MORE ON BEAGLES

Because we are still receiving inquiries and complaints about the military use of beagles in research projects, Mr. Hoyt wrote to Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger requesting answers to various questions.

The following draft was prepared by Mr. Hoyt to aid the staff in answering correspondence on this subject:

In spite of the vigorous efforts of several animal welfare organizations and expressions of protest from tens of thousands of citizens, The HSUS has been advised by the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense that both the Air Force and Army testing programs utilizing beagle dogs and other animals are continuing.

In a letter to Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger dated January 4, 1974, Mr. Hoyt requested answers to the five following questions. The response, as dictated by Deputy Staff Assistant Philip A. Farris, dated January 22, follows each question:

Q. "Is the program initiated by the Department of the Air Force (Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio) still being conducted, and if so, what is the proposed duration of this testing project?"

A. "The programs of the Army and Air Force, which are being conducted in a humane manner, are still being carried out. Requirements for this research are still valid. Tasks within these programs differ in duration, some of them requiring up to one year of study. It is almost certain, because of the chemical complexity of Defense systems, that requirements to evaluate the toxicology of new fuels and materials will occur in the future."

Q. "How many animals, specifically beagle dogs, have been used in this project and what is the current status of these animals?"

A. "As to the number of animals involved, this information is being compiled in a special report requested by Congress. Until the compilation and full report are completed, we are unable to provide this information."
Q. "I should like answers to the first two questions as they apply to the testing program undertaken by the Department of the Army at Edgewood Arsenal (Maryland)."

A. Same as answers to the first two questions.

Q. "Has either the Department of the Air Force or Department of the Army revised or cancelled either of these programs as a result of the much public protest that has been registered with your office, the Departments of the Air Force and Army, the President of the United States, members of Congress, etc.?"

A. "There has been no significant change in the projects involved, although they have received extensive review. The requirement for this research exists, as does our responsibility to ensure the health and safety of our people."

Q. "What alternative programs have been considered by the Departments of Air Force and Army that would not require similar projects utilizing animals in the future?"

A. "To meet these responsibilities, the Department of Defense conducts a program of research and development, test, and evaluation, whose aim is to understand, treat, and control, as necessary, hazards, injuries, and diseases associated with military activities. Our focus in this regard is on the people, both military and civilian, within the Department of Defense.

Underlying the research you have questioned is the premise that no ethical or scientifically prudent way exists in which new treatments, exposure standards, risk criteria, drugs, and vaccines can be introduced for human use without prior evaluation in living creatures. Law and Federal regulations require that certain experimentation must be conducted on animals before the methodology is adopted for human use. As to using computer design in such experiments, we are advised that the requirement to make observations in living systems is far greater in the biological sciences than could be handled by simple computer models."

It is clear from this response to my letter that the following conditions still exist:

1. Both the Air Force and Army testing programs are continuing with "no significant change."

2. The numbers of animals being used, including beagle dogs, is for the moment being kept secret. The HSUS has requested a copy of the report being compiled for Congress."
3. The Department of Defense regards criticism of its testing methods and procedures misplaced. In other words, this department of government does not feel obliged to justify the morality of its actions as regards this testing process. It is "scientifically conventional."

4. There is no foreseeable end to the use of animals in military testing programs though "a broad program to review certain aspects of this research and our use of animals has been initiated."

It is quite clear that there is nothing illegal about the testing programs being conducted by both the Air Force and Army. A recent court case by an anti-vivisection society to prevent the use of beagle dogs in the Air Force testing program has been dismissed. Likewise, though there have been vigorous protests by a few Congressmen, there has been no genuine Congressional pressure to halt these tests. Nor has public protest had much impact.

In spite of the apparent disregard of public outrage, you are urged to continue to express your views on this matter to your Congressman, Senator, Secretary of Defense, Secretaries of Army and Air Force and others.

WRITER JOINS STAFF

Charles F. Herrmann, Madison, Connecticut, has joined the staff of HSUS and is working with Dale Hylton on redesigning the format of KIND publications and newsletters. Charlie will also work with John Demmers, HSUS Norma Terris Humane Education Center, in developing audio-visual educational programs for teachers and children. Charlie's varied experience includes writing for children, advertising copy, and teaching at the elementary and college levels. Welcome aboard, Charlie!

STATUS ON HSUS PETITION TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. Madden has had several conferences with officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning our petition which includes, among other things, priority for the shipment of living animals.

Two other matters are pending before CAB. One matter relates generally to live animal shipments and the other is to create a new schedule of priorities in air shipment.

One will be a detailed evidentiary case that already has all of the pet industry intervening, the carriers are well represented, the shippers are represented, but the animals are not represented at all. Obviously, HSUS should be involved in both cases.

We have decided to legally intervene in both of the two previously pending matters to obtain speedier action on our own petition. We will present more details as they become available.

NOTE: In a two-page letter, the Air Line Pilots Association has written to the Honorable Robert D. Timm, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board strongly supporting
our petition. One statement reads, "It is imperative that live animal shipments be given priority over inanimate cargo, and that if the animals cannot be assured of such treatment, they not be accepted at their point of origin.

IDAHO WILD HORSE CASE SHAPES UP

The HSUS and the American Horse Protection Association are seeking the release of material collected by two federal agencies on the facts concerning the round-up.

The release of this material is opposed by government attorneys on the grounds that it is a privileged and confidential "investigatory" file. The government claims it still may prosecute the ranchers and release of this material would interfere with such prosecution.

The judge ruled he would examine the reports. He has done so and has now asked the government attorneys to give him supporting evidence if they still claim we should not see the material.

This looks like good news for our side.

A THANK YOU FROM MARCO POLO PARKES

Mr. Parkes wants to extend his thanks and appreciation for the hospitality accorded him by officials and staffs of the various regional offices he recently visited.

A poll taken by the staff at our national headquarters, however, reveals that 98% of the employees recommends that he spend at least a year in each region. 1% (Pat Parkes, does not approve of this recommendation, which has, therefore, been rejected). Because Mr. Hoyt is on a very busy schedule, we have listed 1% as undecided.
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