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©1979, The Humane Society of the United States
How and Why The HSUS Was Founded

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) originally called the National Humane Society, was incorporated on November 22, 1954 in the state of Delaware for the prevention of cruelty to animals. Court action in December of 1956 by the American Humane Association prompted the Board of Directors to change the Society's name rather than use funds contributed for animal protection to pay for costly litigation.

The HSUS came into being because, for several years previously, a great many people throughout the United States were aware of the tremendous need for a strong humane group that would actively endorse and work towards eliminating, on a national scale, some of the more obvious cruelties and injustices imposed on animals in slaughterhouses and by uncontrolled breeding of domestic pets. They also realized the necessity for a humane organization that would act in a missionary role, to encourage and assist in the formation of humane societies in the thousands of towns and areas where none existed.

At first it was hoped this kind of leadership could be found within a "reformed" American Humane Association, and to this end a large group of AHA members, in 1954, nominated candidates for election to The AHA board in opposition to a slate named by the board itself. The majority of members at The AHA convention held in Atlanta, Georgia, October 1954, endorsed the humane goals of the insurgents and elected the three candidates on the reform slate — Miss J.M. Perry, Raymond Naramore and Roland Smith. But the old board retaliated by firing or forcing the resignation of several staff members, including Fred Myers, Larry Andrews, Helen Jones and Marcia Glaser, and through a change in the bylaws succeeded in disenfranchising a majority of members.

Among the first Board members were Dr. Myra Babcock of Detroit, Michigan; Mr. Oliver Evans of Clayton, Missouri; Mrs. Elsa Voss of Monkton, Maryland; Mr. Delos Culver of Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania; Mr. Arthur P. Redman of Seattle, Washington; Mrs. R. Alger Sawyer of Scarsdale, New York; Mr. D. Collis Wager of Utica, New York; Mr. Robert Chenoweth of Kansas City, Missouri; and Mr. Charles Herbert Appleby of New York. Mr. Chenoweth was elected President of the newly formed Board. The working staff consisted of Fred Myers, Larry Andrews, Helen Jones and Marcia Glaser.
Because of discontent with The AHA practice of placing contributed funds in special endowment trusts instead of using them for direct relief of animal suffering as their donors had intended, the bylaws of the new Society specifically forbade the transfer of operating funds to a restricted endowment fund without a referendum vote of the entire HSUS membership.

Funds were very low in the beginning. Three of the principal founders had to borrow money on their life insurance policies in order to keep the fledgling society afloat. Nevertheless, the new society embarked on vigorous campaigns against the surplus breeding of cats and dogs, the brutal treatment of food animals in slaughterhouses, and the abuse of animals in medical research laboratories. The first leaflet published was entitled They Preach Cruelty. It attacked the cruelty that results from the constantly mounting population of unwanted dogs and cats. Also exposed and publicized were the cruel conditions under which monkeys were being shipped into the United States.

One of the cruelties exposed by The HSUS in the early days was the tragic plight of monkeys imported for use in laboratories.

- Eli Lilly & Co.

In 1956 humane slaughter became a primary issue with the introduction in Congress of the first humane slaughter bill by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan. Soon after, the late Senator Hubert Humphrey introduced a similar bill in the Senate. The new Society supported these bills and quickly became the leader in the fight for slaughterhouse reform. The HSUS distributed leaflets on the issue at the rate of 2,000 a day.

It sponsored a study of electrical stunning which was then being used for the slaughter of hogs in Denmark. At the same time Board member Arthur Redman produced a film on hog slaughter exposing its extreme cruelty. The film was widely shown to the public and to Congressmen.

Humane stunning techniques such as the Remington stunner came into use following the passage of The Humane Slaughter Act of 1958.

- HSUS

The first issue of The HSUS News was published in April 1955 and had as its lead story the fight to relieve the tragic plight of laboratory animals. There was also a story on slaughterhouse reform efforts along with articles on educational activities and a list of resolutions that had been adopted as policy by the Board of Directors. The first News was published bimonthly in a newsletter format. Over the years the News has evolved into an attractive and informative magazine that is distributed quarterly. Through the years materials and publications were developed on virtually every issue and have grown to a point where a multi-page order form is needed to list the more than 100 publications currently available. Additionally, special publications have been developed for teachers and children; Close-Up Reports on specific animal welfare issues are distributed at least four times a year to a constituency of approximately 115,000 people; Shelter Sense is issued bi-monthly to subscribing humane societies and animal control agencies to assist them in the day-to-day operation of their shelters; Kind magazine for children is published six times annually, and the educational magazine, Humane Education, is distributed quarterly to members of HSUS’s National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education.

HSUS’s Institute for the Study of Animal Problems will soon
publish a fifth regular publication entitled *International Journal for the Study Of Animal Problems*. The Journal will feature scientific articles on problems facing the humane movement and what can be done about them.

### Staff Changes

On July 13, 1956 one of the principal founders of The HSUS, Larry Andrews, resigned from the staff and was elected to the Board of Directors. In April 1958 he resigned from the Board. His staff replacement marshalled support for the Society’s programs, organized special committees in states and communities to work for slaughterhouse reform and a reduction in the staggering number of surplus cats and dogs. Slaughterhouse reform was especially important since interest in humane slaughter legislation had continued to increase and, by this time, seven bills were pending before Congress. The work of The HSUS during this period produced a massive letter-writing campaign to Congress and, in the fall of 1958, President Eisenhower signed the new law. It was the first major victory for the young HSUS which had led the battle for slaughterhouse reform for several years.

In 1959, to win the cooperation of church groups, Helen Jones (one of the founders of the Society) resigned to head the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare. The National Catholic Society was started with the moral and financial support of The HSUS in the hope of gaining strong support for the cause from the church.

The Society created a Technical Services Department to provide technical assistance and advice on animal welfare problems to local humane societies and governmental agencies. In July of 1960, the Livestock Department and Field Service Office was opened in Denver to serve the Rocky Mountain area. The Society also began to expand its scope of activity and, at the 1960 Annual Conference, a resolution was adopted to work toward the end of the slaughter of fur seals. A nationwide campaign for state humane slaughter laws was intensified and the new Livestock Department began extensive investigations into the transportation of livestock.

### Branches and Affiliates

A program to organize and open a self-supporting branch in every state was started in October 1957. It was the goal of the branches to help local societies with their problems and spread HSUS influence across the country. Each branch was to have a separate board of directors and would follow the policies of the national HSUS. Branches were incorporated in Connecticut, New Jersey, Utah, Minnesota, Virginia, California, Northeast Texas; Champaign County, Illinois; and Montgomery County, Maryland. Over the years, however, it was discovered that the Society’s growing influence had created an ever-increasing demand for HSUS activity outside those states with branches and there was a pressing need to expand the work into other states while maintaining central control from the Washington headquarters office.

Thus it was that the current HSUS President, John A. Hoyt, conceived the idea of regional offices spread across the country to cover several or more states. The Society now has seven regional offices covering thirty-six states. It also has an office in Tuscaloosa, Alabama; a Humane Education and Nature Center in East Haddam, Connecticut; and an active state branch in
New Jersey. All of them with the exception of the New Jersey Branch are under the direct control of the Washington, D.C. headquarters. All are doing aggressive and effective work in carrying out a wide variety of animal welfare programs. It is probable that other regional offices will be opened as the need arises and funding is available.

Regional Directors meet frequently to discuss common problems. Pictured (l. to r.): John Inman, Jr., (New England), Ann Gonnerman (Midwest), Douglas M. Scott (Rocky Mountain), Sandra Rowland (Great Lakes), Charlene Drennon (West Coast), Donald K. Coburn (Southeast).

In the summer of 1960 HSUS bylaws were amended to allow local humane societies to affiliate with the national organization. Minimum standards of operation which applicant societies had to meet were established. A thorough inspection was made of all societies applying for affiliation and approximately 30 were eventually accepted. The program required, however, that each affiliate be inspected at least once a year and, in addition to the many other activities in which the Society was engaged, it became impossible to maintain the staff and funds necessary for these frequent and often expensive trips.

It was decided therefore to discontinue the affiliation program and substitute a new program in which local societies and animal control agencies could be accredited by HSUS if they met established standards. This program is now in effect and has produced excellent results. Currently, 13 organizations have been accredited by The HSUS with approximately 26 more in various stages of the accreditation process. In all, more than 100 applications have been received since the program began.

Anti-Cruelty Programs

Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon, a HSUS Director, introduced the first humane trapping bill in July 1958 at our request. The bill was cosponsored by Senators Estes Kefauver and Hubert H. Humphrey and would have required the painless capture or instant kill of animals trapped on federal lands and federal waters. It would also have required the inspection of traps every 24 hours. Unfortunately, despite all efforts, the bill did not become law.

Anti-trapping continues to be a major thrust of HSUS programming.

Dick Randall

The great interest of The HSUS in achieving protection for laboratory animals had not lessened. Much opposition was coming from large universities and commercial research facilities. In 1959 Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky introduced the first bill to protect laboratory animals, drafted by the Society for Animal Protective Legislation. The Board of Directors of The HSUS could not support it because enforcement would have been through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Surgeon General’s Office. Since most researchers and research institutions were receiving grants from HEW through the National Institutes of Health, the Society felt that enforcement would be weak, at best.
In an effort to gather as much information as possible about the cruel uses of animals in laboratories, The HSUS placed undercover staff investigators inside research facilities. They were asked to take photos and keep a daily diary of the work of the scientists. Conditions were found to be shocking and the investigators’ work was heavily publicized in the News and other HSUS publications. In August 1959, HSUS started to prepare the evidence and a complaint for action under the anti-cruelty laws against certain laboratories. The complaint was filed by The HSUS California Branch against White Memorial Hospital of the College of Medical Evangelists and eight physicians. The Branch also filed charges of cruelty against Leland Stanford University.

The California Board of Health, charged by statute with enforcing anti-cruelty laws, claimed to have investigated HSUS charges but refused to hold a public hearing, put witnesses under oath, or to allow a stenographic record to be made of what witnesses said. The California Branch appealed to the State Supreme Court and, in turn, was sued for libel by three staff research workers of the College of Medical Evangelists. No decision was handed down against The HSUS California Branch and the publicity which the case attracted exposed rampant abuses of animals in laboratories and won wide public support for reform. Also The HSUS published a book entitled *Animals in a Research Laboratory* which recounted the scenes witnessed by Society investigators inside the research facilities. The book was widely distributed.

The HSUS continued its fight for the protection of laboratory animals by drafting a strong bill that was introduced in Congress by Representative Morgan Moulder. A number of other laboratory bills were also introduced and, in September 1962, public hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Fred Myers and others from The HSUS testified in support of the Moulder bill and related proposals. Unfortunately, none of the bills was reported out of committee. Nevertheless, the effort to achieve the enactment of protective laboratory legislation continued with bills being introduced by various Congressmen at the instigation of HSUS and other animal welfare organizations. This helped to keep the issue of laboratory animal protection before the public which, in turn, fostered support for less stringent, yet desirable, legislation that was to follow. Huge quantities of literature were distributed and a statistical analysis of grants for biomedical experiments was financed by the Doris Duke Foundation, published by the Society, and widely distributed. The information in the analysis also was used in publications and Congressional testimony.

Investigators Frank McMahon and Dale Hylton inspect crated animals destined for laboratories at Pennsylvania dealer in 1964.

— Paul Bauer

In early 1966 Chief Investigator Frank McMahon, who had joined The HSUS in 1961, organized a raid with officers of the Maryland State Police on the facilities of Lester Brown, a dog dealer in White Hall, Maryland. The raid was covered by reporters and photographers from Life magazine. Conditions for the animals there were incredibly bad and, on February 4, 1966, a picture from this raid appeared on the front cover of *Life* with the caption “Concentration Camp for Dogs.” A flood of publicity resulted and brought renewed interest in how animals were being handled in the channels of supply to medical research laboratories. At the same time, McMahon was monitoring dog auctions in Pennsylvania where crated animals were brought in car trunks and trucks and sold in large quantities without proof of ownership. In April this issue came to a head when a stolen dog wound up in a research laboratory and was subjected to surgery and destroyed before its owner could recover it. The result was that Congressman Joseph Resnick of New York introduced the so-called “dog stealing bill.” Several other Congressmen introduced similar bills. Public hearings were held before the House Agriculture Committee. A HSUS representative who had posed as a dog dealer disclosed his shocking experiences. Finally, a bill sponsored by Congressman W.R. Poage and Senator Warren Magnuson became the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966. Although basically a law to prevent pet thefts, the Act contained provisions for the licensing and inspection of dog and cat suppliers to laboratories and for the proper
care and treatment of animals not undergoing the experimental process in research projects. In 1970, provisions were added to cover exotic species in zoos, circuses and other areas. And, in 1976, amendments were added to improve the transportation standards of animals covered and to prohibit organized animal fighting. The Animal Welfare Act was a big victory for the humane movement and HSUS had played a major role in achieving it.

Other Anti-Cruelty Work

From its inception, The HSUS has carried forward an aggressive investigative program. In addition to the extensive work done uncovering cruelties in laboratories and slaughterhouses, HSUS investigators have worked tirelessly to stop the mistreatment of horses and cattle in rodeo events, barbaric and illegal dog and cockfights, the soring of Tennessee walking horses to accelerate the refinement of their fancy gait, the staging of "bloodless bullfights," cruel "coon-on-a-log" contests and their variations, the inhumane raising, transportation and confinement of food animals, the abuse of animals used in science education, the needless and often cruel killing of wild horses, greyhound coursing, and other such evils. At the same time, the investigators have worked to upgrade standards of operation in public pounds and private animal shelters, zoos, and puppy mill operations where animals were often kept under the worst conditions.

The Society, working with other groups and individuals, was successful in rescuing hundreds of beagles that were being kept in the sub-basement of the Agriculture Building in Washington, D.C. for experimental purposes. In February 1962, working with the Humane Society of Marin County, California (a HSUS Affiliate at the time), HSUS and local investigators uncovered a large dogfighting ring and identified a leading commercial promoter of the fights who was actually producing his underground newspaper on a government printing press.

In July 1962 HSUS raiders chased an armed dogfight gang into the Mississippi swamps. The dogfighters came from seven different states and escaped by fleeing across a county line where warrants obtained for their arrest were legally ineffective. The governor of the state wasn't available and state police claimed they had no authority to act. This, despite the fact The HSUS investigators had been threatened with shotguns by some of the dogfighters.
In May 1963 the Society prosecuted two cockfight promoters in Maryland and both were found guilty of cruelty to animals. In handing down his verdict, the judge said the evidence submitted by HSUS showed cockfighting to be cruelty *prima facie*.

The abuse of animals in rodeo events was still another target of HSUS efforts on behalf of animals. Chief Investigator Frank McMahon attended hundreds of these spectacles and on several occasions filed charges against promoters and contestants. Unfortunately, the courts refused to consider rodeo events a violation of anti-cruelty laws even though pain-producing devices like the “hotshot” were often used. A successful aftermath to one such prosecution in Baltimore, Maryland led to enactment of a local ordinance banning rodeo. The state of Ohio subsequently passed a similar law.

Through publicity and public education the abuses in various rodeo events were brought to public attention. Further, The HSUS helped the Wyoming Humane Society in a suit against state officials to stop rodeo cruelties. Specifically, a writ of mandamus was sought to halt steer roping and force the state veterinarian to enforce the law prohibiting steer busting.

The Society also took to the courtroom in March, 1961 to sue WRC–TV in Washington, D.C. for airing a rodeo, or any similar program, into states in which rodeo events violate anti–cruelty laws. The Society contended that rodeos are public showings of a series of acts of cruelty to animals in violation of the licensing requirements for the “public interest” as defined and set forth in the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended. The HSUS charged that the defendant had violated the conditions upon which the station should continue to be licensed. WRC and NBC television moved for dismissal of the petition pointing out that the American Humane Association had a supervisor at the rodeo and, therefore, no abuse could have been perpetrated upon the participating animals. Although HSUS lost the case, it had been a bold attempt that would have had far-reaching results if it had succeeded.

In 1973, HSUS sponsored a project to develop scientific information regarding stress, torment and injuries sustained by animals performing in rodeo events. Information documented by veterinarians and assistants was used in a national campaign to educate the public about the hidden cruelties in rodeos. The campaign resulted in thousands of inquiries being received and an anti–rodeo bill was introduced in the state of Colorado. Although the bill did not pass, hearings were held in the Senate. It was significant, however, that the Society was able to bring this kind of testimony before a legislative body in a western state.

Chief Investigator Frank McMahon died on July 1, 1975. Today, HSUS investigators not only maintain the momentum of the past but continue to push into new areas of investigative activity.

During the early 70’s the Investigations Department quickly became involved in the plight of wild horses and the inefficient and inhumane manner in which the Wild and Free–Roaming Horse and Burro Act was being enforced by the Bureau of Land Management. In 1973, the Society discovered that wild horses had been placed in a corral on a mountain cliff in Idaho. Several horses had died at the bottom of the cliff after falling and fatally injuring themselves in an attempt to escape. The HSUS investigation resulted in national publicity and the public learned that the Bureau of Land Management was not doing its job properly.

When, in 1977, the Bureau of Land Management proposed to round up wild horses in Challis, Idaho, HSUS and the American Horse Protection Association brought suit against the Department of the Interior. The lawsuit blocked the round-up and resulted in major changes affecting the management of the rest of America’s wild horses.
The Bureau of Land Management finally put together a proposal for an "Adopt-A-Horse" program. HSUS soon uncovered evidence that horses were being adopted out to horse dealers as well as individuals. The evidence was presented on national television, and in 1978, a further suit was brought against the Bureau. As of this writing, the suit has not been decided.

Wild burros living in the Grand Canyon also have been a target for elimination by so-called wildlife biologists. The National Park Service claimed there were 2500 wild burros living in the park. The burros were accused of overpopulating and over-eating and otherwise damaging food sources and the habitat of Bighorn sheep. HSUS questioned NPS's estimates and brought suit against them for failing to file an Environmental Impact Statement. The Society is still awaiting the Statement, but advance information indicates the National Park Service can produce only 220 burros in the entire canyon.

The Society also has gathered detailed information on coursing and training greyhounds for racing purposes. In 1978, HSUS investigators, sizing up the coursing field of the National Greyhound Association, determined that television filming could be done from an adjacent field owned by another party. Accordingly, a team of ABC photographers and crewmen filmed the event and showed the coursing on the "20/20" TV news program. The result was an immediate surge of public indignation. Bills have been introduced in Congress but hearings have not yet been held. Meanwhile, primarily due to the publicity, the National Greyhound Association has itself banned "public" coursing.

In horse racing the use of drugs has dramatically increased in the last ten years. States have legalized drugs for horses, specifying which may or may not be used, but enforcement procedures are poor and ineffective. Some of the most dangerous drugs are the most difficult to detect. Often a drug makes it possible for a horse to run when it is injured or in pain and should not have been entered in the race.

According to Jockey Club statistics the rate of injury to horses has gone up 60% since drugs were legalized. Some statistics say the increase is as much as 400%. It is estimated that one out of 50 horses dies annually on the track.

The HSUS has now drafted a bill for congressional consideration prohibiting administration of drugs within a twenty-four hour period before a race, establishing pre-race testing, disqualifying any horse if drugs are found, establishing stricter penalties, and prohibiting the freezing or icing of horses' legs before competition. This legislation soon will be introduced in Congress.

Humane Education

The promotion of humane education has been a fundamental focus of HSUS programming from the founding of the organiza-
tion. Major emphasis was placed on the need to make people aware of the major national cruelties to animals and to educate young people to a greater sensitivity to animal care and well-being. Part of this effort involved a program of counteracting the negative psychological aspects of cruelty produced by experiments and the dissection of animals used in science education. Articles, speeches, and publications by HSUS staff members and directors hit hard at this inhumane and educationally worthless use of animals. The Society began to produce written and audio-visual materials for the use of teachers in elementary and secondary schools and for showing to clubs and civic organizations. In April 1959 the first sound/slide filmstrip entitled People And Pets was produced and distributed. It was designed to teach the basic principles of pet care to children between the ages of seven and fourteen. It also answered the usual questions asked by Girl Scouts seeking to qualify for Animal Care Proficiency Badges. Later, another filmstrip entitled Dogs, Cats, and Your Community was produced on the subject of surplus breeding of dogs and cats. Both filmstrips received nationwide distribution.

Fred Myers, a founder and executive director of The HSUS, was convinced that humane education was the essence of animal welfare work. So committed was he to this goal that he resigned as executive director to devote most of his writing and time to developing a humane education program. And, so, in May 1963 Myers became Vice-President and Director of Education while Mr. Oliver Evans, an industrialist, financier, president of the Animal Protective Association of Missouri, and a director of The HSUS for the past eight years, was elected President of the Society. Other changes were made to accommodate the new positions. Mr. Robert Chenoweth was elected Chairman of the Board of Directors and Mr. Collis Wager became Vice-Chairman. These changes were, of course, approved in a membership referendum since policies and programs of The Humane Society of the United States are always controlled by the voting membership.

At the Society’s 1963 Annual Conference a gift of a 140 acre farm by Miss Edith Goode, Washington, D.C., Miss Alice Morgan Wright of Albany, New York, and the National Humane Education Society, was announced. Plans were made for a National Humane Education Center to include a demonstration shelter operation, dormitories for students, and development of the property as a nature center. This had long been a dream of Fred Myers, the donors, and other officials of the organization and plans went forward rapidly.

But tragedy struck on December 1, 1963 when Fred Myers, just fifty-nine years old, died of a heart attack. The loss to the humane movement and, especially, The HSUS was keenly felt by those who had known and worked with him. Oliver Evans, who had guided the Society for eight months with Myers’ help, now assumed full responsibility for the growing organization. Evans continued with plans for the National Humane Education Center. When the shelter was completed, a program of training seminars for shelter managers and other personnel was begun. A classroom in the main building was used to train visiting students while part of the remaining space served for the creation and development of the KIND Youth Membership Program. It was soon discovered that travel distances from other parts of the country to the Virginia facility was a major deterrent to attendance. Also, operation of the demonstration shelter was siphoning funds from national humane programs.
It was during this period that Oliver Evans, President, commissioned a survey on the feasibility of introducing humane education concepts into the classroom. The survey was conducted by a professor of education from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. It enjoyed high returns, virtually all of them enthusiastic. It was clear there was a need and a strong demand for humane education instructional materials.

Adoption and reprinting of animal care leaflets from The Kindness Club program gave HSUS materials written for children. This was followed by My Kindness Coloring Book, a teaching unit called Meeting Animal Friends, and a series of curriculum-integrated teaching units called Teacher PETS, each based on one of the children’s animal care leaflets. It was a beginning.

During this period The HSUS began to explore with the University of Tulsa the development and field testing of humane education materials for integration into school curricula. The Society entered into a contract with the University of Tulsa and the Humane Education Development and Evaluation Project (HEDEP) was created. Humane education materials were developed with extensive field testing.

Out of the HEDEP program grew a membership organization for teachers, humane educators and others which was formed in late 1974. The new educational organization was named the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE). It began with a technical Journal which has now developed into Humane Education, a magazine for educators that rivals The HSUS News magazine in format and design. More curriculum materials of a multi-media nature were produced by NAAHE under the titles Sharing: You And The Animal World and Teaching Aids for Living and Learning. The success of these materials can be judged by the fact that they are being widely used in school systems throughout the country. NAAHE was relocated to the Norma Terris Humane Education and Nature Center in East Haddam, Connecticut and has held a significant number of teacher training seminars and college accredited humane education courses across the country. Professional development programs are also conducted at the Center itself for teachers and humane educators.

As a natural outgrowth of these seminars, workshops, and college courses came the idea for a historic Humane Education Curriculum Development Conference which was held June, 1979. The working conference of twenty–three participants from different parts of the country developed a model humane education curriculum guide for adoption or adaptation by school systems across the country. The basic concepts to be taught through humane education were identified and applied to learning activities in language arts, social studies, math, and health/science at each of four levels, spanning early childhood through grade six. Development of the guide is seen as a major step in establishing humane education as a viable and legitimate force in the modern educational community. The guide will be available in late 1979 or early 1980.

In November 1977 The HSUS published a unique and scholarly book entitled On The Fifth Day which was considered a milestone in the continuing efforts of the humane movement to make people conscious of the interrelatedness of all life and the need for acceptance of a humane philosophy. The book was a compelling collection of essays by noted philosophers, anthropologists, social biologists and other distinguished scholars. It might never have been produced without the vision of former President Oliver M. Evans and Richard K. Morris, Professor Emeritus of Education and Anthropology at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut. Unfortunately, Oliver Evans died before the publication of this book which was dedicated to his memory.

To fulfill the many requests for information about humane and conservation job opportunities, the Society produced a new booklet, Careers: Working With Animals for junior high through college students which became an overnight success. It was a definitive work listing career positions, requirements, usual salaries, and college and other courses helpful to persons seeking employment in animal related work. Thousands of copies were sold and a new, updated version of the original booklet is now available. At the same time a unit of six sound filmstrips
for elementary grades focusing on careers in the care and training of animals was produced, written and photographed by HSUS staff. This unit, too, was well received and orders continue to be received.

Wildlife Protection

No animal welfare organization has carried forward as intensive a program for cleaning up bad conditions in zoos as has HSUS. The Society’s zoo specialist and field investigators have visited several hundred zoos, especially during the period 1971-1979. No zoo has remained the same after such a visit. Many improvements have been made in changing these facilities into a positive learning experience for visitors. Some of the work has been done in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the Animal Welfare Act but for the most part it has been HSUS efforts that have produced improved results. The professional quality of the Society’s work in this area has earned the respect of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums and, in fact, many zoos now seek advice from HSUS. Roadside zoos are, of course, a particular problem and, with untrained owners and totally inadequate facilities, they should be closed down.

The Society has had to fight ignorant and ill-advised zoo owners. It has had to contend with USDA agents who are not properly trained and often seem disinterested. It has had to cope with vague regulations, or regulations calling only for minimum standards. But nevertheless the campaign to clean up zoos will continue regardless of the difficulties experienced heretofore.

The Society also has long been involved with the plight of marine mammals, especially the annual seal slaughter on the Pribilof Islands, on ice floes off Newfoundland and in South Africa, the tuna/porpoise problem, and the cruel killing of whales. Chief Investigator Frank McMahon had investigated the Pribilof hunt in the years 1968 through 1971. He participated in the investigatory work of an advisory committee seeking a humane method of killing the seals instead of clubbing them. Although the methods tested produced unsatisfactory results, the HSUS investigator was able to make recommendations for closer supervision of clubbing activities and improving herding procedures. The recommendations were followed and improvements made.

The clubbing of seals remains a problem, however, and it should be eliminated. The Society now plans to continue working in Congress for legislation to stop the Pribilof hunt. It feels there is no need for this massive and inhumane slaughter.

A similar situation has existed for years on the ice floes off Newfoundland. Conditions there are even worse than on the Pribilof Islands. The HSUS has repeatedly and publicly protested this hunt and other humane groups and individuals have created a public outcry against it. The Canadian Government
has refused to cancel the slaughter and has worked consistently to keep adverse publicity to a minimum. The HSUS had an observer at the hunt — in fact, one of the last observers permitted on the ice — in 1978. That investigator found that the hunt was cruel. It now seems that public indignation and protest is the only way to stop the clubbing of baby harp seals in Canada and an intensive HSUS campaign is being mounted to attain this objective.

Sue Pressman holds baby harp seal during trip to Newfoundland ice floes as observer of seal hunt.

Seal clubbing is also an annual event on South African shores. It has been witnessed by a HSUS observer who is one of the few humane workers who has witnessed all three seal hunts. In this case, however, the Marine Mammal Protection Act calls for a moratorium on the importation of any part of marine mammals until a state or government can prove the population is at optimum level, seals are not nursing, and the killing methods are “humane.” Thus, when the fur industry tried to import 70,000 pelts, The HSUS sent an investigator to South Africa where it was quickly determined that the clubbing of the seals was not humane. Upon return to the United States, the investigator testified before government officials and South African seal skins have not been imported since 1974.

Keen interest and concern by animal welfare and conservation groups prompted the organization of a consortium called Monitor, HSUS being one of the charter members. It was formed to ensure the government was enforcing both the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

The HSUS has worked to solve the tuna/porpoise problem. Although protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act large numbers of porpoises were being drowned in the netting of tuna. Congress gave the tuna industry adequate time to redesign their equipment so that fewer porpoises would be killed. After two years, the industry still had done little to reduce the killing. It was then that the issue of killing porpoises was taken to court and, after a two year battle, the tuna industry was told it had to stop killing porpoises.

Congressional hearings were then held at which HSUS testified. As a result, the tuna industry is now under regulations that require them to reduce substantially their kill of porpoises over a three year period.

The HSUS instituted a boycott of tuna and tuna products to put pressure on the industry to reduce the killing. Based on a poll of the members, the boycott will remain in effect until a determination is made of the success of the industry in approaching “near zero porpoise mortality.”

In another part of our program to protect marine mammals the Society has fought for a moratorium on all commercial taking of whales. About seventeen other groups have worked with HSUS in this effort. The World Federation for the Protection of Animals (of which HSUS is a member) has been an important participant in meetings of the International Whaling Commission. The HSUS has pressed for legislation here at home to prohibit fishing in U.S. waters by nations that do not observe the quotas established by the International Whaling Commission. This year a partial moratorium was finally achieved. No whales are to be taken in the Indian Ocean and taking whales with factory ships is forbidden except for Minke whales. This will effectively reduce the amount of whaling.

Vice-President Patricia Forkan with whale model used in demonstration at International Whaling Commission meeting in Australia.

— HSUS
Leadership Changes

Increasing pressures to attend to family business matters forced Oliver Evans to resign the presidency in 1967. He had worked diligently and determinedly, and without compensation, in maintaining the Society as a dominant force in the humane movement. Now, however, family business affairs kept him away from Washington and he felt the Society needed the presence of a full-time chief executive. He remained active as a member of the Board of Directors and also served as Treasurer.

For some time thereafter the presidency remained vacant but the national staff, under the direction of Vice-President Patrick Parkes, continued to function effectively and The HSUS continued to grow and prosper. Finally, in 1968, the Board of Directors chose Mel L. Morse, long time executive director of the Humane Society of Marin County, California and former executive director of the American Humane Association, to fill the position of President. Mel Morse accepted the position and moved to Washington, D.C. About a year later, however, he resigned and returned to California to continue his work with the Humane Society of Marin County.

In 1968 it became apparent that Robert Chenoweth, now advanced in years and retired, was no longer able physically to carry on the duties of Chairman of the Board. By that time Coleman Burke, noted New York lawyer and prominent community leader, had been elected to the Board of Directors. Mr. Burke succeeded Mr. Chenoweth as Board Chairman and the latter was elected to the position of Chairman Emeritus.

The search for a new chief executive continued during this time and, on April 1, 1970, Dr. John A. Hoyt of Fort Wayne, Indiana was chosen as President. Dr. Hoyt was a minister who brought unusual talents to his new position. Mel Morse was elected Vice-President in charge of the Society’s operations on the West Coast leaving that office several years later to assume direction of the Animal Care and Education Center located in Southern California.
Under Dr. Hoyt’s capable leadership, The HSUS began to grow rapidly. Membership growth and new and expanded programs accelerated at a gratifying pace. During 1970 and subsequent years, the system of state branches was phased out and the regional office program begun. Also, accreditation of local humane societies and animal control agencies was initiated under the Department of Animal Sheltering and Control. The National Humane Education Center in Waterford, Virginia was transferred to the Washington headquarters office and the demonstration shelter was sold to the Board of Supervisors of Loudoun County, Virginia. Training seminars were no longer held at the Center. Instead, teams of experts in animal control and welfare were sent to selected areas across the country to hold workshops and seminars. This quickly proved to be successful as attendance at the workshops grew rapidly.

In 1976 a disaster relief program for animals was established. The program provided a response to both natural disasters, such as hurricanes and earthquakes, and catastrophes caused by human accidents such as oil spills. Consultations were held with officials of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the revision of their pollution contingency plan. The Fish and Wildlife Service now frequently consults The HSUS when disasters occur and a great deal of rescue work has been done by HSUS personnel in oil spills such as the Olympic Games oil tanker that leaked 133,000 gallons of oil into the Delaware river. Help, too, was given by the Society in rescuing animals when the Teton Dam collapsed in Southeastern Idaho and during the massive flood in Johnstown, Pennsylvania in 1977.

New departments and staff were added to the organization. NAAHE was created and another division, the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, was brought into being. The Institute is structured and staffed to undertake in-depth studies of the major problems that have plagued the humane movement for generations and discover solutions to those problems. Scientifically oriented, this division has already addressed in detail the plight of animals used in biomedical research and testing and in factory farming. Pet overpopulation is another of the Institute’s efforts and it is hoped that an injectible birth inhibitor for male dogs will be available soon. The institute has been publishing a bulletin on animal welfare science and this publication will be incorporated in 1980 into the International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems. This new division has a board of advisors from the international scientific community.

The Legal Department was established in 1975 when the General Counsel for The HSUS, who had handled the Society’s legal affairs for many years, moved into the headquarters building and became an integral part of the staff. The quality of publications and other materials was upgraded and new publications developed. The HSUS began to give greater emphasis to public relations and publicity to make people conscious of the many forms of animal cruelty that exist and what can be done about them. Attendance at the Society’s annual conferences grew steadily as careful attention was given to choosing speakers and subjects for discussion and debate. The highlight of the Conference had always been the presentation of the “American Humanitarian of the Year” award at the Annual Banquet. To elevate the prestige of this honor it was decided to rename the award the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal after the famous naturalist and writer. The award was presented in the form of an especially designed bronze medal and its first recipient was Mrs. Joy Adamson of “Born Free” fame.
A vice-president for development was hired to help increase the organization's outreach through increased membership and widespread mailings. A program coordinator was added to the staff to supervise and coordinate the many activities of the Society. Other personnel were added to the staff to handle legislative matters at both the state and federal levels of government. The organization also hired a director of wildlife protection and stepped up its campaign to clean up zoos and to eliminate cruelty in the "harvesting" of seals in Newfoundland and the Pribilof Islands. A program was also initiated to stop the killing of whales and porpoises.

By 1979 the number of staff members had grown from the original four people who organized The HSUS to eighty employees. The original membership of the board of directors had risen from fifteen to twenty-one. The constituency had reached 115,000 people. The modest budget of earlier years had climbed close to the $2,000,000 mark for the year. The Society purchased its present headquarters building in 1975 and staff occupied four of the five floors with the fifth floor being leased. The building, conveniently located in downtown Washington, was a great advance from the modest quarters the Society occupied in its beginnings and the several other addresses at which it was located between 1954 and 1973. More importantly, considerable cost savings were effected since payments for space were now building equity while, previously, the money had gone for rent. The new building was dedicated to the memory of Oliver M. Evans in recognition of his outstanding leadership to the humane movement and his personal dedication to animals.
Dedicated to the memory of Oliver M. Evans, The HSUS headquarters building in Washington, D.C. stands as a monument to his leadership and dedication. Evans is shown here talking to Phyllis Wright, Director of Animal Sheltering and Control.
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Each year on the occasion of this annual conference, it is my responsibility and privilege to report to you on the programs, activities, and growth of The Humane Society of the United States. Some of you will recall that my first such report was made in Warren, Ohio, nine years ago. Newly inaugurated into the arena of animal welfare work only a few months preceding that occasion, I was limited in my perspective of both the accomplishments and potential of The HSUS. Yet it was for me a thrilling experience to have been afforded the opportunity to be associated with a mission and cause I regard to be paramount in our society today.

You were then for me a new family, a new home, a new community of people whose hopes and visions I had previously shared only from a distance. Reared and immersed in the Christian tradition and having served as a clergyman in that tradition for fifteen years, I had little acquaintance with the dynamics and spirit of the animal welfare movement and almost no knowledge of The HSUS. Yet a man who knew both traditions and had successfully embraced both in his commitment to help create a society of ethical and moral integrity, dared to enlist my participation and commitment to this cause called animal welfare. In the span of one evening in the living room of his New York home, Coleman Burke persuaded me that there was no greater opportunity for meaningful and purposeful service than in the company of those who had chosen to work through the vehicle of The HSUS for the welfare of those animals we acknowledge as fellow creatures.

The nine years that have spanned the 1970 Conference and this, our 25th Anniversary Conference, have left me with no doubts that whatever the forces or influences that brought us together, it was a happening of great significance in my life. For it is with a great sense of pride that I stand before you today and count myself among those who have participated in the growth and development of this great organization. Thank you, Mr. Burke, for your faith and vision that resulted in my becoming associated with The HSUS. And thank you, dear members and friends, for your dedicated support and unflagging devotion which have made The Humane Society of the United States the most effectual force within our country today for the protection of animals from abuse and suffering.
A copy of the remarks I shall make today are printed in the booklet which shall be given to you following this session. Also printed in that booklet is a brief history of the growth and achievements of The HSUS since its founding in 1954, compiled and written by Patrick Parkes and Jacques Sichel.

In that historical overview, you will read of the more significant programs and activities that have marked our growth and development. You will also be reminded of some of the people whose personal convictions resulted in the creation of this organization and whose untiring dedication influenced and molded its continued growth and development through the years.

Consequently, I shall not on this occasion recount those events in detail but, rather, seek to set in perspective the ways in which those programs and activities affect and influence the challenge and opportunity that is yet ours today.

The theme chosen for this 25th Annual Conference, Humanness In Action: A Heritage For The Future, seeks to unite our present work and future challenge with a heritage that took seriously the need for an active participation on the part of individual humanitarians. Indeed, if I were to identify the one most important reason for the vitality of The HSUS today, it would without a doubt be the principle that those who perceived the need for animal welfare reform did not perceive it as hope for the future, but, rather, as a here and now reality that claimed their personal initiative and involvement. And from that involvement came the convictions and insights that have become our inheritance today.

Rollo May, in his book Courage To Create, has written that, "The deeper aspects of awareness are activated to the extent that one is committed to the encounter." It is little wonder that those persons not involved in the animal welfare movement wonder at the intensity of feeling and action of those who are. It is little wonder that those who question the validity or priority of this endeavor in light of the human suffering of the world fail to perceive in this activity a dimension of profound significance for human as well as animal welfare. It is little wonder that those who observe with disdain the affection and compassion for animals we manifest should themselves remain so callous and indifferent. For unless one becomes personally involved, that is to say "committed to the encounter," he shall never know the deeper aspects of awareness such commitment creates and sustains.

We are in great debt to Fred Myers and those other founders who insisted on structuring The HSUS an organization of individuals rather than an association of organizations. We are also in their debt for effecting a process of government whereby the directors of The HSUS are chosen by the members from among their own number without personal or professional ties that would compromise their critical judgments affecting the programs and pursuits of The HSUS. Consequently, the policies and resulting programs of this Society over the years have been free from the pressures of self-interest or institutional compromises. But it is not finally the structure or government of an organization that creates its vitality. Rather, it is the dedication and commitment of those individuals who constitute its membership.

It would in the context of this address be utterly impossible to recall the names of those who in very special ways have left their mark on our present and future activities. Instead, let me tell you something of the nature and quality of their witness.

First and foremost, they were people who possessed a genuine love and concern for animals. Most owned pets or other animals, but the breadth of their concern went far beyond these personal identifications. Either they were born with or evolved a sensitivity toward animals that would not permit them to close their eyes to the suffering and abuse they observed. The animal suffering became their own in such a way they were moved to a response of protest and action.

Secondly, they were people who weren't afraid of criticism or censure. Often regarded a bit sentimental in some of their attitudes, they nonetheless confronted and accepted criticism and ridicule that would have deterred many others. They were willing to stand up and be counted, to live their convictions in public as well as private, and, when necessary, to fight for that which they believed. Though far from popular in many circles, they refused to be dissuaded in the rightness of their cause. The unpopularity of their attitudes and actions often resulted in their being dubbed "little old ladies in tennis shoes," an identification they wore with pride.

They were also people willing to make personal sacrifice for the realization of their goals. In some cases, denying themselves basic necessities of life, they would put the welfare of an animal above their own. But whether rich or poor, they gave generously of what they had to further a cause that was paramount in their lives.
In most cases, they were people who recognized the importance of concerted action. Whether in association with others in their own communities or as members of a state or national animal welfare organization such as The HSUS, they extended their personal dedication and witness into far reaching circles. Through personal action and financial support, they caused to come into being organized programs and efforts to complement and expand their more personal efforts.

Historically, the majority of these persons have been women. Endowed with a sensitivity and capacity for empathy which the male gender sometimes lacks or is reluctant to give expression, it has been the women of the world who have constituted the greater witness in promoting animal welfare protection.

Most were well-informed, not always from an intellectual perspective, but from an experiential identification that provided both insight and understanding. And though their responses were sometimes more emotional than rational, they knew well the reforms that were needed.

It is of this fiber, then, that The HSUS is made, a fiber that has served us well these past twenty-five years and one which must never be lost, no matter how old we become. For except we retain this same character of sensitivity, commitment, and sacrifice, we shall have lost our fundamental ingredient for effective animal welfare reform.

Indeed, I am convinced that the future shall require even greater personal involvement and action. For the forces that perpetrate cruelty in the name of science, technology, recreation, fashion, and luxury are those same forces which appeal to our interest on many other levels. The foods we eat, the clothes we wear, the recreation and entertainment we embrace, the scientific and technological advances we covet and enjoy — all these would compromise our commitment to protect animals from cruelty and suffering in subtle and hidden ways.

Personal choices and decisions shall mark the degree of our commitment to humane values each day of our lives. And though it may sometimes seem that our independent actions make little difference, it is these personal actions in concert with those of others that shall create and sustain the effectiveness of our witness.

As an organization, The HSUS has over the past twenty-five years grown in both numbers and influences. Increasingly cognizant of the strength and sophistication of those forces and institutions we are obliged to confront, it has become quite clear that we must be equally strong and sophisticated. Thus, we have recruited and hired over the past several years staff who are professionally trained and highly skilled in their respective disciplines. We have, likewise, broadened the scope and breadth of our programming to such a degree that there is now no major area of animal cruelty and abuse we are not prepared to address. Though sometimes lacking staff time and finances to respond to every issue to the fullest extent, there are nonetheless few areas of concern affecting the protection of animals ignored by The HSUS. Indeed, when the entire range of animal welfare concerns are evaluated as a whole, The HSUS stands today as that organization most broadly influencing animal welfare throughout the country.

Fundamental to the leadership role has been a major emphasis on the ethical and moral character of our work and program. With careful attention to proper techniques and procedures, we have insisted that our first and foremost task is the enunciation of the rights of animals to be free from cruelty and abuse and the responsibility of a civilized society to insure those rights. Through numerous speeches, television and radio appearances, articles and books, various staff and board members have promoted this ethic far and wide. How fortunate to be blessed with such persons as an Amy Freeman Lee, a Roger Caras, and a Michael Fox to pronounce these ethical values clear and wide. And alongside these are several regional directors and various department heads who day-in and day-out bear witness to this same dimension of our work and program.

We have also established within The HSUS a commitment to scholarship and objective reasoning. Through the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, we have assembled a small but effective group of scholars who are addressing a variety of animal welfare problems with a depth of inquiry and response unique to the animal welfare movement in this country. The same kind of discipline also governs various other programs of The HSUS. We have wisely recognized that except we challenge our adversaries with concrete facts and documented evidence, we shall surely minimize the validity and effectiveness of our efforts.

We have also refined and upgraded our educational programs. Through our National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, we are providing the kind of professional training of teachers and the development of materials that will significantly enhance the promotion of humane education throughout our schools and youth organizations. Coupled with
this emphasis is our newly designed and greatly expanded *Kind* magazine for children, a copy of which you received in your Conference packet. It is our hope that this excellent magazine will vastly grow in popularity and readership in the years ahead.

The range of cruelty investigations and accompanying reforms is the most inclusive and effective of any similar organization. Through the work of a team of investigators based in Washington and throughout our regional offices, The HSUS daily investigates cruel and unwarranted abuses in such areas as wild horse and burro roundups, dogfighting, cockfighting, coursing, transportation and slaughter of animals, horse racing, zoos, rodeos, circuses, films and television productions, puppy mills, laboratory uses of animals, seal clubbing, and many, many more. While obviously not being able to cover every incident of cruelty and abuse, even some of major proportions, The HSUS provides the greatest breadth and number of investigative activities available today.

We, likewise, provide the most extensive assistance available to local animal welfare organizations throughout the country. Through our seven regional offices, The HSUS Accreditation Program, regional leadership workshops, NAAHE education workshops and teacher training seminars, our newly instituted Animal Control Academy in cooperation with the University of Alabama, and *Shelter Sense*, a publication for shelter personnel and management, The HSUS provides a wide variety of services for the benefit of local animal welfare organizations at little or no cost to those societies. It is an obligation we have increasingly assumed over the years and one we shall continue to expand in the years ahead.

Within the next few months, you will begin to notice various changes in HSUS publications and materials as well as an increased exposure of our work and programs through various media outlets. Utilizing the past several months the services of Earle Palmer Brown and Associates, The HSUS has improved and expanded our internal publications and especially our public exposure. Six newly developed television spot announcements will be aired throughout the country during the next several months. Radio spots, print ads, and feature articles will further expand our outreach to the public.

We are in the process of developing one of the finest animal reference libraries in the world. Under the direction of a professional librarian, we are collecting a wide variety of animal-oriented books, periodicals, and literature. Additionally, in conjunction with the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, the most extensive collection of materials on animal welfare science is being assimilated, developed, and cataloged.

We have, likewise, improved our internal capacity to provide better membership development and control, in-house typesetting and printing and other important functional services.

Through our legislative and legal department, we are constantly monitoring, drafting, and effecting the enactment of legislation, both state and federal, while at the same time, challenging through oversight hearings and legal action government policy affecting animals. There is, perhaps, no single area of work more important to animal welfare reform than this vital area. Working both independently and in association with various animal welfare and environmental groups, and on occasion with governmental agencies, The HSUS is making a vital contribution toward the protecting of animals from cruelty and abuse at both the legislative and administrative levels of government.

Nor are our efforts limited to this country. Through the International Whaling Commission, the Conference on the Law of the Sea, the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, and the International Society for the Protection of Animals, The HSUS is contributing worldwide to the protection of animals.


It is clear that the kind of leadership and programming cited above could not happen without the generous financial support of our members and constituents as well as a continued growth in our membership. Through the intensive and ever-expanding efforts of our membership development office, we have realized over the past several years a dramatic growth in membership and financial support. Yet, except for our vital ongoing programs and activities which seek constantly to eradicate cruelty and suffering to animals, our fund raising efforts would surely fail.

There are several other areas of our work I have failed to mention in this review of program and activities. However, I
wish to take the time remaining to look with you for a moment into the future. Having spoken of the dedication of those who
gave birth to The HSUS and their legacy to us, and having reviewed several important activities and programs of the pre­
sent, what does the future hold for those of us involved in
animal welfare concerns?

I make no pretense at being either prophet or seer. Yet there
are a few discernible signs which I think merit consideration.

It is my conviction that over the next several years an increas­
ing number of people will steadily join the ranks of those com­
mitted to the protection of animals. Through education, public
exposure, and individual awareness of animal cruelties, per­
sonal attitudes toward animals will begin to shape more clearly
definable cultural and social attitudes that will favor animal wel­
fare reform in certain areas. Activities such as hunting, trapping,
rodeos, coursing, dog and cock fighting, seal clubbing, whaling
and similar activities will become increasingly repugnant to a
greater number of people.

Educational institutions will slowly reflect this trend, but will
not be especially receptive to formal values clarification teaching
embracing animal welfare concerns. At the same time, how­
ever, changing cultural attitudes will be acknowledged and
communicated.

Religious institutions will continue to ignore animal welfare
issues and, as the character of these institutions becomes more
conservative, animal welfare organizations will become a point
of reference for those for whom the broader dimensions of
ethical and moral concerns remain important.

“Animal rights” discussions and debates will embrace a
wider spectrum of discipline and professions. Such debates will
influence legislative action positively in the immediate future,
but will be met with increasing hostility in years to come.

As indicated previously, the more obvious and insidious
cruelties perpetrated on animals will become repugnant to an in­
creasing number of people. This, however, will result in vigor­
ous and well-financed efforts on the part of various groups to
preserve their “rights” to abuse animals through sport, recrea­
tion, and economic gain. The battle lines between the pros and
cons will be much better defined and more intensely drawn.

Similar lines will be drawn between pet owners and non­
owners, especially in metropolitan areas. The ownership of pets
will become more restrictive, prohibited altogether in some
areas. Animal control programs will be viewed a necessary evil
rather than a positive community service benefiting animals
and people alike.

Animal cruelties will become more subtle and refined. Such
areas as intensive rearing of food animals, laboratory and phar­
maceutical uses, and animal management and predator control
programs will head the list of animal abuses.

Personal attitudes and actions toward animals will be more
definitive and precise. Such practices as vegetarianism, the
refusal to wear clothing items such as furs and, perhaps, even
leather products, and the boycotting of various practices involv­
ing the exploitation of animals will find new converts and
adherents. A commitment to the protection of animals from
cruelty and abuse will be increasingly an intensely personal
decision.

During the next several years, the future for organizations such
as The HSUS appears to be hopeful. The degree to which we
are able to capitalize on this positive climate is dependent on
our continued effectiveness, integrity and faithfulness to animal
welfare concerns. For people will make discriminating choices
between similar groups though they share common goals and
values.

What the long-range future holds, I shall not presume to ima­
gine. But of one thing I am sure. The road ahead will not be
easy. The values we hold will be constantly under attack from
many quarters. And the ultimate success of our effort shall de­
pend on the degree and genuineness of our commitment.
Nothing shall be given; it must surely be won. It is a battle that
will require persistent and tenacious devotion to those values
we cherish.

So wherein lies the hope that we can succeed? It lies, I think,
among those persons who have chosen to accept the proposi­
tion that all life has intrinsic value and is, therefore, deserving of
those same considerations we generally reserve for mankind. It
lies with those who, at least in their better moments, are able to
view themselves and humans in general as only one part of a
very complex and marvelous world, rather than its god. It lies
with those who, though they have by no means settled the
issue of any creature’s value to the whole of creation, at least
acknowledge that man has no right, either divine or otherwise,
to exploit creation for his own benefit.
It lies with those whose vision for a better world is not merely restricted to a better world for themselves, but rather for the sake of the world itself. It lies with those who understand that being truly human means being truly humane, and that in the wanton and needless destruction of anything, man overtly acts to destroy himself, not simply as another creature, but as a human being.

It lies with those whose understanding of animal welfare does not begin or end with their own pet, nor in the rescuing or preserving of any one particular creature or species, but who embrace the whole of animal creation as deserving of an advocate for their ultimate well being and care. It lies with those who, though tender in spirit, realize that such a grave issue will not be settled on the basis of sentimentality, but on the basis of a rationality which comprehends that man, though he may be creation’s only reasoning creature, is not thereby its only purposeful creature.

It lies with those who understand that no crusade for right and justice comes easily, but requires a commitment to do battle in the political and social arenas of life where those decisions that sustain or destroy life are finally resolved.

I submit, finally, that the greatest task facing the humane movement today is the task of assisting man in the recovery of his own humanity. For unless he is able to affirm himself as one with the world he is intent upon destroying, it will matter little that we have acted to protect a few million animals.

We are the children of creation. To us has been passed the awesome responsibility of preserving its inherent value and worth. How we perform this task will determine for all time to come the value and sacredness of this trust.

If we profane it, as so often we have done, we and all else shall become victims of death. But if we shall dare to live for the sake of all that shares with us this wondrous creation, not only shall we know the fullness of life in our own experience, but shall forever establish life as the victor over death.