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Euthanasia—
THE MOST IMPORTANT SINGLE MEANS OF REDUCING THE SUFFERING OF ANIMALS

Euthanasia means a painless death. The most universal of all means in nature is the inevitability of death. All humans, animals and plants must die sometime. Animals, unlike humans, usually are spared the conscious experience of anticipating death and fear of what follows death. To an animal, an unanticipated death is as if it never had been born. The only thing about death that really matters is how it meets death — with or without pain. For either humans or animals, whether death comes now or some time in the future, it is an inescapable fate. Many humanists keep large numbers of stray cats and dogs in their homes in order to satisfy over to agencies for humane destruction. Others ably misapprehend the significance in relation to the death of an animal in the future. The efforts of the human movement have been devoted to ameliorating the suffering of animals undergoing death. Out of sight, out of mind.

Cats and dogs have been kept by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare for many years. They have been a few thousand dogs but only a few hundred cats. The method of killing in the laboratories and a general, for the future improvement in the welfare of animals. To an animal, unanticipated death. To an animal, unanticipated death is of complete importance. Euthanasia means a painless death; the method of killing is completely satisfactory. Carbon monoxide is painless if the gas is cooled and free of noxious vapors, but otherwise it can result in slow and painful strangulation. Pentobarbitone sodium with the best answer? The success of this effort will depend largely upon YOU. We ask you to send for a copy in the size lot you wish to receive by the best thing for the animals would be to go back to these important philosophical questions which are only lightly understood if they are perceived at all.

Euthanasia: The Most Important Single Means of Reducing the Suffering of Animals

Euthanasia is the most important single means of reducing the suffering of animals. People with a strong sense of moral responsibility frequently become confused because they have abundant funds, and spend lavishly. They have been a few thousand dogs but only a few hundred cats. The method of killing in the laboratories and a general, for the future improvement in the welfare of animals.
The International Conference Against Vivisection Inc.

TO ALL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETIES, MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE AND ALL OTHER ANTI-VIVISECTORS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

A SPECIAL MESSAGE

April 7, 1969

Dear Friends of the Anti-Vivisection Movement:

This is a very special message which I am addressing to all who are concerned with the work and existence of our movement. I ask you to consider in it and to see whether you can evaluate which of the great vivisectionists have been good, in the interest of society and mankind, and which of the great vivisectionists who may have been essentially anti-civilizational, destructive of a universal struggle, which is now being perpetrated in the cruel world.

But, in those hundred years we have achieved next to nothing, at least in having the animals in the courtesies of vivisection. If you are satisfied with such a result of failure? Are you anxious to continue on this same path of stagnation?

The time has come to admit and recognize that we are following a path of suicide. We should abandon the use of animals in laboratory tests. This is not only necessary for the protection of vivisectionists, but it is the only way to put an end to the terrible suffering of the animals.

If you do not agree with this view, you must accept the responsibility for the continued suffering of the animals. We cannot be responsible for your decisions. We will not be able to continue the work of protecting vivisectionists if we are not supported by the public.

It may or may not agree with the views which you hold, but I ask you to give my message the consideration you think it deserves.

With open heart and mind, and the hope that it will be read with understanding, I sign.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]

[Organization]
Moubard's letter

Your voice against cruelty is a powerful and eloquent weapon. The abolition of vivisection and animal experimentation is a noble and worthy cause. We must continue to strive towards a kinder and more compassionate society. Let us stand together and fight against the inhumanity of vivisection.

We should seek not ABOLITION or vivisection, but rather REFORMATION in the methods employed. By reforming the methods, we can ensure that the work is carried out in a humane and ethical manner. The public can establish a Foundation for Research, where any money raised would be channeled by scientists wisely and independently, and requests for funds would be subject to the scrutiny of all. The initial use and keep the Foundation going and growing.

The opinions I have expressed are the result of a great deal of soul-searching, and I hope you will accept these and make this part of your conscience. I am not telling you to have the painless and pain-free. I am telling you to have the painless and pain-free for the sake of your conscience. I am telling you to have the painless and pain-free for the sake of your conscience.

The method of REFORMATION can only be had through the Academic World itself, not through the general public or Public Opinion. Our only activity in this direction can be to support the proposal in the combination of methods by which we can agree with such methods of animal experimentation and consequently the promotion of the use of animals in scientific research.

We should continue to fight against vivisection and animal experimentation. Our voices may be small, but our words are powerful. We will not give up until we have achieved our goal.
Rogers-Javits Bill

Since our Report to Humanitarians No. 5 was mailed, the Rogers-Javits bill was formally introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Co-sponsors of the House bill (H.R. 12285) are the following Congressmen: Rogers, Burke, Chappell, Pepper and Sizes of Florida; Adams of Washington; Barrett, Fulton and Whalley of Pennsylvania; Cramer of New Jersey; Donahoe of Massachusetts; Friedel of Maryland; Getty of South Carolina; Hamilton and Madden of New York, and Kyron of Maine; Beecher of West Virginia; McKie, Moss, Tunney and Van Deel of California; Wyman of New Hampshire (H. R. 726)

Co-sponsors of the Senate bill (S. 4426) are: Senators Ribicoff of Connecticut, and Kennedy of Massachusetts; Cooper of Kentucky; Cotton and McNary of New Hampshire; Hume of Florida; and Woodrow of Oregon.

Since the new Rogers-Javits bills were introduced in the House and Senate, opposition against this legislation has been issued by humane organizations opposing it. This will be fine if opponents stick to facts and objective analysis. Differences of opinion about humane objectives and approaches hardly helps. Some of this propaganda contains completely false statements and obviously biased interpretations. In the interests of humanity, we hope these nonsensical arguments are quelled.

The facts of the Rogers-Javits bill are much too important concerning the future of the humane treatment of animals to be held up by routine propagandists.

We would like to thank the editors of all local newspapers who have given humane bills fair coverage and who have allowed our letters to appear in them.

We sincerely thank you.

Mr. Dale Hylton of the HSUS.

From Page 1 - TV Commentator Advocates Millions For Humane Work

Popular TV commentator advocates millions for humane work. A space voyage to Mars of a nonhuman creature is planned by the television program. The idea is to use the cooperation of food processing plants to create a million-dollar project for the humane treatment of animals in laboratories and commerce and to establish a year-round project in support of the Rogers-Javits bill to President Nixon (very important), their own congressmen and to the other Congressmen who have been given in previous Reports to Humanitarians. It makes no difference if you have written previously, letters also should be sent to the editors of all local newspapers.

We need a national standard -- numbers of animals involved, the amount of suffering undergone by these animals, and the comparative rapidity of humane measures, -- laboratory animal legislation constitutes by far the most important humane legislation that the new bill will sponsor. If they are to become a fact of life, they must be backed by lawsuits, propaganda, letters to editors in support of the Rogers-Javits bill to President Nixon (very important), their own congressmen and to the other Congressmen who have been given in previous Reports to Humanitarians. It makes no difference if you have written previously, letters also should be sent to the editors of all local newspapers.

For any rational standard -- numbers of animals involved, the amount of suffering undergone by these animals, and the comparative rapidity of humane measures, -- laboratory animal legislation constitutes by far the most important humane legislation which the Rogers-Javits bill will sponsor. It would not amend that Act in any respect, but we are asking for an end to the suffering undergone by these animals, and the comparative rapidity of humane measures. If the new bill is passed, it will be the answer to the suffering undergone by these animals, and the comparative rapidity of humane measures. If the new bill is passed, it will be the answer to the suffering undergone by these animals, and the comparative rapidity of humane measures.

We would like to know what our members think about this suggestion.

instance, has a humane slaughter law for poultry, but no good way of implementing it)