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A foreword

The 1963 National Leadership Conference of The HSUS, a genuine working meeting, provided a unique opportunity for active leaders of the humane movement to combine hard work and serious thought with enjoyable exchanges of experience. The meeting was held in the informal setting of Shawnee Inn, Shawnee-on-Delaware, Penna., September 26-29.

At the conclusion of scheduled formal addresses dealing with major problems of the humane movement, each Conferee was assigned to one of six committees, each of which was assigned the task of exploring in depth the implications of facts presented by the speakers and of formulating recommendations to the American humane movement for strategic action. Representatives of the entire humane movement, not merely of The HSUS, spent the next day and a half in work. Conferees were asked to study documents, statistics, facts—to take into account practical politics and intramural feuds and fights—to think hard and honestly and straight about the subjects put before them.

From these hours of discussion and debate emanated the committee recommendations that are reproduced in the pages of this booklet. The committee work, we hope, will be thought of as at least one step toward unified work in at least a few fields by humane societies in all parts of the nation.

We believe that the decisions were motivated by humane principles—that these findings and resolutions represent reasonable and practical recommendations that will reach the understandings and sympathies of the great army of humanitarians of America.

R. J. CHENOWETH,
Chairman of the Board
Report on Present Condition of the Humane Movement

By R. J. Chenoweth, Kansas City, Mo., Chairman of The HSUS Board of Directors

This is the ninth successive convocation of this kind over which I have been privileged to preside and to which I have had the duty of reporting on behalf of the Board of Directors and the officers of The HSUS.

It may be that I can serve some useful purpose at the beginning of this important three day conference by stating some of the fundamental premises that underlie our meeting and by outlining the condition in which the humane movement is today.

Perhaps I should say right at the beginning that I can find just as many sad, discouraging, and frustrating things as the next man in the daily routines of humane work but about the humane cause and the humane movement I am an incorrigible optimist. There are problems, but we have a record of solving and surmounting problems. There is cruelty and there is suffering, demanding of us unremitting work, but I do solemnly believe that we are steadily, exhilaratingly making progress.

I think, in fact, that the first great premise of this meeting, a conviction implicit in the fact that we are here, is that cruelty can be substantially prevented, kindness can be usefully taught or encouraged, and suffering significantly decreased. We start our deliberations today, as we always do in which the humane movement is today.

The most fundamental task of the humane movement is to move mankind in that direction.

All of us, everyone who works in this field, experiences moments of enormous frustration. Many who are in this room, and tens of thousands of men and women not here, have given unselfish lifetimes to this work and are unable to see progress. Our animal shelters overflow and bulge with homeless and unwanted animals while at the same time the alleys of our cities and the roads of our countryside teem with abandoned and neglected cats and dogs; vast numbers of animals suffer from man’s inhumanity in laboratories; the shackles and power hoists of the packing plants still torture cattle, hogs and sheep; twenty million American men, women and children continue each year, calling themselves “sportsmen,” to slaughter and maim wild animals—for pleasure. Our women still decorate themselves with furs produced by agony. We have rodeos, roadside zoos, dog fights and cockfights, surgery on animals in high school classrooms.

It is understandable if some become discouraged; it is defensible if at times all of us become discouraged. I am not myself immune. There is little excitement in watching the motion of a glacier; it is hard to see that drops of water are wearing away a stone.

But glaciers do move, the hardest granite gives way ultimately to erosion. And every once in a while there is a moment when, after long periods in which the human eye perceives no motion, a great section of a glacier breaks thunderously from the stream in which it seemed so unmoving.

I believe that in our own work we are approaching such a time.

Let met explain why I so think.

The American humane movement approaches its centennial anniversary. Henry Bergh founded the first American humane society, the ASPCA of New York City, in 1865. That was a time when glaciers did break, progress was visible. In a period of only two or three years New York State’s legislature enacted the first anti-cruelty law in American history, the legislatures of a dozen or more other states quickly followed that example, humane societies sprang into being and into effective activity in scores of cities.

There was a long period of rapid and broad growth of the humane movement, a period when the morality of the humane movement was woven into law throughout the country and was recognized publicly as important.

Then, as was perhaps inevitable, there came a period—not of decline but of lowered acceleration—when it again became difficult to see progress. One might date the beginning of that period at about 1912. New humane societies were organized continuously in the later years, new and better laws were enacted to define and control cruelty, a steadily increasing number of humane societies and municipalities built animal shelters. Perhaps the greatest boon of all was the replacement of horses by automobiles.
But by and large, in general, for approximately 40 years our progress was slow, unspectacular, and over long periods virtually undetectable. In some ways, in truth, the mid-years of the first half of this century brought retrogression. Humane societies, in more than a few communities, became “big business.” They achieved wealth—endowment wealth. They acquired “professional” management—not inherently a bad thing but too easily perverted, as experience showed, into sinecures for mere jobholders under boards of directors more concerned with management of securities portfolios than with management of humane work.

The movement slowly lost its original crusading spirit. It forgot its moral motivation. Little by little, so slowly that few humanitarians noticed the changes, more and more humane societies converted their facilities into mere dog pounds—or, to put it in the most charitable and optimistic light—into mere dog and cat shelters. In the very city where Henry Bergh went personally into the streets and horsewhipped a man who was beating a horse, the SPCA that he founded supported the enactment of a pound seizure law and itself sold animals to laboratories.

I do not mean to imply that there was nothing good in the movement, even in the years of lowest vigor. On the contrary, the great majority of local humane societies have always been nobly motivated and selflessly served by a great army of devoted humanitarians. There has never been a shortage of idealism and I know, personally, scores and even hundreds of individual workers and philanthropists who have quite literally given every ounce of their energy and almost every dollar of their material goods to the work of preventing suffering and cruelty.

It is true, nonetheless, that in the several decades preceding 1950 there was little appetite in many of our most prominent societies for controversy, for battle, for sacrifice. Very few ordinary humane societies ever even mentioned, in the period between 1940 and 1955, the scandalous cruelties being increasingly and openly perpetrated on laboratory animals. Nothing was being done for agricultural livestock. Only a few faint voices denounced the cruelties of fur trapping, of sport hunting.

Speaking of the humane movement as a whole: for too long we devoted ourselves chiefly to taking dogs and cats into our shelters, finding homes for perhaps ten per cent of the animals we took in, killing the rest.

It sounds dreary, doesn’t it? It was. It was a discouraging period.

But in the last ten years a new ferment has been at work.

Since 1954 more than 100 new humane societies have been organized in the United States. Humane societies have built more than 60 new animal shelters, costing over eight million dollars, in this single decade. Scores of older shelters have been enlarged, remodeled, modernized. More important—a great number of cities, towns and counties have substituted humane animal shelters and humane animal regulation programs for the traditional dog pound on the city dump, run by the old-type dog catcher.

Most important of all—by far the most important fact of our recent history—the humane movement seems to have been recapturing, or regenerating, its original spirit. In the last ten years we have lifted our eyes and looked at far horizons. While we have been rapidly expanding and improving our physical work we also have broadened our concept of our mission.

Consider:

In the four years between 1954 and 1958 the American humane movement really united, for the first time in its century of existence, to achieve enactment of the Federal humane slaughter law that now, every year, is saving more than 100 million animals from torture. The mere fact that we so united was an excitingly significant development. Hundreds and hundreds of big and little societies, supplemented by great numbers of special committees outside our normal organizational structure and by tens of thousands of volunteer workers, worked harmoniously and unremittingly together for four years.

We were vigorously fought by the billion dollar packing industry, by the politically powerful Farm Bureau Federation, by every national organization of livestock growers, by the Department of Agriculture, by the Pentagon, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the White House itself. And still we won.

The victory was an enormously important achievement. But the fact that we could unite, that hundreds of local societies could lift their eyes from local problems to a great national cruelty, the fact that we had the power to win such a victory, was and is the most significant and important fact about the humane movement today.

Today, this year, we are engaged in a new national campaign against a cruelty greater and enormously more horrible than that of the packing plants—the cruelty inflicted on scores of millions of animals every year in our research and manufacturing laboratories. I feel safe in saying that twenty years ago there were not two dozen humane societies in the entire United States that were willing even to discuss this subject in their meetings or in their publications. The subject was “controversial” and the humane movement, in those days, was almost universally avoiding controversy.

Because the subject is controversial, we have not yet achieved in this campaign the complete unity that carried us to victory in the campaign for the Federal humane slaughter law. It is all the more remarkable and encouraging, therefore, that the issue is being frankly and thoughtfully debated throughout the humane movement and that the overwhelming majority of humane societies are again rising above their local problems,
reaching out beyond their local horizons, and making a reality of the concept of a national humane movement.

I shall speak more, in just a moment, about the status of the campaign for legislation to protect laboratory animals. At this moment I aim only at making the point that something new is stirring, that there is a national humane movement, that the national movement has awakened from a long lethargy, and that great possibilities and great responsibilities lie before us.

The humane movement, in my opinion, is ready today for a development and for great achievements of which we have heretofore barely dreamed.

This meeting, this National Leadership Conference, can provide, if we will it so, the spark that will fire great new forces into motion. This is a relatively small meeting—purposely so—but in this meeting there is latent power, waiting only to be used. This is a meeting of leaders, of people who have influence in many places.

Today the American humane movement has approximately 860 incorporated humane societies. No one knows the total membership of these societies, but it is conservative to estimate that they have an active, close constituency of more than one million persons. They exert very strong influence over many millions of other persons and by their very existence they subtly but visibly and tangibly affect the ethical attitudes of the entire public.

Whatever this Conference agrees upon, whatever this Conference resolves to do, can be accomplished.

Our movement has many weaknesses. There are bad apples in the barrel. A bit later in this meeting we will self-critically examine, in considerable detail, some of our most conspicuous faults.

But from my own position in the humane movement, as Chairman of the Board of Directors of The HSUS and as a member of the Board of Directors and former President of a local humane society that is fairly typical of all such societies, the American humane movement looks vigorous, healthy, and inspiringly progressive.

---

**Analysis of the Battle to Protect Laboratory Animals—Part I**

By Fred Myers, Washington, D.C., HSUS Vice-President and Education Director

The national campaign for a federal law to protect animals used in research, teaching and the production of pharmaceuticals is by far the most important project in which the American humane movement ever has been engaged. It is important not merely because enactment of a well written law of this kind would eliminate atrocious cruelties but because the campaign itself is inducing the entire American public to examine, debate and act upon an issue in which the fundamental ethical philosophy of the humane movement is involved. What we are debating is cruelty, not merely a particular cruelty.

Every humanitarian, every local humane society, should and must enlist in this great campaign and participate in this great debate because the decision that ultimately will be made by the American people and their Congress in respect to this specific legislation will be also an enormously significant and far-reaching decision about the truly basic objectives of the humane movement.

In this conference of leaders of the humane movement we want to discuss the tactics of our effort to achieve protection for laboratory animals. It is vastly more important, however, to see clearly the fact that the campaign to gain protection for laboratory animals is a strategic action that ultimately will have effects on every local humane society and at every level of our work.

Unfortunately, the humane movement is far from unity in this situation. The HSUS supports H. R. 4856, the Randall bill, and H. R. 8077, the identical bill introduced very recently by Congressman Pepper of Florida. The Animal Welfare Institute and the Society for Animal Protective Legislation advocate S. 533 and H. R. 1937. The American Humane Association seems rather vaguely to feel that “something ought to be done” but does nothing. Principal spokesmen for the major anti-vivisection societies fiercely oppose every one of the eight bills on this subject now pending in Congress.

It is most remarkable that in the presence of such chaotic disunity in the humane movement members of Congress have introduced a total of eight bills on this subject, scores of members of the Senate and the House
have committed themselves to vote for a law of this kind and we have won
strong editorial support among the nation's most influential newspapers,
magazines and radio-television commentators. The potentialities, if only
we can unite ourselves, are obvious. My remarks here are offered in the
hope that I can contribute a little bit toward unity.

The Humane Society of the United States drafted and arranged for intro-
duction of H. R. 4856 in Congress because the HSUS opposes and seeks to
prevent all uses of animals that cause avoidable pain, suffering, or fear. The Randall bill is an anti-cruelty bill, in no essential way different from
any of the hundreds of anti-cruelty laws that have been enacted by the federal government, the states, and subdivisions of the states with unanimous
support by all humanitarians.

It has been argued by some persons that the Randall bill and all similar
bills should be opposed because they would not abolish "vivisection." This, it seems to me, is a dogmatic and doctrinaire position that cannot
stand the test of reason. The prohibition of a specific cruelty does not in
logic imply approval of any cruelty that may still be legally unpro-
hibited. As I have just noted, we have all worked effectively together in
the past to achieve enactment of many hundreds of anti-cruelty statutes
and ordinances. None of them abolished "vivisection." None of them, indeed, has abolished cruelty of any other kind. I have never heard it
suggested, however, that no anti-cruelty law should have been enacted
until it was possible to enact a law that would abolish all cruelty simultaneously.

The principal anti-vivisection societies of the United States have already
proved, by trial, that not even a single Congressman will "vivisection." A
bill for total abolition of vivisection on all species of animals would not,
at this time, be acceptable to any member of Congress. To draft such
a measure would not give us a bill—it would give us merely a piece
of paper."

Some of the principal anti-vivisection societies tried, in 1961, to find a
Congressman who would sponsor a bill to forbid merely the use of dogs
and cats in experiments and research. It is worth noting, in passing, that
such a bill would have constituted a mere "regulation" of the use of
animals in research. It would have permitted "vivisection" to continue
without restraint on all except two species of animals. The society which
drafted that proposed bill was unable to get the draft introduced as a
bill, although it tried diligently to do so.

Those who oppose the Randall bill on the ground that it would not
abolish vivisection are, in practical fact, opposing every kind of anti-
cruelty legislation that could conceivably help the animals in laboratories.
I believe that very few members of humane societies or of anti-vivisection
societies really support so sterile and inhumane a policy.

There are those, too, who say that they endorse the general intent of
the Randall bill but who find themselves unable to support the bill itself
because either (a) the bill is "too radical" or (b) because the bill is "too
moderate." Most of the proposed amendments are aimed at a closer
approach to total abolition of pain.

The HSUS would, of course, like to see enacted a law that would totally
prohibit anything that would cause even the slightest pain to animals. It
is impossible, however, to achieve any such goal through any law that Con-
gress will seriously consider. Somewhere short of perfection we must at
this time take what we can get and be happy because we have made progress
because we can save millions of animals from suffering.

The National Anti-Vivisection Society reported in January of 1960 that
Mr. Richard of that society, Mr. Michael Moukhanoff, president of the
International Conference Against Vivisection, and Mr. William Snyder,
president of the Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society, were agreed that the
Moulder bill of that Congress was "as strong and as stringent" as such a
bill could be made. The Randall bill is the same bill. It is really
impossible for the HSUS or for any other humane society to arrange for
Congressional support of the kind of amendments suggested by, for
example, the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare.

I remind everyone concerned, again, that there are eight laboratory-
animal bills pending in the Congress. Any attack on the Randall bill from
within the humane movement makes it more likely than an alternative bill,
much weaker and even dangerous to the welfare of the animals involved,
will become law. The Randall bill is, from the viewpoint of the humane
movement, the strongest and best bill before the Congress. The only
objection to the Randall bill that has been offered by those within the humane
movement who support other bills is a contention that the Randall bill asks
for more control of cruelty than Congress is likely to grant.

It deserves the support of the entire humane movement.

I am enormously proud of the part that the HSUS is taking in this
campaign. As you all know, the HSUS has supplied the humane move-
ment with a wealth of dependable fact about what happens to animals in
laboratories. Our staff investigators have penetrated dozens of the largest
laboratories of the nation and have produced more information about this
subject than the humane movement ever before has had. We have pro-
vided financial support for scientific analysis of hundreds of animal-using
experiments, revealing vast waste and abuse of animals in research. We
have published more than a million books, booklets, brochures and
folders on this subject. Our Directors and our staff—notably Cleveland
Amory—have reached scores of millions of Americans through radio, television, magazines and newspapers.

In the meantime, some of our most influential Directors and members have been and are working quietly but exceedingly persuasively with members of Congress and high officers of the federal government.

No matter how effectively and diligently the HSUS may work, however, this campaign cannot succeed without the unity of which our Chairman, R. J. Chenoweth, spoke to you earlier today. The Randall bill can become law. Of that I am utterly confident. But the Randall bill will become law only if Congress feels an enormous grass-roots demand for this kind of legislation.

To get this message to Congress we need active participation in the campaign by the 800 local humane societies of the country.

I urgently recommend that every local humane society immediately establish a special committee to campaign for the Randall bill. I suggest that each local humane society give to its special committee for the Randall bill a small emergency fund with which to buy HSUS folders on this subject and to pay for mailing such folders to all members of the local society and to influential other citizens of the community. The special committee should aim specifically at inducing hundreds or thousands of local citizens to write to their own Congressmen in support of the Randall bill.

The HSUS will be happy to work with every such committee.

Because of the current legislative log-jam in Congress, with which all Americans are familiar, enactment of a federal law to protect laboratory animals probably cannot be achieved this year. I have no doubt whatever, however, that an effective law—a law that will genuinely protect millions of animals every year from cruelties that now are inflicted on them—can be enacted in 1964. I say in all sincerity that this law not only can be enacted, but will be.

Analysis of the Battle to Protect Laboratory Animals—Part II

By Clarence E. Richard, Chicago, Ill., Managing Director, The National Anti-Vivisection Society

While driving from Chicago to this meeting, Fall was in the air. The muggy warm of summer has given way to the crispness that marks the new season.

Fall means different things to people. But perhaps one of the most important things it means is the biannual political elections. This time next year both political parties will be at one another tooth and nail throughout the country.

I mention political elections because they illustrate the point I hope to bring to you during this discussion today. It's a point never fully understood in countries where there are dictatorships or where democracy has become stagnant or decadent. The point is this: No matter how divided the Republicans and Democrats seem in their attacks on one another, no matter how much they challenge each other in public or private, they are united behind one goal. That goal is perpetuation and improvement of the American way of life.

Their difference is simple. One political party wants to achieve the same goals in a different manner from the other. Their argument is not whether action is necessary. Their argument is what specific actions are necessary. The debate is how to implement their programs, how to improve the American way of life.

Members of the National Anti-Vivisection Society are intelligent people, dedicated to one thing—elimination of the cruel, inhumane vivisection practices in the United States. Likewise, I am certain, members of the Humane Society of the United States have the same dedication, the same zeal to help animals now suffering in laboratories throughout the country.

In other words, we agree on a major point. Both the NAVS and The HSUS want to eliminate suffering which invariably results from vivisection. This is a basic belief which binds us, one to the other, despite any tactical differences which might arise as to how to eliminate the suffering.

We have another common ground, although disputed by some. NAVS members believe that it is morally wrong to practice vivisection on any animals. I emphasize any animals because we do not believe that some
species are more equal than others. Even at this, there is generally little disagreement.

The basic difference is this. Many humanitarians believe that federal regulation of vivisection practices would be “a step in the right direction.”

Recently the NAVS Board of Directors decided to recheck our position, to poll our members, thereby determining whether they favored a federal regulation bill as a step toward elimination of vivisection.

Ballots were sent directly from members to an independent auditor. They were counted. Emphatically, by a two-to-one margin, NAVS members reaffirmed our stand that they favored only total, complete, abolition of vivisection. They opposed regulation as a half-way step.

Why was the vote overwhelmingly against regulation? Not because we’re against a step toward elimination of animal suffering. Can anyone really believe we want animals to continue suffering?

Let me use one analogy to show why we are against proposed federal laws. Then we’ll get down to specifics.

In the mid-19th century, many Americans were convinced that our Negro slaves suffered, that their living conditions often were appalling. Other Americans felt that slavery was morally wrong. It was counter to everything our nation believed in. In other words, all slavery had to go, despite the fact that some plantations were run with adequate facilities.

But, cried plantation owners, the South cannot survive without slaves.

As you recall, slavery was abolished. The South today is in unparalleled prosperity.

Would slavery ever have been abolished if the slaves had been given tile bathrooms, wall-to-wall carpeting, and all the other modern conveniences? Would that moral wrong ever have been abolished? There is strong doubt. Much of the nation’s moral indignation would have been lulled if plantation owners could say, “There’s a federal law against abusing our Negroes.”

Thus it is with vivisection. Will vivisection, a definite moral wrong, ever be abolished if we improve laboratory conditions? Will it be abolished if we give the animals lavish kennels and yards full of grass while they await experimentation? Will it be abolished if we manage to eliminate the greatest amount of suffering? Never. Vivisection would become acceptable in practice and thought, with the moral question neatly tucked away the same as slavery well might still exist.

Now, let’s get away from the analogies and talk about specific objections raised by our members to the regulation bills now pending before Congress.

First, regulation laws don’t work. Example. The so-called restrictions of the British Act of 1876 still permit the infliction of horrible suffering. Yet the Research Defence Society, which holds much the same position in Great Britain as the National Society for Medical Research in America, declared: “Such use of animals in British laboratories is strictly controlled by Act of Parliament and involves no cruelty whatsoever in spite of allegations to the contrary by those who would like to bring this sort of medical research to an end.”

Let’s for the moment disregard the experience of British regulation. Let’s assume everyone favored some sort of regulation. In looking at the bills now pending before the Congress, each one has a basic and horrendous flaw. Each permits the vivisector to act as prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner. Each one permits the vivisector to decide whether suffering is necessary to the experiment. If he feels a specific experiment should be done without the use of anesthetics, his judgment almost certainly will prevail. Our members, who are just as humane as HSUS members, recognize this as a complete farce.

Second, let’s assume that a regulation bill passes the Congress and, by some miracle, it is signed into law by the President. The result would be instantaneous. A cry would echo from every laboratory, “There is no cruelty here. There’s a law against it.” This is exactly what occurred in Britain.

It wouldn’t happen here? It already is happening merely because bills have been introduced in Congress. On May 29, 1960, just 11 days after S. 3570 was introduced in the U. S. Senate, I was debating on Florida television station WFLA with two doctors, one a medical man and the other a veterinarian. The physician declared: “However, because it has been realized that in some remote parts of research there has been some cruelty to animals in the past, there is now a federal law which is required for all animals, for all laboratories who undertake animal research under federal grant. This law demands that all animals be completely anesthetized.”

This facility for the perversion of the truth has been a feature of the pro-vivisection campaign throughout its history. It is to be deplored. The physician further said the cruel experiments which I had described happened a long time ago and were performed by unqualified scientists. Every person here today knows that extreme cruelty still exists widely in laboratories. If you failed to believe this, you would not be in this room today. And yet, every cruelty which we have seen and heard about still could exist with the bills now before Congress.

Third, there can be no middle ground about vivisection. It is morally wrong. Should America 100 years ago have regulated that moral wrong—slavery? And right now, should we attempt to regulate other moral wrongs that exist in this country? Moral wrongs such as drug addiction and prostitution? I cannot believe anything less than total abolition of a moral wrong is acceptable to you.

These points are the ones that divide us, and I believe that we don’t
really disagree about them. But what about the points that unite us? How can we work together for a common goal?

We can and must work together. We are few enough in number. For there are far more people throughout the world who are concerned only with the benefits of drugs than those interested in the elimination of animal suffering.

We—and I mean every person in the humane movement—must have Ben Franklin's fire bell in the night. We must have a clarion in a loud and single note calling us to action together. Once a clarion rings true and clear, other notes of our medley will follow in a call to action.

What is the note we need? Where will it come from? Perhaps it can come from this meeting today. So let me venture forth with a different note from those that have been muffled in the past.

I propose a single step in the right direction as a start—a step, a note, that we all might follow.

As we know, thousands of pets are stolen each year for vivisection. The NAVS knows this. And so does the HSUS as noted in your last newsletter. A man comes to town and offers to buy all dogs offered. In small towns Spot and Rover aren't missed for hours. They have been quietly and quickly collected, herded into trucks and shipped into the next state beyond local law. The dogs then are retailed to laboratories without a question asked. Every one of us has heard of such cases. Do you agree that this is wrong? Certainly. So does the NAVS. Do you want to do something about it? So do we. Is there common ground here to support federal legislation to eliminate such practices? Certainly. Let's back legislation to prohibit interstate transportation of dogs and cats for vivisection. With this as a start, we'll find other areas in which we can cooperate for the common good of animals.

Let's pretend this is the day after the election campaigns are over. Again, we are together under one flag, with one cause. That cause is the elimination of suffering of animals during the practice of vivisection.

Animal Shelter Programs and Policies

By Edwin J. Sayres, Madison, N.J.,
Executive Vice-President, St. Hubert's Giralda

A discussion of policies and programs that, ideally, should be followed by humane societies in the operation of shelters and the limitations that are imposed by finances, local circumstances, and other factors is a substantial undertaking. I would like, first, to give you some background information about St. Hubert's Giralda and hope that what I have to say will contribute something to people confronted with the problems of shelter management and animal control programs.

Our methods and approach were basically acquired from material available through national and state organizations in this field. We are especially indebted to the Union County SPCA Kindness Kennels in Rahway, New Jersey, for their help when it was decided that St. Hubert's Giralda would offer a pet animal warden service to our community.

After a survey we found that the most needed service to our local municipalities was an agency that would and could handle the pets and small animal problems. Since 1958 we have enrolled eight municipalities, covering an area of 90 square miles with a human population of 120,000, 7,500 licensed dogs, an undetermined number of cats, and an undetermined number of strays. We handle about 2,500 animals per year.

We found that most existing laws were antiquated, impractical, and useless. I believe I can safely say that this holds true in virtually every community around the country. A hodge-podge of legislation relating to animal control has accumulated through the years, pertinent at the time of enactment, but most of it now rendered almost unenforceable by the very extent of its detail. A new approach of placing responsibility where it belongs—upon the owner rather than the animal—has long been advocated, as you know, by The HSUS. St. Hubert's Giralda took the opportunity to put it into practice.

Our first step was to suggest control laws that would not cause hardship to the pet owners or the animals themselves and would also include benefits to the non-pet owner and the general welfare of the community.

In our explanation in support of good animal control laws we emphasized that pets kept under control are not exposed to injury and death on the roads, do not cause traffic problems, nor are they apt to come in
contact with rabid wildlife. The public health of the community is protected and nuisance complaints are also reduced.

The cooperation of municipal authorities and key public officials is essential to the proper implementation of an effective program. When properly approached, these authorities will generally support a practical and enforceable program and, in many cases, they will be glad to relinquish the responsibility of animal control to a community-respected humane organization. Our experience has been that many local officials, charged with responsibility of administering an animal control program, lack the knowledge and ability to do the job. They are involved in an area of administration that is, perhaps more than any other, subject to public criticism when improperly handled and they are consequently susceptible to a persuasive approach.

In our own particular case, we found it necessary to enlist the support of (1) the board of health, (2) law and public safety commissioners, (3) the local court, and (4) newspapers and radio. All of these agencies were most cooperative when we pointed out how necessary it was to have their support not only, initially, to enforce a law which would be in the best interests of both the animals and people of the community, but also in carrying out the essential aspects of our proposed animal control program.

It is as easy to dissipate community respect for a humane society as it is difficult to establish the right kind of relationship in the first place. Physical aspects of society work are, therefore, vitally important since they establish the organization’s public image—good, bad, or indifferent. For example, the excellence of a humane education program will be damaged extensively by the existence of sub-standard conditions at the animal shelter, or by field service that is slow and haphazard. At the same time, however, operation of the shelter must not become the entire service to the community. Rather, it should be the focal point around which related services are built.

At St. Hubert’s Giralda we try to remember that the animal control officer, on call or on patrol, is our direct contact with the public. His efficiency in performance is a tremendous factor in molding community opinion of our program. Field service must be prompt, efficient, and understanding. Cruelty cases must be handled firmly and with dispatch. Correction of inhumane conditions must be pursued vigorously and to whatever extent is necessary to remedy specific situations. This phase of activity, like others in an effective animal shelter program, must be handled by full-time personnel with adequate compensation. Volunteer workers serve their best purpose in supplementing the “professional” humane worker.

Pet adoption policies carry a responsibility that is too often overlooked. All of us know it is impossible to find homes for all of the unwanted animals that are bred and all of us know that many adopted female pets are going out of shelters to create a progeny that will eventually require disposition through our shelters’ euthanasia facilities. A female dog or cat, cheerfully released to an adopter, will most surely increase our already staggering overload of work unless our adoption policies include a requirement for spaying. Unspayed female animals that are released only perpetuate the very condition that brought them to the shelter in the first place. The biggest single factor in any adoption policy must, therefore, be spaying of female animals.

We all know that the operation of an animal shelter provides an essential but temporary remedy of effects. We know, too, that obsession with the “cure” can blind us to the prevention that will be achieved ultimately through a comprehensive humane education program.

A humane education program is a related service but its importance should not be minimized by this fact. It offers a far-reaching solution that can significantly affect the treatment of animals in centuries to come. I sometimes think this kind of program is neglected because immediate results are not often achieved. Disregard of its importance on this count would be a sad mistake. If we must have something immediate, we can have that, too. An effective and continuing humane education program will add stature to any society in the eyes of the community it serves. It goes beyond the physical functions of shelter operation and disseminates knowledge on the causes of animal welfare problems to a community that is probably more misinformed than wilfully cruel.

Lectures, appropriate movies, and the distribution of literature are the best methods of implementing such a program. Always, of course, help should be offered to any group or community within the scope of the society that is formulating a pet program. Letters to the editors of newspapers can help to publicize certain issues and problems where widespread support is needed. In general, every opportunity to spread information about animal welfare and specific problems should be used to advantage.

I have been speaking, until now, about the policies and programs of private shelters and how to fulfill their objectives. We cannot exclude, however, a second type of operation—the municipal or city pound.

An increasing number of public pounds can be brought up to humane standards by conscientious effort on the part of the local humane society. Here, again, cooperation from local officials is essential and we, in turn, must recognize the unique aspects of this kind of operation.

The budget is generally small. It often precludes establishment of a satisfactory program of animal adoption and public relations—usually thought of as simply extra expense. We have to recognize this in our dealings with public pounds but we should insist on, as a minimum, humane euthanasia methods and clean kennels, adequately manned and
properly equipped. Extra services in many cases must be provided by volunteer humane workers. Such extra services might include the placement of animals, distribution of literature, or just keeping an eye on the operation. Although budgets may impose restrictions upon public pound operations, we can recognize it and work accordingly toward an improvement of standards.

We, at St. Hubert’s Giralda, felt the need to keep the public aware of our services, the laws of the communities we serve, and the various situations pertaining to the animal world. We had to resort, upon occasion, to paid advertising and, of course, we have always maintained a flow of letters to the public, welcoming inquiries and inviting people to visit the shelter for consultation.

Constant explanation in one form or another, cooperation from municipal officials and the press and radio, all of these things contribute to an effective and successful community pet control program and an orderly public or private shelter operation.

Success is always related to effort. How well we succeed will depend upon the effort we make. In our own case, I can tell you that, after five years, there has been a substantial increase in the number of animals reclaimed, a big decrease in the number destroyed, and an annual increase in the number of adoptions. Nuisance calls have dropped to a healthy ratio and our membership continues to grow.

We have done no more than you can; we may not even have done as well as some other organizations. But we believe that every humane society must adopt policies that, although deviating in some respects from the ideal, will lead to development of a rational, practical, and most important, humane program.

The War Against Surplus Breeding

By Irene Castle, Lake Forest, Ill.,
Founder of Orphans of the Storm

I wish I could make sure that not one more puppy or kitten would be born in the next five years, until America had the opportunity to absorb the many dogs and cats that are at present in this world without homes. There is no sadder sight, to me, than someone standing at the gate of our shelter with a basket or cardboard box of unwanted puppies or kittens! They proudly say they have found homes for five or six—but what homes? You may be sure they do not plan to check on the homes every few months. Many of them will be given away before they have been in the new surroundings one week—sometimes not a day!

Almost the whole humane movement is snowed under and overwhelmed by the still mounting flood of surplus cats and dogs. The surplus turns our shelters into sordid slaughterhouses. It distorts and perverts the thinking of many even of our very best people. Hundreds of our societies are kept permanently on the edge of bankruptcy by the single problem of taking in and disposing of cats and dogs which are homeless or unwanted simply because of the immense surplus of such animals.

It is so easy for all of us to throw up our hands and denounce veterinarians for the high fees that they charge for spaying. It is so very easy for all of us to place the blame on “irresponsible animal owners”. It is easy for us to lay the blame on public pounds or on legislatures.

The fact is, however, that we of the humane movement haven’t cleaned up our own house in this respect. Scores of local humane societies still are unrestrainedly selling unspayed female cats and dogs to any takers who appear. Not one humane society in a dozen is conducting any kind of educational campaign about the evils of surplus breeding. The American Humane Association says that it “has no fixed policy” about spaying. The American SPCA, handling 265,000 animals a year, freely releases unspayed animals for adoption.

People will not realize, and particularly kind people, that the cruelest thing you can do is to let all puppies and all kittens live to grow up. At birth, many—in fact, most—should be put to sleep humanely before they have become attached to people and have grown to enjoy life—only to be abandoned (“dumped”) or passed on into careless or, worse than careless, downright cruel hands.
I have begged, pled with, and scolded people who love animals too much to put kittens to sleep humanely at birth—knowing full well that instead they will press them on their neighbors or give them to farmers or little children passing by, or ring doorbells of strangers to “get rid of them” at six, seven or eight weeks old. It is difficult for most people to understand that the sensible thing is to put all but one male to sleep at birth, and thus help check further over-population of the cat world.

What happens later? Let’s look at the seriousness of their crime and see how much suffering they will have caused for years and years to come. We are speaking of cats now because recently we have run into more cat cruelties than dog.

Don’t think that just because you think you have found nice homes for all of them, that the responsibility of the future inevitable suffering does not rest squarely on your shoulders.

First of all, you should have had your female cats spayed—or should not have accepted a female. Secondly, you have no humane right to give female kittens away. Cats can, and do, have three or four litters a year. If one-half of each litter are females (and often the quota is much larger), they in turn will each have three or four litters a year. One carelessly given away female can in two years produce several thousand cats. Do you know of several thousand good cat homes? When I protest because even my friends often won’t bring their unwanted kitten family to Orphans of the Storm, they bring up those old arguments of “they have a right to live”—or—“they were so darling the children wouldn’t hear of our parting with any of them”—or—“we gave them to a farmer”—or—“a young couple at Ft. Sheridan”—or—“to a little boy who had lost his kitten a week ago”—etc., etc.

Let’s take up, first, the farmer. All farmers have too many cats—people drive by and dump them on a farm. The females he has are continually adding to his number and cold and weary strays in blizzardy winters sneak into his hay barn for refuge if not sustenance. Some farmers may buy food for cats, but all I’ve ever heard of their giving them is skimmed milk, justified by that vicious old adage that “they won’t kill the rats if I feed them.” Rats are not good food for man or beast, and a good ratter is a good ratter even if pig-fat.

Let’s take the home at Ft. Sheridan. We have learned to our sorrow, that Army people do not stay put, and while they may take their dogs with them, you can bet your bottom dollar they won’t take their cat. The little boy who has “lost his kitten,” will also lose the new one you give him. Children handle them too much and their kittens run away, or they take them to play in a neighbor’s yard and forget about them. So the kittens drift off—to be killed by a dog or be run over or swallowed up by the nearby woods—or be picked up to be sold to a laboratory.

Please remember that many people despise cats. It’s not easy for a cat to get itself “a good home”—and most of the homes that the unwanted kitten family are given to will not be “good homes” six months later. Just call up and ask about the kittens you gave away last year before you start saturating the neighborhood this year with your “too cute to be put to sleep” kittens.

We had a call recently to send our humane officer post haste to rescue a cat three little boys were using for a football. They actually were kicking it high into the air from one to another when the humane officer got there and quickly took possession of the cat, bringing it safely to Orphans of the Storm.

We had a janitor arrested for throwing a live cat into a furnace and he was fined only a dollar! Had it been a dog—he might have been fined $100.

Stop and think, you tender-hearted, animal lovers—before you give female kittens away! You must bear the burden of the suffering it generates. Remember that every grocery store, bakery and butcher shop has a mother cat with kittens they are trying to give away. The result is that Orphans of the Storm places only one-fourth as many cats as dogs in homes each year!

One Sunday, just a few weeks ago, ninety cats (including kittens) were brought in which had to be added to the twenty-five or thirty we already had for adoption. People must come to realize that it is not fair to the cat world to keep every kitten born to their female cat and expect someone else to do their dirty work later.
Humane Education Programs for Local Societies

By Frank J. McMahon, Washington, D.C., HSUS Director of Field Service

Although definitely I am not an educator, I believe that I still may be able to report usefully this afternoon some of what is being done in the field of humane education by some of our best local humane societies.

In the years that I have worked in and for The HSUS I have visited several hundred local humane societies—big and little, good and not so good, new and old, rich and poor, in all parts of the country. I have spent many days on analysis of the philosophy, policies, equipment, programs and personnel of those societies.

When I visit a local society I look first, as you might expect, at any animal shelter that it operates. But in a great many situations I give the most attention to the society's educational activities—or lack of them.

From analysis of a humane society's attitude toward problems of education I can learn more about that society's level of intellectual maturity and moral philosophy than from study of any other facet of the society's operations.

I remember, for example, a visit in this last year with a society that had applied for affiliation with The HSUS. The society's small shelter was clean. The President was gracious. I found, however, that in the whole of the preceding year the society had issued no report to its relatively few members or the general public, the only newspaper publicity attained had been an occasional photograph of a dog (never a cat) available for "sale" and that the only leaflet or publication of any kind that the society had available for distribution was a booklet on dog care published by a dog-food manufacturer in which owners were advised not to have female dogs spayed unless some very extraordinary circumstance prevented them from "enjoying the pleasures that only your own litter of puppies can bring".

Perhaps the fundamental moral to be drawn from that incident is that The HSUS should intensify its own program of education of local humane societies. But for the moment let me stick to the deficiencies—I might fairly say the grotesquery—of the attitude of that particular local society to humane education. Before I left that town the Board of the local society and I had quite a long discussion of education.

The Directors began by reporting that their shelter was snowed under with homeless, unwanted, abandoned and neglected dogs and cats. They talked about plans for enlarging the shelter but complained about lack of philanthropic financial support. I heard several stories about cruelties committed by children. There were gripes about lack of cooperation from local veterinarians. The consensus was expressed by the President, who said: "Mr. McMahon, this is a really terrible town for animals."

I think that every member of the Board thought that I was of wandering mind when I responded by asking how many Girl Scouts of the community had won animal care proficiency badges in the last year.

And they obviously had to struggle to remain politely attentive when I followed that up, after they had explained that they didn't know that Girl Scouts had such a thing as an animal-care proficiency badge, by asking what the city editor of their small local daily newspaper thought of their shelter. It turned out that no one present knew the name of any editor or writer for the local paper—the photos of dogs available for sale were mailed to the paper by the shelter manager.

From our psychologist-professor-HSUS Director, Dr. James T. Meharter, and from the director of our education department, Fred Myers, I have learned over the years that there are some very complex subtleties in the business of humane education. The idea is all loused up (if you will permit me to be fully expressive) with psychological and psychiatric concepts like empathy, attitudes, psychopathology, frustrations, complexes. I am perfectly convinced that these words indicate accurately the fundamental nature of what we must ultimately do in the field of humane education. But when I talk about humane education with most local humane societies I would be wasting my time and your money, besides running a risk of revealing my own ignorances, if I tried to talk as Jim Meharter, Martin Winemiller and Fred Myers must talk when they are trying to influence the National Education Association or the education methodologists of a state board of education.

So to the Board of Directors of the little local society that I have been describing I talked about as follows.

The basic objectives of a good humane society, whether a national organization like the HSUS or the smallest local society, is to work itself out of business. The only worthwhile aim is to make ourselves unnecessary. We don't exist just to provide a euthanasia service or an animal exchange service for people who on the one hand want to get rid of animals and who on the other hand want cheap animals.

I asked the Directors to consider, earnestly, whether their shelter wasn't chiefly serving to make it easy for animal owners to be irresponsible.

(Don't misunderstand me, please. Animal shelters are necessary as long as animal owners are irresponsible; euthanasia is a kindness when animals are abandoned, ill or injured, unloved and unwanted. But no
animal shelter, operating in a vacuum, will elevate the public morality toward animals or the sense of responsibility of animal owners.)

And I recommended to that local society these educational activities:

1. Publication at least every two months of a printed (not mimeographed) report of society activities, full of anecdotes about interesting animal rescues and unusual services to the public, always including a non-statistical but revealing article about the magnitude of the work being done for animals and for the community.

2. Distribution of this bulletin to a carefully selected list of at least 1,000 persons (the city has a population of about 90,000 persons) and I recommended that one Director be given the responsibility of constantly and diligently building up that list, one name at a time, so that ultimately it would include every animal lover, every active humanitarian, every potential donor of funds and every influential citizen of the city—ministers, Scoutmasters, the more thoughtful school teachers, officers of service clubs, city and county officials, and so forth.

3. Appointment of or even employment of a publicity chairman or publicity director, to concentrate on supplying to the newspaper and to the local radio and television station news items and material for feature articles about the society's work and goals.

4. Organization of expert instruction, by a member of the society, of Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts seeking animal care awards.

5. Publication and massive distribution, month in and month out, of an inexpensive folder about the evils of surplus breeding of cats and dogs, adapted to local circumstances and statistics from such HSUS publications as "Puppies and Kittens—10,000 Per Hour."

6. At least four courses in dog obedience training, every year, aimed especially at children in families that owned dogs.

7. A series of seminars (or arguments, if that term describes the idea better) in which Directors and the four employees of the society would thresh out the objectives of the society and the policies and procedures at the shelter that would promote those objectives.

That is as far as I went in the discussion of humane education with that particular society. That was all that the Board of Directors could be expected to absorb and accept at that time. It was not enough, of course. But, as a field worker in the humane movement who fights practical problems, I would be very happy if all local societies, or even a majority of them, were executing intelligently as much of a humane education program as I urged in this particular case.

Consider, please, what problems of that local society might be effected beneficently by merely the minimum educational work that we discussed.

A. The flow of surplus puppies and kittens into the shelter (and, let's be frank, on to euthanasia) could be reduced.

B. The number of strayed and abandoned animals might be reduced.

C. The attitudes of large numbers of children (here I'm talking about "attitudes" as Jim Mehorer and the other psychologists use the word) could be materially affected so that we might have more genuine humanitarians in the next generation.

D. Contributions of money would be increased, thereby making possible more work and better work.

E. The philosophical and ethical understanding of humane work and planning and execution of the work of the society would be elevated and improved.

Not a thing that I suggested is beyond the capacities of even the smallest humane society, provided only that there is enough brain power within the existing leadership to understand what is needed. Educational work of that kind doesn't cost money; it makes money. If you think of such things in dollars and cents terms, the truth is that no humane society, and especially the poorer societies that are closest to financial bankruptcy, can afford not to do this kind of educational work.

Humane education programs for local humane societies, of course, can and should be much more sophisticated, much more elaborate, much more pervasive of the entire community than the elementary projects that I have mentioned. In variety we can think of a range from promotion of school poster and essay contests to seminars on advanced psychology for school teachers. In terms of specific purposes we ought to cover everything from "how to feed a kitten" to "support the Randall Bill to protect laboratory animals." We should aim our education at kindergarten children but also at farmers trucking cattle to the stockyards.

Mel Morse is to be chairman of the conference committee that later will dig much more deeply into this subject and offer recommendations to the conference and the entire humane movement for improvement of our work in this field. I hope that Mel will find opportunity to tell you about what his own society, the Marin County Humane Society, is doing and initiating in the field of humane education. The Marin County Society is carrying this idea close to ideal levels. I wish that every society in the country could and would do what is being done and planned by the Marin County Society.

At this time, however, I would personally be very happy if all local humane societies would do just what I recommended to the society of which I have spoken. We could talk next year about further progress. It would be a very happy discussion, next year, because there would have been genuine humane progress in the meantime.
The Next Five Years

By Oliver Evans, Washington, D. C., HSUS President

I want to make it clear at the very outset of my remarks about the problems and the work that lie before us in the next five years that I recognize how rash it is for any man to pretend to prescience. Except for the rare breed of philosophical determinists, however, I think that most of us will agree that events can be shaped by men. I agree with Bob Chenoweth, who opened this meeting with his characteristic note of optimism and determination, that we can make of the next five years very much what we will. In what I have to say about the next five years, therefore, I shall be stating what I think we should will rather than reporting what I see in a crystal ball.

What I shall suggest may be regarded as a program conceived primarily for The Humane Society of the United States. I intend, in fact, to speak chiefly of what I think The HSUS should do and can do. It seems to me, however, that all that I aspire to have The HSUS do is relevant to the problems, the aspirations, and the moral responsibilities of other humane societies of every size and condition—of, in other words, the entire humane movement.

Let me run through, in random order, what I conceive to be the major tasks that the HSUS and the humane movement must undertake in the next five years. Later on I will attempt to sort them into an order of priority.

As Irene Castle has so forcefully pointed out today, we must somehow reduce, radically, the breeding of cats and dogs for which there can be no homes.

We must improve and modernize many of our animal shelters and all of the attendant services to animals and to the public.

We must persuade and coerce hundreds of county and city governments into improvement of public animal pounds and animal regulation programs.

We must achieve enactment of an effective national law to protect laboratory animals—a law with real teeth in it.

We must amend the federal humane slaughter law and achieve enactment of additional state humane slaughter laws.

We must organize new humane societies in at least 80 major communities in which there now is no organized animal protection service or humane education activity.

We must find a means of extending our influence and our physical work into many other communities that because of low population density or other factors cannot now support an independent local humane society.

I could easily, of course, name many other problems and tasks that confront us now and that will not disappear in the next five years. We do almost nothing, as yet, to protect wildlife from cruelty and suffering. We are inadequate in protection of agricultural livestock. We have lost ground in recent years to the commercial promoters of rodeos and other spectacles in which animals are cruelly exploited.

Itemizing our problems, our tasks and our goals as I have just done, it would be easy to become discouraged. No humane society in the United States, including The HSUS, has sufficient funds or manpower to spread itself effectively over all of the areas that I have mentioned. I would be talking pure fantasy were I to suggest that the St. Petersburg SPCA or the Boulder County Humane Society or the Humane Society of Nacogdoches—or any other local humane society—independently launch a program of the magnitude that I have outlined.

Nevertheless—and here I come to the thesis behind all that I stand here to say—nevertheless, every problem that I have mentioned can be substantially eliminated in the next five years, every task that I have outlined can be accomplished.

Three things are necessary—unity in the humane movement, a cooperative division of labor within that unity, and humane education of a kind, magnitude, variety and quality heretofore hardly envisioned.

Let me tell you now about some of the things that The HSUS plans specifically to do in the next five years. My purpose is not to boast about what The HSUS will do but to show, in concrete detail, how the humane movement may achieve effective unity, how each individual society, big or small, can work with all other organizations and humanitarians in our common enterprise, and how a totally new kind of humane education can solve many of our problems.

It is my privilege to announce to you that The HSUS right now is moving to establish near Waterford, Virginia, which is only a half hour's drive from our headquarters in Washington, a National Humane Education Center that will serve the entire humane movement. Most of you undoubtedly already have seen the photographs, at the entrance to this room, of the land and buildings that already have been acquired for the National Humane Education Center. I hope that all of you will look at those pictures again, after this meeting adjourns. I ask you to join me in envisioning what is going to develop there and how the effects of that development will benefit every humane society and every humane worker of the nation.
We propose to create at Waterford the most exciting, the most useful, facility in the entire world for advancement of the humane cause.

More than $350,000 eventually will be invested in the land and buildings of the Center and operation of the Center will rise in a very short time to a level that will cost more than $100,000 a year.

At the Center we will begin within thirty days the construction of a modern, model animal shelter for dogs, cats and other small animals. An existing large barn will be remodeled and modernized to provide a shelter for livestock and other large animals. There will be another new building providing a small auditorium especially planned for children, an exhibit hall, a library and art gallery, and administrative offices. The very lovely house now on the property, approximately 160 years old but modern and substantial in every respect, will be used as living quarters for humane society and government workers, school teachers, and leaders of youth organizations who will come to the National Humane Education Center from all over the nation to receive intensive training in the care and handling of animals, the operation of animal shelters, methods of community humane education, and the use of animals in the development of the psychology and character of children.

By next summer we will have created on the property a ten-acre lake which will be managed to attract and support local aquatic and amphibious wildlife as well as domestic waterfowl. The entire 140 acres is to be planted and horticulturally developed to provide shelter, nesting sites and food for the maximum possible population of birds and of wild animals native to the area.

The animal shelter facilities will serve the animals of the entire county. We think that animals of few other such areas in the United States will be as well served because the primary purpose of our shelter facilities will be to search continually for the very best methods of operation, to maintain the highest possible standards of policy and program, and to serve as an educational workshop for professional animal shelter workers and the leaders of local humane societies from all over America.

We intend to build around the National Humane Education Center a working demonstration of a model program of community responsibility for animals, including the rescue, care, protection and regulation of animals by individual owners, by the community as a political and social unit, and by organized local philanthropic action.

The Center will conduct, always experimenting with the best ideas that both theoretical psychologists and practical workers can devise, an intensive program of humane education of children of the local community.

We expect that the teacher training college of one of America's major universities will send part of its own faculty to the National Humane Education Center every summer to conduct academic in-service training courses in humane education concepts and methods for public and private school teachers.

We hope and expect that humanitarians of the nation will provide an endowment for the National Humane Education Center, to be kept entirely apart from ordinary funds of The HSUS, which will enable us to invite approximately 200 selected humane workers, every year, to attend in-residence training courses in animal shelter operation, humane society business management, principles and techniques of humane education in a local community, and other similar subjects. Our goal is to make such professionally taught courses available without cost to local humane societies.

I want to pause right here, momentarily interrupting the development of my thought, to express inadequately my really inexpressible gratitude to the National Humane Education Society, which has donated most of the land at Waterford as well as a substantial sum of money to be used in initial development of the Center, to Miss Edith Goode, a Director of The HSUS and of the National Humane Education Society, who has contributed additional land on which stands the house in which students at the National Humane Education Center will live while in training, and to Miss Alice Morgan Wright, who has contributed an additional substantial sum to be used in the first development of the Center.

The National Humane Education Society, Miss Goode, and Miss Wright have enabled us to begin. The project is of such magnitude and of such national importance that it will require very generous additional philanthropy from many persons and organizations.

And this is how I tie this specific great project of The HSUS into the fundamental thesis that I stated earlier. The humane movement needs to improve—the humane movement must improve—the operation of its animal shelters. We need—all of us need—a means of training our animal shelter managers, our animal shelter workers. We need to discover and develop new techniques, new equipment. We want to offer training in humane methods of animal care and handling to employees of city and county animal-regulation departments as well as our own workers. We need to experiment daringly and creatively in the development of humane education programs—programs with real psychological impact and effect—for elementary schools, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Clubs. We need a place where everything that can be learned, developed and tested will be passed along promptly and freely to every organization and individual worker of the movement.

The National Humane Education Center will provide all of these things, do all of these things, be all of these things. In this project The HSUS will be applying the prescription for effectiveness that I offered earlier. The HSUS will manage the National Humane Education Center but we will...
invite the most experienced and thoughtful leaders of humane work from all over the country to serve on several advisory councils that will help to plan and orient various aspects of the Center’s program. There will be a wide unity of the humane movement in this project. The HSUS will provide a technical and professional staff at the Center and our field staff will see to it that scholarship-financed training courses are made available where they are most needed, but philanthropists all over the country will participate in the financing and students who will come from all over the United States to live and study at the Center will constantly contribute ideas and bits of knowledge that will in turn be passed along to later students by our teaching staff. There will be a cooperative division of labor and function as well as unity.

No single society, not even The HSUS, could create or maintain a project and program of this kind without cooperation by many organizations and persons. The other side of that coin is that no humane society anywhere could obtain the great help and benefit that will flow from this National Humane Education Center if we did not unite and cooperate to create and operate it.

The already developing National Humane Education Center is a sufficiently great and exciting project to justify much more discussion than I am now offering. You will later hear very much more about it. I have told you about it at this time because the conception behind it exemplifies and elucidates the basic idea that I am trying to hammer home—my conviction that virtually every major problem that we face can be solved, virtually everything that we wish to do can be achieved, if we will but unite, work cooperatively together, and see clearly that every one of our problems is a problem of education.

Now let me speak more fully about what I hope that The HSUS will do and become in the next five years.

I have been a Director of the HSUS for eight years but I became the society’s President and chief staff executive only last month. I have not had an opportunity since I became President for a meeting with the full Board of Directors of The HSUS so what I shall say to you now is an expression of personal aspirations and opinions. The Board of Directors will have its opportunity tonight to tell me in what respects the Board disagrees with me. You will have your own opportunities, in the forthcoming Committee meetings and in plenary actions of the Conference, to express your own opinions.

I believe that The HSUS, which will not be nine years old until November 22, already is the most influential organization and force within the American humane movement. Speaking for the moment as a lay humanitarian and one who until very recently was the President of a local midwest humane society, I am happy that this is so. I know intimately my colleagues of the HSUS Board of Directors—the men and women whom you have elected. I know every member of the society’s professional and clerical staff. I have spent hours and whole days reading back through the never ending, amazing, immensely varied flow through the HSUS headquarters office of correspondence from every nook and cranny of the country, every level of the American public. I can and do tell you, with admiration in my mind and excitement in my blood, that The HSUS is ideality and efficiently led, that your staff is truly dedicated to the humane cause, imaginative, aggressive, thoughtless of hours of work, and that in the broad membership of The HSUS—by far larger than that of any other national humane organization—there is a vitality, a questing, pushing demand for true humane work on new frontiers, that is exaltingly inspiring.

Still speaking as a lay humanitarian, I want the influence of The HSUS within the humane movement to continue to grow. The local humane society that I formerly served as President and every other local humane society in America will benefit if the moral qualities, the aggressive, fighting spirit, and the technical efficiency of The HSUS reach ever more deeply into every level of our national and local work.

I expect, and as the new President of The HSUS I intend, that this shall happen.

My own first desire for The HSUS is the development of its education department. We have just freed Fred Myers, our former Executive Director, to concentrate his work in that area. I hope and expect that within the next five years the HSUS education department will be working at a truly professional level with teacher training colleges, the National Education Association, and the churches of the nation. I expect that by the end of five years we will be producing a steady flow, in cooperation with the staff of the National Humane Education Center, of folders, pamphlets, booklets, and books that can be used by every local humane society in its local humane education program. I expect that at another level of education, the HSUS education department will be using all of the techniques of Madison Avenue to sell the American public the entire humane program.

My second goal, in order of priority, is a large expansion of our field staff. It is a sad fact that right now we do many things badly and we pass up many opportunities for useful work simply because the very few men that we have available for field work cannot be everywhere in the United States simultaneously. I intend to try very hard to talk the humanitarians of the country out of enough money to expand our field staff quite substantially within the next twelve months.

I strongly believe that the organization of state branches of The HSUS should be energetically pushed. Past conferences of this kind have dis-
cussed the theory of HSUS branches many times and I will not cover the
same ground again. I am quite convinced that state organizations of this
kind are a necessary and even inevitable unit of the national organization
of the humane movement. No other form of organization, as far as I
can see, can extend our work and our influence into the vast areas of the
United States in which there now are no local humane societies and in
which, for the most part, no local humane society can be organized. We
think that we now know how to organize and activate viable and highly
useful state branches but we need more money than we now have in order
to launch them. I hope and believe that we shall find a way to organize
at least twenty new state branches in the next five years.

I am sure that I speak for the full Board of Directors of the HSUS as
well as for the staff and the membership when I say that we intend to
achieve, in the imminent future, an effective federal law to protect labora­
tory animals. How quickly that can be achieved depends upon the degree
of unity that the humane movement puts into this project. The HSUS
will spare no money, no manpower, and no effort to get this desperately
needed job done.

I shall not recite again the problems and tasks of the humane movement
that I mentioned at the beginning of these remarks. The HSUS in this
coming year will be working on every one of those problems.

It is time for me to conclude. I hope that somehow I have managed,
in all of these words, to convey to you my own conviction—my wholly
confident conviction—that in the next five years we can and we will
rejuvenate the humane movement, magnify its influence in American life
many-fold, save vast numbers of animals from suffering, and, most
important and, indeed, the climactic goal—move the next generation
significantly toward reverence for all life.

Following are resolutions adopted by the conferees:

I—Condition of the humane movement and program development

WHEREAS, the committee recognizes need for a long range program
to accelerate the rate of growth of the humane movement, and
WHEREAS, a plan that embraces the elements inherent in the pro­
motion of the humane cause must be formulated, and
WHEREAS, consideration has been given to the major categories
pertinent to a five-year development plan including legislation, education,
communication, organization, and public relations, be it

RESOLVED, That this committee recommends:

(1) Continued and intensified action in support of the Randall bill for
protection of laboratory animals; amendment of the federal humane
slaughter law and enactment of new state humane slaughter laws; de­
velopment by The HSUS of a uniform code of anti-cruelty laws that can
be recommended to all state and local governments;

(2) Development by The HSUS of a comprehensive program in tech­
iques of education for humane leaders; increased education of public
officials, the general adult public, and school children through all existing
avenues; and support by all Branches, Affiliates, and individual humani­
tarians in development of the National Humane Education Center;

(3) Development of a program designed to improve communication
and understanding among international, national, state and local humane
organizations;

(4) Intensified effort in program development and establishment of
additional state branches, organization of new humane societies in at
least eighty communities of the nation, and continuing cooperation and
assistance to unaffiliated humane societies;

(5) Greater utilization of advertising and publicity in public relations
activities; and

(6) Full financial and moral support of The HSUS by all humanitarians
through gifts and bequests to implement inauguration and development
of these recommendations.

II—Laboratory animals

WHEREAS, in terms of the number of animals and magnitude of
cruelties involved, experimentation in laboratories ranks as one of the
three leading humane problems in the United States, and
WHEREAS, strong legislative controls applied to animal experimentation can eliminate virtually all of the cruelties which now exist in laboratories, and
WHEREAS, additional influential support can be gained by obtaining formal resolutions by local, state, regional and national associations of churches and civic organizations, be it
RESOLVED, That all local and national societies and individual members of humane societies heighten the program of informing the public of common laboratory cruelties, utilizing all available media, in pursuit of enactment of the Randall Bill, H.R. 4856, as the practical level of protection now attainable for laboratory animals.

III—Shelter policies and programs
WHEREAS, the operation of animal shelters for the rescue, care, and protection of animals and the policies and standards adopted and maintained by humane societies and city and county governments are a community responsibility and a means of public education, and
WHEREAS, fulfillment of these objectives depends on modernization and improvement of animal shelter and animal regulation programs, be it
RESOLVED, That this committee recommends, as initial steps:
(1) Adoption by public and private animal shelters of the policy of not placing unspayed female animals;
(2) Charges, as such, should not be made for services given directly to animals although a minimum gift or contribution, as reimbursement for costs of boarding or other out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the service provided, may be required in connection with animal placement services;
(3) Local humane societies should assume responsibility for observation and evaluation of pound operations in their communities, including the adequacy of existing ordinances, enforcement procedures and physical facilities, bringing the attention of the public to deficiencies with specific recommendations for improvements.

IV—Surplus breeding of cats and dogs
WHEREAS, the breeding of unwanted animals creates widespread suffering for animals, and a drastic reduction must be achieved in the breeding of kittens and puppies for which there can be no homes, and
WHEREAS, an estimated ninety per cent of America’s humane societies release unspayed female animals for adoption, and
WHEREAS, the humane movement itself should stop contributing to the surplus animal problem and means should be found by which all humane societies would adopt a policy that no female animal should be given out in adoption unless it has already been spayed or the society can make certain that it will be spayed, be it
RESOLVED, That this committee recommends:
(1) That, as a means of bringing public opinion, and that of supporters of humane work, to bear on societies that release unspayed females, The HSUS should publish an inexpensive one-page leaflet for insertion in mailing by societies and individuals, explaining that humane societies that place unspayed females are themselves adding to the suffering, and urging that individuals channel their contributions to humane societies who do adhere to the policy of requiring that all female animals adopted from their shelters be spayed, and
(2) That The HSUS initiate a program designed to offer guidance to societies in developing spaying programs.

V—Humane education programs
WHEREAS, humane societies are principally educational organizations with the role of informing the community of the needs of animals and the use of animals in the development of the psychology and character of children, and
WHEREAS, guidance in the effective use at all levels of humane education program materials and methods should be provided through consultation on a national level with leaders of education theory in elementary schools, colleges, and universities and through production of motion pictures, booklets, brochures and other audio-visual materials, be it
RESOLVED, That the American humane movement in its task of advancing the humane ethic through education
(1) Inaugurate and pursue a coordinated national program of humane education, using the professional methods of psychology, psychiatry, and educational methodology, and
(2) Participate in vigorous support of efforts of The HSUS in establishing and development of the National Humane Education Center as the most significant and far-reaching contribution to extending nationwide and world-wide the philosophy and the practice of true humanitarianism.

VI—Protection of wildlife from cruelty
WHEREAS, inhumane methods of fur trapping continue in the United States with no united effort by the American humane movement to abate this cruelty, and
WHEREAS, the hunting of animals for sport is regarded as an evil without a pretense of justification, be it
RESOLVED, That the humane movement take these actions to eliminate the cruelties of sport hunting and trapping:
(1) Obtain and distribute information on the development and use of humane traps, particularly in areas where trapping is a major industry;

(2) Inaugurate contests through humane education programs in schools, churches, and youth groups for essays, photography, posters, slogans, and speech contests on the subject of wildlife to foster understanding of responsibility for protection of wildlife;

(3) Acquire available legal reference material regarding game laws and encourage prosecution for violations of existing laws involving animals and birds, both wild and domestic, with greater publicity directed through news media and humane society bulletins of such prosecutions;

(4) Initiate legislation outlawing the use of steel leg-hold traps or the use of guns, traps, bows and arrows or other lethal weapons by children and teenagers and requiring inspection of trap lines every 24 hours.

VII—Laws and law enforcement

WHEREAS, legal safeguards for the protection of animals from cruelty and prosecution of cases of cruelty to animals are based almost exclusively on state laws enacted in the last quarter of the 19th century with few efforts toward improvement and strengthened enforcement, be it RESOLVED, That

(1) The HSUS issue appropriate analysis, warning and suggested approach for revision to all state and local humane organizations regarding the new American Law Institute model Penal Code as it relates to cruelty to animals;

(2) The HSUS re-evaluate the present state of attempts to control and prohibit dog and cat stealing and issue recommendations and proposals for effective remedial action; and

(3) The HSUS urge every local and state organization of the humane movement to seek an active, local, practicing attorney to serve on its Board of Directors.

Treasurer’s Report

By Edward M. Bostick, Falls Church, Va.

(This report, required by HSUS by-laws, was presented at the Corporation meeting.)

It is a pleasure to report to you, at this annual meeting, because our treasury is momentarily in better condition than at any other time in the last three years.

I hasten to say, however, that from the viewpoint of a Treasurer this is faint praise, even though encouraging. Our financial condition has been exceedingly precarious and often really frightening in the last three years and although the health of our treasury seems to be improving I cannot prudently say that the patient is out of danger. Nevertheless, I wish to put emphasis on the fact of improvement.

These are the facts.

In the first eight months of this year—through August 31—we received for our General, Reserve and Restricted Funds a total of $119,000 (I am going to round off the numbers throughout this report).

In the same period we spent, on general operating expenses, $109,000.

We contributed $6,500 to other humane societies and we made miscellaneous other disbursements of $500.

Income of the General, Reserve and Restricted Funds during the eight months exceeded the total of expenses, gifts and miscellaneous other disbursements by some $3,600. This is mighty close budgeting and shows very precise expense control. The surplus of income over expense was very small but the important fact is that it was a surplus. There have been comparable periods in the past when we ran large deficits.

I hope that you will be interested enough in the society’s finances to wish to study a breakdown of income and expenses. You will find a condensed but full statement of these items posted prominently in this room and copies of that statement are available for anyone who wants one.

I turn now to our balance sheet.

At August 31, 1963, the society had assets of $510,000. Our liabilities were only $13,200. Our net worth, therefore, was just under $500,000.

You will be terribly misled, however, if you do not attentively follow me in the remainder of this report. It is mouth-filling and pleasant to say that The HSUS has a net worth of a half-million dollars. But, as the statement posted prominently in this room reveals, most of our assets are in the form of trust funds which provide nothing at all, at this time, for the ordinary expenses of The HSUS. We hold some of these funds, indeed,
entirely for the benefit of other humane societies. Close to $200,000 of the total is held in trust for HSUS annuitants. Other large funds are held for the Boulder County Humane Society and for the Elsa Horne Voss Animal Welfare Foundation.

The annuity funds ultimately will flow into our operating funds, gradually over many years, and the other trust funds are financing and will continue to finance very useful humane work. We are proud to have been selected to administer such trusts. But I do emphasize to you that although these funds are assets they are not expendable for HSUS work now.

The total net worth of the General, Reserve and Restricted Funds—all of the funds that we can use in HSUS work of every kind—at August 31 was $98,500.

But that figure presents too bright a picture. A qualifying fact is that the assets of this calculation include some $62,000 in the form of accounts receivable and notes receivable, virtually none of which can be collected at this time and which probably will not be collected for several years. They represent loans made by The HSUS to HSUS Branches and to other humane societies.

Another $25,000 is restricted by the donor for use only when ultimately we build a headquarters building for The HSUS. It does not pay current bills.

Other assets are in the form of office equipment, motor vehicles and other properties that are used and useful but which cannot pay bills.

Figures like these are hard to follow by ear, I know, but the summary of them is easy to absorb. At August 31 our General and Reserve Funds were broke—busted. We owed $13,000 in current accounts payable and there was only $1,900 of cash to the credit of those operating funds in the bank.

I am happy to be able to tell you that this month things are looking a little better because we have received two generously substantial gifts. But I want to hammer home, as your Treasurer, the fact that despite the big numbers that result from totaling all of our funds together, including the trust funds held for other societies, our working treasury continues to be very dangerously small and in this last year has several times been actually non-existent.

As you have heard from our President earlier today, we are going to launch almost immediately a very powerful nation-wide drive for $2,000,000 to develop and endow the new National Humane Education Center. I hope and expect that every one of you—every humanitarian—will contribute generously to that special fund. I want to conclude this report by reminding you—and every humanitarian—that at the same time we need a continuing generous support for the HSUS itself.
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