

reaching out beyond their local horizons, and making a reality of the concept of a national humane movement.

I shall speak more, in just a moment, about the status of the campaign for legislation to protect laboratory animals. At this moment I aim only at making the point that something new is stirring, that there is a *national* humane movement, that the national movement has awakened from a long lethargy, and that great possibilities and great responsibilities lie before us.

The humane movement, in my opinion, is ready today for a development and for great achievements of which we have heretofore barely dreamed.

This meeting, this National Leadership Conference, can provide, if we will it so, the spark that will fire great new forces into motion. This is a relatively small meeting—purposely so—but in this meeting there is latent power, waiting only to be used. This is a meeting of leaders, of people who have influence in many places.

Today the American humane movement has approximately 860 incorporated humane societies. No one knows the total membership of these societies, but it is conservative to estimate that they have an active, close constituency of more than one million persons. They exert very strong influence over many millions of other persons and by their very existence they subtly but visibly and tangibly affect the ethical attitudes of the entire public.

Whatever this Conference agrees upon, whatever this Conference resolves to do, *can* be accomplished.

Our movement has many weaknesses. There are bad apples in the barrel. A bit later in this meeting we will self-critically examine, in considerable detail, some of our most conspicuous faults.

But from my own position in the humane movement, as Chairman of the Board of Directors of The HSUS and as a member of the Board of Directors and former President of a local humane society that is fairly typical of all such societies, the American humane movement looks vigorous, healthy, and inspiringly progressive.

Analysis of the Battle to Protect Laboratory Animals—Part I

By Fred Myers, Washington, D.C.,
HSUS Vice-President and Education Director

The national campaign for a federal law to protect animals used in research, teaching and the production of pharmaceuticals is by far the most important project in which the American humane movement ever has been engaged. It is important not merely because enactment of a well written law of this kind would eliminate atrocious cruelties but because the campaign itself is inducing the entire American public to examine, debate and act upon an issue in which the fundamental ethical philosophy of the humane movement is involved. What we are debating is cruelty, not merely a particular cruelty.

Every humanitarian, every local humane society, should and must enlist in this great campaign and participate in this great debate because the decision that ultimately will be made by the American people and their Congress in respect to this specific legislation will be also an enormously significant and far-reaching decision about the truly basic objectives of the humane movement.

In this conference of leaders of the humane movement we want to discuss the tactics of our effort to achieve protection for laboratory animals. It is vastly more important, however, to see clearly the fact that the campaign to gain protection for laboratory animals is a strategic action that ultimately will have effects on every local humane society and at every level of our work.

Unfortunately, the humane movement is far from unity in this situation. The HSUS supports H. R. 4856, the Randall bill, and H. R. 8077, the identical bill introduced very recently by Congressman Pepper of Florida. The Animal Welfare Institute and the Society for Animal Protective Legislation advocate S. 533 and H. R. 1937. The American Humane Association seems rather vaguely to feel that “something ought to be done” but does nothing. Principal spokesmen for the major anti-vivisection societies fiercely oppose every one of the eight bills on this subject now pending in Congress.

It is most remarkable that in the presence of such chaotic disunity in the humane movement members of Congress have introduced a total of eight bills on this subject, scores of members of the Senate and the House

have committed themselves to vote for a law of this kind and we have won strong editorial support among the nation's most influential newspapers, magazines and radio-television commentators. The potentialities, if only we can unite ourselves, are obvious. My remarks here are offered in the hope that I can contribute a little bit toward unity.

The Humane Society of the United States drafted and arranged for introduction of H. R. 4856 in Congress because the HSUS opposes and seeks to prevent all uses of animals that cause avoidable pain, suffering, or fear. The Randall bill is an anti-cruelty bill, in no essential way different from any of the hundreds of anti-cruelty laws that have been enacted by the federal government, the states, and subdivisions of the states with unanimous support by all humanitarians.

It has been argued by some persons that the Randall bill and all similar bills should be opposed because they would not abolish "vivisection." This, it seems to me, is a dogmatic and doctrinaire position that cannot stand the test of reason. The prohibition of a specific cruelty does not in logic imply approval of any cruelty that may still be legally unprohibited. As I have just noted, we have all worked effectively together in the past to achieve enactment of many hundreds of anti-cruelty statutes and ordinances. None of them abolished "vivisection." None of them, indeed, has abolished cruelty of any other kind. I have never heard it suggested, however, that no anti-cruelty law should have been enacted until it was possible to enact a law that would abolish all cruelty simultaneously.

The principal anti-vivisection societies of the United States have already proved, by trial, that not even a single Congressman will sponsor a bill to abolish the use of animals in research. As the Managing Director of the National Anti-Vivisection Society said in a letter to the *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, dated March 10, 1961:

"A bill for total abolition of vivisection on all species of animals would not, at this time, be acceptable to any member of Congress. To draft such a measure would not give us a bill—it would give us merely a piece of paper."

Some of the principal anti-vivisection societies tried, in 1961, to find a Congressman who would sponsor a bill to forbid merely the use of dogs and cats in experiments and research. It is worth noting, in passing, that such a bill would have constituted a mere "regulation" of the use of animals in research. It would have permitted "vivisection" to continue without restraint on all except two species of animals. The society which drafted that proposed bill was unable to get the draft introduced as a bill, although it tried diligently to do so.

Those who oppose the Randall bill on the ground that it would not abolish vivisection are, in practical fact, opposing every kind of anti-

cruelty legislation that could conceivably help the animals in laboratories. I believe that very few members of humane societies or of anti-vivisection societies really support so sterile and inhumane a policy.

There are those, too, who say that they endorse the general intent of the Randall bill but who find themselves unable to support the bill itself because either (a) the bill is "too radical" or (b) because the bill is "too moderate." Most of the proposed amendments are aimed at a closer approach to total abolition of pain.

The HSUS would, of course, like to see enacted a law that would totally prohibit anything that would cause even the slightest pain to animals. It is impossible, however, to achieve any such goal through any law that Congress will seriously consider. Somewhere short of perfection we must at this time take what we can get and be happy because we have made progress—because we can save millions of animals from suffering.

The National Anti-Vivisection Society reported in January of 1960 that Mr. Richard of that society, Mr. Michael Moukhanoff, president of the International Conference Against Vivisection, and Mr. William Snyder, president of the Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society, were agreed that the Moulder bill of that Congress was "as strong and as stringent" as such a bill could be made. The Randall bill is the same bill. It is really impossible for the HSUS or for any other humane society to arrange for Congressional support of the kind of amendments suggested by, for example, the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare.

I remind everyone concerned, again, that there are eight laboratory-animal bills pending in the Congress. Any attack on the Randall bill from within the humane movement makes it more likely than an alternative bill, much weaker and even dangerous to the welfare of the animals involved, will become law. The Randall bill is, from the viewpoint of the humane movement, the strongest and best bill before the Congress. The only objection to the Randall bill that has been offered by those within the humane movement who support other bills is a contention that the Randall bill asks for more control of cruelty than Congress is likely to grant.

It deserves the support of the entire humane movement.

I am enormously proud of the part that the HSUS is taking in this campaign. As you all know, the HSUS has supplied the humane movement with a wealth of dependable fact about what happens to animals in laboratories. Our staff investigators have penetrated dozens of the largest laboratories of the nation and have produced more information about this subject than the humane movement ever before has had. We have provided financial support for scientific analysis of hundreds of animal-using experiments, revealing vast waste and abuse of animals in research. We have published more than a million books, booklets, brochures and folders on this subject. Our Directors and our staff—notably Cleveland

Amory—have reached scores of millions of Americans through radio, television, magazines and newspapers.

In the meantime, some of our most influential Directors and members have been and are working quietly but exceedingly persuasively with members of Congress and high officers of the federal government.

No matter how effectively and diligently the HSUS may work, however, this campaign cannot succeed without the unity of which our Chairman, R. J. Chenoweth, spoke to you earlier today. The Randall bill can become law. Of that I am utterly confident. But the Randall bill will become law only if Congress feels an enormous grass-roots demand for this kind of legislation.

To get this message to Congress we need active participation in the campaign by the 800 local humane societies of the country.

I urgently recommend that every local humane society immediately establish a special committee to campaign for the Randall bill. I suggest that each local humane society give to its special committee for the Randall bill a small emergency fund with which to buy HSUS folders on this subject and to pay for mailing such folders to all members of the local society and to influential other citizens of the community. The special committee should aim specifically at inducing hundreds or thousands of local citizens to write to their own Congressmen in support of the Randall bill.

The HSUS will be happy to work with every such committee.

Because of the current legislative log-jam in Congress, with which all Americans are familiar, enactment of a federal law to protect laboratory animals probably cannot be achieved this year. I have no doubt whatever, however, that an effective law—a law that will genuinely protect millions of animals every year from cruelties that now are inflicted on them—can be enacted in 1964. I say in all sincerity that this law not only can be enacted, but will be.

Analysis of the Battle to Protect Laboratory Animals—Part II

By Clarence E. Richard, Chicago, Ill., Managing Director,
The National Anti-Vivisection Society

While driving from Chicago to this meeting, Fall was in the air. The muggy warm of summer has given way to the crispness that marks the new season.

Fall means different things to people. But perhaps one of the most important things it means is the biannual political elections. This time next year both political parties will be at one another's throat and nail throughout the country.

I mention political elections because they illustrate the point I hope to bring to you during this discussion today. It's a point never fully understood in countries where there are dictatorships or where democracy has become stagnant or decadent. The point is this: No matter how divided the Republicans and Democrats seem in their attacks on one another, no matter how much they challenge each other in public or private, they are united behind one goal. That goal is perpetuation and improvement of the American way of life.

Their difference is simple. One political party wants to achieve the same goals in a different manner from the other. Their argument is not *whether* action is necessary. Their argument is what specific actions are necessary. The debate is how to implement their programs, how to improve the American way of life.

Members of the National Anti-Vivisection Society are intelligent people, dedicated to one thing—elimination of the cruel, inhumane vivisection practices in the United States. Likewise, I am certain, members of the Humane Society of the United States have the same dedication, the same zeal to help animals now suffering in laboratories throughout the country.

In other words, we agree on a major point. Both the NAVS and The HSUS want to eliminate suffering which invariably results from vivisection. This is a basic belief which binds us, one to the other, despite any tactical differences which might arise as to how to eliminate the suffering.

We have another common ground, although disputed by some. NAVS members believe that it is morally wrong to practice vivisection on *any* animals. I emphasize *any* animals because we do not believe that some