the conditions exist to which I am referring, take a tour, visit a few pounds and humane societies; you might be as upset as I am.

Humane education has many facets, as you will hear at this conference. You will be exposed to the work of the Kindness Club, which the HSUS has taken on as a project following the tremendous beginning and development by Mrs. Hugh John Flemming. We feel that the inroads made into this age group will have far-reaching effects and will lead us into the program that is being developed that will be our national Junior program. Both of these programs need funds and are being extended by the Board of Directors as funds are available.

Never has there been a time in the history of the humane movement when it was more opportune to advance the cause of “humaneness.” The rush for a scientific world and the emphasis to “beat the Russians to the moon” has been successful.

However, in so doing, our emphasis on the scientific has omitted the very basic teaching of the humanities. If you have doubt about our success in the scientific field, you have only to read some of the projects displayed at the science fairs. Some of the things happening to animals because of this “scientific drive” you will hear about at this conference. You won’t be pleased.

The success of this teaching is also quite evident in our mental institutions, in the increased case load of those working with the emotionally disturbed. The youth have the message. They can manufacture their own drugs— and they can purchase them freely. If they do not have the funds immediately available, they can kill for them—and they do.

We can give the youth of our country a goal and a cause. They could exert themselves into two tremendous humanitarian efforts: eradicate cruelty and promote humaneness. Our youth, who are inheriting the earth, must themselves fix the goals. They are more intelligent, have more opportunity and more technological advances from which to project.

They could make a campaign out of the Pribilof seal clubbing. They could concentrate on the tremendous cruelties attached to surplus breeding. They could bring reform to the use of animals in entertainment. Use without abuse. They could direct their attention toward the mad rush that is bringing extinction to our wildlife. They could crusade toward the preservation of our natural resources—which include our wildlife—a goal that would see our animals protected for all the people and not for the few whose motivations
are directed toward conservation for killing. You will hear of the more sophisticated phases of humane education when the work of The National Humane Education Center is discussed.

I mentioned earlier that the humane movement is being used. This use is making it difficult to achieve reforms. However, the retardation of advancement of the humane cause is due in some respects to the gullibility of some of those in the humane movement. Other problems that keep us from advancing are the personalities that seem to plague our movement. We realize that we have strongwilled people—and that is fine—but sometimes the fact that the goals are the same but the directions different makes us achieve nothing but confusion for those who are inclined to help.

I am sure that if we had presented a united front, we would have reform for the animals in the laboratory process now. Perhaps we would not have had all the reforms that we seek but how can you compromise with degrees of cruelty. You can stop what you can and work for more.

I am convinced that the rodeo programs would not contain bucking horse events or bull riding if the rodeo did not have “humane supervision.” If you wish to see the results of the supervision and then view a rodeo without the supervision, you will see no difference. There is still the use of the torturous bucking strap, and the requirements in the rules of the rodeo promoters are there for all to read and to observe in the action in the arena. This supervision has extended rodeo and in some instances placed it on television even though the Television Code forbids it.

We find it difficult to stop absolutely the abuse to animals in the entertainment field. In fact there is more and more use and even more and more abuse. We see increased activity as we now have the traveling zoos to shopping centers. The small menageries with the miserable animals in piano crates, packing boxes, wire cages, all packed into too tight compartments and carted from shopping center to shopping center. Some of these capitalize on the description, “children’s petting zoo.” This is to give it an aura of respectability so that parents can show their children the animals—show them in perhaps the most miserable conditions possible in most instances. Just another point about the continuation and expansion of the rodeo. Have you noticed the respectability of an animal event, depending upon who is sponsoring it? For instance, the Junior Chamber of Commerce groups across the country do a great job for their communities. The funds raised by them help a variety of needs. We at the HSUS are seeking answers; we need to expand the horizon. Each of you can recite to me the work done by dedicated groups or individuals in many areas, including the efforts of humane societies in raising funds to subsidize persons who wish to own a spayed female cat or dog, making up the difference between what the veterinarian charges and the amount of money available from the individual with matching funds from the humane society. Doesn’t this seem a little out of order? Are these funds needed for other vital programs? Let me ask you another question. Can you tell me of any dog food manufacturer that has contributed any money to this tremendous community problem?

Now I don’t wish to show that I am completely naive to the extent that I don’t know that if the surplus breeding curtailment program were widespread there would be less animals to eat food and possibly to be treated. I doubt that in my lifetime or yours we will see any significant drop so that this should not be a factor.

The use of the humane movement to sell food is widespread. Each of you is deluged with pet food promotions, with societies being enticed with leaflets, pamphlets, animal care information. In one case now a dog food manufacturer is even holding ‘meetings of animal shelters workers on how to do their job. Premiums of food for the shelter and, in some instances, give-away programs are ours for the acceptance only.
Nowhere in this propaganda is there a mention about the cruelties perpetrated upon animals. There is no mention of the problems created by the surplus, about programs geared to make it possible to see an end to building more and more dog pounds, animal shelters or additions to the dog runs. Aren’t we really working at cross purposes? Do you think we are being used?

If the AVMA as a policy matter doesn’t wish to become involved with low cost spay clinics, then what is their answer? We can’t believe that it is any program just to patch up the injured who are being smashed by cars, treat the wounded who are being shot, or administer to the poisoned.

If surgical spaying is too costly for them to make concessions, then what are the substitutes? Where is the perfected oral contraceptive? Where is the sterilization injection?

In other words, where is the profession that is to prevent the suffering of animal life? They are very noticeable by their absence. Have you ever attended a conference of animal control workers where spaying was on the agenda and the food manufacturers were the sponsors?

We find dedicated humanitarians — singly or in groups — advocating that they will have no part in animal destruction. This type of program is worthy and yet those of us who have been in this movement very long have seen the results — an accumulation of animals either imprisoned for life in kennel runs or running at large where disease is rampant.

Many of us investigating such premises see miserable animals — some tied to trees, others chained to dog houses, many with sores, some dead among the living — the usual pattern. Then where do you say no to the next animal when all the facilities are full? Again, tremendous veterinary bills just to keep the animals alive. For what? How about the hundreds to follow? There comes the time inevitably when the decision has to be reached — euthanasia.

Have the conditions changed in the last 25 years? The answer is obvious. It is getting worse. The HSUS is seeking answers. Should all segments of the humane movement pool their resources to find the solution? Are we content to follow the present course — expending thousands of dollars, enormous amounts of time and utilization of facilities, just to keep pace — knowing we are only dropping behind the surplus?

We need to zero in on some of the problems of this movement — concentrate on the ordeals to which animals are subjected — focus attention collectively on a great cruelty. How about the absolute banning of the use of the bucking strap on rodeo animals? Can’t we all agree as humanitarians that it is a barbaric, torturous device? Are there persons attached to the humane movement who can, in good conscience, accept this device? Those who profit by cruelty shouldn’t have the humane movement aiding and abetting them.

If humanitarians united in one crusade, devoting their time and finances to eliminating just one cruelty — like the bucking strap — wouldn’t we finally be achieving a goal and desire of the organizations that were incorporated to eradicate cruelty?

How is it possible for promoters of rodeos to go blandly on their way, attaching to an animal a device which can be seen by any spectator? Its very presence and use causes the animal to buck and fight to dislodge it. Obviously, when it is loosened, the animal quits bucking. The animal is trying to tell the spectators something. Why are they so blind?

One individual, admonishing me for talking about rodeo cruelties, called in on a radio talk show on which I was being interviewed. He mentioned that he had been a rodeo performer for 20 years — riding-bucking animals — and he hadn’t seen any such cruelty as I described. I suggested to the caller that the next time he left the bucking chute that he ride backwards so he could get a view of what was happening. He could then see the hot shot (electric prod). He could then see the men viciously tightening the bucking strap, and then he could see the bucking strap itself and know that the action of the animal he was riding was actually in protest.

Again let me say that I know there are exceptions and many individuals are making their contribution to the program. But where is the power and the money that is being taken from the pet owners and humane societies? Shouldn’t it all be directed in a common cause, to eliminate cruelty? There must be some additional thinking given to animal welfare as a whole by those who evidently are hiding their heads in the sand. Who decreed that the humane movement only was to be saddled with this problem? Is not this responsibility to be shared by all of those who are profiting by animal use, either as manufacturer or a professional? I would say that it is and I would hope that you people here and others would challenge those involved in these fields to begin to give some consideration to the problem.

I had a strange feeling during this past year as I was standing on San Miguel Island off the coast of Santa Barbara, California, among some thousand or so elephant seals and sea lions. I was there as an observer, thanks to Senator Alan Cranston. These creatures were stretched out in the sun sleeping—just a sea of them. Some were motionless; others were moving slightly, throwing sand over their backs. The majority looked as if they were dead and only roused as an observer, thanks to Senator Alan Cranston. These creatures were stretched out in the sun sleeping—just a sea of them. Some were motionless; others were moving slightly, throwing sand over their backs. The majority looked as if they were dead and only roused as we walked among them, some only really being aware of our presence as we touched them. Then they would rear up and caution us to go away. We found this placid scene even though within a couple of hundred yards were the oil slick beaches and oil soaked
debris. This menace could cause death and in some instances had done just that.

I thought how like ourselves this scene was, those of us in the humane movement, those in the humane movement who profess to be humanitarians, those who would utilize creatures such as this even to the point of total elimination; all of us basking in the sun when nearby is the great disaster that faces us all; the exploitation, the use, the abuse, the utter disregard for tomorrow; the reason for my being there due to man's drive for prosperity, for worldly goods, for the development of our country, and man's involvement in the disruption of the natural balance.

We in the humane movement have witnessed many such disasters - man-made and others, such as the hurricanes that are attributed to an act of God. All of them are disasters and disasters usually draw people together during the time of the actual disaster. Then as the crisis lessens, we draw apart and the personalities emerge again, the accusations, the self-seeking moves to achieve personal ends beyond that of fellow human beings. Humanitarians are sometimes the most cruel of them all, as you can witness each week as you see correspondence, as you read printed materials, as you see their actions.

A very good friend wrote the other day, and I am sure she won't mind if I quote her: "There are enough pitiful unwanted animals in the world to fill all the shelters that all of us can build. And enough problems to keep all humane-minded people busy. Anyone who attempts to frustrate efforts on their behalf is not a humanitarian. He violates all humane ethics. 'To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards out of men,' said Abraham Lincoln!"

Like the sleeping seals, with death lurking nearby, we must not be unaware. We have the power and the ability to stop cruelty and suffering and neglect. It is there for all to see and we must see that more and more become aware and that they participate. The ordeals to which animals are being subjected should haunt the conscience of every man, woman, and child in our country. Animal and human neglect and suffering needs the attention of more persons now than ever before.

Someone has to sound the alarm. We at the HSUS are doing that but it takes thousands of really interested people. We need action - not lip service, not sham. I would challenge all who hear me or read these words to start making sounds - and constructive ones. Time marches on and the purposes for which this organization was founded and those of all humane organizations must be fulfilled. The obligation to realize the dreams and aspirations of our predecessors is our challenge and the job is still before us.

---

**Report of the Treasurer**

by William Kerber

To accomplish all of the wonderful work of our humane society, we are dependent upon the generosity of our members and our friends. They are our earning power; they are our goodwill. The HSUS has progressed in its great work year after year through generous contributions and bequests. Be they small or large, they are necessary and appreciated. Even the smallest gift would look mighty large to just one single animal if he could realize it as the source of kindness or humane treatment to him. And large contributions would bring a chorus of happy gratitude. The thought of that is part of the reward to the giver.

True, without some unusually large gifts we would never have been able to build such an active and dedicated organization to carry on our humane program; nor could The National Humane Education Center have been built as a tool; nor could we look forward to the continuation and expansion of program on all fronts of the humane movement. Thankfully, a gradual expansion in the budget each year has been been possible.

We have no Endowment Fund. The policy is to spend our cash currently to help suffering animals. Perhaps some day bequests may come faster than currently needed and we could then create an Endowment Fund. Or, persons may contribute large sums for this special purpose. I only mention this as it would best assure a steady flow of income to augment the voluntary contributions received throughout the year.

It is not customary to read the financial report in detail in these meetings; however, I will mention some figures as we go along. For those who are interested, details can be discussed later with our able assistant treasurer, Mrs. Moneta Morgan.

The year 1968 ended with income of $406,000 and expenses of $392,000, resulting in income over expenses of $14,000, which did not add much to our working funds. The October-November period
just a year ago was a worrisome time as our funds ran very low and we had to postpone payment of certain large bills. But in December, a response of over $100,000 restored the treasury to where we could again see ahead for several months. Such a situation can happen—and does happen—as contributions are not received in regular monthly amounts and, of course, the receipt of legacies is unpredictable. A small reserve is therefore important to maintain stability of program and operation.

In comparing the first eight months of this year, the nearest period to our meeting of a year ago, we can see the trend of income and expenses. Our expenditures so far were $50,000 higher than during the first eight months of 1968. Fortunately, our income was up due to the receipt of two unusually large bequests which were most timely in encouraging continuation of programs, and for which we are most grateful. This increased income enabled us to accelerate the educational programs of both The National Humane Education Center and The HSUS.

Our education programs are only one phase of our work. As our President has indicated, intensive and extensive campaigns are being waged on all fronts: against cruelty in rodeo, bullfights, cockfights, animal dealer establishments, pet shops, public pounds, animal hospitals, roadside zoos, research laboratories, and many others. These programs will be continued and expanded.

It is our intention to launch new programs in 1970 against abuses of animals in science education, in transportation, and in the raising and marketing of livestock. We have the imagination, the determination, the ability, and the willpower to do all of these things; we are limited only by the extent of financial support. And we are so confident that you and other humanitarians across the country will respond to these efforts that we are presupposing an operating budget of half a million dollars for the coming year, a substantial but justified increase. We could usefully employ multiples of this figure and some day, I predict, we shall.

In closing, I want to refer to our Fixed Annuity Plan where the investor-annuitant can invest a sum in a trust administered by the Mellon National Bank and Trust Company and receives a quarterly payment for life. Any unused sum becomes a gift to The HSUS in the name of the donor. The plan can be very attractive, especially as a large part of the income can be tax free and a considerable amount of the principal investment can be deducted as a charitable gift. We would like to bring this to your attention, in talking to your friends, and suggest that further detailed information regarding specific benefits can be obtained by writing to me in confidence at HSUS headquarters.

Continued support from all of our loyal contributors and any new friends that can be attracted will be vital not only to continue our present program but also to encourage further expansion into the field of animal welfare.

I am sure many of you have observed, as I have, that the more one learns of humane work, the more one is almost overwhelmed by the astonishing number of things that need to be done; and the more one is awakened to the need of functioning on so many fronts and the need of creating public awareness of cruelty to animals. There are millions of people who are in fact humanitarians but who have not been aroused to this great need for The HSUS work. They are right on the horizon of our movement if they could only be reached.

What I have tried to say can be said in so many ways. You will hear much of tremendous interest about The HSUS program during this Conference, and you will understand that it takes money to do. Most of all, The HSUS is most grateful to all who have been so generous, and we know you have also been rewarded in your own hearts.
Our Challenge and Our Opportunity

By Coleman Burke
Chairman of the Board
New York, New York

Keynote suggests to me a political convention. Of course, I know that there are no politics in The Humane Society of the United States and, broadly, in the humane movement! So I have decided that I will talk about the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for The Humane Society of the United States. I'd like to make a few personal observations and give some of my ideas of how we can meet the future.

I'm going to take for my text the 12th chapter of Proverbs, the tenth verse.

I'm sure you all know that because I know you read your Bibles just as assiduously daily as I do. "The righteous man regardeth the life of his beast." This is the simple sentence that I found somewhat recently in Proverbs 12:10. It goes on after a semicolon to say what might be a little cryptic. In thinking it over, I believe I understand it — "the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel."

To me this is a very trenchant statement of what's involved in the whole humane movement. And it's one of those verses that just flash out of the Bible and hit you in the face, and you realize that we're working with the same truths that were there 2,000 or more years ago.

The other day you probably all read of the death of Gavin Maxwell, who produced that delightful "Ring of Bright Water." He said, "Stage one on the way to understanding human beings is an understanding and affection for animals." Fit this in with the statement from Proverbs. Actually, Gavin Maxwell was more intrigued in his life by animals than by people. And I know there are others here who are. And I accept that. I'm not critical of it. I rejoice that there are people who are more intrigued with animals than with people.

But I have a very deep concern about many humanitarians — that this is over-emphasized. I'm very much bothered by the phrase, "dogs are man's best friend." There are a great many people who could be brought into the humane movement who get this thrown at them so much — I'm one of them — that you wonder whether these people have human friends. And, really, want to have human friends.

There are a lot of other people who are more intrigued with people than with animals. And I think we must be very careful in this movement to bring about a universal situation where man is recognized as a dog's best friend, and a cat's best friend, and any kind of animal's best friend. This should be our emphasis. This is what we should preach. A universal situation where the world knows that man is not only his fellow man's best friend but the animal kingdom's best friend. That's why I go back to the Biblical quote, and that's why I dared to assert that Biblical quote today. It isn't too popular these days, but if we'd read that good book, we'd be a lot more powerful in doing our job.

We have a harder job in The Humane Society of the United States than many other organizations of the humane movement because all those who have done the hard thinking that has produced The Humane Society of the United States have emphasized the educational impact.

I became interested in The Humane Society of the United States by the inspiration of my dear friend, the late Luella Jeffrey, and others whom I sought out to know when I began to see the vista this organization had. I think it was a small disaster that I was elected as Chairman last year because I can't give this the time and I can't give it the attention that I would like. I guess all of us feel that way if we're dedicated people, and I hope I belong in that group; we like to put out for good causes in which we are interested. But I'm proud of this past year.

Demands for help, for leadership, for guidance, for standard setting, continue to pile up at a rate that calls for continuous expansion. More and more, the Society finds itself in activities that cover an expanding spectrum of life on earth.

We now find that wildlife needs our kind of philosophy and our kind of activity in spite of all that conservation organizations do. This is evidenced by our programs of saving the wild mustangs, stopping cruelty in seal harvests, and fighting cruel hunting and trapping.

Both animals and people need us in emergencies. We have saved starving mustangs; we have brought relief to stricken victims of Hurricane Camille.

Humane societies and city and county governments need us for advice on animal control measures and guidance on municipal control contracts.

Youth, and youth organizations like Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Clubs, and Future Farmers of America, need the humane educational material we produce to help make them better citizens.
Local animal welfare organizations need us for help with all kinds of problems relating to handling of animals, humane programs, and society and shelter operation and management.

The U.S. Government needs us. Legislators call on us for information relating to animal problems with which to answer correspondence. Government agencies seek our advice and cooperation in dealing with issues involving animals. Our representatives are on the U.S. Sanitary Livestock Commission—now known as the U.S. Animal Health Association—and the Task Force working on seal harvest methods in the Pribilof Islands. We work with the USDA on Public Law 89-544 and we have investigated, at the request of Congress, how the Federal Humane Slaughter Law is being implemented in slaughterhouses.

We are needed by humanitarians for advice and information on every aspect of humane work.

Domestic animals need us and our continuing campaign against surplus breeding.

The nation's schools need us for the production and distribution of classroom material aimed at developing attitudes of kindness in the young.

The animal control workers of America need us because, through our National Humane Education Center, we can train them in the best techniques and methods of doing their job.

Animals exploited in entertainment, in science education, in food production, and animals cruelly treated in transportation and biomedical research desperately need the help and relief we are bringing them.

We are needed to develop—through publicity, making people aware, and organization of subsidiary units—an ever-growing corps of adult humanitarians who will take action against cruelty in our society.

I kind of wondered what Henry Bergh would think if he were here today. I think he would be amazed, and very sobered. I believe, however, that with the perspective that he had then he would agree with me, and with others of you, that the time was never better to have our work surge ahead.

We must create a broad climate of goodwill and dedication. We must put aside the petty differences. We must really throw ourselves into the battle for a brave and courageous but a kind and non-violent world. We must put out the fires of hate in a world in scary turmoil, and build a world based on the concept of Dr. Schweitzer: respect for every living thing. Let us not forget in the humane movement, this means respect for each other as well as respect for the animal kingdom.

Protection of Wildlife
By Leonard Hall
Naturalist and Conservation Writer
Caledonia, Missouri

There seems to be, and I'm sure it is true with all of you, a feeling that the time has come when we must expand our area of concern to include wild birds and animals, as well as the domestic animals and pets which are part of our interest today.

On the basis of this assumption, I'd like to cover the following points in my discussion. First, all those sound and logical reasons to include a broad interest in wildlife in the program of the humane society. Second, some specific areas and problems that might engage our interest and action. Third, how can the humane society—an organization which is created primarily for action at the local level—and its members function in the field of wildlife conservation?

In this discussion I want to refer you to a chart done by, perhaps, America's first great animal ecologist because what we are really talking about is Aldo Leopold's biotic pyramid, or Pyramid of Life, which we must keep in balance if man is to continue his life on this earth.

In approaching the first question—should wildlife be one of our interests—it seems to me that we are at once brought up against a problem which not only our wildlife but people of the entire world are facing today. This is the problem of pollution of the air, of our soil and water, brought about by the very technology that allows us to boast the world's highest living standard today.

To put the matter bluntly, during the last half century or so, applied science has literally plunged recklessly ahead, piling one scientific breakthrough on top of another, and one material gain on top of another—apparent material gain—without ever projecting ahead to determine the final consequences of these so-called scientific advances.

We have an agriculture today that is actually a monoculture, the culture of individual crops in vast areas. What is happening in
agriculture is that we are very rapidly breaking down the original biological structure of our soils, destroying the soil fauna and flora which are the basis of all other life. Instead of utilizing the elements provided by nature for normal, healthy agricultural production, we are forcing ever higher yields of poorer quality crops through the use of poisonous herbicides, pesticides, and chemical fertilizers which, themselves, can become poisons when they pile up in the soil and when they spill over into our lakes and streams.

Now, these may kill a pest for the short term that you are aiming at, but they allow stronger pests to multiply and the balances of nature are upset. All of you who have read Leopold’s book, *Sand County Almanac*, know what happens to the biotic pyramid when you attack any of the levels of the biosystem or the ecosystem, which are the basis of all other life. Instead of utilizing the elements provided by nature for normal, healthy agricultural production, we are very rapidly breaking down the original life base. This picture isn’t a pretty one. When we think of wildlife, we’re apt to think of our endangered species first, then of species that interest chiefly the hunter or the commercial killer. In the domestic field we think about those 6,000 sheep that were killed out in Skull Valley, Utah when nerve gas got loose from an aerial drop and drifted in the wind. The interesting thing to me is not those 6,000 sheep—it’s easy for sheep breeders to go out and breed 6,000 more sheep—but here is a vast area in the State of Utah which is now a complete life desert; nothing lives there. This also doesn’t include the thousands of acres that caught the drift of this one nerve gas accident where life or countless life forms have since been destroyed and will not be replaced for a long, long time to come.

Actually, sadly, this is the kind of destruction that goes on relentlessly day after day in America as a result of such seemingly harmless and normal operations as heavy fertilization of a corn field with 12-12-12 and nitrogen and anhydrous ammonia, or the spraying of an alfalfa field with a chlorinated hydrocarbon to kill an aphid but also killing everything else that visits that field or lives in it. The DDT that the Forest Service has finally quit using, or the fogging of a suburb for mosquitoes during the summertime, or the spraying of estuaries for sandflies that bother our well-to-do but thin-skinned anglers. Now, the destruction here comes not only in the kill of harmless or even beneficial life forms but also in the build-up of harmful and poison resisting life forms.

There is no magazine published in America that doesn’t have some article in almost every issue on the environmental problem. There is no newspaper that doesn’t have two or three articles every day. And this is a wonderful thing. Whether it will save us or not we don’t know.

Meanwhile, the biocides that we are pouring into our lakes and rivers and oceans are reducing the process of photosynthesis in marine algae—perhaps already by as much as 75%—thus causing a reduction in oxygen production in the world’s atmosphere that could become catastrophic because a great deal of the oxygen that you and I breathe is produced by marine algae. And this is made worse by the steady destruction of our forest lands all over the world. Two-thirds of the world’s forests are gone, and they will never be restored.

At the same time, and this is even more serious, the proportion of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere increases every single day. This gas traps the heat through what is known as the greenhouse effect and this will eventually cause, if it’s not already causing, a steady rise in earth’s temperature that can eventually melt the polar ice caps, raising the level of the oceans and eventually flooding every coastal city on this planet, every city on every seacoast in the world.

Now, you think this isn’t happening. But I read a symposium on the polar bears just within the last two or three days and one of the things brought out was the shrinkage of the ice floes which are the polar bears’ habitat. Now, why? Why is this, unless it is from this increase in carbon dioxide which is gradually raising the earth’s temperature?

Soon you will see that we have already gone a long way toward impoverishing this pyramid of life. We have cut off most of the carnivores at the top or we have let many of the herbivores, the hoofed mammals, explode; we’re killing some insects and encouraging others; in our agricultural lands, where we had two or three hundred plant species, we’re cutting them down to one and destroying the biological richness of that soil. This has already resulted in the extinction of many higher life forms in our time. I’m not talking about evolution. We all know that any animal that outlives its purpose on the planet becomes extinct. This has been done by the hand of man.
When we review the list of vanishing wildlife, we realize that all of these creatures today are being destroyed, literally, by the hand of man. Some through deliberate changes that we make in the landscape which limit or destroy their living space; some through outright persecution or overkill, and we know where these happen. Sadly enough, some by overkill of predators that allow population explosions of hoofed mammals like the deer.

Finally, we find many groups of concerned and interested citizens—national and international in scope—who work directly or indirectly to alleviate or correct these conditions. Now, most of them have their own field of interest. There is the Audubon Society; their field of interest has broadened out far, far beyond birds. There is Defenders of Wildlife; this is the organization, probably, whose interests in its field are the closest to your interests in the humane society.

The Wilderness Society is not primarily interested in wildlife and yet the Wilderness Society comes the closest, I think, of anybody to creating true wildlife refuges. Most wildlife refuges today are places where you lure animals in and feed them and then go in and shoot the surplus.

The Sierra Club is interested in many fields. One of them certainly is the protection of wildlife; another is the protection of and expansion of wilderness. So, it’s plain that there are many organizations who have small areas of interest, at least, that are in common with ours.

There are others who are interested in conservation, like the National Wildlife Federation, who had a primary interest in hunting. That was their only interest. Today they realize that if they don’t get in there and pitch in the field of the human environment and in the protection of wilderness and in keeping our streams and lakes clean, free of pollution, there isn’t going to be any hunting and there isn’t going to be any fishing. So, they have made a fascinating switch in their biggest areas of interest, I’d say within the last two years, and this is a wonderful thing.

But it’s also plain that any organization with the humane interest of The Humane Society of the United States can certainly afford in the field of wildlife to throw its not inconsiderable moral influence and its weight into the ring on the side of, let’s call them, the angels. And this is the preservation of our environment and the preservation of all of our wildlife in a sane and healthy manner.

What are specific areas and problems which might engage our interest?

Here we see the need to seek out and encourage every effort to improve the life environment—in our neighborhoods, and in the state, and in the nation. We ought to work to do away with long-lived pesticides like DDT, and we’re making progress in this field. Certainly, we should be working on it as well as the National Wildlife Federation. They are working on it because it kills fish, but there are reasons other than that—it might kill us, too. We should work for an agriculture—and this is probably the hardest of all—based on sound, natural principles rather than an agriculture whose primary purpose is to enrich the coffers of the great chemical companies of the United States. We have to work for unpolluted water for domestic use and certainly for recreation.

We have to work for clean air to breathe, even in cities where there isn’t any wildlife. We’re going to have to work for an end to the unwarranted and dangerous manufacture of poisonous herbicides and pesticides. I don’t say that we can ever grow crops again without fertilizers or without herbicides and pesticides in America, but we’ve got to find the ones that aren’t going to kill us 20 years from now, or kill our children 30 years from now. The research hasn’t been done, and I’m a little scared that it isn’t being done. We have to end the dangerous manufacture of certain war weapons like nerve gases—and there are much more horrible ones than that, you know. Some of them have already been dumped into the sea in so-called concrete containers that are going to last forever.

These are all aims that humane societies everywhere can work for. At today’s rate of population growth, it’s utterly imperative that we create more parks for recreation and to preserve scenic beauty, that we have more carefully managed forest lands (in spite of what the foresters say, we are still destroying our forests), more untouched wilderness areas of good size where plant and animal life may continue unharrassed by human intrusion.

We must work to end actual cruelty to animals, a condition which is always unnecessary and very often due to ignorance or commercial greed. As an example of what I mean, we should urge an end to the slaughter of the blue whale and other endangered aquatic species. A moratorium of 25 to 50 years on whale harvests might get the blue whale back over the edge; otherwise, it will be extinct in another generation or less. We must fight the stupid poisoning programs of the Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management against such so-called predators as the coyote and other rodents, programs which kill countless beneficial forms of wildlife.

We should make severe penalties mandatory for killing bald eagles. We should work to close the season on polar bears around the whole Arctic circle (and, interestingly, I’m quite sure that Russia would go along with us on this, and I think Canada would, and the only problem that we would have so far is with Norway) until we are sure that we have a surplus of polar bears. I think we ought to try to keep all wildlife right up to the edge of its habitat; not so that it’s starved but so that it’s full.
We still have a totally stupid and unscientific bounty system in many states, and in every one of them we know that it is unnecessary; we know that it is just a means of buying a certain group of voters out in the back country. We certainly should join the campaign on a nationwide basis to close the roadside zoos, where I think probably more cruelty to wild animals is practiced than in anywhere else in America.

What we’re ever going to do with regard to that jetport and the Army Engineers and their draining of the land north of the Tamiami Trail I don’t know. If we can’t do something, the alligators will drown and, with them, about 60 species of the most magnificent birds that this continent has and what other aquatic life is almost impossible to say.

We should stop the baiting and killing of chained raccoons. This is still common in backwoods country all over the United States. We should join in a survey of the illegal use of snowmobiles. Now there are almost a million snowmobiles in the United States today. One thing they’re used for is to go into the north woods when the deer have yarded and move from one feeding area to another. These deer are run to death with snowmobiles, slaughtered and the carcasses thrown away because it’s out of season to bring them in. And we’re destroying many terrifically fragile areas in the national parks through the use of these machines.

 Probably the most difficult area of all is the protection of our wild waterfowl whose numbers are going down steadily—decade by decade—in America. The hunters protest, you know, that this is all habitat destruction. A lot of it is habitat destruction, but still you can maintain your duck numbers equal to the habitat if you send enough ducks north every spring to replenish the flocks to at least what they were last year. There is not one duck hunter out of one thousand in America that can identify ducks—not one. So they shoot anything and everything that comes along. Last year because of the illegal kill of mallards and wood ducks, they said they were going to end the season. They opened it again this year, through political pressure, and there’s no doubt they’ll kill just as many illegal ducks this year as they did last year. This is going to be a tough thing to work on—but only people like us can work on it, or Defenders of Wildlife, and one or two others.

There are other areas wide open for action. But how can an organization like this, now chiefly at least devoted to the humane treatment of domestic animals, play its part? The answer here isn’t easy. It seems to me, however, that the Society might make an analysis of all the organizations in the United States who have some parallel interest to ours in the field of wildlife. Many of these organizations (I think of two right away—Defenders of Wildlife and the Audubon Society) have expert legislative services which keep their memberships informed of exactly what’s going on in government. Some of them have active programs in such fields as ending the poisoning campaign of predators. I believe it’s true that in many instances in humane societies we have to work as individuals because we’re scattered, but you can work as individuals. I can get an answer to letters to our congressmen if I write them about one of these problems. They feel they have to answer you. Of course, I have a twice a week newspaper column so I don’t have any trouble with these matters. My newspaper is starting to write editorials on conservation—a good, conservative, Republican newspaper that for years wasn’t interested in matters like this at all. But they get so many letters about the column that I write that now we have editorials in the St. Louis Globe Democrat on conservation, on the preservation of wild species, on the creation of wilderness areas, on not damming the rest of our rivers, on saving the Everglades. They would never have thought of this five years ago. You can do the same thing, but you have to do it with letters to the editor—and that’s a powerful influence in America. The membership, however, has to have information to do this and that is the task of the national organization; there is no other way you can do it. Defenders of Wildlife has fifteen pages of legislative information in their magazine every other month on bills that most of you people would be interested in—every single one of these bills—and they will tell you where it is, what committee it’s in, where it stands, and then you can decide what to do about it.

There’s no doubt in my mind that such proposals as this have been discussed by the membership of the HSUS for a good many years. It seems to be that the forces of wildlife destruction and of environmental destruction are closing in on us. Not only do we have inhumane treatment of wildlife, we have to think of what’s going to happen to the next generation and to the generation after that. They won’t be here. Most of the top biologists in America today think we have five generations to go at the absolute utmost before we’re gone.

Now, the time for action is here. A world without wild creatures would be a very sorry place. I think we’ll all agree to that, and a world without any human beings would be even sorrier. But the interesting thing about a world without human beings is that there wouldn’t be a soul here to care about it if there were no human beings. And, with that, I think I’ve said enough.
Problems in Transportation of Animals

By Mrs. Alice M. Wagner

HSUS Secretary; former editor, Popular Dogs

Springfield, New Jersey

This afternoon we are considering the problems involved in the transportation of animals. Undoubtedly we have all had people problems as we travel by car, train and by air, and with the increase of travel things seem to be growing worse instead of better. I commuted from my home in New Jersey to Philadelphia for 18½ years — a round trip of five hours — so I know plenty of things that can happen in transportation and commutation.

So it is with animals. An increasing number of animals are being shipped — shipped as pets, shipped as meat animals, for zoos, for laboratory work. There are so many ramifications to the transportation of animals that first let me tell you how I became interested in this subject. About 18 or 19 years ago I was shocked to learn of the bruality involved in shipping meat animals when I saw two pictures. One was of a man laughing and twisting the tail of an injured cow that had fallen from a truck. When he twisted the tail hard enough, the cow tried to get to her feet. The other picture was of a newborn calf. An electric prod was being used to get it on its feet and in a truck. I wrote for the pictures and published them in Popular Dogs.

The reaction from readers of the magazine was immediate. People were angered and wanted to help.

Then I received one phone call from a man who was really angry. He told me in no uncertain terms that I had not given him or his humane group a credit line. And, as you know, a credit line is important to a newspaperman or a humane worker. It was Fred Myers. Fred was both a newspaperman and a humane worker. So, he was doubly angry. When I told him it was an oversight and I promised to help him on all humane problems, which I did from then on, Fred and I became close friends and continued to cooperate on humane work from 1951 until his death.

A few years later I invited Mr. John Macfarlane, Director of the Livestock Department of the Massachusetts SPCA, to write a series of articles for my magazine. I had and still have great admiration and respect for Mr. Macfarlane and his work and wonderful accomplishments. I learned a great deal from him. One thing he said years ago still applies today. He said, “If you can show a businessman where he can make a little more profit, he is more likely to listen to your suggestions about humane treatment and technical changes.” I have used this approach through the years in my work with purebred dogs, and it certainly does work. I used it on breeders, I used it on shippers, I used it on airlines.

Although Popular Dogs is a purebred dog magazine, I published many articles on meat animals and slaughter. I learned that the greatest percentage of meat animals are raised west of the Mississippi but they are consumed east of the Mississippi — and that in one year the wasted and bruised meat would have filled railroad box cars each to the capacity of 38,000 pounds and would have reached forty miles. I don’t know whether you can picture that. Forty miles of box cars, each filled with 38,000 pounds of dying and bruised animals — waste meat.

There is a law that animals must be rested each 28 hours when shipped by rail. Today, most meat animals are transported live by truck. But there are no laws for trucks.

This summer I tried to get the license number of a truck filled with calves. I could see that there were some downers in it. The truck was traveling so fast and switching from lane to lane that it was impossible for me in a passenger car to catch up. Both the public and the meat industry should face the fact that if millions of pounds of wasted meat could be saved, food would sell at a lower price. But, as I have captioned many articles, the cruelty is worse than the waste.

It is painful to talk about the problems of transportation of laboratory animals — for it seems no one cares. No one but you — the humane-minded.

It is really ironic that we who are opposed to furnishing animals for research must do all in our power to facilitate the humane transportation of such animals to the laboratories. We have to do it. From the cats and kittens that are thrown about in sacks — to the crowded boxes and improvised crates with unwanted litters of puppies — and trucks of unwanted dogs, usually in compartments so crowded that if one dog stands on his hind feet he can find no place to put his front legs except on another dog. Often sexes are not divided; neither are small dogs separated from the large. And there is much fighting because dogs tend to blame other dogs nearby for their injury and distress and for being hungry or without water.

Although the petnapping law passed in 1966 has improved some trucking conditions for dogs, wardens and dealers in many areas
continue to truck and transport dogs in crowded, inhumane conditions.

The importation and transportation of monkeys for laboratories, I am told, has improved a little. Rough handling, the wrong food, not enough water still produce many deaths and, among pregnant monkeys, stillbirths. I could not describe to you the crowded cages of pregnant monkeys needed for experiments. An order is sent out for so many hundred pregnant monkeys which then must be caught and shipped. Protests to India and the Philippines seem to have helped the situation where once monkeys could not even sit upright and had to crouch in their own filth. Even in this past year, from East Africa, containers only 11 inches wide and 11 inches high contained three to four monkeys—25 per cent were dead.

A friend of mine in India deplored the wholesale trapping programs and related to me that these small animals, weighing only a few pounds, even attack the trappers, trying to save numbers of their monkey colonies. She described their loyalty and kindness to each other and to their young. A large percentage of animals shipped for zoos die en route because ship or airline personnel do not understand the needs of animals.

I became aware of the tragedies of shipping dogs by air in the mid-forties. And when I became editor of Popular Dogs, I decided that an issue on transportation was important. I asked for records and incidents from readers. Suddenly I received hundreds of letters. It was then that I wrote all major airlines and the Railway Express Agency, suggesting rules and recommendations for worldwide transportation of purebred dogs. Not until I mentioned I had hundreds of letters and reports of tragedies and possible suits against the companies did airlines agree to meet with me. We met in New York and, for the first time, recommendations for shippers, airline personnel, and for consignees were agreed upon. I published these recommendations; that was in the mid-fifties. But I also published all the readers’ letters of complaint. I thought I had to. After that, I presented the transportation issue every four years, trying to prod the airlines into doing something. For a while transportation seemed to improve.

Today, however, air and railroad travel, even for people, is so unpredictable that the shipment of animals is extremely bad. And, what is worse, the travel industry seems to take it for granted that animals can be treated like inanimate merchandise.

Although I am concerned with the shipping conditions for every live animal, my work and much of my investigation has been in purebred dogs. I learned that one large mail order house ships on approval, C.O.D. That means cash on delivery. Some people had seen a crate at an airport containing a dog, moaning in distress. The crate was being returned to, imagine this, a post office box of a mail order house. The mail order house denied knowing about the dog and the crate was opened. A Doberman had been crammed in a 22 x 13 inch crate. The Doberman measured 37” x 23” at the shoulder. His paws were raw from scratching; he was ill; he had chorea; he had not been watered or exercised. He was destroyed humanely. The dog had been ordered by mail but the buyer didn’t like his looks and so refused to pay the C.O.D. charge, and the dog was shipped all the way back. The airline should not have accepted the dog in such a crate, but this happens all the time. Neither should the veterinarian have issued a health certificate; evidently he issued the certificate without even seeing the dog. It’s only one incident but it can be multiplied over and over again every week.

Another dog was shipped from the same mail order house in a crate that was nailed shut with no provision made to water or feed the dog. Although this dog had a health certificate attached to the crate, the veterinarian who examined the dog in New Jersey said it would have been impossible for the animal to have deteriorated so badly in the 8 days of shipment. Imagine, 8 days it had traveled. It left Nebraska-supposedly in a healthy condition. Much is the fault of a shipper, of course.

I resigned as editor of Popular Dogs in 1967; after 18 ¼ years I wanted to devote all my time to humane work. I became editor and consultant to a number of publications and this past April again wrote an article on shipping dogs by air—this time for Dog World. I visited the Animalport at the Kennedy Airport. The port is open 24 hours a day, every day of the year. They receive all in-transit animals whose owners cannot meet them on arrival and animals—being transferred with a stopover. They handled 878 dogs during December, 1968, and a total of 65,000 animals for the year. That’s quite a number of animals. There were horses, crates of monkeys, and dogs, and everything imaginable—except maybe a giraffe—while I was there. The work of the Animalport at Kennedy Airport in preventing distress and relieving anxiety, hunger and suffering of animals is tremendous. This past August I also visited the Animalport in London, another very fine building.

After checking to see if any other airports provided such facilities and contacting many shippers, and even mail order houses, I sent my revised list of recommendations for shippers, for airline personnel, and consignees to all major airlines. Almost all of them answered; with the exception of maybe two or three, I got an immediate response.

All of the airlines explained to me why in transit there is no provision for personnel to get into these compartments. They said if an animal did become loose or if the air pressure failed, they couldn’t possibly get into the cages to try to put oxygen masks on the
animals. You can see that there is a real definite problem there and, also, traveling by air the space of time is very, very short.

United said: Your recommendations are fine. Our compartments are pressurized and temperature controlled. Ground personnel are extremely mindful of safety. National said: Your list is quite complete. Eastern wrote a long letter but this is the gist of it: Personnel in our cargo department agree with your list. Our records show a total of 13,903 dogs shipped in one period, with revenue approximately $266,000. All dogs except guide dogs must travel by crate. Delta said: Your recommendations cover all problems and we constantly remind our personnel that dogs need more ventilation. Mohawk: We have no additions due to the fairness of your list. KLM: Your lists are complete; the subject covered most fairly. Trans-World, Lufthansa, BOAC all agreed with no additions. PanAm said we have one suggestion: Please add that dogs should never be placed where they may be exposed to jet engine noise.

Regarding this last problem, I recently received a copy of a letter from an airline cargo handler: "I load and unload freight and baggage for a major airline. We handle dogs and cats that are kenned for transportation. Most of these animals have never experienced anything like this before and they are petrified from the noise of the screaming jets and so much jostling around. Some animals try to chew through the kennels and they end up with broken teeth and bleeding mouths. Some even get loose. A veterinarian informed me that a tranquilizer pill is available. Please print this in all the papers and magazines to tell shippers to give animals and dogs tranquilizers."

Of particular concern to me is the REA (Railway Express Agency). I cannot say enough about the REA, and all of it is condemnation. Even if one ships by air, the animals must be trucked to laboratories may be trucked around all day before delivery or the airports. The REA is widely used by puppy mill breeders because they can send dogs, and even entire litters—two litters may be a crate—on a C.O.D. basis—cash on delivery. It is appalling that the REA continues to accept live animals on a C.O.D. basis. I don’t know what we can do about that.

We have records of dogs being delivered and returned because the buyer changed his mind and did not like the looks of the dog or litter when it arrived. The REA even ships animals C.O.D. out of the country. That’s unbelievable.

A breeder in South Carolina offers to ship dogs REA and C.O.D. anywhere in the United States. A woman wrote me (she wanted help): “The puppies arrived in an orange crate. Both were ill. At the express office the crate was in a wide, drafty space. I rushed the puppies to the veterinarian. Both died.” This woman, of course, should never have ordered from a breeder who ships C.O.D. by Railway Express Agency.

I wish I knew the solutions to the problems in transportation—both for people and animals. Legislation is only a part of a solution. For with legislation there is a problem of enforcement. There is little legislation governing animal shipments; there is no federal legislation governing truck transportation outside of P.L. 89-544. Today 95% of livestock travels by truck and an attempt to pass humane legislation governing truckers was defeated by the trucking interests.

I save newspaper clippings of accidents involving animals. I would appreciate receiving all such stories for my files and my files are bulging. In one incident the driver escaped uninjured when his truck crashed with 105 calves. When police arrived, they found 40 of the calves had died, with many injured. I wondered: Was the driver going too fast? How many hours and how many miles had he driven without sleep? Why did he have an accident? I could cite hundreds of letters, reports, and tragedies that I have collected regarding animal transportation—tragedies of carelessness and indifference to animal suffering. But you all know of similar cases, probably worse.

The HSUS, I believe, could stimulate worldwide efforts to improve animal transportation by making the public aware of the way all animals are shipped. Every airport should have facilities for animals. In New York, the ASPCA has a fine building. In London, the Royal SPCA built an animal hostel in 1952. All large airports should provide a comfort station for animals. At smaller airports a nearby humane society or kennel could contract to provide board and exercise and food for animals held over a day or more. It seems inconsiderate that airlines accept animals and also make quite a bit of money on animal travel but so far airlines have not built a single accommodation for animals. So, it’s up to the humane societies to consider how this is to be done. I don’t think that we should have to be able to give the public the money. I think some way, somehow, we must force the airlines and force the government to help. It’s up to us to push it, but I don’t think we should provide all the money.

Priority handling must be a must. Animals should be last on a plane and first taken off. I had 25 recommendations for shippers, for airline personnel, and for the consignees. Anyone who would like to receive a list of these could write me in care of The HSUS at our headquarters offices in Washington. I shall continue to work for legislation to this effect. There must be protection for all live animals, both domestic and wild, throughout the United States and the entire world, that it shall be an offense to convey or carry any animal or bird in such a manner as to cause the animal unnecessary suffering. I welcome suggestions and help from all humane-minded people.
Humane Education Programs for Youth  
(PANEL DISCUSSION)
I — By Dr. Virgil S. Hollis  
Superintendent of Marin County Schools  
Corte Madera, California

Developing the number of school administrators who are increasingly becoming interested in humaneness and the humane society members who are interested in education, I think, means that all of us must keep close touch with each other although we know very little of each other's field. This exposure to you and your programs in meetings such as this will surely result in a united attack on a mutual problem. We need your help. And you need our help. You need help from the group that I represent in education because the many programs that are part of your cause for which you struggle will only be realized when you find a way for them to become a part of the educational program in the schools. There is a need for your programs in our curriculums. But just how do we get them there? This is our big question. I do hope that at the conclusion of this session we will arrive at some idea of what we might be able to do.

We think we do a pretty good job in identifying the most important factors available to man and we continually seek to discover better ways to transfer this information to children. Now we are also increasing our effectiveness with the 3 R's, with mathematics, with science, with what we in education call the cognitive domain. But what are we doing with what youngsters think of other youngsters and what youngsters think of themselves—how they feel toward and treat their fellow man?

Our unsolved problems are not how we can learn together, but rather how we can live together, and create an environment in which learning can flourish. What has happened to kindness, to sympathy, to love, to understanding, respect, and compassion in our language and in the American way of life?

Just this year, man reached the moon. But at no time in history has man been further from reaching the heart of his fellow man. And when I say fellow man I can include animals in this area. My concern for the lack of humaneness in the hearts of school age children is not a vague "in the clouds" concept and I'm not repeating words or quoting from the press. This school year is very young; this is only the beginning. When we look at the unrest on the college campuses that is spreading to the high school campus—yes, even to our elementary schools in some areas—I'm sure that there is a relationship between that and the lack of understanding and empathy for their pets.

The inability of man to live and play and study with man today, I think, threatens the very foundation of our educational program. This is where we need your help. We're not going to solve the entire problem, and you aren't the panacea for it. But you do offer one of the most concrete identifiable programs with which we can attack the problems related to student violence. The surface hasn't even been scratched when we consider the potential of using the concepts of humane education in the classrooms of our country. We don't know if there is a relationship between kindness towards animals and an opportunity to learn love and compassion from caring for a pet. And, if attitudes can be developed through the love of animals, is there an ability to transfer such traits to your fellow man when you are growing socially and emotionally as a young child and as a student?

We don't know if there is a relationship but—you as an organization and we as educators—let's join our forces. And I say we must join forces and develop plans for a controlled scientific sociological experiment that will prove what can be done.

We do know that sitting youngsters down in chairs and telling them to be nice boys and girls doesn't work. We know that showing them a motion picture on ways to improve interpersonal relationships doesn't work. We know that punishing, levying a fine, and assigning prison terms doesn't work. We know that moving to another community doesn't work. A lack of humaneness is a problem of the times that seems to recognize no boundary.

You and your programs, your facilities, are perpetually a great untapped source of power. We need more and more pilot programs, the results of which can be evaluated, the objectives measured, and the effects of what we think will work can be proven of value. If your educational programs, if what you stand for, can be made part of our programs, if they can make a measurable difference in the area of humaneness to man, if they have something to contribute to solving the man to man problems that threaten the very existence and the effectiveness of our school programs, I am confident there is
Decision making has been something that we have been striving to teach in our schools for many years. Undoubtedly, many of you were confronted with the memorization of the basic steps to problem solving when you were in school. You were taught, and we are still teaching, the academic, the rational — in fact — the intellectual skills in how to make decisions which are solutions to problems.

This has all been well and good. But only to a point.

By teaching the mechanical, inhuman approach to living, I submit that we in education have fostered a feelingless mode of living to such an extent that it has become a serious problem. We have to have and teach some feeling in our young children so that we can accomplish the ideals to which each and every one of you are dedicated.

Maybe some of these revolutionaries that are now in our schools, even though some of them have gone overboard and are drowning in their own polluted oceans of life, are sane. Bring sympathetic feelings into the teaching of our schools. Listen to these people. They do say love, sympathy, brother, understanding — and this is beautiful — and other significant parts of their vocabulary. Some of us in this great society claim these revolutionaries are sick. Maybe they are. But maybe, too, they are starved for feeling that we haven't given them, a belonging and being wanted in an educational system that continues more toward polarization and dehumanizing.

But how about those that become objective, impersonal, emotionless, who look at the still mechanical cause and effect solutions to problems? Maybe there is a form of illness in their way of living, too. Undoubtedly the mother image of the schoolteacher is disappearing.

Dr. James Mehörtor, when he addressed your group in 1959, said almost the same thing when he said that there is a cause and effect relationship between impersonal, objective, emotionless behavior and mental illness. Dr. Ben Bloom, a noted educator, and some of his colleagues have developed a structure of education. Their book on the cognitive domain is obviously what the school has been attempting to develop for years. The cognitive refers to the intellect. Cognitive domain refers to facts, to the accumulation of knowledge. But the same group, at the University of California at Berkeley, has developed a similar book on the affective domain. Affective refers to the emotional. Some learned people say it encompasses the value foundation of human behavior. In other words, the basis, the fundamental base, from which the designs and choices of action will emerge into behavior. That's what you and I are here for today — to change the proper behavior.

Ten years ago Dr. Mehörtor told your national conference that the development of this value basis in our country's youth is more important than the academic education. In these ten years more and more of us in education are beginning to recognize that behavior is important — as you, long ago, discovered. We're also finding that learning involves much more than the memory factors that all of us have. It involves explaining, comparing, classifying, interpreting, transferring, applying, evaluating, and the value system. A framework of attitudes and the attitudes, I hope, are the important thing.

We're getting evidence every day that leads us to believe that behavior — the way of living or acting of a person — depends on his sense of values, what he considers important. This is the emotional part of the human, the feeling level that you are trying to attain in your communities, in your school teachers, so that they will transmit to young minds a feeling and a regard for animals.

In the education profession we are just now beginning to be aware of the fantastic importance of this domain. You have been aware of it for years. Now, we must join together, and there is so much to do in this area. We feel that this is the new frontier in education—developing a value system in the emotional area of human behavior of teaching and learning.

Now, let us step back for a moment and take another look at the youth around us and listen — with our sympathy and emotional systems as well as our intellectual ones. I contend that we are led to some good conclusions. First, the schools of America have to develop programs of instruction that increase sympathy and affection, to include a sense of values, of concern, for those who are suffering from pain and misfortune. Under no, and I repeat, no, conditions can we afford to have children given instruction which leads them to develop apathy or indifference to suffering or pain of any kind. We must take definite steps to provide our children with planned learning experiences in caring for others and loving beyond themselves with compassion for all forms of life.

This can be done, this is being done. Giving of one's self benefits others in the educational experience and can be built into the
secondary curriculum. A significant number of high school students in pilot programs are working with physically and mentally handicapped children and are working in pre-school and Head Start programs. The personal growth that they are experiencing in these programs cannot be duplicated in our classrooms, and I suppose that Albert Schweitzer's "reverence for life" philosophy is the most appropriate concept in this context. We must teach it, and in fact live it and apply it ourselves in our everyday living and business.

We also, by teaching compassion through example, will demonstrate that there is no better formula for living — in fact, learning. Bolton from the University of Oregon has said that this must be done if we are to survive as a healthy race. William James once said "strong intellect needs strong sympathy to keep life steady." And, I would say, keep life balanced.

Obviously, history has shown us that no civilization has endured when its values become purely economic, materialistic, and scientific. We have to have that emotional feel for the attitudes for ourselves and for all forms of life. And what does this lead us to? What implications are emerging in this new frontier of human endeavor? What does it mean to your humane society? What does this mean for our schools? And what does this mean for our children and their children's children? And what does this mean for our civilization?

We will not endure unless we develop, through your strength and force and energies, compassion for life. I submit to you that the stated primary objective of our Marin County Humane Education Center is no better explanation for these thought-provoking and far-reaching questions. I think it hits right at the nucleus of this thought, and I'm sure you will agree. The Marin Humane Education Center's primary objective in the community is, if you will, to develop, to create, and encourage humane attitudes toward humans and animals.

We also feel that this Center has four dimensional approaches to achieve the objective, and I think they make significant contributions to the life of our children in Marin. One is through animal control; this is probably the most traditional part of the program. It involves the animal ambulances, the animal shelter, and the placement program. Another dimension is through the use of the Center by community groups. Mel Morse has created a Center where groups can visit and choose from several opportunities the kind of experience that will be most beneficial to them. Field trips to the Center, personnel visits to community organizations, meetings of afternoon and Saturday training classes are some of the services to the organizations in the community. This has real informal educational implications. Another dimension having significant implications for instruction is the information resources center. Each of you has this also. Teachers use the pamphlets, bulletins, library materials, and audio-visual materials. But the school program dimension carries the greatest impact educationally, I feel.

Stan Friese, our Deputy County Superintendent, has been on the spot to work with the teachers of our system. In our school summer program we have been working to set some specific objectives in changing the attitudes of children.

As a number one objective, we hope that by June of 1971 we can stabilize the pet population of Marin County. We hope to make some contribution toward that because we think that if we can it would solve many other problems of unwanted pets, of strays, and of young children not having pets.

Secondly, we hope to develop a sensitivity toward animals, to help children recognize what it means for an animal to suffer, what compassion is, what responsibility toward an animal is.

A third objective is that we would like to develop knowledge of the animals in our immediate environment. Children can learn the habits, be able to identify the animals.

A fourth goal is that through the education program in the schools we want to explain so that children understand the proper care and procedures for providing for a pet.

And, fifth, and this is the most difficult part, if we can prove statistically that what we teach about humaneness toward animals can be transferred into humaneness toward our fellow man, we will have met a crucial problem faced in education right now and broken the barrier that has faced humane education in the past.

We have been fortunate to have the Humane Education Center and to build our program on that Center and what it has to offer as an outdoor lab where classes can go and observe as a follow-up on what has gone on in the classroom — and, after returning to the classroom, follow-up on what has happened to them, their new feelings, new thinking, as a result of their visit there.

Not having a Humane Education Center such as we have should never in any way slow down any school district in this country in developing programs in humane education. I hope, because we do have the good fortune of having the Center immediately available to us, that we're able to develop materials and programs for you that you can use in any way you want in the communities you represent and the facilities that are available to you.

II — By Sherwood Norman
Director, Youth Correction Services
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
New York, New York

We don't think enough in terms of what kind of creatures, what kind of animals, we are, and I am going to just put in this thought —
that man has just really barely come to exist on this earth. When I taught school long ago, I had a “time line” with every half-inch representing a thousand years. A little sign at the beginning said “here life began.” Then there were various signs with the algae and the fishes and the amphibians and so forth and, of course, man occupied just a very small part of an inch at the end.

We need to think about that a little bit when we think about our attitudes toward each other and toward animals, too. It seems to me that man has been occupied since he’s been on this earth, for the most part, with trying to control his environment. We’re still doing it; we’re still trying to control it. Our effort to reach the moon (perhaps I should say, with all its greatness) was a feeble attempt again to control our environment. And, of course, along with this to control our fellow man.

Control of our fellow man is probably one of the oldest things we have in written history. The early laws are efforts to try to control each other so we can control our environment so we can survive. And we have inherited this point of view with all our civilization. This is a sobering thought I hadn’t intended to bring up, but I think it’s something that is well to keep in mind when you think about the behavior of man and his children.

Now, I’m concerned particularly with the prevention of delinquency and youth crime, and you might like to know what the National Council on Crime & Delinquency is. It’s the only national non-profit private agency working to prevent and control crime and delinquency by tapping both professional expertise and citizen action. It is a major non-governmental agency dealing with the entire criminal justice spectrum from police to courts to correction. It’s pioneered in setting standards, promoting model legislation to upgrade treatment services, personnel, and even the physical design of criminal justice facilities, institutions, etc.

I would like to treat my role in this discussion of humane education from the point of view of preventing delinquency. The prevention of delinquency and youth crime begins with the kind of environment we provide for our children — in homes, school, community, nation and world. It continues with the services available to parents and children on the verge of trouble and in need of help, and it concludes with the effectiveness of correctional services after court processing. I hope, when you go back to your communities, you will cease to think about the correction of crime as a police problem (once you get them apprehended, put them away and forget about them). This is the general attitude of people who want more and more and more police protection, which is needed, without giving consideration to what happens afterward.

We contend that unless all three approaches to delinquency prevention are applied, we are trying to stem a tide by merely controlling an eddy. Removing delinquency-creating situations is one. Providing services to those who are on the verge of trouble is two. And, thirdly, to correct the situations and the services given to youngsters and, adults, of course, but particularly to youngsters who do get into trouble with the courts.

The role played by education in this process is crucial. For it is inhumane education, more than any other public service, that drives young people to delinquency and crime. It is not by chance that the number of police apprehensions and court appearances go up after school gets into full swing in the fall, or drops in the summer — as it does in many communities. I’m trying to get some research money to find out to what extent this is true, but it’s surprisingly true as we’ve seen by making surveys in courts in various parts of the country. It is the experience of people who work with delinquent youngsters that failure in school creates terrific anxieties and pressures, which result in the kind of acting-out behavior which gets them into trouble until they no longer care. This is inhumane.

When other social pressures are added in home and community, the marvel of it is that we don’t have more delinquency and crime than we do.

Now, one of those pressures, of course, is poverty and an education geared to a life which is very different from the life that many of these children lead. We’re just beginning to notice that 40% of our nation lives in deprivation or outright poverty. Not by choice. As Michael Harrington points out in “The Other America,” they made the mistake of being born to the wrong parents, in the wrong part of the country, in the wrong racial or ethnic group. They could have been paragons of will and morality but once that mistake has been made most of them would never have had a chance to get out of “the other America.” Unequal economic opportunities, intensified by unequal opportunity in education.

In some of our cities, per pupil expenditure in the ghetto schools is one-fourth of that of the rest of the community. Lower salaries are paid to teachers working under the poorest conditions in the areas of highest need. Competitive grading is used as a whip. Slow learners, constantly humiliated by teachers, cease to try and fall into a groove of failure where they are almost certain to remain. Fifty percent of the stealing and burglary cases that reach some of our juvenile courts are committed by school dropouts without a job. Every one of these youngsters, upon reaching the state training school, has thousands of dollars spent on him which might better have been spent in his own community’s schools. Citizens can equalize educational opportunities by getting their boards of education to provide much smaller classes for physically and emotionally handicapped, brain injured, and retarded children where possible in their own local schools. When I say this so glibly —
physically and emotionally handicapped — this means so much more than these words. “Emotionally handicapped” means unable to learn what he is supposed to learn in the classroom in which he is trying to compete with others. Smaller classes, special teachers, are a tremendous help in this. The second thing is realistic job training programs for high school youngsters not bound for college. This means training for jobs in growing industries with labor shortages. It also means paid work and school programs geared to reducing the number of dropouts, but so often this is done without realistic recognition of the kind of jobs they’re going to be able to get anyway when they get out. The program is all academic centered or school centered, and the teachers (bless them) are waiting only until the students get to be 16 when they can drop out anyway.

Some citizens have reduced burglary and theft from 10 to 87 per cent simply by getting more lights on the street at night. Now, this doesn’t seem to have much to do with education and yet it does perhaps because it’s really adult education and with regard to our children is also humane education. Instead of spending over half a billion dollars a week on killing human beings to make the world safe for democracy abroad, we might better spend money to safeguard democracy at home and eliminate situations which breed delinquency, youth crime, and racial bias — for these are demoralizing our future citizens and threatening our national security from within.

I looked up “humane” in the dictionary and it said that it was having feelings and inclinations creditable to man. Well, what is your idea of man? I believe that there is something fine in every individual, and I would say every animal, too, really. Education, which means to lead forth or draw out, implies the drawing out of a personal thing, something potential, something latent. If you believe that there is fineness from within and you draw this out, how can this be done humanely? Again, as we were looking at man sociologically a moment ago, let’s look at him biologically for a minute in terms of his birth, what he comes into this world equipped with, and the experiences he has from the moment of birth on. How much is he loved? How much is he cared for? How much do those who care for him give him the satisfactions of living in a world—a buzzing, blooming world, I believe it was once called—that gradually makes sense to him because he feels he is a person of worth?

As he gets bigger and older you don’t have parents teaching a child to talk and giving him grades according to whether he talks at the right time or learns to walk. Some children have physical handicaps that make it impossible for them to walk right away and others walk immediately. Some talk immediately and some turn out to be quite intelligent even though they talk a little later than usual. But then when we get them into our school system, they come in and immediately are supposed to compete with other children at their age. Educators are now beginning to realize the fallacy of this and are providing for differential classes, reading classes where a youngster can go at his own rate of speed in the early elementary years. Unfortunately, this begins to get more and more rigid as they go up in the scale. I’m surprised at how many schools are still in the days of rigidity as far as what is expected of youngsters and what happens to them. And this is what I want to speak about.

They may look fine, they may look as though they’re getting along beautifully. In fact, they’re very vigorous in their throwing of rocks through windows and annoying teachers and acting out, we call it. They are really saying to teachers and parents and the community generally that things are not right, they are not getting satisfactions out of life which mean they can put forth their maximum effort of their ability to learn. When they are unable to do this, they lose face with teachers, they lose face with other kids, they gravitate to other kids who are beginning to have troubles, and pretty soon you begin to have those youngsters, the troublemakers, standing together and beginning to do things that cause difficulty at home and in the community.

I think that we ought to take a good look at what we can do in the way of intervention and control when the child enters school. When you stop and think of it, this is his first experience with organized group life. Here society imposes on him with daily responsibilities. Someone other than his parents sees him in relationship to his peers and authority. Here the child’s self-image, developed in the preschool years, undergoes severe testing. If the infancy and preschool experiences have given him confidence, that adults on the whole are supporting, that growing up has rewards, then a child is ready to cope with experiences in the streets and school without fear. If, however, infancy and preschool experiences leave him with a feeling of not belonging, if early steps in growth bring more rebuffs than rewards, a child’s self-esteem is impaired and he is ill-equipped to face new experiences in street and school. In spite of advances in education, public schools have been slow to recognize the emotionally handicapped youngster. They seem unable to let go of a grading system which exalts the easy achiever and punishes the struggling slow learner. As failure spirals downward the child ceases to care. His behavior becomes worse. Punishments increase. He is more drawn to other kids with problems. Soon school pushes him out altogether. We call him a dropout.

What is needed is small remedial classes for this group, a flexible approach to subject matter, and a sufficient number of teachers trained in special education to man them. To avoid deviant behavior, the downward drift of failure must be re-routed into carefully planned steps of success. This is more important than keeping up with a pre-determined grade level. But even more important than this
is a feeling for the youngster undergoing these experiences. And the
difficulty is that teachers have not been trained to recognize these
youngsters. They see them only as interfering with their unit. And it
might even be a unit on humane education. It may be that some
youngsters have no use for being kind to animals for reasons very
well established in their own bringing up, and this needs to be
recognized. We need to be able to identify these children. Some
public schools have developed a clinic team—the psychiatrist,
psychologist and social worker—to help teachers identify and handle
problem youngsters, work with parents and call for other community
resources. Such services are usually found in prosperous suburban
districts and generally are far from sufficient even there. Some
schools employ social workers but never enough, and seldom with
adequate training. Law enforcement officers who realize the moun­
tain of failure and humiliation behind most truancy can avoid adding
to the child's distrust of authority. And I think the same thing could
be said to almost anyone.

Now let me come down to an illustration. A boy smashed his
index finger in the second grade and was made to write with his
middle finger at a time when the class was learning cursive writing,
having changed from printing to cursive writing toward the end of
the second grade. He had great difficulty coordinating his muscles
with his index finger, even greater difficulty with his middle finger,
but he persisted. He tried to do what was expected of him, he tried
to conform. Well, he never quite succeeded. When the index finger
was repaired, the teacher insisted on his going back to writing with
his index finger, so his writing was even worse than it was with his
middle finger. Now, if you can, imagine what this would be like for a
young child and the effect it has on his future work in elementary
school — third, fourth and fifth grades — and the exasperation of
teachers who see the messy writing and the incoherent letters and
who forget what initiated this and then start blaming him. Pretty
soon he starts not to try; he doesn't finish writing the assignments;
and he's blamed for that. And this constant blame, blame, blame —
you know yourselves in training a dog how far that kind of thing gets
you. And yet we haven’t learned this with regard to children yet.

This child begins to act out, of course, and begins to become a
behavior problem in class, and he’s been a model child before this
happened. At home he is loved and appreciated and wanted and yet
he even begins to act out at home and begins before long to become
a problem in the community. This is where delinquency begins very
often, sometimes with something as specific as a thing like this.

But take another youngster who was one of the battered and
abused children you have heard about. Many states now have battered

or abused children laws. It’s amazing how many cases there are;
we don’t know for sure. It is said by some who have made a
study of this that there are probably more infant deaths due to
physical abuse of children than from any other cause. It’s really quite
as shocking as keeping animals in small cages, and yet we’re doing
very little about it for the most part. The particular youngster that I
have in mind was finally taken from the parents for adoption when
he was three, I believe, but he was too upset and too disturbed for
anyone to be able to adopt him. At five, after being in more than
half a dozen different foster homes, he was about ready for mental
hospital care. He’s just living from one institution to another. And
it’s entirely within the realm of possibility that this child may be one
of those who commits one of these senseless murders that you so
frequently read about.

Now this violence comes from failure to recognize and identify
the symptoms early enough to be able to do something about it. All
of us, perhaps, have become too accustomed to violence and the big
educator that I call the “eye” — the idiot tube. A generation has just
about reached its maturity today that has been brought up with TV
babysitters which have stressed violence, and I think you know the
violence commission recently came out with a condemning
report about this. Unless we care, unless we do something, citizen
groups with our votes and our support, these situations are going to
continue.

Now I didn’t begin to describe some of the situations these
children go into when they do come to the courts — the detention
homes which are not homes at all but jails. In 93% of the counties of
this country children are held in county jails that aren’t fit for adults.
If you want to be concerned about cruelty to adults, look at your
county jails and see what they’re doing there. If you’re concerned
about children, urge that there be some kind of regional detention
home that can take in a large number of these counties, any one of
which is too small to build its own, which could be a center with
some professional services for these children who are so disturbed
they are likely to be locked up.

These are some of the things that open up a perfectly
breathtaking task for citizens who are sensitive and who hope to
move civilization beyond that point of three-quarters of an inch, I
think it was, at the end of the time line to the point where man’s
finer feelings and concern for other people and for life in general can
be directed toward more intelligent humane education.
III — By Dr. Jean McClure Kelty
Assistant Professor of English
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio

All of you, I think, have had a chance to examine The Kindness Club manuals. I think you are all aware that The Kindness Club was originally founded by Mrs. Hugh John Flemming of Canada, that it had phenomenal growth in Canada and the United States and internationally, that The Humane Society of the United States was asked to take over The Kindness Club in the United States, and that we worked about two years to produce the program as it now stands. I hope that most of you are familiar with the material, and that those of you who are not will take the opportunity to examine this material. The program goes through age 11. Two other programs have yet to be developed for the intermediate age group (11 to 14) and for the older children (14 to 18). These are in the planning stages, but I might mention to you that the ultimate dream is to produce a kind of Scout program which would take children all the way from age 7 through 18. There are many ways this program can be used. I hope that all of you will use your imaginations, that you will use all of it or parts of it any way you can work it into school curriculums, humane society curriculums, individual planning groups. If you can get den mothers interested in handling groups in small communities, fine—any way that this can be used.

I would be very happy to talk to any of you individually about ideas that I might have on this and I would be very eager to find out your ideas on use of the program. However, this is a kind of introduction to what I want to say to you here today.

Actually, I want to address myself to you as leaders of humane societies. It is all very well for us to outline this Kindness Club program, but to be of any real value it seems to me that, as adults and as leaders, we have to know what our goal is, we have to know where we are going. We have to know this in order to carry out, with any measure of effectiveness, Kindness Club programs in our own community, but more important and what really concerns me: it's no good to teach a philosophy to children unless at the same time we as adults work to produce a world where they can practice what we have taught them. It would be like teaching children to read, if this were possible, in a world where there were no books.

This, it seems to me, is somewhat the path that we have pursued in the past. We've lived with the words, "humane education," for at least a hundred years, and I can't see that it's gotten us very far. In case any of you think that humane education is new, let me remind you that in 1869 Angela Burdett-Coutts in England wrote a letter to the Times "to entreat public attention to a systematic training in principles of humanity toward animals." An association named the Ladies Humane Education Committee for the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded. That was a hundred years ago. And, may I remind you what most of you already know, that George T. Angell in America had many thousands of children involved in his Bands of Mercy. What happened to the children that we see no, or little, effect of this teaching?

I would contend that the basic philosophy of the western world is antithetical to our convictions about animals. We of the humane movement have produced no philosophy to counter it. Therefore, the young people we influence by programs like The Kindness Club must either reject what we have taught them and ultimately be absorbed into the system or they must remain outside the system for life, misfits, and therefore impotent.

Let us examine just why this is so. The Judaic-Christian system and the western system—one largely a result of the other—puts man at the center of the universe. Man is made in the image of God; man is given dominion; man is a little lower than the angels; the world was made for man.

I'd like to read a brief section from what seems to me a very powerful book, Design with Nature, by Ian McHarg. "Our failure is that of the Western World and lies in prevailing values. Show me a man-oriented society in which it is believed that reality exists only because man can perceive it, that the cosmos is a structure erected to support man on its pinnacle, that man exclusively is divine and given dominion over all things, indeed that God is made in the image of man, and I will predict the nature of its cities and its landscapes. I need not look far, for we have seen them—the hot-dog stands, the neon shill, the ticky-tacky houses, dysgenic countryside and mined landscapes. This is the image of anthropomorphic, anthropocentric man; he seeks not unity with nature but conquest."

I might add (and I don't think that McHarg would disagree at all): I will show you a world where thousands of animals are cut up yearly in varying degrees of pain so that man can live a couple of years past his time to die in a world that is already overcrowded. I will show you a world where animals are used in research so that women can have more babies to overpopulate the earth, where animals are exploited for the entertainment of man, where animals are hunted for sport, where thousands of animals are used in space programs in an attempt to destroy other planets as we have done the earth. (I might digress here a moment. One of my favorite statements in this connection Norman Cousins made recently in Saturday Review when he said: the question is not does life exist on other planets, but does intelligent life exist on earth? Where Christmas
puppies are given away and bought casually as stocking stuffers and as casually dumped, where live animals are thrust out of their homes by what Paul Ehrlich has called the "beaver building complex" of the United States Corp of Engineers, where pest animals and pest insects (and, mind you, it's man who determines who's the pest) are poisoned, where animals are trapped so that women can brag about the price of their coats. You can go on ad infinitum. But all of this is based on the assumption that this is man's world to use, to exploit, or to destroy. What is the alternative?

Man needs to ask himself, it seems to me, whether he has any right to assume that he is the center of the universe. Again, may I quote, and this time McHarg is paraphrasing Loren Eiseley: "Man in space is enabled to look upon the distant earth, a celestial orb, a revolving sphere. He sees it to be green, from the verdure on the land, the earth, he perceives blots, black, brown, grey and from these extend dynamic tentacles upon the green epidermis. These blemishes he recognizes as the cities and works of man and asks, 'Is man but a spinal tumor, and finally, although no man will hear it, right to assume that he is the center of the universe. Again, may I recognize as the cities and works of man and asks, 'Is man but a culmination of biological evolution or it might in contrast be an aberration, a spinal tumor, and finally, although no man will hear it, the algae may laugh last.'"

If we assume, for a moment, that man is not the height of evolution, that man is not the center of the universe but merely a part of the ecostructure, merely a piece—and a very small piece—of the whole, not necessarily, mind you, any better part, man begins to ask himself just what his responsibilities and his obligations are. It is ludicrous, I contend, to talk about humane education when the whole system under which we live denies the necessity for humaneness. You end up with the absolutely arrogant assumption that you should be humane because you become thereby a better person. Let's begin to recognize that we've got to throw out a lot of dead wood before we can hope that anything like The Kindness Club can take root.

There was never a better time than now. This is exactly what the "flower power" people are saying. I teach in a university, and it is to these young people that I can talk. They understand. It is not the materialistically oriented sorority, fraternity young men and women who understand. It is the hippies, if you will, who understand exactly what you mean when you talk about pollution and wilderness and kindness and love and humaneness. They talk the same language.

So it comes down to this. We're not talking about humane education; we're talking about the subversion of the philosophy of the western world, and we'd better start realizing it. It's a sobering thought, I think, that the two positive philosophical positions which are consistent with the humane ethic—what we call the humane ethic—have not come out of the humane movement. The first—reverence for life—from a scientist. The second—reverence for our environment and for the creatures who share it—from ecologists.

Ian McHarg goes one step farther than Schweitzer and says that Schweitzer recognizes value only in that life which is beneficial to man. McHarg says we have no right to make this assumption. All life is unique and, therefore, valuable. To be sure, the subversion we advocate is not a violent overthrow, but it will come to that if we're not wise enough. Because what we're calling humane education is really an alternative to violence, chaos and destruction, both of our universe and ourselves. Because regardless of our arrogance, and Faulkner, if we continue to pollute and destroy man will not only not prevail; he will not survive nor will anything else.

We have to work piecemeal with the general public, but we'd better quit pretty fast talking to ourselves and to kindred souls about these things were the answer to all the earth's problems—and we'd better start considering very fast the enormous scope of what we've got to do if we're going to salvage a world in which anything like The Kindness Club has any validity.

We need to start working to produce an environment where man retains the integrity of his land, the integrity of the myriad creatures who share, and who are co-inhabitants of, that land. But we can't keep doing it benevolently. How can we be sure that we are better than those who share it?

I have tried to talk to local humane groups about pollution and destruction of wilderness land and I always get the same answer: yes, that's too bad but, you see, there's the shelter. I have tried to talk to humane educators and remarked that we don't need new textbooks; we need to affect the minds of those who teach the texts we already have. After all, you can teach Hemingway's "Death in the Afternoon" as a lesson in compassion. (Might I note here, incidentally, that at a recent teachers' conference it was the so-called long hairs who were calling for an evaluation of the morality of literature.) But the
same old answer comes out: we need humane education in the
system.

I have tried to talk junior humane programs to local humane
societies and they say, yes, that’s wonderful, but we don’t have the
time and staff and, besides, exactly how do you go about it? I try
pointing out that ecologists and people in the humanities and the
college young people are our brethren but no one has the time for
that kind of talk, either.

So my challenge to you is this—and might I add that I’ve come
to this after long soul-searching. I would love to bury myself in one
small program. I’m not a person who likes to take on the whole
scope. It’s terribly defeating. I would like to stay in one small
program where I can see at least one tiny result, but I don’t think it’s
possible—not for those of us who are leaders in the humane
movement. In order for us to implement the dream of Mrs.
Flemming and all of those who have worked with The Kindness
Club, we must be leaders who are capable of the groundwork of that
dream. We must be willing to try to subvert the system of the
western world because only by subversion of that system that says
that man is unique and supreme can we ever hope to produce a world
where animals count, where the individual man counts, where land
counts, where everything counts, where The Kindness Club for
children is anything more than a quaint diversion which children will
be expected to outgrow.

If the active young people have taught us anything, it is that
there is no such thing as a partial commitment. The world is moving
too fast, the environment is being destroyed too fast. As Peter
Schrag, in “Life on a Dying Lake” in a recent Saturday Review has
pointed out, “We are trying to satisfy a new, though still unclear,
sense of community with old priorities.” So, he says, “evasion of the
issues is inevitable,” but a “professed commitment to protect an
environment that ends with a squabble over sewer taxes is no
commitment at all. Can one take seriously an organization whose
interest in conserving fish is unmatched by a position on the
antiballistic missile?” And so with us. A commitment to create
kinder, gentler, more sensitive children that ignores a new shopping
plaza which will destroy a natural watercourse is no commitment at
all.

I repeat: “We are trying to satisfy a new, though still unclear,
sense of community with old priorities.” And if we continue to do
so, then The Kindness Club, on which all of us have worked so hard,
will someday be another experiment like the Band of Mercy. It’s no
good to teach children kindness and love and concern for all living
things unless we, as adults, and as leaders of the humane movement,
are willing to try to build and accept the kind of world where such
an involvement is possible.

The Misuse of Animals
in the Science Classroom

By Prof. Richard K. Morris
Professor of Education, Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

At The HSUS Conference held in Washington in 1961, Dr.
James T. Mehorer of the University of Vermont declared “...our
historic failure in humane education revolves about two points: (a) a
philosophy, and (b) a psychology.” Seven years later, as moderator
of a panel discussion on humane education, I pointed out that there
was a need for research leading to a defensible philosophy of humane
education and research into the psychological effects on young
people of violence on television, gun clubs in the schools, and of
elementary and secondary school experiments on living animals. This
“historic failure” is still with us today.

In the area of philosophy, there have been some hopeful
stirrings. The message of the humane movement has attracted such
distinguished philosophers as Brand Blanchard, F.S.C. Northrop, and
John Findlay. Reverend Charles N. Herrick, whom many of you
know, now pursuing an advanced degree in philosophy at Trinity
College, and Associate Professor Robert Brumbaugh of the philoso­
phy department at Yale, have recognized the urgent need for a more
humane ethic—and they are doing something about it.

A few months ago, I wrote to Dr. Jean Kelty that those of us
involved in teacher training should make every effort to enroll
philosophers of education in the task of forging what Albert
Schweitzer called “a boundless ethic that passes beyond man and
includes all living creatures.” This year, as vice-president of the New
England Philosophy of Education Society, it is my intention to do all
in my power to introduce this neglected objective into the
deliberations of that forum. If we do not involve the teachers of
teachers, and the teachers themselves, in the ethic of our cause, we
will have lost some important allies.
In the area of needed psychological research, the forecast is less certain. I suspect that most psychologists and psychiatrists—educational psychologists excepted—have been over-sold on a therapy which would in no way restrain the individual. Restraint, they declare, inhibits; inhibitions are detrimental to human development. And yet societies or cultures devoid of restraints on undesirable behavior make a mockery of individual freedom and sow the seeds for their own destruction.

If we are to eliminate or even reduce the abuse to animals in our country’s elementary and secondary classrooms, we must have the support of pertinent psychological findings that demonstrate the extent to which there exists a whole host of suspected relationships. And yet societies or cultures devoid of restraints on undesirable behavior make a mockery of individual freedom and sow the seeds for their own destruction.

In November, 1965, in a talk before the HSUS Connecticut Branch, I proposed that we attempt to secure a regulation to be issued by the State Board of Education regarding its stand on the care and use of animals in our schools. The Executive Director of the Connecticut Branch, Rear Admiral James C. Shaw, remembered this suggestion and asked me to arrange a luncheon meeting at which he, Allen Loeb of New Haven, and myself would present to Commissioner William J. Sanders a draft of our proposal. The result was a policy statement passed by the State Board of Education on 7 February 1968.

The full text of that policy statement reads as follows:

For science to be taught effectively in the schools, there must be a variety of objects, equipment, materials and supplies available for study at first hand. Living plants and animals are included, since they comprise a significant part of man’s environment.

It is the position of the State Board of Education that the use of living animals as an adjunct to teaching science is quite appropriate and is to be encouraged under conditions which insure proper care and treatment for any creatures used for instructional purposes. This is in keeping with the requirement of Connecticut Statutes that schools shall provide “instruction in the humane treatment and protection of animals.”

The State Board of Education urges that the following principles be observed in carrying on the instructional program of the public elementary and secondary schools and in any other school-sponsored activities:

1. Animals should always be maintained under the best possible conditions of health, comfort and well-being.
2. No vertebrate animal should be subjected to any experiment or procedure which interferes with its normal health or causes it pain or distress.
3. Any experiment which involves the use of vertebrate animals should be carried out by or under the personal direction of a person trained and experienced in approved techniques for such experiments.

This policy statement went out in a circular letter from the desk of the Commissioner to all Chairmen of Boards of Education, to all superintendents of schools, and to all heads of science departments throughout the State of Connecticut.

Incidentally, Dr. Sanders told me just the other day that no action he had taken ever prompted such a volume of fan mail. It came from all over the country. This is proof to me that you people really do your homework.

It must be noted, not without some regret, that a policy statement of this kind is not the regulation we had sought and therefore would not have the effect of law. Yet it does represent the stand of the State Board of Education and, as such, can be used as an instrument to promote more humane practices in our schools. Admiral Shaw has stated his view thus: “We found that a straight, frontal attack on the problem was useless at the time. Nevertheless, the policy statement gave us an effective tool. As cases have come to
our attention, we have been able to use it. Further," he asserted, "our clipping service indicates a substantial reduction in complaints after the policy went into effect. Our plan now will be to take any such complaints as may occur and publicize the offense as contrary to the Board's policy and in violation of the Connecticut anti-cruelty law, or of Sec. 10-15 of the Statutes which calls for instruction in the humane treatment and protection of animals and birds."

When I asked a friend of mine to secure for me the new 1968 editions of the three texts prepared by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (better known as BSCS), she inadvertently revealed that I was preparing a talk for The Humane Society of the United States. "Oh," said the instructor, "assure Dr. Morris that students in my classes never experiment on any vertebrate animal." Aha, I said to myself, here is a high school biology teacher who knows the policy of the State Board of Education.

Now the BSCS textbooks in the blue, yellow and green versions were not compiled under the constraint of a declaration such as we now have in Connecticut. Begun in 1959, as a remarkable team effort, the first editions of the BSCS versions were studied by two million secondary school pupils. Already available in a third edition, the three versions--each arranged for a different ability level--were not intended to produce a uniform, nationwide curriculum in the biological sciences. Nevertheless, they have virtually achieved this goal. Dr. Arnold B. Grobman was chairman of the original Steering Committee that drew up the BSCS textbooks. Some of you will recall that he appeared for the defense in the East Orange "chicken case." Had New Jersey at that time had a policy similar to Connecticut, the outcome might have been pleasantly different. The teacher could not have allowed a student to perform an experiment with which he himself was not familiar.

It should be conceded that the BSCS textbooks are a major achievement. They are beautifully illustrated; their information has been constantly up-dated; they emphasize the latest biochemical approach to biology; they include some ecology; and, with a few surprising exceptions, they are scrupulously correct from the viewpoint of science. Human reproduction is now discussed and illustrated in the latest green version. These books are a far cry from the Moon and Ritchie texts that were available when I taught biology.

Live animal experiments described in the BSCS textbooks include the use of frogs and chickens, both vertebrates with remarkably developed nervous systems. Teacher Manuals for each version go far beyond the experiments outlined in the texts. Their philosophy seems to be that the able student may wish to exceed even the teacher's command of experiments. Nothing indicates that there would be anything but praise for the Connecticut student who, a few years back, castrated forty-four pairs of live rats and surgically joined them together to test the flow of injected hormones across the parabiotic barrier. The boy got his know-how for this project from the report of a medical team which had performed the identical experiment more than twenty years earlier.

We believe that the wording of the Connecticut policy will be a positive deterrent to this kind of cruel, repetitious and therefore unnecessary experimentation by a boy not yet out of his teens. Should it fail to deter, at least it would enable us to bring such public pressures to bear as would in themselves check any propensity for a public school to support a continuation or repetition of this type of activity.

Much of importance is missing from today's school textbooks in the life sciences. The beauty of nature must be inferred by the student from a study of high quality photographs, but the words "beauty" or "beautiful" must not be used, for it is the stance of science that it makes no value judgments. It is worth noting, however, that on the college campuses there is a growing aversion to expanding the scientist because young people today will not let him escape into a valueless world. The "Great Chain of Being," the oneness of life, is hidden in the illustrated classifications of life forms relegated to the back of the textbooks. Any hints at wonder, awe or mystery are studiously avoided. The impact of these books, unlike the older texts, is that life is no mystery—man has conquered all. There are only the faintest rumblings in the sections on ecology that man may be the biosphere's most dangerous animal.

On this hard diet school children are fed. The new jargon is "discovery" which means to discover by one's self through experimentation what has previously been discovered. Under this new pedagogy, the student goes through a long and tedious process of duplicating what history has already learned. It is little wonder that we find them seeking to perform an increased number of experiments on living animals. What can we do to check this abuse perpetrated on sentient creatures?

One thing, of course, is to find adequate substitutes for the live animal experiment and explore the means for bringing about the favorable reception of these substitutes. The HSUS is working on a project to devise research kits that would introduce the use of models—mathematical and mechanical—computerized instruction, tissue culture studies and gaming techniques as substitutes for live animal experiments. This is in the right direction. It deserves our support and every success.

We should also encourage, through every legitimate means possible, a wider use of plants in experimentation. The obvious scientific reason for the use of plants seems to have escaped many educators. One can produce plants in great numbers, providing statistically significant data totally absent from so many experiments.
involving animals. The benefits of such an emphasis would be great. It would give the student a better understanding for the need to quantify his 'data; it would greatly lower laboratory costs, and it would provide a blessed release for animals that might otherwise be used. After all, the first great principles of genetics came from the study of strains of the sweet pea.

The effort to supply schools and teachers with printed material that suggests guidelines for humane education must continue. I have in mind the manuals of The Kindness Club, such excellent pamphlets as *Animals In The Classroom*, a bibliography prepared by the Ohio Humane Federation, and *Humane Biology Projects* released by the Animal Welfare Institute. But we must be increasingly sophisticated about such publications, for our job is to educate. We should set our best writers, especially those with experience in teaching, at work in crashing the numerous professional journals of the teaching profession. We should remember the words of A. Bronson Alcott: "When introducing educational improvements, great care is required to graduate their introduction to the state of common opinion."

A great opportunity awaits well planned humane education and nature centers. The Connecticut Branch will soon have its own center through the generosity of a devoted humanitarian, Miss Norma Terris. What more natural place to bring together elementary and secondary school teachers, especially teachers from the cities who have little chance to observe animals and plants in their natural environment?

Summer workshops for such teachers in such a setting could have beneficial results in classrooms throughout the country. If invitations to the centers are also extended to student groups, the opportunity to spread the humane message would be even more effective.

As for science fairs — local, state and national — these will be hard nuts to crack, but crack they must, and at the source. An unprecedented campaign is needed to educate the sponsors of these fairs. Here I am convinced that teachers and professional educators can be of real assistance, for many have already questioned the scientific and educational merits of the exhibits and the inordinate amount of time and money which a student may spend on a single project.

Of course, a central culprit in the science fair arena is the National Science Foundation. But here I need not remind you of the kinds of pressures which may be brought, for NFS grants come out of your pockets as taxpayers. Rest assured that the new mania for experimental transplant of organs in rabbits and other animals, brain surgery on mice and even primates such as the spider monkey, recently reported at the International Science Fair in Fort Worth, Texas, would have been greatly diminished had NFS grants for biological projects been withheld from high school students. There is no victory in the 1969 ruling which prohibited the display of any live animal at the International Fair. Photographs of what preceded the exhibits were testimony enough of the cruelties and suffering involved.

Above all, we must be continually vigilant about what goes on in our schools if we hope to reduce and, even more hopefully, eliminate the abuse of animals in the science classroom. Somehow we must teach children that animals, too, have rights and that they have these rights as against man. Perhaps it is time, if it is not already long overdue, to launch a civil rights campaign in behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. One thing is certain, as the great scientist Alexander Von Humboldt observed: "Cruelty to animals cannot exist together with true education and true learning."
Of all the great shortages in the world today, animal protein is high on the list. The world’s livestock population is more than twice that of the human race, and while we know how to utilize this great source of food, mankind is faced with the reality that more than half of the world’s livestock are suffering from malnutrition and disease. The problems involved in feeding a burgeoning human population do not necessarily include rate of production of animals but the wise utilization of the animals we already have. In many areas of the world, certain animal proteins are not eaten because of superstition and/or age-old beliefs that do not stand up, really, under our modern knowledge and dietary requirements. For instance, the pig is a great source of protein, yet its flesh is prohibited by the orthodox of the Hindu, Hebrew and Islam religions. Perhaps these sincere and religious people should review their age-old dogmas in the light of man’s twentieth century dietary needs and modern standards set for nutritional food.

In some areas of the world the ingestion of eggs and poultry is prohibited. In other lands the slaughtering of cattle and the consumption of beef are taboo. In a few areas on earth there is a livestock population explosion comparable to that of the human family. Many of these animals, however, are unproductive, or they produce such a low level as to be of practically no food value whatsoever.

We will produce the protein we need only when all men come to realize the close association that exists between soil and plant, plant and animal, and animal and man, and when we learn to apply our existing knowledge to the improvement of livestock at all levels and to eliminate or control the great worldwide protein waste caused by disease, parasites and--important to us--careless and inhumane husbandry practices. It is indeed a sad commentary that all of the nations on earth ours is by far the most wasteful and, yes, the most inhumane as well in its handling of its livestock.

The humane movement is to some degree responsible for the indifference expressed today toward livestock—an indifference that is demonstrated by entirely too many men. We have by-passed livestock in our humane programs in favor of the dog and the cat. But I can’t help but feel that our reasons for walking around the large animal problems are several-fold—lack of knowledge, fear, and the misconception that only dog and cat owners like animals or would be willing to contribute to our work. Then, again, some of our people are sentimentalists who do far more harm than they realize.

Now, in the face of a worldwide crisis and pressing demands in our country for sufficient food to feed the estimated 30 million Americans who allegedly go to bed hungry day after day, we must widen the umbrella of our professional interests to include all animals, especially livestock. And, of course, in addition, the so-called wildlife that share our land with us. Too long have we basked in the light of human emotionalism and too long have we acted like spoiled children bent upon keeping our candy all to ourselves. We do not share with one another for selfish reasons. We communicate only on levels that do not involve possible sources of financial support. I have always maintained that societies that do their work effectively and efficiently and in a businesslike manner will find the money they need to carry on their services. And may I, in all modesty, point to my own organization as an object example. There is sufficient support for all of us and little need for us to act so selfishly with each other. It is time for coalition of our organizations. The dictionary tells me that a coalition can be a temporary alliance for joint action.

It is and has been for years very confusing to the general public when brochures are read indicating that there are 800-odd humane societies in the United States and that they are all affiliated with either the HSUS or the AHA. Mel Morse was kind enough to send me a brochure the other day from the AHA indicating that there are now close to a thousand societies. This was good news. From my own experience over the years, I had come to the conclusion that there were not more than about 400, but I’m glad that there are a thousand. I hope they’re effective. This sort of promotion material is dishonest and does more to hurt than is realized. There can be little doubt that there is need for both national organizations—let’s say two major organizations. There are, in addition, some 24 national groups set up to protect animals from coast to coast. Competition is healthy, very much worthwhile, and it helps to keep all groups on their toes. However, they and all the other groups should strive to...
work together on major issues. This we have never done. I can visualize a future in which all humane organizations will have resolved their differences and come together as a powerful force within our total population, working in unison wisely and methodically, to protect all animals that are in need of help, whether domestic or wild. Believe me, I think it can be done.

One must never tear down ideas unless there are better “do’s” available. Since there are many better “do’s” in sight, I will try to list them in the light of their relative importance as I see them. Some of these thoughts will probably increase the adrenalin flow of a few of our friends (not in this room, I hope), but it is time for better “do’s” to come to the surface. It is time for someone to tell it like it is.

The protection of pets is, of course, never ending. In this area, most humane organizations do a really good job. We should, however, blot out all of our false ideas about rabies and distemper and recognize that both of these diseases do actually exist and that preventive medical care is always in order. I’ve known a dozen societies in this country that have been very forceful in their thinking that there is no such thing as rabies, that this is an idea propelled by the veterinary profession in order to increase their income. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We can and we must cooperate with competent men and women who teach dog obedience and with all those men who practice the profession of veterinary medicine. Such cooperation should become part and parcel of our whole program everywhere, especially in urban areas where the pet populations are relatively high. By the same token, those veterinarians who believe in get rich quick policies must come to understand that they, too, have moral responsibilities quite similar to our own. We must encourage the highest form of mutual respect between ourselves and those who practice the profession of veterinary medicine. Such cooperation should become part and parcel of our whole program everywhere.

Obedience training offers a great many opportunities to enlarge our list of friends and supporters. During the last three years, we have been fortunate in New England by having one of the best dog training groups in the northeast come to the Eastern States Exposition, which is our large show here, and put on demonstrations of dog obedience. There’s nothing that will ingratiate you more quickly in the hearts of your fellow countrymen than having a dog that is a good citizen. I can strongly recommend that all of you cooperate with your dog obedience people. There are some that are bad; cull them out. Most of them are good. And I think they have a lot that they can teach you; you have a lot that you can teach them.

In areas concerned with water and air pollution, humane organizations can and should participate in these local programs. However, before we offer our services to anyone, we should study the local program and problems and know what we’re talking about. There are several groups that we should be cooperating with. Almost every city in the United States today has what is known as a conservation commission. They would welcome your interest, your counsel, and your help. Sensible wildlife conservation presents tremendous possibilities for a healthy and effective program, from the raccoon and the skunk, both of which are increasing in number, to the hundreds of mammals and songbirds and marine life presently endangered by insecticides and herbicides.

State departments of fisheries and game offer many avenues of mutual interest and concern. Yet there are some humane societies in this country who still look upon fish and game officials as demons and fourth class citizens. We must unlearn many of our old witches tales because they’re not true in the light of what we know today. Whether we like it or not, there is a place for the careful and conservation minded hunter. The only hunters with whom I am in complete disagreement are the careless ones and those who use bows and arrows. The method of bow and arrow hunting is far more inhumane than it is productive of food and is today a multi-million dollar industry, due largely to our refusal to work together in the very beginning as a united force. Now we’re much too late, and all we can hope to do is watch for violations of local anti-cruelty laws in our various states.

Livestock, animals raised in confinement, animals in large numbers shipped to other countries, and, of course, those cattle, calves, sheep, swine, goats, poultry and horses raised for the purpose of supplying meat for human and animal consumption will present problems that will increase in importance as long as they exist.

Humane problems involving livestock are a hundred times more important and much more complex today than they were a hundred years ago. What can societies do to prevent or reduce this reservoir of potential cruelty? I think we can do many things.

It would help if we could act in unison and a like manner whenever similar programs and problems arise. For instance, many of your organizations are located in areas where there are 4-H Clubs and where there are high schools teaching vocational agriculture. Students in such high schools, known as Future Farmers of America, are working with animals constantly. These people don’t even take a vacation during their four years of high school. Their vacation periods must be spent on a farm working in some area which is parallel to those things they are studying during their school years. This goes on all during their four years of high school. These people would welcome your interest in their work, and you have much in common. Together you could promote a great many things – the humane handling of animals from birth to slaughter, the equipment that is used on our farms to make sure that it is effective and not causing bruising, crippling, and pre-market deaths.
There is another very important area that I think we've overlooked completely – the fire safety methods that are not being used in our country. This is of tremendous importance. It should be to the humane field. It certainly is to the nation's economic well being. Last year, alone, we lost 800 million dollars worth of farm property, and much of that was lost in the form of livestock that were burned to death. Our agents are constantly being called to attend fires where they can humanely dispatch animals that are subjected to the heat of a burning barn. This is to say nothing about the many race track fires that occur annually because almost all race track owners refuse to pay for sprinkling systems. It costs about $185 today to put a sprinkling system in a barn to cover an area of a box stall. And most of them feel that this expense is much too high to pay. I recall a case in my own state a few years ago. I spent two days with the owner of a dairy farm, a good dairy farm. He had 95 milkers at that time and about 35 additional dry cows and several calves. He said, after the second day, that he was going to install a sprinkling system because it was a good barn and he had a lot of money invested, but he never got around to it. And two years later 88 of the finest Guernsey cows in New England died in a barn fire.

4-H members, Future Farmers of America, livestock agricultural students at the college level, believe me, are the salt of the earth. These young people are not busy rebelling against the establishment although they have their reasons to as well. Most of their interests lie in animals, including dogs, but in spite of this huge reservoir of potential cooperation, I have never heard of a humane society working closely with these people. And I often wonder why.

You would marvel at the attitudes of these young folks. For more than 40 years 4-H club members have worked with animals. There are today 2½ million of them. And about a million of those 2½ million are working with animals, a great many of them with dog clubs, with dairy clubs, with beef, sheep, and swine clubs. 450,000 members of the FFA are working from coast to coast and they are directly concerned with the production and marketing of animals.

While there have been challenges in the past, my friends, the humane movement will face new and far more complex challenges in the future. The question we must ask ourselves is, will we be ready, will we be qualified to meet these challenges successfully? Some of us have not yet learned how to treat our fellow men with respect and understanding. Such people should never associate themselves in a work that is or should be predicated upon kindness, sympathy, understanding, and brotherly love.

We have the tools today to do the job. The answer to what we do with these tools is in your hands and thousands like you from coast to coast.

Let us try to change some of our out-dated and erroneous attitudes. It won't be easy, but it must be done if the humane movement is to survive another century and continue to maintain its place among those services that benefit mankind. The one great catalyst we must have in order to change wrong attitudes where they exist, and chart new and more acceptable programs in the future, is total involvement and a greater understanding on our part of all living things – human as well as animal.

No matter how well intended a program, a drug, an opinion, a law, they all need the test of time to prove themselves. No matter how much interest we may engender in your minds today, it's going to take time for you to adapt your actions and your thinking to those ideas we put before you. We can only hope that your organization will try to apply its great influence, its wisdom, and its determination to the protection of millions of animals that have received little more than passing notice over the years. Believe me, once you do, you will find a new life in the old stereotyped programs of yesterday.

Remember that livestock constitute a major part of our total agriculture and, my friends, believe me, if it were not for agriculture, we would not be meeting here today. Certainly, a nation capable of creating a force powerful enough to thrust a rocket through space at a speed of 7 miles a second can be expected to understand your reasons for protecting livestock and be willing to support your work.

The epilog to any plea we make for you to concern yourselves with more than 20 million livestock will probably be written by humane society personnel yet unborn because change doesn't come overnight, but if our work is going to be truly effective, we must change our attitudes.

II — By Dr. F. J. Mulhern, Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Thank you for this opportunity to participate in your annual meeting. I would like to acquaint you with the work we have been doing in the Agricultural Research Service in relation to animal diseases. The losses from these diseases have been substantial, amounting to billions of dollars each year. Of equal interest to you is the pain, suffering, and death which occurs as a result of them.

We are committed to the eradication of these diseases where it is feasible, both technically and financially. The record has shown that even when the ultimate goal of eradication has not been reached in some programs, the disease incidence has been dramatically reduced and, thus, the suffering.
The solution to these problems has to be through the efforts of man. Individual owners were powerless to do anything substantial about it, and so our task in this area of disease eradication was similar to yours. How do you get man to face up to a situation and put forth enough effort to do something to change it? If change is to be made, there must be constant and continuous pressure.

I believe there is a growing awareness today by man of his total environment, and I'm speaking to you today as an administrator within government. Man, in looking at his environment, is searching to comprehend its parameters, and he feels very insecure until he really recognizes those parameters. In his search to find these parameters, he has become somewhat confused. However, I believe we are causing some changes in the area that I'm deeply associated with and I'd like to share some of them with you. I believe you can help us.

Historically, the first animal disease known to be eradicated in this country was in 1892 when contagious pleuropneumonia, that came into this country from animals that had been imported, was eradicated.

When this was successful, the Department efforts were turned toward cattle fever ticks, which were plaguing all interests in developing a cattle industry in the southeastern states. A particular tick was responsible for the spread of this disease. When it became known that the disease was being spread by the tick, it was a major breakthrough because after that finding, people began to study other vectors to see if they were capable of spreading other diseases.

The cattle fever tick was eradicated in 1940 from all infested states except in an area along the United States-Mexico border in which we must keep a continuous watch for evidence of its spread.

The next program was begun against sheep scabies, an insidious disease spreading across the country. This unsightly skin condition, caused by a parasite, was widespread. The incidence was dramatically reduced at one time and, as a result, much of the support present when the condition was prevalent did not continue. It wasn't long before the incidence was again on the rise. In 1962 there was again a demand to reactivate the eradication program, and this time to carry it to its completion.

When incidence gets low, the cases become more difficult to find. I sometimes wonder if we have the manpower and the interest of the industry involved and humane societies and other groups to help us find the last remnants of the disease and once and for all eradicate it.

The present generation seldom sees the hunchback which was quite evident a few decades ago. This is because we are eradicating tuberculosis in our cattle. A few decades ago half of the children admitted to a hospital in Michigan with deformities of the spine had cattle tuberculosis. Here, again, we are looking for that needle in the haystack—the last remnants of infection. In some counties, as high as 85 per cent of the cattle were once infected. In all counties of the United States today the incidence is less than one-tenth of one per cent.

A program on cattle brucellosis was started in 1937 and was greatly accelerated in 1952 in order to do something significant nationally against this particular situation. With this accelerated program and coordinating all our efforts, we are working vigorously to reduce the incidence below one percent in the last of the states, which is an interim goal before complete eradication.

A hog cholera eradication program was begun in 1962 against this number one killer disease of swine. We are now reaching a stage where all states have all-out eradication programs. Our challenge is to keep the momentum going until we can eliminate this killing disease of swine that has plagued us since the 1830's, when it was first reported in this country.

In 1957 we started an eradication program in the southeast to rid the area of screwworms—a larval stage of the screwworm fly. The female fly lays its eggs on any open wound of animals, after which she dies. The males live about three weeks.

We found that we could sterilize the fly with x-rays during the pupae phase of its development, and the flies that developed were sterile. If we could raise, sterilize, and release these sterile flies in quantities so that we could overwhelm the native fly population, ten to one, we could eradicate the species. This was done. There hasn't been a case of screw worm in the southeast since 1959. We have now pushed the fly all the way back to one of its breeding grounds in Mexico, and further efforts are being made in this disease eradication program.

It is interesting to note that wildlife populations also are increasing in the areas where the fly has been eliminated. One reason for this is that the eggs laid by the fly in the newborn of wildlife were killing them.

As many of you are aware, we have also been responsible for the 28-Hour Law that applies to the movement of livestock by railroads. It's been a long time since we have had a complaint registered on inhumane treatment of livestock being hauled interstate by railroads. This law is really discriminating, however, since the majority of the transportation of livestock is by truck. I agree fully that this is an area that needs concerted attention.

As you are aware, we have been involved in the implementation of P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare act. We are pleased with the results even though there is still a lot to be done. Your organization is to be commended for the work it has been doing to get action on cases that are not covered by the law.

We are dissatisfied with the results to date in stopping or
reducing the alleged thefts of pets to be used for research. We felt that by now we would have prosecuted several persons for this unforgivable practice. We hope that the law and regulations are a deterrent, but we are sufficiently realistic to know that its passage and implementation does not stop all of it. There are still reports of theft, but we haven’t been able to prove any cases to date and prosecute those responsible.

I know that some of you may be dissatisfied with what you might call lack of action on our part, but our personnel must follow instructions and guidance of our legal department. The only way we can take additional action, if it is to be constitutional, is to amend the Act to get the authority.

One of the reasons for my dwelling on our disease eradication programs is to highlight a record of being relentless in fulfilling our ultimate goals. With the active participation of organizations such as yours and others working in the humane areas, with state governments becoming more active, and with continuous action on our part, many of the abuses to animals will eventually be eliminated.

There is still a lot to be done in many of the areas in which you have interest. S. 2543 to stop the soring of horses is a definite step in the right direction. The endangered species bill is likewise important legislation. Also, I understand that legislation has been introduced in relation to roadside zoos.

There is another important problem confronting all of us, and that is the pollution of our environment. All of us are rather late in recognizing that something must be done about it. Better testing techniques that have become available to us in recent years have helped us to realize that some contamination was taking place that previously went undetected.

Now that we have this analytical capability, we should monitor our activities so that we not only know what we may be adding to the environment but also what happens to it afterward. If we must use something that is harmful to certain parts of the environment, then great care must be exercised to keep that harm to the very minimum. I don’t think that we should arbitrarily discard certain tools that we use to grow our food and fiber on the basis that we can’t handle them safely. At the same time, I’ll admit if they can’t be handled safely, they should not be used.

I believe that if we have more than one chemical that is equally effective and the need for its use is essential in our food production, but one is more hazardous than the other, we should not recommend the one that is more hazardous. We have been asked to ban the use of DDT. Because we have not taken such action, some have said we are trying to protect the agricultural chemical industry. Others have said we place the production of our food on a higher priority than the safety of our people and animals, including fish and wildlife, but this is not so.

We simply have to act within the framework of the law that we must administer. These products have been licensed for years as to their safety and effectiveness. When we withdraw them, we must have adequate evidence to defend our action. One of the major difficulties we are trying to resolve is whether laboratory results are comparable to that which occurs in nature. If our scientists agreed that they were, we wouldn’t have any difficulty cancelling some products that are on the market today. In the meantime, we must strive to get such data.

We now have pesticide monitoring stations set up across the nation. We will be enlarging them. We will know what effect we are having on the environment. It isn’t as good as the system that monitors nuclear explosions, but it at least shows that we have become aware that we must know what happens when we add a chemical to our environment. We will also know whether we can use it without having it accumulate.

We have just completed the design of a study with the Department of Interior to determine if the use of mirex bait used against the fire ant will have any harmful effects on crabs and shrimp. The laboratory tests show that they might. These enlarged field tests will show us if it occurs in nature. The difference between our approach today and in the past is that now we are conscious of what harm can be done, and we are using these chemicals much more intelligently.

Of great concern to us is that some of the persistent chemicals may be harmful to us eventually, but the alternatives can be much more harmful immediately to those who must use them.

I have covered a wide field. I have tried to show that our interests cover many areas. All of them, I’m sure, are of interest to you. If there are any questions, I will try to answer them.
Extension of Community Programs for Animal Protection

By Milton B. Learner, President
Indiana Federation of Humane Societies
Indianapolis, Indiana

What real value does a county, city, or village humane society actually contribute to the humane movement in our country?

Allow me to cite one example that occurred in Indiana. During 1965, the Indiana Federation of Humane Societies introduced their version of a state humane slaughter bill in the House of Representatives. There it languished in committee until approximately ten days prior to adjournment. The pertinent committee chairman came from a small Indiana town where no effective humane society existed. In fact, it was only the efforts of a well organized humane society located several counties distant that finally resulted in the release of the bill from committee and passage by the House. Unfortunately, insufficient time remained for action by the Senate. Two years later, such a bill was enacted into law. During this two year hiatus, thousands of Indiana cattle were pole-axed, and countless numbers of pigs were tortured in the slaughter process. Please excuse this reference to tragedy, but it is nothing less than the terrible truth.

My discussion today will cover the development and extension of humane activities at the state and local levels. This will include the work of a state federation, a comparison between federations and HSUS branches, and the cooperation in national programs by both—while extending such activities to the grassroots local societies. Whatever authority this speaker can muster on these subjects has been gained essentially, it must be remembered, during his tenure as President of the Indiana Federation of Humane Societies.

A state federation of humane societies is quite impressive in nomenclature. It implies united action, resulting in the exercise of power from the top down to the local individual societies. At least in Indiana, nothing could be further from the truth. Probably a more accurate term to use in describing our group would be a confederation of autonomous societies instead of a federation controlled solely by its own Directors and its own dictates. Our federation exercises no veto authority over any of its individual member humane societies. Funds are not solicited from constituents or donors of such local member societies. Our funds are obtained only through dues from member humane societies and individual members of the federation. Now, in spite of this ostensible, fragile structure, most of Indiana state humane legislation of the past ten years has actually been enacted through the leadership, or under some influence, of this particular federation.

How does the federation operate? Our federation is based on four principal policy objectives:

1. It acts as legislative liaison and actual lobbyist for state and national humane bills.
2. It offers a forum for discussion and dissemination of matters, both practical and philosophical, pertaining to functions of the humane movement.
3. It serves as a sort of collection agency of animal cruelty cases.
4. It aids, advises, and supports new humane societies and individual worthwhile projects of these societies.

At no time has our federation considered operating an animal shelter or adoption center for pets. This is not our objective; we leave this to the local societies. We do, of course, advise and furnish research material for such purposes, but let me develop these four policies objectives with some concrete examples as they occur in Indiana.

The Indiana Federation’s main forte thus far has been legislation, and I make no bones about it as I believe legislation has to come. That’s your start; you have to have laws.

An example is the current Rogers-Javits laboratory bill, which under various other names has previously caused some controversy. During a recent federation meeting, this bill was again thoroughly examined and discussed. Ultimately, a resolution supporting the bill was adopted and forwarded to all Indiana federal legislators. We now have documented confirmation of approval of the Rogers-Javits bill from both United States Senators from Indiana – Birch Bayh and Vance Hartke. At least one Indiana Congressman was a co-sponsor of a previous companion bill. The views expressed in our resolution supporting the Rogers-Javits bill are really the views of several local Indiana humane societies. Each individual humane society then issued its own resolution and then the ball started rolling. The word went out to local constituents who in turn contacted Congressmen,
we reached the state where a large number of Hoosiers are having sought editorial help, and rounded up local support. Consequently, the sum total of all of this eventually results in an outflow of material from the incorporated societies voicing their collective views in unison.

In the case of state legislation, the Federation forms a legislative committee prior to the current session. This committee not only makes personal contacts with legislators but directs local society efforts in persuading their lawmakers to see the light at strategic times during the legislative session. The timing is very important in this. It is in this area where our legislative policy is either going to be successful or just be mediocre.

Our federation people spend considerable hours at the state capitol. But it is futile for a federation officer to consistently and repeatedly contact a balking legislator outside of his own voting district. What counts in local politics is the direct solicitation by a legislator's district constituents. One can have the forensic elocution of a Bryan and fail because one happens to live in the wrong county. If there were no other reason for forming a local humane society, the reason for effective legislation would be, in my opinion, sufficient.

Continuing with the second policy objective, one of the most interesting functions of our meetings involves discussion of current problems and their solutions. It is surprising how many local societies never thought of charging spaying fees nor obtaining long-term shelter leases. Many don't understand that saving clauses can be included in their shelter lease to protect their interest in case of animal seizure laws. Not all of our local societies are even knowledgeable of laws that enable them to obtain funds for operation of shelters in their own jurisdictions. Our federation can offer these people answers based on the pooled experience of years of experience in animal humane work of society members.

On several occasions our federation board members have appeared with the local people before their governing agencies and aided in obtaining funds and passage of local humane ordinances. The federation recently published a packet containing all Indiana laws affecting our objectives in the humane movement in general which, obviously, includes all animals. We delivered these packets to all Indiana county sheriffs as well as all individual humane societies. You see, we are laying the groundwork. We are going to advise everybody what the law is in reference to cruelty. The next action will be to send the packet to each county prosecutor. He is a very powerful individual under our form of government. In many instances he makes the decision whether or not the case will be tried.

The need for solving cruelty cases, in keeping with our third policy objective, has caused our federation the most concern. This function actually requires time and professional personnel. Reduced to a simple quotient, it requires finances. Our federation needs a full-time salaried investigator who is experienced with searches, warrants, and the constabulary in general. At the present time, we forward the investigation of cruelty cases to a society nearest the scene of the cruelty. This can present difficulties. Societies do not always want to get embroiled in matters that may lead to notoriety as a result of investigations. Not because they are afraid of the notoriety, they just don't have the time to perform this function. They have their own problems.

We are now speaking of investigations of major, systematic cruelties such as conditions existing at rodeos, large-scale dog thefts and maltreatment and, of course, possible violations of the state humane slaughter act. We know that is going to present a problem. We finally have the law, but the big problem will be enforcement of the law. The hiring of a professional investigator will be on our agenda during our fall meeting next month.

The same problems of personnel and financing affect the function of our policy of initiating new humane societies, our fourth objective, where these societies are needed. Again, we try to have nearby, effective societies perform this task. Adjacent societies usually know who the expressed local humanitarians are in those areas actually needing a society.

Many times an investigation of a cruelty case will disclose sufficient interest by individuals who may form the nucleus of a prospective society. Sometimes the very needs of a local area stimulate interested, although latent, humanitarians. A need for proper animal shelter facilities can result in such stimulus. Although we encourage local societies to correct the existing pound facilities first, where the governing agency is willing to finance both the construction and the complete administration of the shelter, we advise a local group to build a shelter. Our federation will furnish construction plans, lease forms, and operating procedure suggestions for all these local societies we try to start. Our goal is a humane society for each county—92 humane societies for Indiana's 92 counties.

Throughout the execution of these four policy objectives runs a steady current of planned education of the public. The federation has contact with approximately 74 radio stations, 15 television stations, and well over 500 newspapers in Indiana. Prior to the passage of the Indiana humane slaughter bill in 1967, all these news agencies were solicited on at least two occasions, carefully and factually stating the advantages of humane slaughter.

What is the composition of a state federation? Who are its members, officers, and directors? Does a federation duplicate functions of local societies?
The federation must have as members the strongest and most effective societies in the state. Although individuals can be members, and we welcome them, the representation must be essentially that of the incorporated local humane society. I think the reason is obvious; I have spoken about legislative attempts in the past.

Indiana has approximately 40 societies on the books. At least 20 of these 40 societies are members of our federation and we believe that most of the effective Indiana societies are members of the federation. As a matter of fact, I think we are represented by 5 local societies here today. We insist that our board of directors include active officers of local societies. It is obvious that with this type of representation there will be strength and little duplication of effort will occur.

There is another salient reason for the composition of the type of federation I have described. Indiana authorizes local county commissions to appropriate up to $15,000 per year to societies for animal control purposes. This sum is a vital source of operating revenue to local societies. These funds are not available to our federation or to any other statewide organization. Consequently, in order that these funds be obtained for animal welfare, we have to start local humane societies that would be capable of operating shelters. It is true that our federation can come up with the names of about 1,000 individual Indiana humanitarians. We have, however, only used this source of manpower in our efforts towards obtaining humane legislation and not as a source of revenue.

We are now exploring the possibility of obtaining joint county financial support, that is, one county to finance adjacent counties, or two or more counties to finance operations for a central shelter. We are talking now of obtaining statutory funds for operating shelters. It should be remembered, however, that many of our large and powerful humane societies already are operating shelters so they might as well obtain this $15,000 and thus release additional funds for other humane purposes. Perhaps the laws in other states may be similar and I am most anxious to have a further discussion on this.

It is obvious that the type of state federation I’m talking about exists only because a sufficient group of local humane societies believe that such a federation serves a worthwhile purpose. So long as the four main policy functions outlined previously are followed diligently, I am certain such a federation will continue to exist. Our members have had minor differences of opinion. As President of the Indiana federation I am very careful to air and consider all views during our discussions. It should be remembered that our members are affiliated with or otherwise influenced by several national organizations.

I have described a federation of societies in the past few minutes and now I should like to bring into the picture another level of humane activity of the individual states. The HSUS state branch program is similar to that of the federation, similar in objectives. It, too, believes in not duplicating local activity. It believes in strengthening state and local anti-cruelty laws, campaigning extensively for national laws such as the Federal Humane Slaughter Act and the current laboratory regulatory bill.

I think the major difference between our type of federation and the HSUS branch program is probably one of form of organization. The HSUS branches exercise a large degree of autonomy and they are financed through their own efforts without reliance on the parent organization.

The HSUS branches, as I see it, complete an interstitial gap untouched by national and local society activity. The HSUS branch actually completes projects on an operational level in those areas not covered by a local society, but these projects are at least statewide in nature and not restricted to local situations.

The HSUS branch operates directly in the field as an adjunct to local societies. The purpose of the branch is to amplify all of the HSUS campaigns against national cruelties and to execute the program of protecting animals from cruelty at state and local community levels. In order to effect these objectives, the branch organizes statewide or regional programs for public education, for passage of additional and improved anti-cruelty laws, for enforcement of existing laws by conducting thorough investigations of cruelties, and for cooperation with local societies.

An example of an HSUS state branch program is prevention of the breeding of surplus animals. This is done by active education of the public, primarily directed to the adult. Now we have heard and we all agree that we must emphasize the children in our society. Obviously, they are the future minds. But if you want to get action today and tomorrow, you also have to educate the adult. He casts the vote, he spends the money.

By education, the HSUS branch means, for example, the pressure of taxpayers on city governments to use humane methods. Now how do they use this pressure? They have to show these city governments that it may be more economical to do something in a way other than it is being done. This is the type of pressure that will move women’s clubs to help sponsor a spaying clinic and that will bring about higher license fees for unspayed female dogs in order to discourage breeding altogether. The same attack is directed by the HSUS branch in obtaining state humane slaughter and legislation against the use of rodeo bucking straps.

During the past 20 minutes I have explained in some detail a federation of humane societies as it exists in the state of Indiana. Indiana has what I would consider a number of effective local humane societies. Consequently, I think a federation serves their
interest by coordinating their local society activity. Perhaps in another state where insufficient numbers of effective local humane societies exist, a more autonomous federation would be required.

Please don’t allow the words “advise,” “coordinate,” and “distribute” leave an incorrect impression of this type of federation. These words smack of staff operations as distinguished from actual action in the field. Our officers are not members of a “passive resistance” movement. We are hard-hitting in our field of endeavor, and our board of directors contains personnel who are the officers of the most active societies in the state. But, we do believe that humane treatment of animals can be achieved by people convincing their neighbors through their own local society.

If I may end with this observation, I shall like to state that the Indiana Federation of Humane Societies will accept advice, help, and comfort from all national organizations. We will carefully weigh all material, we use most of it, and thank the offeror even if it is not used. It gives me great pleasure to advise this group that we in Indiana have never rejected any advice, material, nor offer of use of personnel from this magnificent organization, The Humane Society of the United States.

Protection for Animals in Biomedical Research

By F. L. Thomsen, Ph.D., President Humane Information Services, Inc. St. Petersburg, Florida

Now, I know that some of you are not going to like what I have to say about laboratory animal legislation. I can only describe the situation as confused. It reminds me of a sign on the desk of a business friend: “If you can keep a cool head, then you just don’t understand the situation.” But whether or not you agree with me, let’s keep a cool head. I don’t hate anybody, and I hope you won’t hate me.

By every rational standard – numbers of animals involved, the average amount of suffering undergone by those animals, and the comparative feasibility of remedial measures – laboratory animal protection is by far the most important humane project of this or any other decade.

Yet, little more than lip service has been given to this project by many or most humane societies. The HSUS and Humane Information Services are the only two large societies that really have gone to town in behalf of this much-needed improvement in animal welfare.

I am not going to review here the need for some kind of laboratory controls. If there are a half dozen people in this audience who are not already thoroughly convinced of this, I would be greatly surprised. With at least a hundred million animals used by the laboratories annually, in all kinds of ways involving a great deal of completely unnecessary suffering, anyone who is content to let the situation continue to ride along is indeed lacking in any compassion for animals.

Nor am I going to review in detail all of the things in the Rogers-Javits bill which would result in eliminating or reducing this
suffering. Permit me to make this categorical statement about it: Nobody, but nobody, has gone into the subject more thoroughly than the group of people most intimately associated with the attempt to obtain laboratory improvement. Oliver Evans, Pat Parkes and Frank McMahon of the HSUS, The Reverend Charles Herrick, formerly Vice President of the HSUS, Frances Holway and Charlotte Parks of the Committee for Constructive Laboratory Animal Legislation, and I have devoted years to studying and working on this question. We have visited countless laboratories unannounced. We have talked at length with many biomedical scientists who are quite sympathetic to our cause and who are professionally aware of conditions which lead to unnecessary suffering by laboratory animals. We have read numerous highly technical books and articles dealing with possible ways of reducing animal suffering in the laboratories.

Our conclusion from all of this work and study is that not just a small part, but that most of the suffering undergone by laboratory animals in “unnecessary” under the terms of the pain provisions of the Rogers-Javits bill. Granted, it will take some time and effort to bring about the necessary interpretations of these provisions. The Act, when passed, offers us the medium through which to obtain such interpretations.

This unnecessary suffering results mostly from the indifference, and from the inertia and the lack of proper scientific training and technical knowledge, of many of those conducting laboratory animal experiments and tests. If only this unnecessary suffering were eliminated, I sincerely believe that 95 percent of all the suffering of laboratory animals would be eliminated. Who would want to wait another hundred years to attain 100 percent elimination, when we can get 95 percent soon?

The Rogers-Javits bill is directed specifically and effectively at those operations which result in unnecessary suffering. It would not interfere with legitimate and humane biomedical activities. It would not prevent all pain, because some of it is incurred in painful research or testing which the public and the Congress as well as biomedical people consider to be necessary and desirable. They will never, for example, agree to forego painful research which might lead to a cure for dreaded cancer. But over a period of time, the Act would gradually eliminate a large part or even the suffering which now is considered to be necessary.

During the past year the leaflets and newspaper advertisements of some societies have generated among humanitarians a renewed hope that the use of animals in laboratories can be entirely eliminated soon by the use of computers and tissue cultures. Now, nobody in the humane movement in this country antedates me in their interest in this possibility. I have for years been studying this subject. In 1964 I toured Europe in an effort to learn more about it, and had several long conferences with Professor Aygun of Turkey, a biologist and humanitarian well known for his work in this field. It was partly because of my insistence that strong provisions for the promotion of replacement and substitution were incorporated in the original Rogers bill of 1965. I have worked hard to give technical information to Congressman Rogers and others, which has resulted in similar provisions being incorporated in the present Rogers-Javits bill.

But, friends, why do we humanitarians so frequently seem to go overboard for some new idea or fad like this, rather than to consider it in proper perspective which takes into account not just what we would like to see done, but also what is possible to get done? What good can it do to make demands or plans which have no chance of fulfillment? There is no prospect whatsoever that we are going to get some law, or some administrative action by the government, that would result in the sudden substitution of computers or other technical methods for the use of animals in laboratories.

This replacement will come about, but gradually. That has been the history of all improvements in research and professional practices. It required years to persuade physicians to abandon use of the blood-sucking leech, to understand the significance of bacteria and viruses, and to adopt aseptic methods in surgery. Who was it that discovered the potentialities of computers and tissue cultures in biomedical research? Not any humanitarian, but the scientists themselves. Those scientists who understand these methods and their possibilities are writing the papers in the medical journals that are quoted by humanitarians. It is to their personal interest to promote the use of these methods, which would enhance their professional prestige and emoluments. There is a division in HEW that has been working on this for some time. They issued a bulletin advocating the use of computers in biomedical research as long ago as 1965.

The real question is, how can we best assist these and other progressive scientists to more rapidly advance their ideas? Certainly it is not by writing letters or placing advertisements in newspapers denouncing scientists for being ignorant, untrained, stubborn and sadistic. That will only antagonize the scientists who need to be persuaded. No, the best way is to offer help and encouragement to the scientists who are working in these new fields. They need most a directive from Congress, implemented with legislative authority and funds. And the best way to get that is to pass the Rogers-Javits bill, Sections 8 and 9 of which would give assistance in the further development of these new techniques and provide for educational activities at a professional level to persuade the scientists to move more rapidly in the direction we want them to.

So, there is no doubt whatever in the minds of those humanitarians whom I mentioned as being most knowledgeable in
this field of laboratory legislation that, if the Rogers-Javits bill is passed, it will do more than any other feasible action to promote replacement and substitution. But in addition to accomplishing this highly desirable objective, passage of the bill would accomplish a great many other things to relieve the suffering of the animals. It is a good bill, a really strong bill. It is the best bill that humanitarians can ever hope to get through Congress in the foreseeable future. Yet, a considerable segment of the humane movement is either very lukewarm or opposed to the bill. Why?

Those who are familiar with the history of the humane movement know that this cleavage of opinion can be traced to personal and organizational rivalries which have nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of the bill itself, and to the traditional anti-vivisectionist stand against any regulation as a "legalization" of the use of animals in laboratories. The arguments used against the bill are merely rationalizations of these deep-seated emotional responses. If one argument against the bill is demolished, as when the provisions amending P.L. 89-544 were eliminated, the opponents merely shift to another argument.

Those who have taken the lead in opposing the bill have constructed a whole series of straw men representing what they have claimed to be fatal weaknesses in the Rogers-Javits bill. As fast as one straw man is demolished another is erected.

The opponents of the Rogers-Javits bill say that humanitarians who have devoted years of work to this attempt to get effective laboratory legislation are "venal" (that is the word they have used) "enemies of humane treatment of animals," in league with the laboratories to destroy P.L. 89-544, the petnapping act. As most of you know by this time, the Rogers-Javits bill does not amend in any respect whatever P.L. 89-544.

The other objections that have been raised to the Rogers-Javits bill are just as silly and untrue. These objections have been rather thoroughly reviewed and answered in past issues of the Reports to Humanitarians published by Humane Information Services. We have shown that enforcement of the proposed Act would not be by "the vivisectors" themselves, but from beginning to end would be under the control of the administrative agency. We have shown that the use of in-laboratory committees of scientists to assist in the enforcement procedures is one of the most effective provisions of the bill. And we have shown that the penalty provisions and other features of the bill have been very carefully worked out to promote effective enforcement.

The objection that the bill gives responsibility for enforcement to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare rather than to the Department of Agriculture reaches about the limit of absurdity. Now, I have nothing against the Department of Agriculture person-
room are followers of these opponents of the bill. I am not questioning your sincerity in the slightest, but that of the so-called leaders who cook up these phony objections.

Many things are debatable. But the statement that the Rogers-Javits bill would contribute substantially to the alleviation of laboratory animal suffering is not. Only the blindly prejudiced or those who are unfamiliar with the provisions of the bill and what they are designed to accomplish would make such a claim. If any of you still are unconvinced, you cannot have read with an open mind the detailed analysis of the bill, section by section, which appeared in our Report to Humanitarians No. 8, issued last June. I notice that the National Society for Medical Research in a recent bulletin has quoted extensively from our Report, evidently in an attempt to scare physicians into opposing the bill, by showing that the bill is not a "paper tiger." Evidently our explanations were more convincing to researchers than to some humanitarians!

But there still remains the valid question, "Even if the Rogers-Javits bill would do a lot of good, shouldn't we attempt to get something stronger, different or better?"

Even if the Rogers-Javits bill were not as good as its supporters think, it is better than nothing unless there is some more satisfactory alternative. Is there such an alternative? For the answer to that you will have to depend upon two pieces of evidence. First is the fact that those behind the bill are experienced in legislative matters and have talked with scores of Congressmen and other informed people. Nobody consulted has even suggested that stronger legislation could pass Congress in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, some think that the provisions of the Rogers-Javits bill are so strong that it cannot be passed now.

Secondly, as of now, October, 1969, even the humanitarians who oppose the bill are not advocating any specific legislation which they believe to be stronger. They all seem to want to "wait" for some vague time in the future when conditions will be more favorable. Meanwhile, hundreds of millions of laboratory animals would continue to suffer needlessly, year after year, because we failed to act now.

There has been one intelligent, rational suggestion of an approach which could be considered an alternative to the Rogers-Javits bill. We suggested this alternative in our Report to Humanitarians No. 6, issued last December, but a better statement of it has been made by Mr. Michael Moukhanoff, who for 22 years was President of the International Conference Against Vivisection, Inc., until forced to resign because of his statement reviewing the ineffective position of the anti-vivisection movement. In our Report to Humanitarians No. 9, issued this past September, we have reproduced the famous letter written by Mr. Moukhanoff, and his summary of the kind of laboratory legislation, focused exclusively upon replacement or substitution, which he thinks might be more effective than the Rogers-Javits bill. Sections 8 and 9 of the Rogers-Javits bill would, in my opinion, accomplish essentially the same results as those contemplated by Mr. Moukhanoff's well-reasoned suggestion, and in addition the bill would accomplish a great many other things to alleviate the suffering of laboratory animals.

So, I can see nothing on the legislative horizon that would be stronger or better than the Rogers-Javits bill. I sincerely believe that there is no possibility whatever of any other action during the foreseeable future to curtail the suffering of laboratory animals comparable to what would be achieved by passage of the Rogers-Javits bill. If you disagree with that, I hope you will, during the discussion, state specifically what measure you think would accomplish more. If everyone would be constructive, instead of merely trying to tear down what is suggested by others, we would get farther in the humane movement.

In the few minutes of time left to me, I would like to deal with our chances of obtaining passage of the Rogers-Javits bill.

Very frankly, and with great regret, I must say that unless humanitarians and humane societies who profess to be in favor of the bill do some really hard and effective work, we don't stand a very good chance of winning. The so-called humane organizations and the medical research interests that oppose the bill have much more money behind their opposition, and they have been far more active than the humanitarians who are favorable to it. As a result, members of Congress think they see a group of humanitarians who don't amount to much politically anyway, and who are more or less evenly divided in their support of, or opposition to, this bill. And the opponents can bring to bear on Congress many more people with influence and money — campaign contributors and leading citizens — than are found in the ranks of supporters. So, the only way the bill's supporters can succeed is by seeing to it that the overwhelming majority of letters to Congress are in support of the bill.

Most humane societies have been doing little or nothing to generate such support. How long has it been since your own society — local, state or national — has sent to all its mailing list a comprehensive analysis of the bill and a really strong appeal to write favorable letters to the President, to their own Representatives and Senators, to the Chairman of the House and Senate Committees to which the bill has been assigned, and to all of the newspapers and magazines circulating in your area? I could name names and give some specific examples which might make some people here today feel uncomfortable, but I won't.
Just writing a few letters yourself is not enough. If you really want to help, you should put pressure on your local and other society officers to circulate their mailing lists with such appeals. Only by a united effort such as this can humanitarians hope to obtain passage of controversial legislation such as the Rogers-Javits bill.

You say you have written in the past? That makes no difference — nobody is going to check the files.

You claim you are too busy rescuing stray animals or conducting rummage sales for your local animal shelter? You could engage in such activities for 50 years and never accomplish as much in preventing the suffering of animals in such great numbers as by writing a few letters which turned out to be the straw that broke the camel's back of opposition to laboratory legislation.

You say you have heard so much on both sides of this question that you are confused and don't know what you should do? Then get the recent excellent special bulletin of The HSUS dealing with this subject, and Reports to Humanitarians Nos. 7, 8 and 9 of Humane Information Services, and take enough time to really read and understand them.

Ignorance of the law is no excuse in the eyes of a judge. And ignorance will be no excuse in the eyes of your own conscience if you do not, now, do everything in your power to become informed and to act intelligently and vigorously.

Cruelty for Fun

By Cleveland Amory

President, Fund for Animals

New York, New York

Just before I came up here I was handed a letter from Mrs. David Crosland of the Montgomery Humane Society, Montgomery, Alabama. "I hope this will reach you in time," she said. "Last Saturday, in a clearing near a pond well off the main road south of Andalusia, Alabama, men, women, and children gathered to enjoy the spectacle of 50 dogs tear to pieces 3 raccoons. From across the state they came, over 100 strong, with chairs, food and beer, to watch and participate in the Alabama State Championship Field Trials and Water Races, and to the delight of all but a little girl, the coons were torn to pieces. The little girl buried her head in her mother's dress and cried softly.

"One of these euphemistically called 'special events' was the coon-on-a-log. The cooners anchored a box in a pond about 20 feet from shore with the open end facing the bank. Wearing large protective gloves, two cooners took a coon from its cage, tossed it by its tail into the water, and then two others put it in the box. All the spectators gathered along the bank, some sitting in chairs, others standing, most drinking. The air was pregnant with talk and excitement.

"Holding their dogs on the shore, the cooners worked them into a frenzy. The dogs, foaming at the mouth, strained to break free and attack the coon. When the signal was given, a dog leaped into the water and paddled toward the coon. As the dog neared the box, the coon stood up on its hind feet, making cat-like screams. The dog grabbed the coon, tearing it from its box and into the water. 'A coon can drown a dog in 3 cups of whiskey,' said one of the cooners. Two cooners near the box tried to break the dog's hold. The coon tried to swim away but the cooners grabbed its tail and slung it back into the box. Over 10 dogs got their chance. By the fifth dog the coon no
longer tried to swim away; he merely clawed at the box, trying to keep from drowning."

They tied the coon to a pole, they did all kinds of events down there. I won’t detail them all. I’ll just read the last paragraph of the newspaper dispatch. “After the long day, the coons were given, what was left of them, the sanctuary of their cages until Sunday when the entire contest was to be waged again. Alabama has a state law exempting raccoon baiting from the general cruelty to animals statutes. Every fourth Saturday and Sunday, however, the cooners meet ten miles south of Andalusia. All that is needed is a permit from the Alabama Department of Conservation.”

You know, I don’t like the way the word “conservation” is used much of the time. Also I don’t like the fact that we, all of us in this movement, run away so often from things we could do something about. There are approximately 300 of us in this room; there were 100 at that event. I can’t remember when The HSUS has ever had a conference in the south and, yet, that is where we need it most. I would very much like to be there one day at one of these coon things. You know, I really would, very much, because it would not take very many of us to stop this thing.

A year ago, you may recall, I went down to debate at the American Legion hall about the so-called “bunny bop” in Harmony, North Carolina. It was a foregone conclusion how it was going to be decided. They were all American Legionnaires and they voted that night to hold the “bunny bop” again. But the next day there was such a lot of renewed interest in this and so many photographers and newspapermen and television cameras, and one thing and another, that even the rabbits got scared and they were not able to get their normal quota and could only find 6 rabbits. There were so many hunters that all of the rabbits were scared for miles around.

My problem this year was to try to go down there to the woods of North Carolina and write the story of how such a thing could occur. How could families – men, women, and children – enjoy surrounding a field with their dogs and driving into the center a pathetic bunch of rabbits, male, female, and even baby-rabbits, and crushing them to death with sticks and stones, with their hands, even their feet, in a blood-soaked orgy of violence? How could such a thing occur? I want to report it to you step-by-step as it happened just a couple of weeks ago, because I think you would be interested in it and as it has a bearing on that coon hunt down there in Alabama.

You are dealing with a foreign country when you go to a place like that. I had more feeling of intimacy with the people of the Middle East, even with the people of Spain, than I had with these people. I stopped at what passes as the crossroads of Harmony, North Carolina and I went into a little cafe there and I said to the young lady in back of the counter, “What’s Harmony known for?” She said, “Pretty girls.” She was pretty, too. I said, “What do you think about the bunny bop?” She said, “I don’t like it.” And then a fellow nearby said, “If you want to know about the bunny bop, you ought to go down to Forrest Reavis’ place.”

Well, I went down to Forrest Reavis’ place, which is a kind of combination pool hall and general store. He was sitting on the counter. I said to him, “Are you a member of the American Legion, Mr. Reavis?” He said, “Sometimes I is and sometimes I isn’t.” I said, “How can you tell which is which?” He said, “Mostly by tending to my own business and wishing other folks would do the same.”

From there I went to the commander of the American Legion. I sat in his house and told him I was writing this story, and I was writing this story under great difficulties and that this story was going to be published in December in Holiday. I did not want to throw the gauntlet down so that they would have the hunt again. You see, you are dealing, as I said, with a foreign country. If you come even from the next county, you are a foreigner in Iradell County. I went to Commander Pierce Van Hoy and I said, “Commander Van Hoy, do you think it is a good thing to smash rabbits, which are probably the most defenseless animal there is?” He said, “Mr. Amory, you’ve had the wrong idea about this. We just go out to tell tall tales and listen to the music of the hounds baying.”

We had some support here. There were some good people of the American Legion in New York and elsewhere who thought it was a terrible thing. But, you know, you are operating with people who really do not see anything wrong with using an animal for sport. It is a very difficult thing. In prior attempts a lawyer couldn’t be found who would prosecute the case for cruelty. You are operating with people who have a different feeling about killing and hunting than we have.

Hunting, again like laboratory animals, brings everybody down on your neck. It brings down on your neck the Fish and Game Department. Isn’t that a lovely word – “game?” Who decided they were game? It brings down on your neck the arms manufacturers. You see, guns and hunting licenses can be bought right together. Who decreed that all these people that don’t like hunting shall every fall have their lands overrun by these people who have no concept whatsoever of property rights or other animals? You know that story about the man who finally wrote down on each of his animals “I am a cow,” “I am a dog,” “I am a cat,” “I am a pig.” They didn’t shoot any of them; they shot the John Deere tractor.

Now I want to talk to you about two specific areas where I have had a good deal of experience in the last few weeks. One is the bullfight. It seems to me, again, we have taken the attitude that the bullfight is so strongly entrenched that nothing can be done about it.
Nothing is further from the truth. One of our directors, Alice Wagner, just got back from a trip to France. She asked me to point out that letters properly directed to France, which allows bullfighting in only two southern counties, really would be effective. I think they would pay a good deal of attention if they got a lot of letters from American tourists saying that they would not go to France as long as bullfighting was allowed in any part of France.

One of the things that my weeks in Spain, where I saw 42 bullfights, told me was that it is by no means as popular as you think it is. It is at least 50% supported by the tourist industry. It is almost impossible to stay at a Spanish hotel and not go to a bullfight. The concierge will call you about it, he'll tell you about it, he'll say he thinks he can get you a ticket. You get there and three quarters of the row is empty, and yet he's gotten his cut, of course, in getting you to the fight.

Every single thing about the bullfight is a phony, from the concierge selling you the ticket to what happens in the ring. It is almost unbelievable that this has been blown up to the proportions it has, and it is possible for us to make great inroads in the bullfight. For instance, we would believe that all of these Spanish people, and particularly their great writers, like so many of our great writers who praised the bullfight, have praised the bullfight. Nothing could be further from the truth. By far the majority of the great Spanish writers hate the bullfight just as much as the people in this room.

The number of people in Spain who hate the bullfight is really extraordinary and extends up to the very highest levels of government. They can't do anything about it, unfortunately, because it has lately been promoted very cleverly as a kind of peon sport. You know, the only way you rise in Spain is to be like Cordobes and come in with a sack on your back and end up being a great rancher.

Again, nothing could be further from the truth. Bullfighting was a noble sport promoted down to the people. Only very recently were they allowed to fight the bull on foot at all. It was nobles doing it in the court and no common person was ever allowed to come anywhere near it and all the tradition of it.

As for the bull itself, we are told that the fighting bull will charge a freight train, can split a leaf with his horns. I decided the only way this could be proved one way or another was to go into a field with the bulls. There were at least 100 bulls there; all were going to be sold to the corrida the next week. They were being fed at the time, which is not the best time, I presume, to go up to them. Not a single one moved in my direction, not a single one. There is not a bull that I saw in Spain that not only is not capable of the kind of thing we have been told they do but that is literally capable of being treated like any other animal. Not as a useful pet around the house — it would be difficult in the library, you know. You will often see the bull almost wag his tail like a dog — even with all the misery that is happening to him. It is really the most incredibly promoted nonsense and there is no reason for us to put up with it any longer.

Something you could do very much to help would be to sit down and write a post card or letter to Holiday about this article on bullfighting. I think that it would really help and it will mean that there will be more animal articles in the magazine.

Let's talk for a moment about some of the other areas. What can be done about hunting? Well, one thing is ridicule. Some of you will recall some time ago I formed something called the "Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club." I have tried to revive that this fall in an article and I don't know exactly where I'm going to publish it but I thought it would be a good way to do it. I start out, "The other day I picked up a magazine which on the subject of hunting I regard as sound as a nut. I refer, of course, to the magazine Guns and Ammo. In it there was an advertisement. Next time somebody puts the knock on hunters, it said, tell him this — tell him that hunters do more for conservation than the rest of the population combined. It is the hunter and the fisherman who ante up 140 million dollars a year for the support of state fish and game departments — all 50 of them. This money, the ad said, is used to protect all wildlife, including hundreds of non-hunted species — shore birds, song birds, owls, hawks, even mammals that your family enjoy. And that wildlife refuge he took his kids to last summer — guess who paid for the land? The truth is hunters care enough about wildlife to willingly pick up the tab. Give your friend, the ad goes on, a dose of the birds and the bees. He probably doesn't realize that doves and quails have a 75% annual mortality, whether they are hunted or not. Then, stop him cold with a hot statistic. Because of scientific game management paid for by hunters, many species such as the white-tailed deer are more numerous today than when the Indians were doing all of the hunting. In fact, hunters have actually added species. The ring-necked pheasant, for example, has been around so long that most people think he is a native. What they don't know is that hunters paid to import and propagate these birds. Now we have more than 60 million ringnecks.

"In the years that have passed since I founded the Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club, many people have put the knock on us. I have myself, if you can believe it, been subjected to a steady barrage of pot shots from bleeding hearts and hunter lovers. You know the type. Little old men in hunting shoes, many of whom I am charitably inclined to believe may have genuinely misunderstood the Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club but far too many of whom, alas, have wilfully spread malicious gossip about it."
"It has been said, for example, that the Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club is in favor of extermination of hunters. Nothing could be further from the truth. The next time a friend tells you something like that, tell him the facts. Tell him that the HHH has never once in its history to our certain knowledge favored the extermination of a single hunting species. All we have ever sought to do each fall is trim the herd and, sure as shooting, if we did not crop the surplus each year, nature would. After all, why on earth would we want to exterminate hunters? It simply makes no sense if for no other reason than the point of view of our own self interest. If we exterminated hunters, what would we have to use for game? Really, such arguments grow tiresome.

"The next time you hear some hunter lover tell you that the Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club is exterminating hunters, tell them to cool it. Tell them about their white-tailed hunters and the ring-necked hunter. The ring-necked hunter, for example, has been around so long that most people think he is a native. What they don’t know, of course, is that we helped propagate him. Now we have millions of ringnecks, all as game as they come.

"Tell your city friends, too, that the Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club not only pours money into the general economy but spends countless hours planting feed and cover, and occasionally taking to it. But let’s make something perfectly plain. We are not bounty hunters. Not a single cent of bounty has ever been collected by a single member of the HHH, or any of the married ones either. We are sportsmen. We love the out of doors and — this is the thing that the hunter lover never seems to realize — we love hunters. I, myself, have seen a large, red-jacketed, well-brisketed hunter etched against the sky on a cool crisp fall day and been so moved that, even before I sighted my trusty 378 Weatherby, I will be frank to admit I took a last long appreciative look through the binoculars.

"And, yet, again, if you can believe it, the first thing I got asked by one of those bleeding-heart hunter lovers when I go! h��me was ‘Well, if you loved him so much, why did you shoot him? A man who asks a question like that not only doesn’t even deserve an answer, he obviously doesn’t know the first thing about sport. Such a person should in the interest of commonsense ask himself which was more merciful: a swift, well-placed slug from my Weatherby or a long, cruel dragged-out winter in the city, where at the very best the hunter is bound to fall prey to air pollution, traffic jams, and rotten service."

The Humane Movement and the Survival of All Living Things

By Roger Caras
Author, Lecturer
Kew Gardens, New York

It is an honor to be asked to be here to make a few pertinent, perhaps incorrect, remarks.

Judging from some recent mail that has come as a result of some television appearances, I present myself to you as a 225-pound, 6' 2", 41-year-old, little old lady. Also, as a result of some recent remarks on the Today show about hunting, I thought you would like to know that according to some letters from Wyoming and Montana I am impotent, homosexual, communist, capitalist, out for a quick, cheap buck. All that was in one letter.

What do I say to people like you? Do I tell you that the world is a dreadful place? Should I tell you of the cruelty that I have seen in roadside zoos? Shall I tell you of idiots that buy lions and keep them until they go bad and then have to have them put down? Shall I tell you that we are the Gestapo of the animal kingdom — that all living creatures dread us? I think not; I think perhaps you know this even better than I.

I think we might look for a moment at ourselves — not suffering animals. What are we doing? Where are we going as a nation, as a species, as a planet? Are we going to heaven, or are we going to hell?

I think we might look for a moment at ourselves — not suffering animals. What are we doing? Where are we going as a nation, as a species, as a planet? Are we going to heaven, or are we going to hell? I don’t mean to inflict my religious belief on anyone, but I do believe that man’s heaven and hell are of his own making.

Our population is insane in its rate of growth. This was pointed out to you yesterday. I’m sure you all know it. Our air is unbreathable. Lake Erie is gone. We are told that the oceans can be gone within 10 years. There will be no fish out of the sea to eat. Our soil is disappearing. The pollutes in the air are creating a greenhouse effect. I stood at the South Pole a few years ago. The snow is 9600
feet deep; there are 6 million square miles of it. If we melt it, our problems are solved because all of the ports of the world would vanish and the ocean will rise 200 feet.

Our wildlife — a pitiful situation. Of course, we always have “gods” that will help with this: the Corps of Engineers — the only military organization in the world that awards medals for stupidity above and beyond the call of duty.

Things are happening to us, things we do not understand because we do not understand ourselves or our times very well. We are confused. We are confused because we have stepped off our own planet into space. Because our cities are an archaic idea and are decaying before our eyes. We no longer know how to educate our children. Crime is at a rate that is incomprehensible. Drugs are rotting out the core of our society. There are new standards in sex that neither we nor our children understand. There are new family values, new relationships that are completely beyond us. War isn’t even fun any more. No one wears feathers or red coats. The atomic threat hangs over us.

Something is triggering a change in the human race. I sense it wherever I go. I sense it in the mail. I sense it in the halls of Congress. I sense it in everyone I speak to. There is a restlessness. Man is beginning to see that there is a new consideration that must permeate every single thing he thinks and does on this earth. It is called conservation. It is no longer a dirty word. It is no longer a luxury. It is an absolute necessity or we perish.

Now, I perhaps understand the humane movement imperfectly. But I do believe that among many of you there exists a terrible prejudice. You think that conservation is a dirty word because it brings to mind the Isaak Walton League and Ducks Unlimited. You perhaps do not like hearing that it is the hunters who save the wildlife of America. Let me assure you that I am anti-hunter completely. I am just two-thirds of the way through a book called “Death is the Name of the Game,” to be published by Little, Brown. I am condemned because of my radio and television remarks about hunters. I am totally anti-hunting. I would not pretend to defend them for a moment. But, I am totally pro-conservation and I beg you to be liberal in your thinking and do not condemn conservationists as hunters because they are not necessarily that.

Hunters are here to stay. I don’t know what we can do about them except condemn them in our own hearts. They are growing at a rate that is impossible to comprehend. Last year they spent a billion dollars — 64 million in fees to state conservation officers. Right across this country with the exception of about 5 states there are 100 preserves. I don’t know how familiar you are with this grotesque distortion. If you want to see it, go to Salem, New Jersey where there is a hunting preserve that charges $100 to $150, depending on the horn length, for the opportunity to kill domestic goats with a rifle — domestic goats.

I feel it important to belong to the enemy camps. I am a member of the National Rifle Association, the American Fur Breeders Association, and all the rest of them and get the literature. I had a pamphlet sent to me last year on how to operate a hunting preserve. Are you familiar with the process known as “dizzying”?

Marvelous! You raise your birds in a pen. They are, therefore, not strong fliers. They are confused when released. But to make sure they are confused you take them out of the pen, put your thumbs up under the wings, and you snap hard against the lungs; then the bird for about half an hour is dizzy, unable to orient itself. It is known as “rocking” or “dizzying.” You then put the bird on the ground and you tell the hunter where to walk. After he has shot it, he brings it back to the club house, has a martini and you trade him a cleaned bird for the one he shot. He doesn’t have to wait or clean it himself. This is what hunting has become in this country. It is deplorable.

It is deplored by the conservation organizations, but it is the fastest growing facet of gun sports and will continue to grow all out of bounds. At the present time, 80% of all cartridges and shells fired in this country are fired at living targets, only 20% at stationary targets or clay pigeons. So do not expect any support from the gun industry. Nor, for that matter, from the government. The government will oppose you right down the line on anything you attempt to do with hunting because hunting is the firearms industry and the firearms industry means a technology that continues to develop and is always ready for conversion in the event of an emergency like World War II. One that overnight could be converted to military arms. The Pentagon will never let you touch hunting. When it comes to that, the Pentagon will be in there fighting for them.

In the conservation field we face the same three evils you do. First, at one end of the spectrum, we have the psychopath, the sadist, the person who enjoys inflicting injury on living creatures or an environment. There is nothing you can do, nothing we can do, about such a person; he has to be incarcerated.

At the other end, you have the ignorant. This is our most fertile field. People who don’t know that they are doing something wrong. They don’t know that it’s terribly cruel to buy a gibbon from a pet dealer. They don’t know that the gibbon is collected by a hunter who goes out and shoots the mother out of a tree and if the hunter has guessed right, the baby has been weaned and therefore it is worth taking, and that 1 out of 20 will reach this country alive. If it hasn’t been weaned, he leaves it. Then there is the person who buys an ocelot, not knowing that only 1 out of 10 lives to be a year old. That’s the fertile field for both of us.
But in the middle is the toughest field, and the one we must find a way of reaching somehow. These are people that suffer from the worst of all diseases of the soul — apathy. They don’t get pleasure out of inflicting pain but they don’t get pleasure out of not inflicting pain. We will reach them only through shock therapy. I call them names on television. Perhaps someone else has a better system, but we must reach them some way because this is where our biggest problem lies, I do believe.

History will tell us one day that our generation has failed — we are a failure. We shall continue to fight, but we shall end as a failure. We are leaving behind us a hideous, wicked bill to be paid for by our children and our grandchildren. The heritage our children shall receive is strontium 90, DDT, stupidity, ignorance, greed, and avarice — right across the face of the earth. We can keep it from going further than it has, perhaps, to some degree, but we must admit that the kids today have something on their side. They can look at us and say what the devil are you telling us? You tell us to cut our hair — we tell you not to cut the redwoods.

People more than ever need the wild places and the wild things — in their homes and in their midst — eternally available. And they need those symbols of wild things, the genetically engineered examples or models of them — the household pets.

Last year, more people went to zoos in this country than attended every single spectator sporting event combined. That includes rodeos, horse races, football, basketball, baseball, tennis, hockey. Put it all together and they didn’t come close to the zoo attendance. Last year, believe it or not, the gate count at our national parks was 150,836,000 admissions. That seems almost impossible. Of course, there were a great many repeaters, but nearly 152 million people showed up in our national parks last year.

Conservation and the humane movement are Siamese twins. They are inseparable. I beg you to keep this in mind, to think about this, because there is an explosion coming in the conservation movement. Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, a great conservationist and humanitarian, is leading the fight now for a teach-in that is going to take place in colleges across this country early next year — early in 1970. Students and teachers are going to sit and talk about nothing but ecology and a crash program of awareness. We are heading for national and international catastrophe and it will soon be on us. These forces are bringing to the foreground the absolute necessity for conservation. The humanitarian movement can gain nothing but strength from the association. Do not be prejudiced against it.

Tell me, for instance, under which heading these cases belong — conservation movement or the humane movement?

An American businessman arrives at a sheikdom on the Gulf of Aden. He is a guest of the sheik — whose income is about a million dollars a day from oil. This is a man who orders 50 bullet proof Cadillacs at a time, who maintains 26 castles and homes and estates. The second day the sheik says we are going hunting. The third morning, they get up early and they go downstairs and have their breakfast. The American visitor is surprised because he is not handed a rifle or a shotgun. They go out and there are in line the shiny black Cadillacs limousines, air-conditioned, of course. As he climbs into his Cadillac the guest sees the string of jeeps pull up and he knows why he was not given a shotgun or a rifle. He hears the radios back and forth, the planes that are now assembling overhead; and the convoy moves out. They move about 20 miles across the flat gravelly arid country and the planes from the sheik’s private air force begin calling in reports. They radio to the jeeps, the jeeps pull up alongside the Cadillacs, the men transfer to jeeps that split off while the other jeeps join the airplanes in a herding operation. And a herd of rare oryx, now frightened half to death and running until their hearts are bursting, are herded by jeeps and by aircraft toward the waiting jeeps, which are equipped with 50-caliber machine guns. As the herd approaches, it is raked and destroyed. Half of the animals, of course, are no more than crippled and left to die in the sun. They go back for lunch. The oryx is a vanishing species. It’s a conservation problem — is it yours?

I told you how the gibbons are collected. The mother is shot out of a tree. That’s how most of the young cats are collected. The mothers are shot. You can’t walk up and take the cubs away from the mother. The cats are vanishing. It’s a conservation problem — is it not yours?

I was involved in the grizzly bear controversy. Here is a typical example of idiocy in our time. A scientist, a noted biologist from Maryland, took note of the fact that 2 young girls were tragically mauled by bears in Glacier National Park on August 13, 1967. His solution was a proposal that bears be removed from our national parks. The cry went out and picked up tremendous speed in this country: The parks are for people, not for bears. The Audubon Society called me and asked me if I would use the written word and radio and television and take the fight on and I did.

These are the facts. Our parks have existed for 97 years. Almost 151 million people went to them last year alone. Sixteen of the parks have bears. Last year, 38 million people visited the parks with bears. In 97 years, 5 people have been killed. Two in Glacier, tragically, although they were guilty of at least four different infractions of commonsense and park rules. Certainly that is no excuse for their deaths. I am not suggesting that they deserved to die, but that is why
they were killed. Only 3 others in 97 years. In that same year in Glacier park, 2 people were killed while swimming by outboard motor propellers hitting them. No one called for the elimination of outboard motors. In that same year, 47 people were killed in national parks in high altitude accidents: exposure, falls, coronaries because they overexerted themselves. No one suggested keeping the park visitors to sub-alpine slopes. But because 5 people have been killed in almost a century, the call went out immediately from a scientist and a biologist to kill the bears, the grizzly bears of which there are fewer than perhaps 500 in all of the continental United States south of Canada. Is that a conservation problem or is that a humanitarian problem?

Our goals are the same, ladies and gentlemen. We seek a world where humanity prevails. Where greed, avarice, stupidity – the collective human distemper – will not vent itself on lesser creatures and seek to destroy the livability of our planet for all creatures – human and otherwise.

Animal slaughter is here to stay, but aware people can make it easier for the beast to bear.

Vivisection is here to stay, but concerned people can make it a sane program.

Hunting is here to stay but it can be regulated and made to benefit the resources of our planet, be made more humane by demanding as much of the man with a gun as we do of the man with a car – no more than that. Just proof of sobriety, sanity, some training, and some proof of skill before being given a gun and told to go and kill.

An era of conservation mindedness has been born – it is about to explode into maturity. The humane movement can only benefit from the association, only enrich its own comprehensiveness and effectiveness, only enhance its own following, increase its strength and its power by the association in fact and in image.

God bless you for what you do. Mother Nature and history already has.

---

**Following are resolutions adopted by the conferees:**

**I.**

**WHEREAS,** in the life of western man in the twentieth century there are innumerable manifestations of the lack of appreciation for the necessity for the humane approach to life, and

**WHEREAS,** history has provided conclusive proof of the impossibility of right conduct without a precedent of ethical, moral, and spiritual values, and

**WHEREAS,** many animals used in science education are cruelly treated, and

**WHEREAS,** prominent educators and scientists have said that such abuse of animals is psychologically harmful and educationally useless, and

**WHEREAS,** there is an increasing emphasis on painful uses of animals by many researchers, and

**WHEREAS,** these practices and attitudes lessen sensitivity to life in general, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That The HSUS do everything within its power to bring about a proper appreciation of and respect for the humane approach to life so that this approach may not only be established and maintained but brought to full fruition, and be it further

RESOLVED, That local humane societies and humanitarians be encouraged to work with school boards to adopt official formal policies to insure that no living animals are used in science education in any way that interferes with their normal health and well being and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That The National Humane Education Center and The HSUS continue with all possible speed the development of the necessary materials, procedures and techniques for the education of teachers and students and that special effort be made to secure the endorsement of leading colleges and universities, especially state teachers colleges, for implementation of this formal humane education program.

**II.**

**WHEREAS,** coon-on-a-log, coon-in-a-hole, and other versions of raccoon baiting are primitive entertainment, inhumane, barbarous and clearly degenerating, and

**WHEREAS,** children watching these spectacles of pain and bloodshed are not being educated for a good world, and no community with a sense of pride can countenance them, and

**WHEREAS,** the state of Alabama has a statute specifically exempting coon-on-a-log and other versions of raccoon baiting from the general cruelty to animals statutes, therefore be it
RESOLVED, That The HSUS petition Governor Albert Brewer and the legislature of Alabama to enact legislation to prohibit these contests and also be it
RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be sent to Governor Albert Brewer, to the legislature of Alabama, and to the press.

* A ruling by the Alabama Attorney General, announced in December 1969, makes coon-on-a-log and similar events illegal if the animal is tormented in any way.

III.

WHEREAS, the first major federal legislative success of the humane movement was in the late nineteenth century and was responsible for the first transportation act (the 28 hour law), and
WHEREAS, the numbers of animals involved in intrastate and interstate transportation have reached prodigious proportions, and
WHEREAS, conditions under which these animals are transported in many instances do not meet humane standards, and
WHEREAS, there is not sufficient legislation to insure humane treatment of all animals in transit, therefore be it
RESOLVED, That The HSUS should continue its program to eliminate the suffering of animals in all forms of public transportation.

IV.

WHEREAS, the wildlife throughout the United States and elsewhere has been most cruelly treated and, in some instances, has been threatened with extinction, and
WHEREAS, public opinion also has failed to keep pace with humanitarian ideals with respect to reverence for all living things, be it
RESOLVED, That any threat to the ecological balance undermining the pyramid of life be vigorously opposed by the humane movement, working in close cooperation with all concerned organizations including Defenders of Wildlife, the Wilderness Society, the Audubon Society, and the Sierra Club.

V.

Be it resolved that the HSUS staff continue to assist and work with the Department of Agriculture to make further strides to improve administration of P.L. 89-544.

VI.

Be it resolved that The HSUS continue its all-out effort within the limitations of the law to secure enactment of the Rogers-Javits bill.

VII.

Be it resolved that The HSUS continue to seek elimination of abuses to Walking Horses by reaffirmation of its support of the Tydings bill and such other means as will reinforce the nationwide campaign for this remedial law.

VIII.

WHEREAS, it is the task of all branches and individuals affiliated with The HSUS from various states and cities to promote and support actively the enactment of legislation for the humane slaughter of livestock,
Be it Resolved, That
(1) the basis of such legislation shall be that each animal is to be rendered unconscious prior to slaughter through electrical, mechanical, or chemical means, and
(2) where ritual (kosher) slaughter is concerned, the term “humanely slaughtered” shall apply only to large animals positioned in a restraining or holding pen during the killing process and this method shall be used for kosher slaughter instead of shackling and hoisting of live, conscious animals, and
(3) sheep and calves are exempted at present, until such time when a device will be available for a humane system of slaughter for these animals, and
(4) in promoting such legislation, every effort shall be made by the humane organization and individuals to establish a close relationship with Jewish religious and community groups and organizations for the purpose of eliminating any and all opposition to humane slaughter legislation, and to dispel any accusation of anti-Semitism in the ranks of humanitarians.