(No. 15) -- Man's Greatest Cruelty to Animals
Humane Information Services, Inc.
Ritual Slaughter

Following publication of our Report No. 5, in which reference was made to the suf- fering of unanesthetized animals that are humane- ly slaughtered, we received a number of indignant letters from Jewish members, pro- testing the implication that ritual or kosher slaughter is completely humane, because the expert cutting of the car- rtot artery produces unconsciousness. Apparently without reading the remainder of the article which explained that it is the pre-slaughter handling, which gives rise to the suffering, they canceled their memberships and ordered us to remove their names from our mailing list.

We deeply regret this kind of misunder- standing. We wish to make it clear that Humane Information Services is in no way connected with the animals for the marked concern they have shown over the years for the suffering of people. But we will not be forced to accept the truth about ritual slaughter, just to save the feelings of some of our good friends of the Jewish faith, or to secure their contrib- utions.

Kosher Slaughter

The Holy Torah (Jewish laws) took great precautions to guard against the infliction of pain upon animals slaughtered. The five major laws of Jewish ritual slaughter, or ritual slaughtering, however, were designed to eliminate pain. They require that the shochet, when the head and throat of the animal, for the purpose of bringing it into H...
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may be discovered later when the carcasses are inspected might be transmitted to a healthy cow or killed in the floor after being cut. What is needed, therefore, is a device for positioning the animal's head and thorax so that it can be either cast or shanked and hoisting or hoisting and hoisting of conscious ani-

ments. This means some kind of a holding pen.

The American SPCA, in New York City, in cooperation with other humane organizations, has already spent large sums of money, on work extending over a long period of years, in an attempt to develop such holding pens. Success was attained in the case of a holding pen for large beef cattle, developed by the Stockmen Brothers Meat Packers of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. However, there has been little or no success in developing a good holding pen for small animals. "baby beavers", calves, sheep and lambs. We understand that the American SPCA is no longer working on this problem.

Mr. John C. Macfarlane, vice-president of the Massachusetts SPCA in charge of its livestock department, apparently believes that it is possible to develop a unit suitable for all species and weights of animals that may be handled in the present available holding pen for large animals.

If such a pen can be and is inverted and moved to suit requirements of the USDA, state sanitary officials, the packers, and other interested parties in the community, the way would be paved for solution of the whole problem of pre-slaughter handling.

We are not expert in these mechanical matters, but we wonder why the Danish Welfare pen, used in Israel, could not be adapted to United States requirements. We understand that it is considered by packers to be too complex and costly.

What Should Be Done?

Some concerned humanitarians think it best to attempt once more to gain acceptance of the principle of pre-slaughter holding pens for large animals, leaving that for other species and weights for later action after a suitable pen for smaller animals has been developed.

Others would press now for humane slaughter laws in the various states now having them, such as New York, containing the same ritual exces as do present federal and state laws, until the small-animal holding pen is ready. This would at least bring more humane practices in the treatment of animals to the same status as that of the fowl. Some humanitarians do not agree with this, as too complex or costly.

These humanitarians even doubt that these humane practices could be adapted to large, since the animal is subjected to a series of manipulations which, although not physically injurious, may create tremendous psychological trauma. They see in the insistence on "human" slaughtering methods that the animal does not appear to them to be an arbitrary and completely illogical interpretation of the original prohibition against cruelty.

Electrical stunning before shackling and hoisting, they believe, would not violate the religious prohibiton that the animal should be "healthy and normal" when cut, since the animal's body would not undergo any physical change. They believe that electrical stunning would be a sanitary procedure. The sanitary prohibition of casting to the floor, or fire or other regulations applying to the sanitary condition of the pre-slaughter holding pen, was conducted. Why then, they ask, should animals be subjected to more than the necessities of sanitation? They believe that really is nothing more than a tradition which is imposed upon animals by a majority of the Orthodox, and to the union of kosher slaughterers?

A second viewpoint, who believe that all effective opposition to applying to all slaughter the humane methods now required for kosher slaughter, will not only, if a massive educational program was conducted in the Jewish community. The only reason why that is not the present policy, they say, is the fact that most Jews do not know the facts. Once they do, it is believed, they will change the policies of the Jewish community. The real truth, they say, is that everybody concerned has been "pussycatting" about the Jewish community. The solution, they say, is that every Jew in the United States, it is claimed, and the demand for humane slaughter in the Jewish community itself would be so great that it would over-whelm the remaining minority. And the Jewish community is the only remaining barrier to the spread of humane practices in this country. The reduction of theanimus of the Jewish community was the chief weapon in the anti-Semitic campaign.

Others feel strongly that it is an issue to bring to the fore at the next national conference of humanitarians and that the solutions to any important issue or significant sugges-
tion naturally because some people might be of-
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SLAUGHTER Conditions in Foreign Countries

Conditions surrounding the slaughter of animals vary everywhere and usually are even worse than they were in the United States prior to passage of the humane slaughter laws. In Brazil and some northern European countries are ex-

cellent. We have heard that the Soviet Union has passed laws regarding the humane slaughter of cattle and that they use electricity for heavy cattle. In many cases, however, the conditions are primitive and barbaric, espe-
cially in South America.

In Europe, however, much cruelty are in connection with transportation of the ani-

mals to be slaughtered, and too, there are railroads equipped for trucks, water transportation is frequently used. Ani-

mals may be loaded on river barges by cruel methods, or tied to the sides of the vessels for the long and painful trip. (See SLAUGHTER, page 3)

What is Being Done Now in Foreign Countries?

With the International Society for the Protection of Animals and the World Federation for the Protection of Animals, have done some excellent missionary work to improve slaughter conditions in various countries. The use of humane stunning equipment, and in some cases donating the equipment to small slaughter plants that could not afford it. Some foreign national or local so-
cieties also have participated. In Jamaica, for example, the SPCA has been engaged in humane slaughter, with the cooperation of the Jamaica Agricultural Society. An attempt was even made recently to handle the problem. It is trying to

before the journey to market begins, or after the journey is completed. Wild cattle may have their eyes punched out, to make them more easy to handle in loading or unloading. In some countries, to the point of slaughter. They may be prodded with a pole called the "ferray", a device which is jabbed into the animal's flesh or eyes. Once in the packing plant, after all this brutality, the animal is subjected to further cruelty resembling those used in the United States before passage of the humane slaughter laws. Animal cruelty, we should point out, does not only encountered include some which are even more cruel than those already mentioned. In some countries packers use a long bar with a chisel-like shape the end on to stun cattle. Why then, they ask, should we press now for humane slaughter laws in the United States, when the Soviet Union has passed laws regarding the humane slaughter of cattle and that they use electricity for heavy cattle?
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we must follow instead a "wholesale" approach. The requirements to be imposed upon the United States by passage of the federal and state humane slaughter laws.

 obligatory to ascertain, nobody has even proposed a concrete, "whole-
sale" approach to the problem. Yet, the difficulties encountered in this action seem to be substantially less than those which attended passage of the United States laws.

One of many inhumane ways of handling food animals on their way to meat-packing plants is the carcass unloading. In the absence of a procedure, several live cattle are hoisted over the side of a ship. Many times a horn breaks, or the animal becomes loose and falls on the deck or railing of the ship, breaking its legs and ribs. Occasionally an animal suffers a broken neck or severe cervical strain.

Fortunately, the more advanced meat-packing plants now use more humane methods of handling animals in the plants. Demonstrating new, humane -- and also safer -- methods of slaughter would require the cooperation of all countries involved.

The suffering of the millions of animals undergoing inhumane slaughter in the United States and abroad represents a humane problem of the greatest magnitude.

The need for cooperation and coordination of efforts of humane societies in dealing with the inhumane slaughter is well illustrated in the enactment, during the last days of the 91st Congress, of P.L. 91-579, the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, which was signed into law on September 8, 1970.

This bill requires the cooperation and coordination of efforts of the various national humane societies. It provides a complete reorganization of the existing legislative machinery for handling the operation of humane legislation, who had very vigorously supported it. One of the important contributions of the Rogers-Javits bill is the establishment of a Council for Humane Legislation. This would greatly improve the so-called "housekeeping" activities for Humane legislation. Furthermore, a Comprehensive Legislative Review Board was created to help the humane movement.

This overall strategy for dealing with the problem could be developed at a meeting of the national humane societies. This should be a working group, composed of people who are knowledgeable about the problems and have a broad background in the field of humane legislation, and are not represented on the Council. The Council appears to have the potential to be a strong and effective body, and our organizations are working together to consider strategy and decide upon an overall program. However, the success of the humanitarians who are most knowledgeable and experienced in this field will be greatly facilitated if they are not divided among different national humane societies.

Third, this overall strategy for dealing with the problem should be developed at a meeting of the national humane societies. This should be a working group, composed of people who are knowledgeable about the problems and have a broad background in the field of humane legislation, and are not represented on the Council. The Council appears to have the potential to be a strong and effective body, and our organizations are working together to consider strategy and decide upon an overall program. However, the success of the humanitarians who are most knowledgeable and experienced in this field will be greatly facilitated if they are not divided among different national humane societies.

Despite this auspicious beginning, we believe that the Council has excellent possibilities for developing and carrying on a successful program of humane animal legislation. We feel that it should be given a new start by a complete reorganization of its present structure, with all interested national and international organizations being given an opportunity to participate.
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CRUEL KILLER DRUG

SUCCE tYLCOLCHOLINE

As part of its continuing action program dealing with euthanasia (see Report to Humane Societies, 1970, page 27), Humane Information Services has been trying to eliminate use of the cruel drug succinylocholine chloride (succinylcholine). This drug is used to immobilize and kill animals for destruction, and to prevent them from suffering during their sacrifice. A lethal dose of the drug produces death by immobilizing the respiration organs, along with the other muscles, causing fatal suffocation. But there is no depression action on the brain, and the experimental subject is capable of communicating his suffering. A physician discussing an operating technique in which a less-than-lethal dose of the drug is used warned against an overdose, which he described "as a kick". They tied one end of a rope to the rear bumper of an automobile, and then drove off at high speed, the dog being dragged, until it either died from the strain or was killed by the enforcement officer. Naturally, this fiendish act aroused the indignation of the community in which it occurred. The state's attorney, in order to obtain the maximum punishment allowed to obtai n a conviction because the appli cation of laws used the words "any horse, cat-
ttle or other beast". The judge upheld the defendant's argument that the word "beast" covers non-combatant animals. One of the men then was prosecuted under a misdemeanor law which contains the word "animal", and was convicted. The other man meanwhile had skipped back to his home in the North. Humane societies in other states have en countered similar difficulties in obtaining convictions. One reason is that the applicable anti-cruelty laws in many states display signs of a common origin, probably the result of humane societies copying the inad equate laws of other states trying to obtain passage of legislation. A recent example of this pitfall is the "Model State Law for Prohibiting Use of SUCCE tYLCOLCHOLINE CHLORIDE FOR Destroying Animals". Committee of the American Veterinary Medical Association, which in no way could reproduce euthanasia is strongly condemned.

We discovered that succinylocholine chloride is used throughout the United States in large hun man-eat animal shelter with a man familiar to every humanitarian, in the belief that it wanted to ensure humane handling, although it took us a year to convince the society's management that they were wrong. They im plemented their plan and see the drug in actual use, although of course they would have sold us nothing since they would have been able to fabricate the drug and cannot con tinue its intense suffering. Fortunately, we were able to get action in this matter without the society's help, which would have made it impossible to interfere with their shelter, and in the event that succinylocholine chloride had been used in their animal shelter, we would have ended up干涉 theirs. The head of his department has admitted to us that the drug is not suitable for euthanasia, although he has not stopped the veterinarian from continuing this practice. Ho wever he will be there with it.

If Humane Information Services had never done anything else during its three years of existence, it feels that work has paid off. If dogs and cats "put to sleep" each year by this cruel drug, our existence would have been fully justified.

Now we are working on a veterinarian who is field representative of the department of public health for the state. He travels the state visiting shelters and pounds, to which he has been recon nected with the help of the society for "euthanasia". The head of his department has admitted to us that the drug is not suitable for euthanasia, although he has not stopped the veterinarian from continuing this practice. But he will be there with it.

If you know of any humane society or public pound using succinylocholine chloride (succinylcholine) or "tranquilizing", please get in touch with us immediately. We will endeavor to see that you will not be embarrassed by your use of it.

Only if a society refuses to consider the evidence, and clearly indicates that it is indifferent to animal suffering in euthanasia, will we resort to publicity. Our only objective is to reduce animal suffering.

This is an example of one of the action programs in which Humane Information Services is now engaging, and therefore is reporting its progress to you. In some future issue of this Report to Humanitarians we will review our progress to date, and in the meantime, we will continue our efforts to eliminate use of succinylcholine chloride.

Important Contribution to Preparation and Enforcement of Laws Affecting Animal Welfare

Many state laws and local ordinances affecting animals are very loosely worded, making difficult to enforce. Most of these laws were passed years ago, when the legislators were dominated by the rural vote, and the laws are stated in terms that are more applicable to a bygone era of farming and livestock than to today's agribusiness and urban environment.

A rather typical result is to be observed in what happened in Florida when two young men took a visitor from a northern state, went to obtain some "kicks". They tied one end of a rope to the rear bumper of an automobile, and then drove off at high speed, the dog being dragged, until it either died from the strain or was killed by the enforcement officer. Naturally, this fiendish act aroused the indignation of the community in which it occurred. The state's attorney, in order to obtain the maximum punishment allowed to obtain a conviction because the application of laws used the words "any horse, cat-
ttle or other beast". The judge upheld the defendant's argument that the word "beast" covers non-combatant animals. One of the men then was prosecuted under a misdemeanor law which contains the word "animal", and was convicted. The other man meanwhile had skipped back to his home in the North. Humane societies in other states have encountered similar difficulties in obtaining convictions. One reason is that the applicable anti-cruelty laws in many states display signs of a common origin, probably the result of humane societies copying the inadequate laws of other states trying to obtain passage of legislation.

A recent example of this pitfall is the "Model State Law for Prohibiting Use of SUCCE tYLCOLCHOLINE CHLORIDE FOR Destroying Animals". Committee of the American Veterinary Medical Association, which in no way could reproduce euthanasia is strongly condemned.

We discovered that succinylocholine chloride is used throughout the United States in large humane animal shelter with a man familiar to every humanitarian, in the belief that it wanted to ensure humane handling, although it took us a year to convince the society's management that they were wrong. They implemented their plan and see the drug in actual use, although of course they would have sold us nothing since they would have been able to fabricate the drug and cannot continue its intense suffering. Fortunately, we were able to get action in this matter without the society's help, which would have made it impossible to interfere with their shelter, and in the event that succinylocholine chloride had been used in their animal shelter, we would have ended up interfering with theirs. The head of his department has admitted to us that the drug is not suitable for euthanasia, although he has not stopped the veterinarian from continuing this practice. But he will be there with it.

If Humane Information Services had never done anything else during its three years of existence, it feels that work has paid off. If dogs and cats "put to sleep" each year by this cruel drug, our existence would have been fully justified.

Now we are working on a veterinarian who is field representative of the department of public health for the state. He travels the state visiting shelters and pounds, to which he has been reconnected with the help of the society for "euthanasia". The head of his department has admitted to us that the drug is not suitable for euthanasia, although he has not stopped the veterinarian from continuing this practice. But he will be there with it.

If you know of any humane society or public pound using succinylocholine chloride (succinylcholine) or "tranquilizing", please get in touch with us immediately. We will endeavor to see that you will not be embarrassed by your use of it.

Only if a society refuses to consider the evidence, and clearly indicates that it is indifferent to animal suffering in euthanasia, will we resort to publicity. Our only objective is to reduce animal suffering.

This is an example of one of the action programs in which Humane Information Services is now engaging, and therefore is reporting its progress to you. In some future issue of this Report to Humanitarians we will review our progress to date, and in the meantime, we will continue our efforts to eliminate use of succinylcholine chloride.