Humane Livestock Handling

by Temple Grandin

The livestock industry loses $46,000,000 every year due to bruises on the animals, according to the Livestock Conservation Institute. This is one indication of the amount of injuries suffered by cattle, sheep, and pigs in stockyards and meat packing plants, and during transportation to the plants. Aside from injuries, the animals can also suffer an enormous amount of stress from overcrowding and abusive handling.

Poorly designed facilities and stockyards which do not take into account the physical and psychological characteristics of the animals can cause stress and injuries. When animals balk at moving through the chutes or up the ramps leading to slaughter, handlers may use electric prods to force them to move. The overuse of electric prods is a major cause of cattle becoming bruised because they get riled up, ram fences, and get trampled on. The humane factor in this cannot be overlooked, but better equipment which encourages the animals to move along instead of causing them to balk will reduce the need to use prods.

Well designed equipment will help reduce stress on the animals because they will move more easily through the facility with a minimum of excitement. When the animals move easily without balking, they are less likely to be abused by impatient handlers. Knowledge of livestock behavior is essential in order to design equipment which will reduce stress. Natural livestock behaviors can be utilized to facilitate the flow of animals through a chute or alley.

Cow Psychology

Cattle, sheep, and hogs have wide angle vision. Cattle and sheep have a 360° visual field. Cattle and other grazing animals such as deer are equipped with wide angle vision so they can see a predator coming while they have their heads down grazing. In fact, a cow can see behind herself without turning her head.

This is why a cow can be easily spooked by a moving object. Livestock handling facilities such as the single file chute, which leads to the stunning pen, should have high, solid sides. Solid sides prevent the animals from seeing people, cars, and other moving objects outside the chute, which may frighten them and cause them to balk.

With wide angle vision, cattle have very little ability to judge distances. This lack of depth perception is one of the reasons a cow is likely to refuse to cross a shadow. The cow’s reluctance to cross areas of bright and dark contrast is one of the reasons a cattle guard works.

Experience has shown that curved chutes are more efficient than straight chutes. Cattle will follow a curved path more readily than a straight one. The curved chute enables the animal to circle the handler in a natural manner. In a curved chute with high, solid sides, the animal will only be able to see the animal in front of it, disappear around the bend. The elimination of distractions and the animal’s follow-the-leader instinct will help move it through the lane without harassment from the handlers.

Studies have also shown that the shape of a livestock holding pen at a slaughter plant may be just as important as the number of square feet allotted per animal. A long narrow pen has more perimeter fence in relation to floor area than a square pen. This provides each animal with more fence line space. Observations indicate that livestock prefer to lie along the fenceline because it is the animal’s natural instinct to circle around the handler. Note also the long, narrow holding pens at the top of the picture, designed to give more fence line space for the animals.
Equipment Improvements

There are certain instances where an improvement in equipment will drastically reduce bruises and injuries. A trucking company was able to reduce bruises by modifying the doors on the trucks used to haul the cattle to the plant. When the cattle exited from the trucks they would hit their hips on the door frame. This would result in a large bruise on the loin. The slaughter plant owner had the trucker modify the doors so that they were wide at the top and narrow at the bottom. This forced the cattle to walk through the middle of the door and thus avoid striking the hip.

Another example of a modification which prevented bruises was the installation of a truck scale at a slaughter plant for weighing cattle that were going into the truck. This eliminated the extra handling and stress of unloading and working the animals across the scale in the stockyards. The truck scale paid for itself in bruise reduction in six months. Bruised meat cannot be used for human consumption. The scale also reduced labor requirements.

Changing and modifying chutes which are used to restrain animals for stunning can often greatly improve the humaneness of the operation and reduce bruises. This is especially true in plants which use a stunning pen where two cattle are placed in a single compartment. When one animal is stunned, the other live animal will often step on it and cause bruises. This type of pen is also very dangerous for the employees. Employees shackling cattle from this stunning pen were suffering an average of two serious injuries, such as broken arms, per year.

Replacement of the double two stunning pen with a conveyor restrainer system, as shown above, is one of the most humane systems for restraining cattle or hogs for stunning. The conveyor restrainer was completely paid for within two years from the savings of reduced bruises.

Rough Handling

The number one cause of bruises is rough handling. The prevention of bruises is mainly a matter of preventing people from using rough, abusive methods of handling. Good equipment will help prevent bruises, but equipment will not solve the problem. The bruise problem has tended to increase during the last five years. People are the cause of over 50% of all bruises. Observations indicated that a few very rough people inflict a high percentage of all the bruises. The worst cruelties are inflicted by people, and it is impossible to build equipment which will prevent a cruel person from being cruel. I have witnessed people doing some really terrible things to animals, such as ramming a stick down a cow’s throat. In these instances, the individual person should be severely punished, not the company the person works for. Fining a slaughter plant $2,000 is like giving you a $2.00 parking ticket. A stiff fine to the individual who was cruel would put an end to many of these acts.

Kosher Slaughter

One of the most serious cruelty problems in slaughter plants is the pre-slaughter stunning of large (over 1000 lb.) steers in kosher plants. Federal health laws require that no animal fall in the blood of another animal after slaughter. Kosher slaughter requires that an animal be conscious when slaughtered. To meet both requirements, most U.S. kosher plants shackles the animal by a hind leg and hoist it off the ground while it is still conscious, then slaughter it. With large steers, this process results in great pain. At one plant, the bellows of the animals could be heard from the front office. In some instances, the shackling chain can break the animal’s leg.

The ASPCA pen used to restrain large steers for kosher slaughter in some plants is an improvement over shackling and hoisting conscious animals, but there have been some problems with it. It is a complex piece of equipment and requires a very skilled operator to operate it humanely. In the hands of a careless operator, it can apply excessive pressure to the backbone and neck and cause more carcass damage and broken legs than shackling and hoisting.

Better restraining equipment is needed. I have been working on designing better equipment for large cattle. The University of Connecticut has developed a prototype restrainer for kosher slaughter of sheep and calves. Their equipment is very good, but they have not worked on plant scale. These projects were funded by the Council for Livestock Handling and Protection, of which the HSUS is a member.

Good equipment concepts are available. It is now mainly a matter of finding a plant and installing a complete working system. Plants which slaughter kosher are reluctant to spend money on equipment because the kosher market is so variable. A plant can be in the kosher business one month and out of it the next. There are a few well established kosher plants which can be good candidates for either a large animal or a small animal system.

Humane livestock handling is both morally and economically sensible. Facilities designed with the animal’s needs and characteristics in mind can help eliminate stress and injuries. It is most important that the people who handle the animals and run the equipment have a respectful attitude toward the livestock. Strong enforcement of current laws on humane slaughter will be another factor in improving livestock handling. Animals do not know before slaughter, and every effort should be made to prevent any cruelty in the process.
NEW ACCREDITATIONS ANNOUNCED

The Pet Overpopulation Problem Can be Solved!

The Humane Society News • Winter 1979

According to Phyllis Wright, HSUS Director of Animal Sheltering, there is a serious problem. Responsible owners who lease, license, and neuter their pets will be the solution to the pet overpopulation problem. It’s the job of animal control agencies and humane societies to help create such owners.

Some communities with aggressive animal control programs have seen a decrease in the numbers of dogs and cats that must be impounded and destroyed. One of the best documented is that of the Vancouver Regional Branch of the British Columbia SPCA in Canada. Under the direction of C. Jack Holmes, The Vancouver Branch has developed a two-part program to induce and encourage pet owners to be more responsible.

OPERATION TATTOO

The Vancouver Branch operates seven shelters, and is directly concerned with animal control in seven other municipalities. Operation Tattoo was instituted because statistics showed that 72% of the dogs entering Vancouver’s jurisdiction had no form of identification.

A policy decision was made in 1974 that all dogs adopted from the Branch’s shelters must be tattooed. Other cities can tattooed pets than to the abstract problem of pet overpopulation. With this in mind, the clinic emphasizes the benefits of healthier, more affectionate pets, with less urge to roam and fight. The clinic has been fully booked since it opened in 1976. It was financially viable after two months of operation.

The Vancouver Branch recently issued a summary of animal control statistics for 1976 and 1977. The summary compares statistics from the eight municipalities participating in the low cost spay/neuter clinic with those of two municipalities which do not participate. The summary makes the following observations:

• Impoundments of non-participating municipalities showed an increase of 41% (partly because one of the municipalities employed additional staff while participating municipalities showed a decrease of impoundments of 9%.

• Non-participating municipalities had 39% of impounded dogs reclaimed, while participating municipalities showed a decrease of 58% of impounded dogs reclaimed.

• The number of surplus animals euthanized increased by 37% in the non-participating municipalities, while decreasing by 27% in the participating municipalities.

These statistics clearly show that a comprehensive animal control program can have a definite impact in reducing the suffering created by pet overpopulation. Legislation, education, and sterilization are the keys to the creation of a responsible pet owners.

The HSUS believes that the pet population problem can be solved by each community initiating a comprehensive animal control plan including spay/neuter programs and other measures designed to encourage pet owner responsibility.
TUNA BOYCOTT TO CONTINUE

In the Summer issue of The Humane Society News, members were asked to give their opinions on continuing the tuna boycott in light of progress made by the tuna industry to save porpoises. Of the 512 responses received, 306 voted to continue the boycott, while 206 felt it was time to discontinue it. While the total number of responses was low, the trend toward continuing the boycott wasvery definite. Most respondents voted to continue even underlined their reply to make it more emphatic. Many added comments such as the following:

"I don't feel that any porpoise should be killed just because they swim over tuna. Until someone comes up with a better way of catching tuna, I think the boycott should remain."

"Discontinue—with the understanding that the boycott will be reinstated if the industry does not continue its efforts to further reduce porpoise kill."

"If they (the tuna industry) are going to make an effort to save the porpoise, we are going up and they will slow their efforts, or maybe quit cooperating altogether."

"I feel that discontinuing the boycott at this point would be premature. While the tuna industry seems to be cooperating in efforts to save the porpoise, the legal quotas of 31,500 and more are still far too high."

"If the boycott is lifted, the tuna industry will still be giving us up and they will slow their efforts, or maybe quit cooperating altogether."

"Keep the pressure on—do not relax."

"Even if the boycotters were officially off, I (and probably many others) would not want to buy a product that kills dolphins or harasses them in the chase."

"No more of these intelligent, helpful, intelligent creatures should be murdered horribly in the tuna nets."

"Even among those who voted to discontinue the boycott, many included provisos which showed they still felt justified in continuing it. A recent report from the U.S. Department of Commerce shows the trend toward reducing porpoise kill slackened."

The following comments reflect this concern:

"I think the tuna boycott should be discontinued because it has served its purpose. The tuna industry has finally realized the seriousness of an animal's life, and the sanctity of life, even though, until not one life is wasted, and I think the tuna industry should also realize we haven't forgotten about them."

"The Humane Society News
does not want to see porpoises being killed. The industry should get its act together and stop killing porpoises."

"I think they should keep the boycott going because the porpoise is an animal that is not protected by law."

The tuna industry does deserve congratulations for its recent efforts toward saving porpoise, and its success in significantly lowering the number of porpoise killed. The HSUS will continue its efforts to further reduce porpoise kill. The HSUS is going to continue to work towards this goal and will not give up until every porpoise is protected."

The tuna industry would not want to see the HSUS discontinue its boycott efforts. The HSUS is going to continue to work towards this goal and will not give up until every porpoise is protected."

The following comments reflect this concern:

"I think the tuna boycott should be discontinued because it has served its purpose. The tuna industry has finally realized the seriousness of an animal's life, and the sanctity of life, even though, until not one life is wasted, and I think the tuna industry should also realize we haven't forgotten about them."

"Discontinue—with the understanding that the boycott will be reinstated if the industry does not continue its efforts to further reduce porpoise kill."

"If they (the tuna industry) are going to make an effort to save the porpoise, we are going up and they will slow their efforts, or maybe quit cooperating altogether."

"I feel that discontinuing the boycott at this point would be premature. While the tuna industry seems to be cooperating in efforts to save the porpoise, the legal quotas of 31,500 and more are still far too high."

"If the boycott is lifted, the tuna industry will still be giving us up and they will slow their efforts, or maybe quit cooperating altogether."

"Keep the pressure on—do not relax."

"Even if the boycotters were officially off, I (and probably many others) would not want to buy a product that kills dolphins or harasses them in the chase."

"No more of these intelligent, helpful, intelligent creatures should be murdered horribly in the tuna nets."

"Even among those who voted to discontinue the boycott, many included provisos which showed they still felt justified in continuing it. A recent report from the U.S. Department of Commerce shows the trend toward reducing porpoise kill slackened."

The following comments reflect this concern:
HSUS Aids Gorilla Protection Effort

Digit and Uncle Bert died while trying to protect their families. Digit and Uncle Bert were two members of a group of free-ranging mountain gorillas being studied by researcher Dian Fossey, a remarkable woman who has devoted her life to the study and protection of gorillas in the Parc des Volcans of Rwanda and Parc des Virungas of Zaire in Africa.

In the past year, poachers have brutally killed and mutilated several of these gorillas. Digit was speared to death, and his head and hands cut off, apparently to be sold to collectors. Fossey reports that an African dealing in animal goods was offering $20.00 for the head and hands of a silverback gorilla.

Uncle Bert and a female, Macho, were shot and killed, and Macho’s infant injured, by poachers who may have been trying to capture the infant for a zoo. Uncle Bert was decapitated, but one of Fossey’s student assistants frightened the poachers away before they could remove his hands or decapitate Macho. The infant later died of its wounds.

When Digit and Uncle Bert were killed, they were in each case trying to move their group to safety, away from the attacking poachers. According to trail evidence, Uncle Bert was killed when Macho was shot by pursuing poachers and he hurried back from leading the group to safety to try to rescue her.

Fossey has organized her student assistants into poacher patrols to help buy equipment and supplies the patrols need to continue their work. In addition, HSUS has solicited donations of camping equipment on behalf of Fossey. North Face, Trailwise, Coleman, and Nippe Nose, manufacturers and distributors of outdoor equipment, have tentatively agreed to donate tents, clothing, cooking equipment, and other supplies for Fossey’s patrols.

Relief Sought for Animal Actors

Fame may be the reward for the people who star in movies, but animal actors seldom benefit from their time in the limelight. Animals are used, and often abused, in the entertainment industry. For example, HSUS Wildlife Director Sue Pressman has investigated how animals are treated in the making of the movie "The Wiz." Animals in films have been shot, burned, ridden over cliffs, and made to fight to the death with other animals, all to achieve the special effect the director called for.

HSUS, therefore, thus achieved, the first such code to be written. HSUS hopes the Animal Trainer’s Code will encourage other trainers to adopt this Code for their own operations.

This wolf is being harassed by the trainer so it will appear ferocious for the camera.
Jackrabbit Roping Cancelled
by Mark Vogler

Mark Vogler, a reporter for The Midland Reporter-Telegram, covered the cancellation of the jackrabbit roping contest in Odessa, Texas for his paper. Here, he reports on the event for The HSUS News. Vogler has worked as an investigative reporter for several west Texas newspapers and has also written articles on the jackrabbit controversy for the wire services.

On October 1, 1978, about ten news reporters converged on the Ector County Coliseum grounds in Odessa, Texas, to watch officials of the Permian Basin Fair and Exposition stage the annual World Championship Jackrabbit Roping Contest in defiance of legal threats by The Humane Society of the United States.

Most of the reporters were disappointed. There was no confrontation, no field day for the media. The contest was cancelled.

HSUS investigators Marc Paulhus and Rich McCracken had advised fair and county officials on the eve of the event that The Society planned to file criminal complaints under the state's anticruelty statutes if the event took place. As planned.

Although fair officials attributed the cancellation of the contest to their inability to find enough jackrabbits, Paulhus said, "It seems to me they could have rounded up enough rabbits if they really wanted to go ahead with the event. They could have even purchased the rabbits from one of the local jackrabbit contractors." Paulhus was referring to local merchants who send mass shipments of jackrabbits from the Midland-Odessa area to other states for use as live bait in greyhound coursing.

The present day contest is a revival of a sport last held in 1932. That year, animal protectionists succeeded in urging the Ector County Sheriff to issue an injunction to stop the rabbit roping. However, County Judge Henry E. Webb at the time enabled the show to go on when he decreed that "a jackrabbit is not an animal, but a rodent or a pest." He issued a restraining order against the sheriff.

I saw the event in 1977, and found that some contestents weren't content to rope the rabbits. A few cowboys delighted in jerking the rabbits in the air. One man stretched a rabbit's neck in full view of youngsters. Another rabbit was trampled to death by the hoof of a horse as one contestant tried to lasso the rabbit from the saddle.

Part of the folklore of the city is how grown men got their kicks roping jackrabbits while traveling over the desert terrain in jeeps. Out of this grew the annual fair's jackrabbit roping contest. A number of jackrabbits are released in a 40 by 40 foot fenced area, while entrants vie to lasso one in the shortest time. Contestants are supposed to release the rope after looping it around the animal's neck.

Last year, the local humane society had protested the event, but were unable to stop it. Fair officials were pleased with the publicity generated as radio stations from Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and other large cities across the country took an interest in the unusual event once local members of the humane society tried to put a stop to it.

Recently, however, publicity became less welcome as the ABC television series "20/20" focused attention on the business of catching and shipping jackrabbits for use in greyhound coursing. HSUS Chief Investigator Frantz Dantzler went with Gerald Rivera, the ABC reporter covering the story, to west Texas where they followed an animal action with one of the rabbit sellers.

Within a week after the program, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department in San Angelo launched a probe into the business. Other federal and state agencies have begun their own investigations into the "rabbit "industry."

Agents have cited possible violations of federal laws such as improper transportation of unlicensed animals which may be carrying communicable diseases, importation of jackrabbits into states where coursing is illegal, income tax evasion and conspiracy to violate several federal and state laws.

While the Odessa Chamber of Commerce promotes the city with its jackrabbit statue, the animal appears to be in danger of being exploited out of its existence in the area. During a previous HSUS investigation, it was learned that one airline serving Odessa shipped out about 1000 rabbits in approximately one month to several other states.

The issue of cruelty remains a primary concern with The HSUS. Fair officials denied that the roping contest constituted cruelty to animals, but The Humane Society investigators disagreed. "We view this event as a clear violation of article 11 of the Texas Anticruelty Code," said Paulhus, "and will definitely take action for any animal cruelty acts if the rabbits are tortured, abused, killed, or injured in any way."

While the cancellation of this year's event was viewed as a victory by the investigators, they realize the roping contest may be scheduled again next year. "I can assure you the event will not happen again," said McCracken. "If they try to have it next year, we'll be back. We'll do everything in our power to see that it is stopped."

Meanwhile, The HSUS will continue its efforts to protect the west Texas jackrabbits from capture and shipment for use as live bait in greyhound coursing.

This jackrabbit statue is a landmark in Odessa, Texas.
ANIMALS OR PEOPLE?

Those who care for animals are too often accused of loving animals more than people. The unfairness of this charge is deeply felt but sometimes difficult to express.

Lord Houghton of Sowerby, a member of the British Parliament and a long time champion of animal welfare issues, was recently faced with this charge. During a debate in the House of Lords on hare coursing, Lord Houghton discounted the charge. His expression of concern for all living things speaks for many of us.

With your Lordships' permission, I want to avail myself of the opportunity on this occasion to refute the suggestion which came my way in the course of the debate on the Child Protection Bill Second Reading last month: namely, that I am not a fanatic; I am not crazy. I reject the proposition that fondness for animals implies some lack of concern for human beings. Do I have to prove a love of children by being cruel to animals? Is the person who is cruel to animals likely to love children all the more? Is that the proposition, or is cruelty an evil strict in the nature of some humans which makes selfless love, whether for human beings, or animals, impossible?

When Queen Victoria was urging the Beardsley Park Zoo Pressman has visited that zoo. The itinerary included several Connecticut zoos; R.W. Commerford & Sons at Goshen, the Willington Game Farm, the Children's Museum at West Hartford, Old McDonald's Farm in Norwalk, the Beardsley Park Zoo in Bridgeport, and the Moran Nature Center and Zoo at New London. They also inspected the Science Museum Zoo in Worcester, Massachusetts, the Roger Williams Park Zoo in Providence, Rhode Island, and the Winter Zoo, in Stoneham, Massachusetts.

The pair were particularly concerned about the Beardsley Park Zoo. Pressman has visited that zoo six times since 1971. After the October inspection, she wrote to the Mayor of Bridgeport commenting "This letter is to register our disapproval and concern for this zoo. It appears to have fallen below the standards of the 1971 inspection when it was listed as one of the worst zoos in the country. The same problems that brought condemnation seven years ago still exist." Pressman recommended hiring an experienced zoo director and new staff, and remodeling the antiquated mammal house and anteater's winter quarters. A joint improvement effort by the Springfield Parks and Recreation Department demanding that Morganetta, the elephant, be given winter quarters immediately. They also recommended closing the golden eagle and polar bear displays because "The displays teach nothing about the behavior or ecological importance of either species. There is, therefore, no justification for keeping these animals in captivity.

The city of Springfield agreed to make changes for Morganetta, and will seek additional expert consultation on changes in other parts of the zoo.

Commenting on the New England zoos, Inman said "We hope to effect the changes so desperately needed in the care and use of animals in all the zoos. But where the money and interest to create a really good zoo does not exist, we want to help them go gracefully out of business."
Changes at Corpus Christi

Corpus Christi, Texas, and the Coastal Bend Humane Society have caused Corpus Christi, Texas officials to reconsider awarding them the use of succostrin, a drug that kills by paralyzing the muscles until suffocation.

Regional Director Doug Scott and Phyllis Wright, Human Care Director and the Animal Advisory Board, discussed the euthanasia problems at a meeting for local law enforcement personnel and public officials. Requests, mainly from Florida counties of Hillsboro, Citrus, and Taylor, have been turned over water and food bowls in some crates. But happily the owner was found guilty under the West Coast Office at 512-854-3142.

Tiffin, Ohio, with a cruelty investigation, which is the reason for the continued conviction ever obtained by that society. The case involved a man who kept about 70 dogs on his property. Rowland reports that when she accompanied Humane Agent Steve Tanner and Shelter Manager Scott Rosenberg to the property, she saw "emaciated dogs tied on short chains to concrete drying beds that had served as dog houses for them. Many dogs appeared to have symptoms of mange. Other dogs also appeared to have symptoms of distemper."

The owner was found guilty under Ohio State anti-cruelty laws. He was fined, but the fine was dropped when he agreed to dispose of all but ten of the dogs. The Nacogdoches shelter is for the adoptable ones and euthanizing those that were very ill.

Rocky Mountain Staff

The staff of the new Rocky Mountain Regional office expanded recently with the addition of Philip Steward as Field Investigator. Steward came from the western states originally, but for the past several years has been working out of HSUS' headquarters office in Washington, D.C., doing cruelty investigations nationally. Before joining HSUS, Steward had worked in law enforcement and in animal control in California.

His new assignment will be to investigate complaints of cruelty, abuse, and neglect in the Rocky Mountain states, and work with the national investigations staff on cruelty cases in the other western states.

Regional Director Donald Cashen went to Salt Lake City in November to participate in Utah's celebration of Humane Education Week. The public proclamation of this special week was the result of the efforts of Mrs. Carol Browning and Mrs. Robert Browning of Salt Lake City. They wrote a letter to the Utah Humane Society indicating that they would like to be added to the list of speakers for the November 25-27, 1979 meeting of the Utah Humane Society.

With the number of airports Ann Gonnerman visited in the weeks before Christmas, you'd think she was a worldwide traveler. Not so! HSUS's Midwest Regional Director went looking for trouble in the pet trade because her region is the "home" of many of our country's puppy mills and pet breeders. It has found that she needs to keep a constant eye on the way pets are transported around the country.

One even refused a shipment when she didn't like the crates and wanted to feed on Christmas. Check this cow with the lights on and you'll see why. She turned over water and food bowls in some crates. But happily the owner was found guilty under the West Coast Office at 512-854-3142.

The owner was found guilty under Ohio State anti-cruelty laws. He was fined, but the fine was dropped when he agreed to dispose of all but ten of the dogs. The Nacogdoches shelter is for the adoptable ones and euthanizing those that were very ill.

Rocky Mountain Staff

The staff of the new Rocky Mountain Regional office expanded recently with the addition of Philip Steward as Field Investigator. Steward came from the western states originally, but for the past several years has been working out of HSUS' headquarters office in Washington, D.C., doing cruelty investigations nationally. Before joining HSUS, Steward had worked in law enforcement and in animal control in California.

His new assignment will be to investigate complaints of cruelty, abuse, and neglect in the Rocky Mountain states, and work with the national investigations staff on cruelty cases in the other western states.

Regional Director Donald Cashen went to Salt Lake City in November to participate in Utah's celebration of Humane Education Week. The public proclamation of this special week was the result of the efforts of Mrs. Carol Browning and Mrs. Robert Browning of Salt Lake City. They wrote a letter to the Utah Humane Society indicating that they would like to be added to the list of speakers for the November 25-27, 1979 meeting of the Utah Humane Society.

With the number of airports Ann Gonnerman visited in the weeks before Christmas, you'd think she was a worldwide traveler. Not so! HSUS's Midwest Regional Director went looking for trouble in the pet trade because her region is the "home" of many of our country's puppy mills and pet breeders. It has found that she needs to keep a constant eye on the way pets are transported around the country.
ANIMAL RIGHTS

The Search for a Legal Definition

For the first time, the 1978 HSUS Annual Conference featured a workshop on the rights of animals. The discussion, titled "Can Animal Rights Be Legally Defined?", was conducted by Mr. Robert Welborn, Vice Chairman of the Board of HSUS and a practicing attorney in Denver, Colorado, and Murdaugh Stuart Madden, General Counsel of HSUS. Their thoughts form a background for the resolution, "Animal Rights and Human Obligations," adopted by the membership at the Conference. Below are excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Welborn, and Mr. Madden.

Remarks by Mr. Welborn:

Over 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson proclaimed the inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These, he said, are the endowment of the Creator and represent a station to which men are entitled by the Laws of Nature and Nature's God. Did Jefferson contemplate that only man is or should be under the aegis of the Laws of Nature and Nature's God? Possibly this question did not occur to him, but how ironical it would be if Nature's creatures could not claim the rights that are the endowment of creation.

Laws dealing with the protection of animals and prohibiting certain cruelties to them are premised to a large extent on the concept that cruelty to animals is immoral rather than on the concept of inherent rights of animals.

There is a fundamental difference between an approach to animal welfare in terms of the inherent rights of animals and an approach in terms of humane moral obligations. The difference is spiritual, philosophical, and practical. If animals by virtue of life itself do have inherent rights, then it is not just bad for man's morals to deny these rights, it is an offense against life itself. Possessing inherent rights, animals have a status, or station as Jefferson called it, which is entitled to respect by virtue of itself and quite apart from man. Finally, as a practical legal matter, rights may be enforced in behalf of the possessor if the possessor is not capable, as in the case of a guardian in behalf of minor children. These rights are not without restriction and limitation, of course, even as applied to man. A man's life may be called upon as in war; liberty is limited in many ways in the interest of others in the society; happiness in the physical sense may not be pursued without inhibition. These concepts, therefore, are more profound than the outward manifestations. They mean an appropriate right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in relation to the rights of others.

Thus, if we say that animals are endowed by their Creator with these inalienable rights, it does not mean that no animal may be killed, that animals may roam without restriction, and that animals may not be restrained in gratifying their physical appetites. Nature itself brings about limitations on these rights. One animal kills another by instinct; life feeds upon life; the liberty of one animal to roam freely is naturally limited by its fear of other animals.

Since man dominates this earth and all other living things, it may seem academic to distinguish between animal rights and human obligations. It may be said that in either case the animal will receive only such respect and humane treatment as man is willing to give. This may be true in a limited sense, but the declaration of animal rights standing by itself because it reflects the fundamental truth will be an important weapon in the spiritual, philosophical, and legal battle that must be waged. It will give animals standing in our society to claim through a representative their own position and station under the laws of Nature and Nature's God. The recognition of animal rights can dispose of the rationale advanced by some superficial writers that the only reason man should avoid cruelty to animals is because the practice of cruelty is not good for man and that animals have no inherent dignity and no inherent rights.

What greater inherent dignity than in the mother cow with her calf, the community of wolves, the colony of ants building and rebuilding, the chimpanzee free in the jungle, the bird guarding its nest, and the dog mourning its lost friend. It is an affront to the laws of Nature and a sacrilege under Nature's God to say that only one species of God's creation has inherent dignity and inherent rights.

We need a declaration of independence for animals confirming these inalienable rights of life, liberty, and
As far as protection goes, the Old Testament contains a number of clear provisions for the protection of animals—rest on the Sabbath for cattle as well as man, animals of unequal strength were not to be made to work together, and so forth. The following general statements of rights (as adopted with HSUS Resolution—see box) could be the basis for the delineation of animal rights. The declaration and establishment of animal rights in detail and with force and effect is the only hope for success in the achievement of animal welfare. Otherwise, we risk to have animals treated as though they were not even "property"—like cabbages and carriages. We tend to say "incredibly terrible," but we must admit that there are worse things under the law, and one of them is and was to have animals treated as though they were not even property. The property concept ties into a human involvement, and it was long ago a crime to damage or injure the property of another, or in the case of wildlife, the property of the Crown. Therefore, being "property" of another gave such a measure to be free of cruelty and brutality by third persons. However, it did not protect the animal from the owner's own mistreatment and neglect, and, of course, if it were a stray or a wild animal, the Crown or the owners of such property could treat it, starve it, or abandon it with impunity. This created a very serious problem historically within the animal welfare movement in the Anglo world, because the so-called "non productive" dogs and cats were not treated like property as were horses, cows, sheep, swine, etc., and this left these pets out completely as far as protection and prohibited conduct toward them was concerned.

Today there are literally thousands of animal related statutes in this country, ranging from state to state, and with the rights. The answer is no; no more than an "animal has an inalienable and protected rights discussed above, and it is man's obligation to respect their dignity, their life, their liberty and their inalienable and enforced obligations and duties with respect thereto, as follows:

1. Animals have the right to live and grow under conditions that are comfortable and reasonably natural.
2. Animals that are used by man in any way have the right to be free from pain and suffering caused or permitted by man, other than pain and suffering resulting from treatment for the welfare of the animal.
3. Animals that are domesticated or whose natural environment is altered by man have the right to receive from man adequate food, shelter, and care;
4. Animals that are or should be under the control and protection of man have the right to receive such control and medical treatment as will prevent propagation to an extent that causes over-population and suffering; and
5. The HUMAN SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES FURTHER that it is a duty common to all mankind of whatever religion or philosophy to care for and protect all animals and all other living creatures, to protect animals against cruelty and avoidable pain and suffering, and to experience the compassion and of kindness towards them, and to respect their dignity, their liberty and their own sphere of existence.

ANIMAL RIGHTS AND HUMAN OBLIGATIONS

Members and constituents of The Humane Society of the United States attended the Annual Conference in Dearborn, Michigan, this 14th day of October, 1978, by resolution, with reference to animal rights and human obligations, that animals possess certain inalienable and legally protected rights and duties, and that the obligations vis-a-vis animal rights—most of which I now propose that the Conference for adoption as a Resolution of The HSUS entitled Animal Rights and Human Obligations.
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Animal Rights & Human Ethics

A Review of the 1978 Annual Conference

Humanitarians from around the country gathered at the Regency Hyatt Hotel in Dearborn, Michigan last October to attend the 1978 HSUS Annual Conference. A full schedule of general sessions, workshops, and special events kept conference-goers busy learning and talking about animal issues during the three-day conference.

The highlight of the conference was the Annual Awards Banquet. Richard Knowles Morris received the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal. His most recent service to animal welfare was co-editing, with Dr. Michael Fox, the book "On The Fifth Day," a compilation of essays on man's views of animals and animal rights.

Certificates of Appreciation were presented to Robert McBride, General Manager of WJBK-TV in Detroit for the station's favorable coverage of animal issues, and to Charles Thompson (right) of ABC-TV for the special segment on greyhound racing he produced for the program "20/20."

"Remembering" by John A. Hoyt at the 1978 Conference.

A final quality I wish to mention which is basic to an animal welfare organization's effectiveness and vitality is that of sensitivity, or caring concern. It is, I believe, that quality which distinguishes between superficiality and genuine leadership.

I am hopeful that every organization involved in animal welfare work understands the importance of this dimension. I am proud that The HSUS gives it a place of prominence. For unless we really care, and are genuinely sensitive to the reality of pain and suffering being experienced by animals in so many ways, we shall find it all too easy to compromise our objectives and give in to the pressures of our adversaries.

Hardly a one of us would object to the progress made in the area of scientific inquiry and research, especially in those areas where the objective and results are clearly in the interest of human or animal welfare. But when such progress involves extensive and repeated cruelty to animals, it is both appropriate and right to challenge the process if not the objective itself.

We do not object to biomedical research per se, and clearly understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from dangerous drugs and other chemical products. But when millions upon millions of animals are used in these processes annually, a high percentage of which are subjected to pain and suffering, it is not at all certain that the end justifies the means. The price of progress is then too high. So what if we cure the world's physical illnesses if we lose our soul, or moral and spiritual integrity, in the process. This is not progress at all, but an illusion of the highest magnitude. We must care, and care enough to challenge and change even the most sacred and legitimate pursuits of science when they involve fundamental wrongs.

The same kind of challenge and confrontation must be directed to the agricultural industry.

Again, the emphasis of The HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of the agricultural industry. For the HSUS has been on reform rather than a rejection of the appropriateness of the industry itself. For the utilization of animals for food will most likely always be one of the major uses of animals, and it helps us to understand the importance of protecting both humans and animals from the cruelties of
The Star Throwers

Excerpts from the Keynote Address given by Dr. Amy Freeman Lee at the 1978 Annual Conference.

If I know anything at all about my own society, it's that we applaud and honor that which is practical. By practical, we mean anything that makes a profit. In the main, the game is motivated by self-interest or by immediate monetary gains. However, when you examine to what extent we have ravished the planet and destroyed the basic life sustaining elements of air, water, soil, and food, to say nothing of each other, how practical have we really been? When we dress the animal, use the fur of our bruised and battered domestic food animals, we find that our cruelty and neglect result in enough wasted meat to feed one million people for one year in the world in which one thousand, one hundred and sixty human beings die of starvation every hour.

On this same earth, there are more people than ever before and more means of destruction than at any time in recorded history. When you add to these ingredients the sad fact that there is a blatant lack of ethical, moral, and spiritual motivation, you see that the problem is both terrifying and challenging. We human beings who created most of the problems must take on the responsibility of solving them. Obviously, everything is a people problem.

In my opinion, there is little hope of success without embracing "sacred discontinuities" and without examining the emanating philosophic and spiritual revolution. Definitively, this means a legal, non-violent way. The vehicle for taking this step toward humaneness is through the spiritual boomerang of committing brutal acts, most repugnant to those who engage in them. By literally turning the boomerang of cruelty toward the tormentors, we can...
1978 Resolutions

Marine Mammals

WHEREAS, the United States has traditionally been the world leader in the conservation and protection of marine mammals; and

WHEREAS, that leadership role has been seriously eroded during the current administration in regard to the great whales; and

WHEREAS, the tuna industry has not achieved the goal of near zero mortality of porpoise; and

WHEREAS, the United States continues to club seals on its own Pribilof Islands off Alaska; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States call upon the U.S. Government to do everything it can to end the killing of fur seals in Alaska.

Adopted by Membership Meeting, October 1978

High School Science Fairs

WHEREAS, the International Science and Engineering Fair conducted by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which is designed to identify student science fair projects at the local, state, and national levels, has adopted adequate rules governing the use of such animals; and

WHEREAS, it has been shown over the past few years that many such projects entail needless and unjustifiable animal suffering; and

WHEREAS, the ISEF has not only not instituted adequate rules for the welfare of animals used in science projects but has even failed to effectively enforce the weak rules they have promulgated;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States condemn the ISEF judging standards until adequate high school science fair regulations are enforced and instituted for the purpose of precluding projects involving animal suffering or abuse in all science fair competitions; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the United States Humane Society of the United States encourage the ISEF to consider as a judging criterion the highest standards of animal care with special emphasis on the use of replacement techniques.

Ritual Slaughter

WHEREAS, no progress has been made in the field of kosher slaughter; and

WHEREAS, there has been significant progress in the field of halal slaughter; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS, together with other humane organizations, undertook in January 1971 to organize the Council for Livestock Protection for the purpose of building a pen for ritual slaughter (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has contributed thousands of dollars for the construction of such pen (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, the University of Connecticut Engineering Department has constructed the pen with the Council for Livestock Protection to build such a pen, stated in 1975 that such pen was ready for commercial construction (Exhibit C); and

WHEREAS, such pen is still not available; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has organized a group of injured invertebrates and organisms in which the use of live animals for the purposes of research and development of the use of poisons for the control of predators on federal lands; and

WHEREAS, since that time the sheep industry, aided and abetted by government employees who disagree with the poisoning ban, has kept up relentless pressure to have the ban lifted to permit the operational use of Compound 1080, and vastly increase and expand the project generally; and

WHEREAS, there has been no real attempt on the part of the government to increase the use of alternative non-lethal methods of protecting the livestock;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States call upon the USDA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the various government agencies to establish and enforce adequate rules governing the use of poisons, and to prepare to institute legal action to ban it, if the aforesaid efforts are unsuccessful.

Predator Control

WHEREAS, in 1972, after many years of indiscriminate poisoning on federal lands without due consideration of adequate rules governing the use of such animals; and

WHEREAS, it has been shown over the past few years that many such projects entail needless and unjustifiable animal suffering; and

WHEREAS, the ISEF has not only not instituted adequate rules for the welfare of animals used in science projects but has even failed to effectively enforce the weak rules they have promulgated;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States condemn the ISEF judging standards until adequate high school science fair regulations are enforced and instituted for the purpose of precluding projects involving animal suffering or abuse in all science fair competitions; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the United States Humane Society of the United States encourage the ISEF to consider as a judging criterion the highest standards of animal care with special emphasis on the use of replacement techniques.

Factory Farming

WHEREAS, the stresses of livestock transportation are responsible for foodborne disease and produce spoilage and frequent loss of life; and

WHEREAS, there is an increasing trend towards intensive, confinement raising of pigs, poultry, beef, and dairy cattle, and calves; and

WHEREAS, such systems are contrary to the best traditions of ethical animal husbandry; and

WHEREAS, the numbers of animals potentially involved is close to four billion annually;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge all members to both recognize the unprecedented magnitude of the potential suffering in this area of animal utilization and support the Society's efforts to bring about effective solutions for the humane utilization of the livestock industry and the environment; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS, together with other humane organizations, undertook in January 1971 to organize the Council for Livestock Protection for the purpose of building a pen for ritual slaughter (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has contributed thousands of dollars for the construction of such pen (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, the University of Connecticut Engineering Department has constructed the pen with the Council for Livestock Protection to build such a pen, stated in 1975 that such pen was ready for commercial construction (Exhibit C); and

WHEREAS, such pen is still not available; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has organized a group of injured invertebrates and organisms in which the use of live animals for the purposes of research and development of the use of poisons for the control of predators on federal lands; and

WHEREAS, since that time the sheep industry, aided and abetted by government employees who disagree with the poisoning ban, has kept up relentless pressure to have the ban lifted to permit the operational use of Compound 1080, and vastly increase and expand the project generally; and

WHEREAS, there has been no real attempt on the part of the government to increase the use of alternative non-lethal methods of protecting the livestock;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States call upon the USDA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the various government agencies to establish and enforce adequate rules governing the use of poisons, and to prepare to institute legal action to ban it, if the aforesaid efforts are unsuccessful.

Walking Horses

WHEREAS, the Horse Protection Act was passed in 1970 and subsequently amended and strengthened to stop the brutal practice of chemical and mechanical sorings of Ten-nessee Walking Horses to affect their gait for the sole purpose of winning prizes and recognition; and

WHEREAS, in 1978 Tennessee Walking Horse trainers are still allowed to win with sored horses through the use of more sophisticated and humane techniques to cause pain; and

WHEREAS, there is still no effective enforcement of the Horse Protection Act by the USDA; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge all members to both recognize the unprecedented magnitude of the potential suffering in this area of animal utilization and support the Society's efforts to bring about effective solutions for the humane utilization of the livestock industry and the environment; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS, together with other humane organizations, undertook in January 1971 to organize the Council for Livestock Protection for the purpose of building a pen for ritual slaughter (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has contributed thousands of dollars for the construction of such pen (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, the University of Connecticut Engineering Department has constructed the pen with the Council for Livestock Protection to build such a pen, stated in 1975 that such pen was ready for commercial construction (Exhibit C); and

WHEREAS, such pen is still not available; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has organized a group of injured invertebrates and organisms in which the use of live animals for the purposes of research and development of the use of poisons for the control of predators on federal lands; and

WHEREAS, since that time the sheep industry, aided and abetted by government employees who disagree with the poisoning ban, has kept up relentless pressure to have the ban lifted to permit the operational use of Compound 1080, and vastly increase and expand the project generally; and

WHEREAS, there has been no real attempt on the part of the government to increase the use of alternative non-lethal methods of protecting the livestock;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States call upon the USDA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the various government agencies to establish and enforce adequate rules governing the use of poisons, and to prepare to institute legal action to ban it, if the aforesaid efforts are unsuccessful.

Bird Trafficking

WHEREAS, the United States is a major market for international commerce in wild birds, and

WHEREAS, accelerated pet industry trafficking in wild birds, in combination with hunting and trapping, is having a deleterious impact upon avian populations; and

WHEREAS, the pet bird trade represents an unjustifiable and cruel exploitation of wild animals; and

WHEREAS, a substantial incidence of suffering and mortality is associated with trade in wild birds as well as with their captivity;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the adoption of import regulations, and international agreements to prohibit the collection and shipment of wild birds intended for the pet trade.

Animals In Entertainment

WHEREAS, the practice of tranquilizing animals or giving them drugs to escape a special illusory effect, such as the simulation of death, is widespread among animal trainers in the motion picture and television industries; and

WHEREAS, many animals are subjected to severe stress by this practice and some are even killed by it; and

WHEREAS, the state of the art is such that live animals can be effectively replaced by animatronic models in scenes requiring special effects; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge all members to both recognize the unprecedented magnitude of the potential suffering in this area of animal utilization and support the Society's efforts to bring about effective solutions for the humane utilization of the livestock industry and the environment; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS, together with other humane organizations, undertook in January 1971 to organize the Council for Livestock Protection for the purpose of building a pen for ritual slaughter (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has contributed thousands of dollars for the construction of such pen (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, the University of Connecticut Engineering Department has constructed the pen with the Council for Livestock Protection to build such a pen, stated in 1975 that such pen was ready for commercial construction (Exhibit C); and

WHEREAS, such pen is still not available; and

WHEREAS, the HSUS has organized a group of injured invertebrates and organisms in which the use of live animals for the purposes of research and development of the use of poisons for the control of predators on federal lands; and

WHEREAS, since that time the sheep industry, aided and abetted by government employees who disagree with the poisoning ban, has kept up relentless pressure to have the ban lifted to permit the operational use of Compound 1080, and vastly increase and expand the project generally; and

WHEREAS, there has been no real attempt on the part of the government to increase the use of alternative non-lethal methods of protecting the livestock;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States call upon the USDA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the various government agencies to establish and enforce adequate rules governing the use of poisons, and to prepare to institute legal action to ban it, if the aforesaid efforts are unsuccessful.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States direct its officers to cooperate in The Humane Society of the United States' efforts in those publications and urge its constituents to support these efforts, and express their condemnation of these cruel and unnecessary practices to the motion picture and television industries.
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Permissive Medication Of Race Horses

WHEREAS, anti-inflammatory, analgesic, anesthetic, and diuretic drugs, medications, and other substances have been improperly used to mask injuries and ailments and enable horses to run which would otherwise be incapable of racing; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the permissive use of such drugs, gandelotin and other substances have drastically increased and injuries and ailments have been markedly more severe; and

WHEREAS, this abuse is increasing in the United States;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States vigorously urge track officials, state racing commissions, and state legislatures to ban the use of these drugs and substances whenever such use would be for the purpose of deadening the pain reaction in a horse at the time of racing.

Livestock Handling In Slaughterhouses

WHEREAS, cruel and abusive handling of livestock in slaughterhouses is still widespread and often unchecked; and

WHEREAS, humane handling must begin from the time the livestock come into the custody of the slaughterhouse up to and including the moment of slaughter; and

WHEREAS, it is possible to design, maintain, and operate livestock facilities not only to be more humane but also to save millions of dollars yearly because of reduction in carcass bruising and other losses.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the USDA to immediately promulgate and strictly enforce regulations which will effectively work towards ending current cruelties in handling connected with slaughter; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that slaughtering establishments be encouraged to build facilities which assist rather than hinder the movement of the livestock; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these establishments take appropriate punishment against any employee guilty of cruel treatment of the animals.

Cosmetic Testing

WHEREAS, new cosmetic formulations and products are usually tested on animals; and

WHEREAS, these tests can cause extreme pain, suffering, and death, especially since analgesics or anesthetics are rarely used; and

WHEREAS, the humane public has a real interest in determining which cosmetic products have been developed and tested without such exploitation and use of animals.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States should call upon the cosmetic industry to disclose the facts regarding the absence of testing with animals any of its cosmetic products so that the humane public can be selected or forego its purchase of cosmetics rather than boycott all of them due to the inability to be selective; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States promote by all possible means the development of alternative test methods for the cosmetic industry.

Animal Welfare Act Resolution

WHEREAS, Animal Welfare Act enforcement has been largely ineffective and many violations of the Act have continued unchecked; and

WHEREAS, the current administration has failed to request and provide adequate funding for vigorous and total enforcement of the Act; and

WHEREAS, many USDA employees have failed in their duty to thoroughly investigate all parties regulated by the Act.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the USDA to increase funding for effective enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and to take the appropriate internal steps to insure that personnel working on Animal Welfare Act matters be properly trained and highly motivated.

Alternatives In Biomedical Research

WHEREAS, approximately 100,000,000 animals are used every year in biomedical programs, including unnecessary toxicology testing and poorly planned research projects; and

WHEREAS, the use of alternatives to laboratory animals can, in many cases, replace such unnecessary testing and, in other cases, reduce the use of laboratory animals;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States and its members make every effort to promote the use and development of alternatives such as tissue culture, unicellular systems, mathematical/computer models and increased use of clinical and epidemiological results; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the relevant government agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to take every effort to collate and analyze the extensive information on alternatives already available in commercial and government files so as to provide access to this invaluable information, thereby reducing the amount of repetitive testing.

WHEREAS, the humane public has a real interest in determining which cosmetic products have been developed and tested without such exploitation and use of animals.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States should call upon the cosmetic industry to disclose the facts regarding the absence of testing with animals any of its cosmetic products so that the humane public can be selected or forego its purchase of cosmetics rather than boycott all of them due to the inability to be selective; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States promote by all possible means the development of alternative test methods for the cosmetic industry.

Animal Welfare Act Resolution

WHEREAS, Animal Welfare Act enforcement has been largely ineffective and many violations of the Act have continued unchecked; and

WHEREAS, the current administration has failed to request and provide adequate funding for vigorous and total enforcement of the Act; and

WHEREAS, many USDA employees have failed in their duty to thoroughly investigate all parties regulated by the Act.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the USDA to increase funding for effective enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and to take the appropriate internal steps to insure that personnel working on Animal Welfare Act matters be properly trained and highly motivated.

Alternatives In Biomedical Research

WHEREAS, approximately 100,000,000 animals are used every year in biomedical programs, including unnecessary toxicology testing and poorly planned research projects; and

WHEREAS, the use of alternatives to laboratory animals can, in many cases, replace such unnecessary testing and, in other cases, reduce the use of laboratory animals;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States and its members make every effort to promote the use and development of alternatives such as tissue culture, unicellular systems, mathematical/computer models and increased use of clinical and epidemiological results; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States urge the relevant government agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency to take every effort to collate and analyze the extensive information on alternatives already available in commercial and government files so as to provide access to this invaluable information, thereby reducing the amount of repetitive testing.
How To: Organize An Effective Program on the Use of Animals in Research

by Dr. Andrew Rowan, Associate Director, The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems

When talking about the technical subject of alternatives to the use of animals in research, one is frequently asked "what can we do about it?" It is always difficult to give reasonable and practical suggestions because of the complexity of the topic. For those interested, the following steps provide a basic approach for a local animal welfare group with only limited technical expertise to call upon.

Decide what stand you will take on the issue. There are a wide range of stances you could adopt, some of which are outlined below. They all have their problems, either philosophical or practical, and you should develop an awareness of the implications whatever decision you make.

Abolish all laboratory animal use. When taking this approach, you may want to augment it with a policy of vegetarianism. You should also be aware of the dilemma posed by medical research. Most of medicine is based on animal research at some point or another. Abolish the use of laboratory animals in non-medical research and testing. The attraction of this approach is that it avoids the dilemma of opposing medical research to the use of animals in research, and alternatives to their use. Notice of the pamphlet's availability will be given in a future issue of The HSUS News.

If possible, set up an advisory committee on the subject of animal experimentation consisting of people with some biological training drawn from among your own membership.

Start involving yourself in local issues and establishing contacts with local research institutions and science fair organizers. The following suggestions may help you in deciding at what level you wish to work.

Schools—Develop dialogue with local biology teachers and discuss the use of live animals in schools. Establish contacts with science fair organizers and monitor the entries involving experiments with live animals and the diligence with which science fair rules on this subject are upheld.

University students—Contact local student groups and try to interest them in the subject and some of the newer ideas which are being discussed and developed.

Laboratories—Most research institutions will (or should) have supervisory committees responsible for the care and use of laboratory animals. See if they are willing to enter into a dialogue and perhaps accept a member of your scientific panel (step three) on to the Committee.

Impounded animals—Find out if impounded animals in your area are released to research institutions. The HSUS believes pound animals should not be used for this purpose. Not only does it raise problems in animal control programs, but pound animals are unsatisfactory as research and teaching models. The unknown background of the animal could invalidate research studies, or at the very least produce misleading results.

When setting a policy on the use of laboratory animals, you should appreciate that it is a complex subject with few easy answers. However, there are simplified tests available. Real progress is possible and there is no doubt that you can help to reduce the level of laboratory animal use (from around 100 million a year) and at the same time improve the quality of biomedical research and the effectiveness of each research dollar.

For those who want to study the topic further, the following books may be of some use:

- Alternatives to Laboratory Animals, by D. M. Smyth, (Southwest Book Service, 4951 Top Line Drive, Dallas, TX, 75247, $9.95 paper, $11.95 hardbound.) This is a useful book, although it is too pessimistic about the real potential for alternatives.

- Painful Experiments on Animals, by Dallas Pratt, (Argus Archives, 228 E. 40th St., New York, NY, 10017, $2.95.) This is useful for background on the use of animals in research, although there is only one chapter on alternatives.

The Future of Animals, Cells, Models and Systems in Research, Development, Education and Testing, (Office of Publications, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C. 20418, $9.25.) This is the most technical of the three publications, but well worth reading for the articles on biostatics and cell culture prospects.

HELP US HELP THE ANIMALS

The animals need your help now more than ever. Millions of dogs and cats are suffering as homeless, unwanted strays. Cattle, pigs, poultry and other animals are being subjected to the cruelties of modern farming methods. In research laboratories, animals from monkeys to mice are used and abused in painful experiments which are too often badly planned and pointless. And these are only a few of the ways the animals are suffering today.

The Humane Society of the United States is committed to the goal of ending animal cruelty and suffering. Your membership, and that of tens of thousands of other humanitarians, increases The Society's ability to stamp out cruelty through legal, legislative, and educational avenues.

Why not give a membership in The HSUS as a gift to a friend or neighbor? We'll send a card to your friend acknowledging your gift.

In addition to your membership, you can help the animals by remembering The Society in your Will. Such a bequest can be a lasting contribution to the needs of animals that will continue long after you've gone. Your request for information about wills will be treated in the strictest confidence by our General Counsel.

Much remains to be done in the fight to end cruelty to animals. The animals need your help. Won't you help us help them?
Humane Slaughter Act Becomes Law

On October 10, 1978, President Jimmy Carter signed into law the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978. This is a major victory for humanitarians and for the food animals that still suffer in slaughterhouses.

The new law requires that all state and federally inspected slaughterhouses in the U.S. use humane slaughtering methods. In addition, all meat imported into this country must have been humanely slaughtered. The new law, a culmination of several years’ effort by HSUS, Humane Information Services, and other humanitarians, will take effect in one year, still leave time for companies to come into compliance. Some additional time may be granted to states which find it necessary to enact new legislation in order to comply. This is the first change in federal slaughter laws to protect animal welfare.

Besides the actual stunning and killing of food animals, HSUS worked diligently to get humane handling throughout the entire journey through the slaughterhouse. As a result, the Senate Agriculture committee in its report on the bill states that pre-slaughter handling should be interpreted to begin at the time the livestock came into the custody of the slaughterhouse, up to and including the moment of slaughter. The U.S. Department of Agriculture will be issuing new regulations reflecting that interpretation and HSUS will work closely with them to ensure the best humane handling possible.

One of the most exciting aspects of the new law is the new authority vested in Federal Meat Inspectors which allows them to actually stop the slaughter line in case of equipment malfunction or abusive behavior by an employee. Many violations can be corrected immediately upon discovery and time consuming legal proceedings won’t be necessary.

The one major exception in the new law is the activity known as “downer” cattle. Downers are cattle not able to stand and are usually down for two reasons: either because the animal was physically injured or it is sick. The HSUS believes that downers should be legal because the inability to stand is not necessarily an indicator of poor treatment on the part of the processor. The Department of Agriculture will develop guidelines to determine in writing that an individual is capable of humane treatment. The HSUS Vice President for Program Coordination, Patricia Forkan, presents Certificates of Appreciation to Senator Bob Dole, Kansas (right), and Congressman George Brown, Cal., (left) in recognition of their efforts towards the enactment of the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978. Each sponsored the legislation and led it through their respective house in Congress. Without their interest and hard work, many thousands of animals would continue to suffer.

The Endangered Endangered Species Act

In 1973, the U.S. Congress passed The Endangered Species Act, a landmark in legislative efforts to protect the diminishing wildlife on the planet. It was one of the most noble and well-intentioned bills ever enacted. Now, even though species of wildlife and plants are disappearing at the rate of two per day and the quality and availability of habitat have worsened in the last five years; the 95th Congress has seen fit to weaken protection.

The Act was under attack for political and economic reasons. As more and more species became officially endangered, more and more conflicts arose with development projects in the few remaining areas where the health and legal requirements would be met while giving a humane death to the animals.

Pressure from the potentially unemployed and from corporations and groups wishing to use the land for other purposes caused many congressmen to abandon their lofty ideals for regional interests and to lose their Endangered Species Act out of the cold.

Section 7 of the original law said that if the survival of an endangered species would be threatened by development with a particular habitat, then no Federal development project could be allowed to go forward in that area. Difficulties with this stricture came to a head in a confrontation between the Tellico Dam project and the endangered Snail Darter—a tiny, very rare fish. 231 out of 393 congressmen sent the Snail Darter possibly to its doom by altering Section 7 to require that economic factors be considered when critical habitats are designated. That could mean the same doom for the whooping crane, the peregrine falcon, the cougar, and other endangered animals.

A special committee empowered to grant exemptions to the Endangered Species Act, has been created. At the insistence of the Secretary of the Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Committee on Appropriations, a code of procedures for the granting of exemptions has been written. The committee has total executive power and a voice in the final decision in favor of an operation project.

The message of the 95th Congress seems to be that it’s perfectly all right to preserve rare and precious wildlife as long as no jobs or money are given to those individuals who want to kill horses on the range, we demand a full study be made. Even using BLM’s own estimate of 50,000 wild horses, few individuals can legally own more than four horses on public lands. Those choices included euthanasia, adoption, and relocation. The burden of the decision between alternatives was on BLM, which hesitated to use the euthanasia option for fear of public disapproval.

In the final weeks before the 1978 elections, Congress took this burden onto its own shoulders by voting to change the law so the killing of “excess” horses is mandated rather than just allowed. The mandate specifies that, old, lame, and sick animals be killed. One by one, these horses can be adopted out, but those for which “an adoption demand by qualified individuals does not exist must be killed.

While this may appear reasonable to HSUS, the HSUS fears the law may result in a loose interpretation by BLM to mean they can immediately kill all the horses on the range. In other words, they’ll make room for more cattle and sheep.

The 95th Congress passed the new law which allows BLM to mean they can immediately kill all the horses on the range. In other words, they’ll make room for more cattle and sheep. The new law provides for regional interests and to lose their Endangered Species Act out of the cold.

The one major exception in the new law is the new authority vested in Federal Meat Inspectors which allows them to actually stop the slaughter line in case of equipment malfunction or abusive behavior by an employee. Many violations can be corrected immediately upon discovery and time consuming legal proceedings won’t be necessary.

The one major exception in the new law is the activity known as “downer” cattle. Downers are cattle not able to stand and are usually down for two reasons: either because the animal was physically injured or it is sick. The HSUS believes that downers should be legal because the inability to stand is not necessarily an indicator of poor treatment on the part of the processor. The Department of Agriculture will develop guidelines to determine in writing that an individual is capable of humane treatment.

The one major exception in the new law is the activity known as “downer” cattle. Downers are cattle not able to stand and are usually down for two reasons: either because the animal was physically injured or it is sick. The HSUS believes that downers should be legal because the inability to stand is not necessarily an indicator of poor treatment on the part of the processor. The Department of Agriculture will develop guidelines to determine in writing that an individual is capable of humane treatment.

Thus, trying to salvage some protection for the horses from this Congress, HSUS fought hard to get a provision into the law which allows an individual to adopt only four animals per year. Unfortunately, that section of the new law goes on to say “unless the Secretary (of Interior) determines in writing that such individual is capable of humanely caring for more than four animals.” That “unless” could be a rare case of a horse or two enough horses to drive a very large truckload of horses through.

We also won a hard fight to get a scientific study to determine the true number of wild horses and their interrelationship with the ecosystem. Since HSUS does not believe there are huge numbers of exuberant wild horse populations, we demanded a full study be made. Even using BLM’s own estimate of 50,000 wild horses, few individuals can legally own more than four horses on public lands. Those choices included euthanasia, adoption, and relocation. The burden of the decision between alternatives was on BLM, which hesitated to use the euthanasia option for fear of public disapproval.

In the final weeks before the 1978 elections, Congress took this burden onto its own shoulders by voting to change the law so the killing of “excess” horses is mandated rather than just allowed. The mandate specifies that, old, lame, and sick animals be killed. One by one, these horses can be adopted out, but those for which “an adoption demand by qualified individuals does not exist must be killed.

While this may appear reasonable to HSUS, the HSUS fears the law may result in a loose interpretation by BLM to mean they can immediately kill all the horses on the range. In other words, they’ll make room for more cattle and sheep.

The 95th Congress passed the new law which allows BLM to mean they can immediately kill all the horses on the range. In other words, they’ll make room for more cattle and sheep. The new law provides for regional interests and to lose their Endangered Species Act out of the cold.

The one major exception in the new law is the activity known as “downer” cattle. Downers are cattle not able to stand and are usually down for two reasons: either because the animal was physically injured or it is sick. The HSUS believes that downers should be legal because the inability to stand is not necessarily an indicator of poor treatment on the part of the processor. The Department of Agriculture will develop guidelines to determine in writing that an individual is capable of humane treatment.

The one major exception in the new law is the activity known as “downer” cattle. Downers are cattle not able to stand and are usually down for two reasons: either because the animal was physically injured or it is sick. The HSUS believes that downers should be legal because the inability to stand is not necessarily an indicator of poor treatment on the part of the processor. The Department of Agriculture will develop guidelines to determine in writing that an individual is capable of humane treatment.
Wild Horse Suit

On October 13, 1978, the United States District Court for the District of Nevada ruled against HSUS in the suit brought by The HSUS in conjunction with the American Horse Protection Association to prevent the round up and removal of over 5,000 wild horses from public lands in Nevada under the control of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). (See Summer, 1978 HSUS News.)

The judgment, handed down after a two-day trial, upheld BLM's authority to conduct the roundups without environmental impact statements being prepared. Although the Court agreed with HSUS that several inhumane conditions had existed in the past in the BLM's handling of horses, the Court did require that any future destruction of horses held in court proceedings be done humanely, rather than by shooting, and that such conditions were to be corrected before any further roundups.

In its official comments, The HSUS, through Animal Welfare Act Coordinator Margaret Morrissey, responded to the Court's judgment by citing recent scietific evidence to support the proposal. The Department had not cited any study or data on the effects of lower temperatures on animals under transport conditions.

Transport Temperatures

Based on the negative comments received from The HSUS and other animal welfare activists, the U.S. Department of Agriculture decided in December not to allow the subjection of many animals, including puppies, to near-freezing temperatures.

In October the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Division of the USDA responsible for administering the Animal Welfare Act, proposed to lower the minimum air temperature at which animals can be held in airport facilities from 45° to 35°. The proposal had been instigated by some commercial animal dealers who had experienced difficulties shipping animals in cold months, thereby disrupting their lucrative Christmas business. Problems occurred because the airlines could not guarantee that the air temperatures within the cargo and terminal facilities would meet USDA standards.

The proposed decreased minimum air temperature would have applied to all breeds of dogs, cats, horses, and wild animals regulated under the Animal Welfare Act except for non-human primates.

Particular concern arose for young short-haired dog breeds which might have difficulty adjusting to lower temperatures. If this proposal had been made final, the results could have been disastrous. Animals can wait at airports for long hours.

The development of acceptable transportation standards for animals has been hindered by the lack of data regarding the effects of various independent factors including humidity, temperature, ventilation, and the heat conduction and insulating properties of materials used in the construction of crates. Although plans exist to study these factors, the USDA has not proposed to change current regulations without reliable data.

In its official comments, The HSUS, through Animal Welfare Act Coordinator Margaret Morrissey, criticized the USDA for not providing sufficient scientific evidence to support the proposal. The Department had not cited any study or data on the effects of lower temperatures on animals under transport conditions.

Furthermore, although requested by The HSUS and required by law, the Department had been unable to date to produce all of the evidence it stated it had used as a basis for the proposal.

Transport Temperatures

On October 9, 1978, at the fourth annual meeting of the Animal Air Transport Association, a Resolution was passed calling upon the USDA to leave the temperature regulations for animal transport as they stand until more studies have been done and additional data is made available. In the preface of the newly proposed regulations, USDA announced that it would initiate action to gather more information.

Nevertheless, a serious danger remains for animals transported during cold weather. In May, USDA issued a regulation which allows USDA licensed dealers to ship animals at lower temperatures than those specified in the regulations if the shipper provides a certificate, signed by a veterinarian, stating that the individual animal has been acclimated to lower temperatures. However, since at present USDA has not instituted an effective scheme to monitor the issuance of the certificates, the potential for abuse is considerable. HSUS is concerned that the certificates will be executed mechanically, without a bonafide examination of the animal. HSUS will continue its careful monitoring of shippers' and airlines' compliance with the regulations.

Meaningful Reform is Possible

It has long been recognized that one of the major cruelties still existing in the United States is the pre-slaughter shackling and hoisting of conscious animals destined for kosher slaughter. To a major extent this condition was eliminated with the development of the ASPCA large-animal restraining pen in the 1960s. However, no similar device currently exists for small animals such as sheep and calves.

Determined to help resolve this dilemma, The Council for Livestock Protection, Inc. was formed in 1971 consisting of several national animal welfare organizations, including The HSUS, and concerned individuals. As a result of a study at the University of Connecticut commissioned by The CLP, a small-animal restraining device has been developed but not yet proven in actual operation. This delay is due in part to a lack of purposeful and meaningful cooperation between animal protection and leaders within the various segments of the Jewish community. It appears, however, that a significant potential for that cooperation now exists. As a result of initiatives taken by The HSUS as formulated in a resolution proposed by HSUS member Max Schnapp, (see p. 24) the following letter was received in my office on December 15, 1978.

Dear John:

As part of the long-standing cooperation and ongoing conversations between representatives of The Humane Society of the United States and the Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, we were delighted to meet with you and representatives of The Council for Livestock Protection on November 16.

Two years ago, as you recall, representatives of the JAC viewed slides of an experimental apparatus commissioned by The Council suitable for humanely positioning a small animal in connection with ritual or non-ritual slaughter. We offered constructive suggestions for its development at that time and again during a subsequent visit to the experimental site at the University of Connecticut.

We were, therefore, heartened to learn on November 16 that the apparatus is now sufficiently developed so that further experimentation can take place. Rabbi Emmanuel Hoffer, who has been actively involved in these matters on our behalf for over 20 years, has offered to be helpful to The Council in their attempts to secure approval from an appropriate slaughtering house for further experimentation with the device.

I was particularly pleased to note the continuing positive relationship between our groups in light of the deep religious strain within Judaism calling for the highest level of humane treatment of all animals. That concern further explains the desire and willingness on the part of the JAC to find common purpose with The HSUS, the Council and the many Americans who support your efforts.

Sincerely,

Joel Ollander
National Coordinator

Through the kind of cooperation pledged in this letter and a continued determination on the part of humanitarians, I am confident the cruelties experienced by the animals destined for kosher slaughter can and will be resolved. Not only would this achievement eliminate the suffering of millions of animals, it would demonstrate in a most significant manner the potential that exists for meaningful reform when people of goodwill are willing to unite in a common endeavor.

John A. Hoyt
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