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Shortly before the Republican national convention at Miami Beach we were notified by telegram that somebody was planning to spray an elephant to be used for publicity purposes at the convention. What, we were asked, were we doing about this? Inquiry finally disclosed that the spray to be used was a harmless orange vegetable dye. Nevertheless, Humane Information Services disapproves of such thoughtless exploitation of animals for amusement purposes. The fact remains that to the celebrating delegates, who included many members of Congress and state legislatures, anyone protesting this "innocent" publicity stunt would have appeared to be a first-class nut. With TV newscasters and reporters present in profusion, it would have been easy to obtain reams of publicity by such a protest, but all of it would have been unfavorable. A handful of unthinking humanitarians would have praised us, but millions of other people, including some very influential ones, would have put us down as unreasonable fanatics. The cause of the humane movement would have been set back. That is not what Humane Information Services calls effective humane work. We try to keep our eyes on the woods, not just the individual trees.

Every day in this world of travail over 16 million animals which have been produced and marketed under conditions involving some of the greatest cruelties known to man are slaughtered for food. But we and other humane societies receive few demands for doing something about this situation. The cries of protest from individual humanitarians which are directed at national humane societies, and which play such a large part in determining the nature of national humane activities, mostly concern isolated cases which appear in the newspapers and on TV and radio. That is one of the reasons why little or nothing has been done by humane societies to deal with what is by far the world's greatest humane problem, namely, the suffering of food animals. This problem is so big, involves so many billions of animals, and is surrounded by so many complicating circumstances, that it is beyond the understanding of many individual humanitarians whose wishes govern the actions of the humane societies they support. These kindhearted animal lovers, however, can understand the thoughtless exploitation of an elephant in Miami or of a few mules used in a poor people's march. Naturally, they show the most interest in what they understand.

These Reports to Humanitarians are devoted to an attempt to fill this informational gap by unearth ing and explaining the humane problems which should be receiving our attention. Humane Information Services is well aware of the fact that it could stir up much more interest among humanitarians, and receive many more contributions, by going through the motions of conventional humane work, such as making a trip to Miami Beach, hiring a photographer and a lawyer, and raising a big ruckus about the sprayed elephant. The formula for "success" in humane work is very simple. But this formula does not result in the alleviation of the suffering of billions of animals that daily confronts our unseeing eyes.

THE WORLD'S GREATEST HUMANE PROBLEM

The importance of a humane problem probably should be measured in terms of three things: (1) the number of animals involved, (2) the average amount of suffering per animal, and (3) the type of animal involved (animals with low-grade central nervous systems, for example, may be considered less important than those with highly-developed systems). On the basis of any one or all of these three criteria, food animals constitute by far the greatest humane problem. This is shown by a talk which our President, Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, gave at the Tenth Annual Meeting and National Leadership Conference of The Humane Society of the United States in September of 1964. A portion of this talk follows:
"Protection of Food and Agricultural Animals

"There are in the world today around three billion quadruped animals used wholly or partly for the production of food. These include nearly one billion cattle, a billion sheep, a half billion hogs, almost as many goats and water buffalo, and the 222 million horses and other beasts of burden that eventually wind up in the kettle. In addition, there are between two and one-half and three billion chickens, geese, ducks, and turkeys. Thus, we have a perpetual inventory of going on six billion domesticated animals used in the production of food. That, my friends, is nearly six thousand million animals!

"Although all of these animals do not arrive at our dinner tables each year, many of them, and their progeny, do. According to my estimates, about one billion 400 million four-footed domesticated animals are slaughtered each year, and in addition about four and one-half billion head of poultry. On top of this, we eat about 13 billion fish, or a total of nearly 19 billion separate, individual, pain-perceiving, sentient living creatures.

"We all have heard that it is almost impossible for anyone to conceive what a billion dollars represents. Now extend the problem to 19 billion animals, and it really staggers the imagination! If we tried to count these food animals that are killed in only one year, as they passed before us on an imaginary moving belt at the rate of one every two seconds, which is the speed of a poultry slaughtering line, it would take a relay of counters working continuously for over a thousand years, or half the time that has elapsed since the birth of Christ!

"Many food animals are raised under ideal conditions by humane farmers, and we're a little inclined to think of those nice conditions on nice farms when we think about food animals. In some countries, conditions are relatively good, especially in Denmark, Switzerland, Great Britain and the United States. But on the average, even in these countries they involve a great deal of suffering on the part of the animals, and even the inevitable minimum is not pleasant to think of.

"Take, for example, a bull calf born on the open range in the United States, where 'men are men' but calves are just 'critters'. The horns may be sawed off, or removed by other electrical or mechanical means such as the Barnes dehorner, which literally pulls the horn out by the roots. If any of you have seen a dehorning operation, you will know that for calves, at least, all is not bucolic tranquility.

"But with this the process has just started. Next the calf must be castrated. This involves removing part of or slitting the scrotum, and pulling out the testicles by main force, or scraping the cord with a knife, or crushing it with a clamp. As with dehorning, no anesthetic is used, except in Great Britain, where it is required by law.

"Next comes branding. The hot iron applied to the hair and skin smells -- and those of you who have received minor burns from briefly touching a hot stove know that it is quite painful, even with a very small spot that you touch.

"All of this, however, is just the beginning. If the 'critter' is kept on the range over the winter, or if it is a part of the production herd, it must face all kinds of bitter weather without shelter. There are blizzards, below-zero temperatures, biting desert winds, sleet, blinding and choking sandstorms that may last for days, snow-covered forage that frequently results in complete or partial starvation. In summer, extreme thirst, drying up of forage due to drought, extreme heat, parasites which sometimes literally eat the animal's flesh until it dies, and other hazards bring other extreme discomforts.

"The bull calf, now a steer, is transferred by various strange and terrifying stages to some far-away feed lot. Here for a brief time he leads a life of comparative ease, but
when ready for market he is prodded or whipped into a truck or railroad stock car, and hauled with assorted discomforts and injuries to the packing plant, perhaps through some intervening concentration yard or central market.

"Because of the federal humane slaughter campaign, you all know what happened to the critter at the packing plant. Now we have 'humanized' part of the slaughter. Instead of being knocked in the head -- or perhaps in the eye or on the mouth or nostrils by mistake -- with a sledge hammer, the animal is stunned with the pneumatic stunner or with the rifle. He does, that is, unless he is destined to be shackled and hoisted while conscious prior to ritual slaughter or is unfortunate enough to be part of the 90 percent of the world's cattle slaughtered without benefit of any humane law. In any event, the final coup de grace is only part of the terror, pain and discomforts of the market place and the slaughterhouse.

"As if this were not enough, in our age of new management techniques and automation the efficiency experts have thought up new methods of producing a pound of animal food at less money cost, although at far greater cost in pain and discomfort to the animals. Many of you already have read Ruth Harrison's book, Animal Machines. In it she details the discomforts of intensive husbandry as practiced in modern factory-like meat-making machines, with animals standing on slats to make manure handling more efficient -- and nothing is more discomforting to a cloven-hoofed animal than standing on slats. They are either crowded together in large pens with hardly room to move, or almost immobilized in narrow individual pens and stanchions, frequently with little or no light and inadequate ventilation. The animal merely exists from the time it is born until it is slaughtered.

"The veal calf is kept in a little box with slats on the floor during its whole life. It's fed a milk-substitute concentrate, as much as it can take. When it has grown a little, it can hardly get up and down, so that it even gets up in a manner contrary to the nature of a calf, and it is in darkness all the time. Dairy calves are exported from the United States by air to Europe because, over there, calves bring about 70¢ a pound, and here the price is much lower.

"Ordinarily on a dairy farm in an intensive milk-producing state where milk prices are high, they would just knock a bull calf on the head and bury him, because the amount of flesh that you can put on by feeding him milk is worth less than the milk itself. They want to milk the mother to get the milk, so the bull calf would be disposed of quickly, fortunately for the calf.

"Nowadays they let him live for five days or a week, put him in a gunny sack, tie a string around the gunny sack, throw him over in the back of a pickup truck when they go to market, and then he's tooted around in the gunny sack to an auction market and they auction him off along with a whole lot of others. Next our little bull calf is taken in a little narrow crate to the airport, along with many others. They are loaded into disposable crates, three to a crate, packed in to take up all available space in the plane. The calves don't get anything to eat for up to 24 hours, the legal time limit permitted, but not always enforced. The calves then are sold in Italy, or Holland or some other European country, to be fed a diet which makes them anemic. This makes their flesh white, a 'desirable' quality in veal. And for the duration of their lives, they are kept standing on slats, in cramped quarters and in darkness.

"The poultry industry also has largely succumbed to this kind of intensive husbandry. First chicks, followed by broilers, now eggs, have come to full-fledged factory production methods in which the chicken never sees earth or sunlight or anything except a tiny cage with a sloping wire floor, which permits the manure to drop through while the eggs roll down to a trough in front, or a large wire-floored house where birds for meat are squeezed together with only room to eat and grow to marketable size. And we have hardly made a beginning in trying to humanize poultry slaughter.
"In these processes found in connection with the husbandry of food animals, losses from death, crippling, bruising, shrinkage or failure to make acceptable gains are counted, not in terms of animal pain or fright or discomfort, but only in terms of dollars. The animal is a product, with no more consideration given for its welfare than can be correlated with profit and loss.

"If anyone should take exception to those statements, let him consider these official words from the United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook for 1960, page 236: 'There has never been much doubt as to how the comfort of farm livestock should be evaluated. Aside from humanitarian considerations in extreme cases . . . the 'comfort' of the animal must be measured by . . . things that actually affect the net return from the animals. In other words, if an animal is gaining weight, laying eggs or producing milk at its highest rate, comfort is assumed.'"

**Remedies**

We could fill ten times as many pages as are in this Report with additional details of the suffering undergone by food animals in the various stages of production and marketing. But that would not help the animals. Some humanitarians have been discussing these conditions for many years, yet little or nothing except humane slaughter laws has resulted.

There are three reasons for this. First, humane societies have been too busy with other work, which may or may not be as important, to get down onto the manure pile and do the hard, grubbing work which is necessary for successfully dealing with the humane problems of food animals. The talk quoted above was given in 1964. Yet the situation remains practically unchanged. Hardly a beginning has been made in dealing with it.

The second reason why little or nothing has been done to cope with the suffering of food animals is the complexity of the conditions which give rise to this suffering. Successful remedial efforts in this field require a knowledge of production and marketing conditions in one of the world's largest and most complex industries. Humanitarians and their supporters among the lawmakers, knowing little about these complexities, are inclined to come up with apparently simple and easy but actually ineffective solutions, such as the Rhodes bill which is discussed later.

The third reason why so little progress has been made in this field is the involvement of so many vested interests. The research laboratories have their influential medical friends to help guard against any regulation which might interfere with their prerogatives. The amusement industry is by no means without political and other friends who will help fight attempts to clean up inhumane conditions. But these vested interests do not hold a candle in political and public influence to the ranchers, feeders, farmers, dairymen, agricultural magazine editors, livestock feed manufacturers, small businessmen in farming states, middlemen, farm organizations, packers, railroads, truckers, processors, wholesalers, chain store operators, farm equipment manufacturers, bankers, electric power companies and rabbis, who are aligned together in a heterogeneous group which has one thing in common: unalterable opposition to any regulatory measure, no matter how humanitarian its purpose, which might affect their pocketbooks. Agriculture and everything connected with it in most countries is a political sacred cow. Nearly all of those engaged in the industry claim a real empathy for animals, and resent any implication that they are cruel as well as any threat to their pocketbooks. Many humanitarians with a city background simply do not appreciate the tremendous political force which all of these interests constitute, and which makes so difficult to achieve any effective remedial measures to deal with the suffering of food animals.

The foregoing conditions make it imperative, in attempting to alleviate the suffering of food animals, not to bring down the ridicule and antagonism of livestock interests and their many friends by trying to pass unreasonable laws, making foolish suggestions or denouncing people in industry. A public relations-minded dairyman near St. Petersburg, Florida, has visiting hours every afternoon. In one corner of the outdoor bull pen is a natural depression that fills with muddy water after a rain. The bull likes to stand in this hole, to cool his hide and avoid the flies. One lady visitor, obviously a humanitarian, complained to the local authorities about the poor bull being compelled to stand in such an unsanitary and uncomfortable place! The St.
Petersburg dairyman was startled by the unexpected action of his guest, and it may be assumed that some poultrymen would be puzzled by Ruth Harrison's statement, in her inspiring book Animal Machines, that breeders who produce eggs for hatcheries do not keep their hens in individual battery cages because the resulting chicks must be supremely healthy in order to stand the rigors of subsequent intensive husbandry. Apparently it did not occur to her that a more likely reason is the necessity for social relations between the hens and roosters, which cannot be handled conveniently in individual battery cages!

It is extremely difficult, in trying to effect action in behalf of more humane conditions for food animals, to avoid occasionally giving the wrong impression, but if we are to be taken seriously by various elements of the industry and by lawmakers we must make every effort to be practical and reasonable.

Ranching

Any humanitarian who has the stomach for it and wishes to see what happens in a slaughtering plant can do so by taking a half day off and driving to the nearest plant. One of our members recently wrote to ask the location of a packing plant to which he would take his daughters for observation of conditions. Good idea! He is not likely, however, to be out on the open Western range when the temperature is below zero and a bitterly biting wind is driving hard crystals of snow into the eyes of cattle with no more protection than that afforded by the nearness of their fellow sufferers. It is quite possible that despite the acuteness of the suffering of livestock in the slaughterhouses and other points of the marketing system close to consumers, more total suffering is undergone on the vast reaches of the open range than in the rest of the system put together. This is especially likely if we consider the world production of food animals rather than just that in the United States. Certainly the suffering of range animals, mostly cattle and sheep, in total far exceeds that of animals raised under the conditions described in Ruth Harrison's Animal Machines.

Some indication of how just weather conditions alone produce tremendous suffering on the part of livestock raised on the open range is given by two recent newspaper stories. One describes the current drought in Chile, where "about 150,000 cattle have died for lack of forage". We can imagine the suffering of these cattle before death finally overtook them, and that of the much larger number of survivors who managed to live through the ordeal until finally shipped off to the abattoirs. Another newspaper item, a mere bit in a routine weather story, states: "Millions of Americans went about their business in bitter, stinging cold yesterday. On Western ranges livestock suffered heavily . . . In Montana, where livestock took a hammering, an airlift was organized to carry hay to starving cattle and sheep. Some ranchers reported 50 percent herd losses . . . A ranch operator southeast of Miles City reported he lost 1,000 sheep when they broke through ice and drowned."

We have all read or heard such statements on radio or TV as we settled down cozily in our air-conditioned or heated homes after a good meal to smoke a cigar and get up to date on the news. Few stop to think that many millions of animals are out there suffering as much as an animal can take and still live, and frequently going beyond this point.

On top of the rigors of drought and blizzard, there are the callous treatment and downright cruelties of man. There are the brutal roping and branding and castrating and dehorning and other features which seem to make ranch life so attractive to young people watching movie cowboys and TV cigarette advertisements portraying the rugged wholesomeness of the West. It's Marlboro country!

What, specifically, might be done to help the animals on the ranches?

Overgrazing

The weather conditions which give rise to so much suffering on the part of range animals cannot be changed by human action. But we can change the conditions of grazing which modify significantly the effects of weather conditions. If ranch land is stocked right up to the point where
the feed is barely sufficient to carry the number of animals grazed, the effects of either a
drought or a blizzard are worse than if the supply of feed is ample. Controlling the stocking of
ranges is the only way to effect any real control over the weather conditions which have been de-
scribed. Of course, nothing can be done to force individual owners of ranch land to not over-
graze; but a very substantial part of the ranch land is owned by the United States Government or
by the railroads or other landowners who lease the land for grazing or issue grazing permits. No
doubt government agencies or other owners of ranch land might deny that overgrazing is common,
but knowledgeable persons have maintained that it is. Nobody at Humane Information Services
poses as an expert on this point; we merely suggest that this is one of the best potential means
of modifying the effects of rigorous weather conditions on livestock kept on the open range.

Animal Rescue Operations

During very unfavorable weather for livestock, particularly in blizzards when the ground is cov­
ered by snow for long periods of time and the suffering animals can find no feed, some ranchers
will hire small planes and dump bales of hay for consumption by the animals. In some instances
the government has helped by the use of National Guard or other planes. But this is not done
with sufficient consistency to prevent tremendous suffering on the part of millions of animals.
It costs money to employ airplanes and buy hay. It is possible that more formal continuing or­
ganization of animal rescue operations of this kind, providing for joint use of planes and more
attractive conditions for the purchase of hay, could be used to modify the effects of weather
much more than is now being done.

Branding

There are two methods of branding livestock which are alternatives to the painful and laborious
hot iron branding. One of these is freeze branding, which is said to be painless and causes less
hide damage than hot branding. This method, which was developed in the USDA, has been gradually
coming into use, but cattlemen say that some more economical and convenient method of producing
the low temperatures is needed.

The second alternative method, termed "cold branding", is widely used in Australia. An adver­
tisement for "Kleermark" cold branding kits states: "At last . . . you can brand your cattle on
the spot . . . anywhere on your spread . . . get a clearer, sharper, more lasting brand with no
fires to build, no irons to heat . . . and with far less danger of infection." The kit used for
cold branding includes 3" grooved numerals; extra rubber for reproducing the rancher's own brand;
an unbreakable bottle of caustic (not acid) branding fluid; and a metal dipping pan . . . en­
closed in a rugged carrying case which is compact and portable.

Humane Information Services has no up-to-date information regarding the experience with this
method of branding. We feel reasonably certain, however, that a satisfactory alternative to hot
branding which is far more humane and economically feasible can be developed, for use under con­
ditions prevailing in this country.

Dehorning

Calves may be dehorned at an early age with a device which scoops out the horn nubs, after which
the wound is cauterized with a hot iron which fits into the hole. Although this sounds, and is,
bloody and painful, the calves seem to recover quickly. The dehorning of older calves or mature
animals is even more painful. One reason why dehorning on the ranch involves so much suffering
is that the calves are dropped at various times during the calving season, and at the time of the
roundup many of the calves are too old for the use of relatively humane methods.

There are three possible methods of eliminating the major cruelties of dehorning: (1) Imposition
of a tax or penalty of some kind, more than now provided by market bargaining, on non-polled-
breed animals reaching the market. This would tend to encourage the use of polled breeds which
have no horns. (2) An additional personal property tax on horned breeds. Granted, it would be
difficult to obtain state legislation of this kind, or to enforce it if passed. (3) Provision
for payment by a public agency of a per-head amount for animals of polled breeds. This would be
a sort of bounty in reverse. No doubt these possibilities would appear to be "crackpot" ideas by people in the cattle-raising states, and at this time should not be taken too seriously.

Again, Humane Information Services claims no expert knowledge of this subject. We do know that dehorning as now carried out on many ranches is an extremely painful and revolting abuse of animals, and that it would be possible for an industry bent on eliminating it to find some practical means of doing so.

Castration

The writer was told by a professor of animal husbandry in an agricultural college of a Western state that the practices surrounding castration frequently are unnecessarily cruel and lead to unnecessary infection and in some cases loss of the animal. He claimed that many small ranchers who are ignorant of the principles of sanitation, upon completing the operation, pick up a handful of dirt and throw it into the incision, in the belief that this has some antiseptic action! Education of ranchers as proposed in the following sub-section would help to eliminate some of the cruelties connected with castration.

In Great Britain, use of a local anesthetic is required. In the present stage of public acceptance of humane objectives in the United States it probably would be impossible to obtain acceptance of any proposed law of this nature, and enforcement under our conditions of wide open spaces would be extremely difficult or impossible. This is something which would have to be approached on a state-by-state basis, and humanitarians should be alert to any apparent opportunities for such advances in their own states.

Persuasion and Education

Little or nothing to deal successfully with the conditions so briefly outlined above can be accomplished through force or legislation. If the humane movement is to do anything about these practices which lead to wholesale suffering on the part of millions of animals, it will be necessary to employ trained personnel who would, among other things, attempt to accomplish the following: (a) persuade the animal husbandry or veterinary departments of Western agricultural colleges to conduct research designed to disclose more humane methods of castrating, branding and dehorning, and to persuade the agricultural extension services dealing with cattle and sheepmen to inaugurate formal programs designed to encourage adoption of the more humane practices; (b) in the absence of success in accomplishing the foregoing, arrange to make investigations, including a thorough review of secondary literature on these subjects, without the assistance of public agencies; (c) work with associations of cattle and sheep ranchers to get their support of more humane methods of ranching; (d) where this cannot be done through the cooperation of extension services, hold meetings with ranchers to explain and demonstrate the improved methods; (e) conduct a continuous educational program with editors of newspapers and trade magazines read by ranchers, and with local chambers of commerce, bankers, and others who through loans or other business operations are in a position to influence the actions of ranchers; (f) work with officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States Government, and with the agricultural departments of railroads, to first get the facts regarding possible overgrazing from a humane as well as a profit standpoint, and then to encourage the adoption of leasing or grazing permit arrangements which will help to prevent overgrazing; (g) attempt to organize more effective animal rescue efforts.

Difficult as this whole program may seem to be and actually is, the situation is by no means hopeless. There are many humane-minded ranch people who have a real interest in the welfare of their animals, and with their help a qualified humane society representative undoubtedly could accomplish a great deal, although in relation to the enormity of the problem progress necessarily would be slow.

From the foregoing it should not be concluded that the problems discussed are apropos only of western ranches. Many cattle are produced under range conditions in Florida, and in some other eastern and Midwestern states. What has been said about the West will apply in almost its entirety to states such as Florida.
Livestock Transportation

The transportation of livestock from ranches or other points of production to feed lots or to slaughter markets, and from feed lots and farms to points of slaughter, may be by rail or truck. Formerly, the railroads handled the bulk of the livestock, but now generally only a part of the long-distance shipments, mostly in the Western states.

The suffering to which food animals are subjected in transportation is indicated by the fact that in one recent year over 75,000 cattle, sheep and hogs were dead on arrival at unloading points where counts are made. If the dead animals received at auctions and other points which are not included in the official figures were added, the number would be several times larger. Crippled and bruised animals no doubt are many times the number of dead ones.

Now, it requires something more than discomfort to produce a dead or crippled animal. Few things are more pitiful to observe than a calf, lamb or hog which has been downed on the bed of a lurching, slippery-floored truck, with the other animals stepping on it repeatedly with their hooves as they attempt to keep their footing. The poor animal makes an effort to stand up again, only to be slammed to the floor or against the side of the vehicle, moaning, bleating or grunting, until it finally gives in to its injuries and exhaustion, its legs twitching as it eventually expires. The writer, while a college student on the way home for a Christmas vacation, rode a cattle car all the way from Wisconsin to Pennsylvania. Asleep on the floor in the midst of a car full of cows when it went over the "hump" in the Chicago yards, he almost became one of the dead or crippled statistics, winding up with a big scab on his face which had been grazed by a hoof. So, we can speak from firsthand experience in testifying to the rigors of rail transportation of livestock, and later experience with trucking was even more impressive. The total amount of suffering involved in animal transportation certainly compares in volume and intensity with that undergone by the animals in the slaughterhouse.

Transportation by Rail

Livestock transportation by rail, despite some abuses which arise from poor train handling or yard "humping", is generally superior from a humane standpoint to truck transportation. A federal law provides for unloading the animals for feed and water after the elapse of not to exceed 28 hours. Responsibility for enforcing the law is vested in the USDA. Policing amounts mostly to spot checks made of bills of lading at the yards where the livestock is received, and the inspectors rarely actually clock the elapsed time of the shipment.

Several years ago a bill was introduced in Congress (the Rhodes bill) to extend the provisions of the 28-hour railroad law to include trucks. Some humanitarians, not familiar with conditions, enthusiastically got behind the proposed legislation, which was not passed. Actually, it would have had few if any beneficial effects. In very few instances do livestock truck trips extend beyond 28 hours. Since then, it has been suggested that the length of time without unloading for feed and water be limited to 20, or 16, or some other number of hours, or be based on the number of miles traveled. The efficacy of such proposals also is doubtful.

Humanitarians sometimes seem to attach undue importance to feeding and watering in transit. There is evidence that animals, immediately after unloading from a railroad stock car or truck after a strenuous journey, usually will neither eat nor drink. The unloading involves extra handling and probable rough treatment of the animals. Excessive handling is to be avoided wherever possible.

The inhumane treatment of animals in rail transportation arises mostly from improper separation in the car, and from poorly-equipped loading pens and chutes and rough handling of animals when loaded and unloaded. The latter is something extremely difficult to eliminate, because of the character of the personnel used for this purpose, and the large number and wide geographical distribution of loading points.

For many years the meat packers, livestock producers' organizations and others have maintained an agency for the purpose, among others, of reducing losses in the transportation and handling of
Livestock on the way to market. These efforts were motivated almost entirely by economic considerations, reflecting the enormous losses, running into many millions of dollars annually, from death, crippling and bruising of many of the animals arriving at the slaughterhouses. This effort, in which several humane organizations have participated, in the main has been well directed and successful in reducing losses and incidentally improving conditions from a humane standpoint in the rail transportation of livestock. Not much more can be done than is being done now.

Transportation by Truck

The trucking of livestock is done by large interstate haulers with heavy specialized equipment, by smaller operators who do custom trucking for all elements in the livestock industry but generally over relatively short distances, and by livestock farmers using their own equipment.

The large companies generally have good equipment suited to the job, and trained drivers who realize the need for proper care of the livestock in order to reduce bruising, crippling, and death losses. However, even these companies do not always use the most humane methods possible. For example, the USDA found that sprinkling hogs in trucks at appropriate times during transit reduced losses and was economically feasible, and also, of course, it would reduce the suffering of the hogs in hot weather. We have no information as to the extent to which this practice has been adopted since issuance of the report, but it does point to the probability that more could be done even by the advanced and efficient companies for the comfort of the animals.

The smaller custom truckers, and particularly farmers, frequently use equipment poorly adapted to the task of transporting livestock. A truckload may contain mixed species, and mixed sizes of any given species, without proper means for separating them. Floors of the trucks frequently are not provided with proper bedding to prevent slipping on curves and sloping roadways. The possibility of provisions for special state licensing of custom truckers and their equipment is worthy of investigation.

If space permitted we could list a great number of specific improvements that might be made in the trucking of livestock. But if such a list were submitted, for example, to Livestock Conservation, Inc., as it was by a lady humanitarian of Minnesota, the comments received probably would appear to be a "run-around". People in the industry would agree that most of the points enumerated represent undesirable conditions for transporting livestock, and that they are encountered every day on the highways and at the loading and unloading docks. But most of them involve things which are matters of degree. For example, the lady humanitarian, who had the benefit of counsel of a person who has spent his life in the stockyards, lists as three things which should be "required by law": (1) a truck not be overloaded; (2) the load be partitioned sufficiently to prevent swaying, bruising, crippling and death; (3) humane handling of animals in loading and unloading. But how could anyone trying to enforce the law determine objectively what constitutes overloading, which depends partly upon the length of the trip and weather conditions? What objective specifications could be made with respect to partitioning "sufficiently to prevent swaying, bruising, crippling and death"? This, too, depends greatly upon the kind of a truck, the kind of load, the kind of roadway, and the length of the trip. And it would be even more difficult to specify objectively what constitutes "humane handling" in loading and unloading.

These are things which will have to be left to careful study and interminable arguments among the experts. We suggest that it would be possible, by working through Congress, to provide for the needed research to be done by the USDA.

Here is an alternative approach which, if it could be put into law, would solve the problem without all of these detailed objective specifications; that is, a law which says that the presence in the truck, either at the unloading point or at any time in transit, of a dead, crippled or badly-bruised animal constitutes prima-facie evidence of cruelty and abuse of the animals transported, and that a specified fine could be levied on the truck operator for each animal in such condition.

At present, if a humane officer in a state having anti-cruelty laws stops a truck because of the humane conditions pertaining to the animals in it, the loaded truck must stand, possibly in the
The federal humane slaughter law, and similar laws which have been passed by 19 states covering animals not included in the provisions of the federal law (those slaughtered in plants which do not sell meat to the federal government), have done an immense amount of good.

We should not accept the idea, however, that all of the slaughter covered by these laws really is humane. One plant visited by the writer and a hard-boiled retired Navy officer is in compliance with both federal and state slaughter laws, yet the conditions of slaughter were so revolting as to cause the officer to become physically ill. We do not have the space to detail all of the conditions which still can exist under the terms of the humane slaughter laws, and would not do so even if we did, because so many of our readers say they cannot stand to read such gory details. Improvement of these conditions will come only as a result of continuing, hard, grubbing work on the part of humane society representatives with enforcement officials and packing house managers, and this will require more funds than humane societies now have available. As a matter of fact, enforcement of these laws has been left largely to the USDA, for the federal law, and to the state commissioners of agriculture or other state enforcement agencies, and humanitarians generally, as well as humane societies, have been inclined to proceed on the blithe assumption that everything is okay once a law has been passed.

The most pressing needs in this field are: (1) passage of humane slaughter laws in the remaining 31 states, (2) amendment of the federal and as many state laws as possible to eliminate the cruelties of ritual slaughter, and (3) extension of humane slaughter to other countries. Humane Information Services cannot go along with those humanitarians who say that we must look to our own backyards first, and leave conditions in other countries to their inhabitants. An animal suffering the tortures of inhumane slaughter in a South American country is just as much a concern to us as one in a packing plant in the United States.

Several humane societies in the United States have excellent literature describing the need for state humane slaughter laws, and have conducted or supported aggressive campaigns to promote the passage of such laws. But the methods used sometimes have been politically inept and inadequate to achieve results. The writer, who led a successful campaign to obtain a humane slaughter law in Florida, prepared a detailed outline of procedures necessary to insure passage of a law in any state. On several occasions he has been assured that it is too much to expect humane organizations to conduct such a carefully-planned and detailed campaign. Until, however, we do, laws will be lacking in many of the states where they are most needed.

The Humane Society of the United States, and its New Jersey Branch in particular, has been especially aggressive in attempting to obtain passage of state humane slaughter legislation which would include ritual slaughter. It is a monumental undertaking in the states where ritual slaughter plants are most numerous, and in which most consumers unwittingly are forced to use inhumanely-slaughtered meat. Humane Information Services believes that the most outstanding failure of such campaigns has been insufficient effort to obtain the cooperation of the Jewish population, which is noted for its liberalism in other matters, and no doubt is as humane-minded as anyone if they could be acquainted with the true facts which are withheld by the minority of orthodox Jewish leaders and organizations.

Information in the files of Humane Information Services indicates that a number of foreign
countries which are important suppliers of beef, lamb and mutton to importing countries have adopted humane slaughter regulations covering animals going into meat exports. But this is not enough. In a later Report, we will deal with this problem of slaughter in meat exporting nations.

Animal Machines

Except for poultry, "intensive husbandry" of food animals of the kind described in Ruth Harrison's Animal Machines is not practiced to the same extent in the United States as in Europe. We will leave the whole question of poultry and egg production and marketing to a later Report.

The British organization, Compassion in World Farming, in a recent newsletter, urged "overseas societies" to "press their governments to take action" with respect to the inhumanities of intensive husbandry. No generalized campaign of this kind, however, is suitable for the United States. It would constitute a waste of time and money. Even in Great Britain, where conditions are much worse in these respects than in the United States, and where the general public is much more humane-minded, little progress seems to have been made. A committee set up to report to Parliament on this subject expressed a "sense of urgency" in 1965, but, according to Compassion in World Farming, results have been lacking.

This is a tremendously difficult problem, and must be approached with utmost care and detailed planning. For example, we might try to obtain state laws against raising cloven-hoofed animals on slats, and specifying minimum sizes for cages or pens and other details. Such a proposal would produce a tremendous uproar among all the agricultural interests concerned, and almost certainly would not be successful. This seems to be a subject where discretion is the better part of valor. A program for working, on a reasonable and practical basis, with the food animal interests concerned, including the electric power companies which have been leaders in promoting intensive husbandry of food animals, somewhat along the lines of our proposal for dealing with the inhumanities of ranch production of food animals, would seem to be potentially far more effective.

The Anti-Cruelty Approach

Perhaps the most effective approach to many of these problems of food animals would be the passage of a federal (relating to animals or products moving interstate) and state laws covering cruelty to animals in general. If we had really strong and comprehensive anti-cruelty laws we could approach many problems, in this field as well as in others, with much greater effectiveness. It would be a battle royal to obtain passage of really good anti-cruelty laws, but once on the books they could be used for achieving many different purposes dear to the hearts of humanitarians, including the elimination of some of the cruelties involved in the production and marketing of food animals. In a later Report to Humanitarians, we will deal with this whole question of state and federal anti-cruelty laws.

Veal Production

One of the worst situations in the food animal field in the United States is the marketing of veal calves produced on dairy farms. Except on farms producing registered breeding stock, bull calves are a useless by-product. Until fairly recently, they would be knocked in the head soon after birth. During the 1960's, however, a market has developed for bull calves, and for heifer calves which are crippled or deformed. Livestock dealers tour the dairy farms, picking up these calves for anywhere from $5 to $30, or the dairyman may take them to a nearby livestock auction. These usually are calves only a day or two old. The better ones may go into calf feeding lots, where they are carried for 60-90 days and may reach 200 pounds before being sold for veal. Hundreds of thousands of others, however, go immediately to slaughter, and may wind up as veal cutlets on your cafeteria steam table, pre-packaged "chicken salad", wieners, or even the hamburger sandwich you eat in a drive-in. Such veal has a different odor and flavor from ordinary meat, and would turn the stomach of anyone familiar with what goes into the product!

An unknown number of dairy calves produced in the United States go into the export market via air freight. In Europe, and particularly France and Italy, pale pink veal is much in favor, and commands high prices. Such veal is produced by force-feeding veal calves with diets deficient in iron and vitamin B12, under revolting conditions, to make them anemic. The animals are kept in
the dark in very cramped quarters so they cannot exercise and in the latter part of their brief lives can hardly get up and down in their stalls. The floors are slatted to permit the manure to drop through. The conditions in general are reminiscent of the Inquisition and the Dark Ages.

Through the recommendations of such popular exponents of French cooking as Julia Child, whose TV broadcasts emanate from Boston but appear on educational television throughout the country, the fad of using pale veal is beginning to spread in the United States. Miss Mabel Crafts, a humanitarian of Jacksonville, Florida, wrote to Miss Child suggesting that she reconsider her frequent endorsements of pale veal, and received the following reply: "Unfortunately, that is the only kind that is of any culinary interest, from the French cooking point of view."

This would seem to be a good time for humanitarians to take advantage of every possible opportunity to head off the use of pale veal in this country. They might write letters of protest to TV stations offering programs which call for the use of pale veal. If an article appears in the woman's section of the paper, or in a magazine, extolling the merits of such veal, letters should be sent to the editors. Very few of the editors or others concerned are familiar with the conditions under which this veal is produced. And many humanitarians will refuse to eat veal at all.

LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR CONTINUING ACTION PROGRAMS

Laboratory Legislation

As this is written in August there appears to be little chance that the Rogers-Javits bill for the humane treatment of laboratory animals will be passed by the present Congress, despite last-minute efforts by Congressman Rogers and some favorable recent developments.

Since our last Report the Bureau of the Budget has approved the Rogers-Javits bill. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has approved the bill and has indicated that it is willing to leave it up to Congress as to what agency or agencies should administer the bill. When Congress reconvenes in September the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is prepared to hold hearings if Congressman Staggers, of West Virginia, Chairman of the full Committee, will permit it. If he does so, it is possible that the Committee will report the bill out to the House of Representatives, and that the House will pass it. The bill then would go to the Senate, where it likely would wind up behind the same Senate committee obstacles which have prevented action on the Javits bill in the Senate since it was first introduced. We devoutly hope that these unfavorable prospects will prove to be unfounded, and that Congressman Rogers' valiant efforts to pass the bill in this session of the Congress will succeed.

The Fur Problem

In Report No. 4, issued in June, we treated in considerable detail the very complex and difficult problems involved in reducing the cruelties of the fur trade, and have been most encouraged by the responses to our request for opinions on several important points, including a choice between two major plans of action. Anyone who thinks that humanitarians generally are incapable of participating in the planning of humane programs, and must merely do what they are told in brief messages from humane societies, should read our mail dealing with the fur problem. Many of the comments were most intelligent and helpful. We will report on this problem later, after some preliminary sounding of opinions in the trade.

Other Programs

The humane rat poison program discussed in our Report No. 3 (March, 1968) and the fur program, together with our technical information services in connection with laboratory legislation, will be continuing action programs of Humane Information Services. We do not expect to accomplish our objectives overnight, of course. Such far-reaching and basic programs will require years of effort to bring to fruition. We hope that we will have the cooperation of other humane societies. We will report to our members on progress when we have something definite to tell you. Meanwhile our Reports to Humanitarians will continue to deal mostly with additional basic and highly important humane problems such as the one featured in this Report No. 5. Our December Report will comprise a complete and up-to-date review of the entire laboratory animal legislation situation.
NEW OFFICE BUILDING FOR HIS, INC.

We are happy to announce that Humane Information Services has just moved into its new office building at 4521 - 4th Street South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705. Correspondents should use this address from now on, although we will still receive mail sent to our old address, 675 Pinellas Point Drive, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705, which is the home of our President, Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen. We had outgrown our former quarters at the latter address. Friends of Humane Information Services who happen to be in St. Petersburg at any time are invited to call and inspect our new home. City bus No. 4 runs by our door.

We were fortunate in obtaining a site which has commercial zoning, permitting operation of a professional office, yet located in a nice residential neighborhood. The building is a converted residence, and contains, in addition to our offices, living quarters for our new Executive Secretary, Miss Emily F. Gleckler. Miss Gleckler works about 14 hours a day, and this combination of office and residence will facilitate such faithful application to her duties.

Our office now is equipped with the usual office furniture, two IBM electric typewriters, a large steel cabinet for storage of address stencils, an Elliott addressing machine, an Addressograph offset printer, and assorted squirrels and birds in the tall pine trees, palms and semitropical shrubs of our backyard. And Emily has a new dog, Teddy II, who already has become an infernal nuisance to those trying to get some work done in the office. Oh, for a nice quiet cat which is not always wiggling around kissing faces and holding out a paw for attention! But women rule the world, and Doc has little or no noise in such decisions any more.

Both the property and the equipment are owned outright by Humane Information Services, Inc., with no indebtedness. No funds contributed by our members have been used for these acquisitions. The property was purchased with funds donated by our President, Dr. Thomsen, and the equipment has been donated by him and by Miss Gleckler. Membership dues and contributions are used only for current operating expenses.

New Executive Secretary

The first year of operation of Humane Information Services was devoted to acquiring and correcting a mailing list of approximately 8,000 names of humane organizations and individual humanitarians, and to collecting materials needed for our research and development work. Our mailing list is made up mostly of dedicated humanitarians who are at least partially familiar with humane problems and the ways in which they have been dealt with by other humane societies. We are indebted to our many friends who have sent to us lists of names and addresses of prospective members. Tests made with various other mailing lists, such as dog and cat breed societies, have been found to yield little response. Our mailing list is not as large as those of two or three other national humane societies, but we believe that its average quality is unmatched. We urge
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our readers to send us additional names and addresses of potential members, including zip codes if possible.

The second year of operation of Humane Information Services has been devoted to the research involved in developing a number of national humane programs, to the preparation, printing and circulation of these Reports to Humanitarians, and to the organization of our work in handling membership relations. All of this has involved considerable experimentation and adjustments because of our inexperience with the new equipment and with the daily operating problems involved. During these first two years of operation the work has been supervised, and much of it done, by Doc.

Our only employee has been a part-time office girl who has handled the mailing list and membership records. Doc has prepared the materials and written the Reports to Humanitarians, and handled most of the necessary correspondence. Miss Emily Gleockler, one of our founders and Secretary-Treasurer, has assisted greatly by working evenings and weekends. But the load on Doc became so great that it was just too much to handle. Miss Gleockler has voluntarily given up her excellent full-time position with the Florida Power Corporation to come with Humane Information Services on a full-time basis, at a much lower salary, as Executive Secretary.

The founders of Humane Information Services have a firm belief in the need for careful, coordinated planning to make humane work more effective. Far too much of humane work has been conducted on a day-to-day, hit-or-miss basis. The encouraging words which we continue to receive from so many of you indicate that we are on the right track. Again, please accept our gratitude for your compliments and assurances of support.

Acquisition of our new fully-paid-for office, and Emily's joining the society on a full-time basis, are part of our over-all plan. The latter provides for long-term financing of our basic activities, which will help to prevent erratic operations. Steps are being taken by Doc to set up a trust fund which will insure the continuing operation of Humane Information Services. Several of our correspondents have called attention to the fact that many new humane societies have not survived initial operation, and have wondered about our prospects in this regard. Some have said that they would leave bequests, or make substantial contributions, only if they could be assured of the continuing stability of the society. The provisions and circumstances which have been described above give such assurance.

This does not mean that we have plenty of money and can get along without the continuing financial support of our members! What we already have set up covers the research and development aspects of the society. This alone would constitute a very-much-needed and essential contribution to the humane movement, but effective action programs to carry out the plans also are needed. Therefore, a second, and even more costly part of our planned operation is to conduct action programs designed to put into effect each strategic plan to deal with a specific humane problem. We look to our members for the continuing financial support needed for maintaining in effective operation the action programs which are being developed now and are being reported to you in these Reports to Humanitarians.