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REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS

LABORATORY ANIMALS A CONTINUING PROBLEM

When the Rogers-Javits bill died in Committee in the 91st Congress, the noisy tone of concern and the gentle advocacy that should be done to reduce animal suffering in biomedical laboratories seemed to die with it. In the past, leaders in the effort to deal realistically with this problem have not forgotten the momentous implications of its failure. It had been made toward an eventual solution. If all of the major sources of animal suffering are classified as momentous, this is much more than a passing of the hope that may be proved necessary, by way of the proposals of others. The punitive approach, which is small appropriation for administration of amendments. One of the biggest stumbling blocks of conditions relating to laboratory animal usage in the laboratories. Many of the objections that we know some of our readers with very strong beliefs. It will object and including other things which we do not believe but know would be popular. If we insist that the laboratories prove their accommodations for the animals, then fight against any provision of money for this purpose, there is little wonder that Congress may be led to question our sanity.

Nevertheless, any humanitarian familiar with the way the system works must be left with a great deal of satisfaction and a marked progress achieved in dealing with the procurement, housing and care of laboratory animals.

On what I feel that the first phase of the laboratory animal front, our test is to Penns the power of public opinion to get the Enact the animal, and give the Act time to work, meanwhile keeping on our ears, getting the need for vote, gaining.appropriations and effective administration.

(Continued in second column)

Merry Christmas All of us at Humane Information Services wish all of our readers a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. May your rewards for your work be as great as your devotion to the animals.

[More Hope for Laboratory Animals]

(Continued in third column)

With some humanitarians, we could substantially increase our dues and contributions. But that would merely be benefiting the scientists and the animals, and our uncompensated officials are not interested in that kind of accomplishment. So, we hope that our readers will go through the rest of this article with an open mind, and forgive us if we express some viewpoints that may not be altogether to agree.

Three Potential Fields of Improvement

All of the potential ways of reducing the suffering of laboratory animals can be grouped under three headings:

1. Improving the procurement, housing and care of laboratory animals. During the 91st Congress, the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, which greatly improved and extended the provisions of Public Law 72-544, passed several years ago: hearings and regional meetings of the administrative staff were held, with humane societies, including Humane Information Services, participating. The passage and now the implementation of this Act provide a great illustration of the effect of cooperation as opposed to fighting among humane societies and scientists. Although much of the progress promised by this Act through the 91st Congress can be given to Mrs. Christine Stevens of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the fate of the National Institutes of Health Appropriation has been disappointing. Congress has passed several years ago: hearings and regional meetings of the administrative staff were held, with humane societies, including Humane Information Services, participating. The passage and now the implementation of this Act provide a great illustration of the effect of cooperation as opposed to fighting among humane societies and scientists. Although much of the progress promised by this Act through the 91st Congress can be given to Mrs. Christine Stevens of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the fate of the National Institutes of Health Appropriation has been disappointing.

2. Greater communication between humanitarians and scientists, so that each group understands the other's viewpoints and progress and the public are not willing to give credit to the other side. They feel so strongly about past against another appropriation intended to provide funds needed for improved housing. Congress had not sufficed had the scientific community offered any strenuous opposition. This illustrates the value of cooperation to obtain that objective.

Although not every aspect of the procurement, housing, and care of laboratory animals will be completely subject to needed corrective action by this Act, conditions will be vastly improved.

The Act provides a convenient vehicle upon which to place any additional provisions that may be desired. Any other approach is not feasible. One of the biggest stumbling blocks yet to be overcome is the much too slow implementation of the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, which was passed by Congress. Here, again, it seems likely that a more effective approach to this problem, with the help of sound organization, will not have sufficed had the scientific community offered any strenuous opposition. This illustrates the value of cooperation to obtain that objective.

Although not every aspect of the procurement, housing, and care of laboratory animals will be completely subject to needed corrective action by this Act, conditions will be vastly improved.
LABORATORY ANIMALS — from page 1

The most important scientific discoveries have been made as a result of indirect results of fortuitous findings in the search for knowledge for its own sake. There is no lack of certain scientists who ever agree to permit humanitarians or bureaucrats or any other authority to determine what is a legitimate laboratory research project, since all of them have the indefatigable search for knowledge as a goal or excuse to pursue one way or another.

Tests, on the other hand, being conducted directly for the benefit of people, certainly can be legislated against. The objections to scientists from the standpoint of whether or not their people-benefits more than offset their pain-suffering is a direct issue, but the scientists can say that if we give them responsibility for protecting people from harmful substances, we must give them authority to determine what tests are "necessary".

Altogether, such mainly subjective judgments do not offer much hope for any meeting of the minds regarding what is "necessary" or "unnecessary". We need some other kind of a definition.

The one possible basis for agreement among scientists and humanitarians is the following: Unnecessary pain or suffering is that which could be eliminated by meeting the requirements, or provisions, of the substantive purposes of the experiment or test.

Dr. Reverend Charles R. Herrick, Sr., who exudes an aura of rectitude and reasonableness which usually can disarm the most intransigent person, has not been audible primarily on the subject of a good many biomedical scientists. The net result of these discussions, conduct while the Reverend Herrick was a staff member of the HSUS, was to reveal that the best scientists, recognized authorities in their field, can be quite unsatisfactory on the subject of the spin-off benefits to a good many biomedical scientists. The Reverend Herrick, Jr., who has received so much more attention in human circles because, first, it is a test of the antivivisectionists for complete elimination of animals, and, second, because it is possible to describe some of the technical aspects of "replacement", which few humanitarians could understand even if they tried.

Reduction

The late Fred Myers, a remarkable man, when he was president of HSUS some years ago, was quite familiar with the possibilities of "reduction" and "replacement," the former seems to have the right and left to gradually or perhaps even recover in pain and discomfort, when there existed no such protective arrangement.

We understand that many laboratories already have been functioning in this manner, under the purpose of giving more pre-examination of projects and procedures than has been true in the past. This willingness undoubtedly will find it desirable to set up standards of their own, in order to avoid testing findings solely on the basis of the individual circumstances applying to each case. Obviously, advantages would be derived by the in-house committees who are sometimes occasionally to compare notes, assisted by some informal or even formal federating group. From this might very well grow some movement toward reaching peer agreement on voluntary standards which would serve as a guide to the in-house committees in other laboratories.

If some voluntary arrangement of this kind could be brought to pass, it is possible to conceive of a normal, formal and regular communication between reasonable and informed humane groups and any federal regulatory committees. This would indeed be a potentially rewarding arrangement, leaving the laboratories to accomplish the needed reforms without looking back to the observance or the observance of the standards which would be enforced by the federal administrative agency. Secondly, recognizing that most of the scientists have recognized both the need for improvement of their standards which would be enforced by the administrative agency did so, they would have an ongoing committee of scientists in each laboratory, responsible for enforcement of the standards.

The second thought is that any voluntary arrangement, which few humanitarians could understand, of this kind could be brought to pass, it is possible to conceive of a normal, formal and regular communication between reasonable and informed humane groups and any federal regulatory committees. This would indeed be a potentially rewarding arrangement, leaving the laboratories to accomplish the needed reforms without looking back to the observance or the observance of the standards which would be enforced by the federal administrative agency. Secondly, recognizing that most of the scientists have recognized both the need for improvement of their administrative agency did so, they would have an ongoing committee of scientists in each laboratory, responsible for enforcement of the standards.

If the second thought is that any voluntary arrangement of this kind could be brought to pass, it is possible to conceive of a normal, formal and regular communication between reasonable and informed humane groups and any federal regulatory committees. This would indeed be a potentially rewarding arrangement, leaving the laboratories to accomplish the needed reforms without looking back to the observance or the observance of the standards which would be enforced by the federal administrative agency. Secondly, recognizing that most of the scientists have recognized both the need for improvement of their administrative agency did so, they would have an ongoing committee of scientists in each laboratory, responsible for enforcement of the standards.

The net result of these discussions, conduct while the Reverend Herrick was a staff member of the HSUS, was to reveal that the best scientists, recognized authorities in their field, can be quite unsatisfactory on the subject of the spin-off benefits to a good many biomedical scientists. The Reverend Herrick, Jr., who has received so much more attention in human circles because, first, it is a test of the antivivisectionists for complete elimination of animals, and, second, because it is possible to describe some of the technical aspects of "replacement", which few humanitarians could understand even if they tried.
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We understand that many laboratories already have been functioning in this manner, under the purpose of giving more pre-examination of projects and procedures than has been true in the past. This willingness undoubtedly will find it desirable to set up standards of their own, in order to avoid testing findings solely on the basis of the individual circumstances applying to each case. Obviously, advantages would be derived by the in-house committees who are sometimes occasionally to compare notes, assisted by some informal or even formal federating group. From this might very well grow some movement toward reaching peer agreement on voluntary standards which would serve as a guide to the in-house committees in other laboratories.
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The late Fred Myers, a remarkable man, when he was president of HSUS some years ago, was quite familiar with the possibilities of "reduction" and "replacement," the former seems to have the right and left to gradually or perhaps even recover in pain and discomfort, when there existed no such protective arrangement. We understand that many laboratories already have been functioning in this manner, under the purpose of giving more pre-examination of projects and procedures than has been true in the past. This willingness undoubtedly will find it desirable to set up standards of their own, in order to avoid testing findings solely on the basis of the individual circumstances applying to each case. Obviously, advantages would be derived by the in-house committees who are sometimes occasionally to compare notes, assisted by some informal or even formal federating group. From this might very well grow some movement toward reaching peer agreement on voluntary standards which would serve as a guide to the in-house committees in other laboratories.

If some voluntary arrangement of this kind could be brought to pass, it is possible to conceive of a normal, formal and regular communication between reasonable and informed humane groups and any federal regulatory committees. This would indeed be a potentially rewarding arrangement, leaving the laboratories to accomplish the needed reforms without looking back to the observance or the observance of the standards which would be enforced by the federal administrative agency. Secondly, recognizing that most of the scientists have recognized both the need for improvement of their administrative agency did so, they would have an ongoing committee of scientists in each laboratory, responsible for enforcement of the standards.
LABORATORY ANIMALS — from page 2 as statistically deficient the article, which did not report number of animals, 217 of 265 experiments employed inadequate or inappropriate procedures. Remarkably large reductions in number of animals used in these experiments were unreported by proper design and analytical procedures. When one considers the great amount of laboratory animals used in the United States, the extent of the wastage caused by this failure to follow established research procedures, not to mention the great dangers of stifling scientific progress, scientists as well as humanitarians must be appalled.

All matters related to the use of animals in biomedical laboratories, by far the most sensitive is the freedom of researchers to pursue their experiments without outside hindrance of any kind. There are very good reasons for this sensitivity. Others have pointed out with dangers as censorship of the press. But does this mean that the researchers should be allowed to do their work without any kind of effective review by their peers, with a view to making procedural suggestions designed to improve the prospective quality of the results, which incidentally would also lead to reduced wastage? Several potential uses of available funds for biomedical research of real benefit to the public would be added to those already realized with supervision of the research should stand by statistically while animals are used. The experiments of which only four percent are judged to have been both well analyzed and well designed.

Can any reasonable scientist feel that he is fair, and speaking in the best interests of his subject, that animals are being used to satisfy all humanitarians concerned with these matters as antivivisectionists and crutchpots? An article that deals with the presentation of good statistical procedures in biomedical research, although it would produce some very bad statistical procedures, would not carry the danger of stifling initiative, and of preventing some highly original and productive animal experiments, which might mean the death of the study, crudely, which may lead others to come up with good ideas and good statistical procedures. But voluntary assistance by scientific peers, to alert the researcher to the dan­ germ with some specific results, a statistic­ al analysis and call his attention to re­ sources for assistance in these fields, could be a source of encouragement to the researcher as well as the potential public health beneficiaries of the work. And it could also prevent a substantial reduction in the number of animals used.

Here, again, the finger points to the poten­ tial role of effective in-house commit­ tees.

Replacement

The possibilities of reducing the number of animals used in the laboratories by replacing them with non-sentient or less­ sentient biological models have been real­ ized by many scientists and by a few humanitarians for well over a decade. The writer made a trip to Europe in 1964 especially to help persuade scientists in that country to work with animals. But voluntary assistance by scientific peers, to alert the researcher to the dan­ germ with some specific results, a statistic­ al analysis and call his attention to re­ sources for assistance in these fields, could be a source of encouragement to the researcher as well as the potential public health beneficiaries of the work. And it could also prevent a substantial reduction in the number of animals used.

The Rogers-Javits bill. Those to be "sold" are Congress and the general public, and the scientists whose evaluations will be accept­ ed over those of any lay humanitarians. And to "sell" them, exaggerated claims and obvious technical ignorance are exactly opposite to an effective approach.

Since our Report No. 10 was issued we have sent it to scientists and humane organiza­ tions that in recent years have special­ ized in animal replacement. We have so­ licited critical analysis. In all that time, not one communication has been receiv­ ed by the Antivivisection Society. We have received significant positive response from the scientific and humanitarians on the research committee. Despite the exaggerated and astounding uninformative propaganda about replacement which circulates among humanitarians both in this country and abroad, replacement does have very real possibilities for reducing the use of animals in biomedical laboratories.

One of the most effective ways of getting such support is through the coop­ eration of those scientists who are most aware of the possibilities of replacement methods, and have been actively working in the various fields of replacement. They can benefit by working with enlightened humanitarians to obtain greater support from Congress and others.

Prospective Action

In the foregoing review of what can be done industriously to reduce the use of animals, stress has been placed on the de­ sirability of working for voluntary action by the biomedical scientists and laborator­ ies. Certainly there is little prospect of obtaining the needed action by legislation in the near future, partly because of the seeming impossibility of every per­ sonalizing humanitarians to agree on any potentially ef­ fective measure which has a real chance of success.

Voluntary action, on the other hand, can be promoted by individuals con­tacting and supporting the same individuals, encouraging evidence that such communication between scientists and humanitarians could be effective in pursuing mutually-desirable ends.

Emily bosses Doc around, but Teddy bosses her. He has the final word on everything.

If there is to be effective communica­ tion, it must be initiated by humane socie­ ties that would like to do such communications, de­ sired not, or for intransigence and violent antagonism to scientists. And the individ­ uals involved with the humane movement must be acceptable to scientists as well informed and objective. Such a re­ presentation must first of all be what he is talking about, and be able to use the scientists' language. He should have desirable personal characteristics such as compassion and abil­ ity to get along with and influence people. And he must be able to devote full time to this specialized assignment for an indeter­ mine period of time, with necessary funds provided.

Obviously, nobody now active in the hu­ mane movement fulfills all of these require­ ments. But if such a person is found, then it will be necessary to go out and find him. And it will take a very substantial sum for salary and expenses. The only society, apparently, with sufficient­ interest in and understanding of the pro­ blem of funding replacement possibilities, is a project in the Humane Society of the United States. At the ESU annual conven­ tion in January of this year, the commit­ tees had voted to provide funds to employ a specialist in this field. Humane Inform­ ations Service, of course, may have to speak in any way for the ESU, but we hope that they will proceed in the directions outlined.

We also hope that the ESU will not make the mistake of putting the cart before the horse, by starting out with specific plans for action programs designed to promote replace­ ment, or other specific measures.

We are interested in and are hoping to find and to try to find some consensus of opinion among well-informed and interested scien­ tists regarding the possibilities, limita­ tions and priorities of different approa­ches. That should take at least a year of work after not much has been done. He should be free of the kind of pulling and pulling in different directions of which some humanitarians are guilty. He should avoid any appearance of favoring one side than knowledge might be guilty. He must have the opportunity to exercise great independence and find out what is expected of him. Above all, he should not have to start balancing off the viewpoints of different groups, but everybody.

In any approach of this kind, much will depend upon the training and ability of the men selected to do the job, and the kind of over-all direction he receives. From what we have learned about the scientific re­quirements of this approach, we are distinctly encouraged.

One potential result of this project is to bring together those humanitarians who are interested in the possible findings needed to bring up to date the very fine and useful book published in 1959, The Principles of Ethical Conduct. This was a report of work conducted under university research grants supervised by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, of London, England. With this book brought up to date, a man in a much better position to sift the wheat from the chaff and come up with some workable program.

Human Information Services from its be­ ginning has been particularly interested in improving the conditions of the laboratory animals. We are encouraged to believe that, following passage of the memorable Animal Welfare Act of 1965, progress will be made. As significant developments occur, we will continue to keep our readers advised.

"What's the matter with them?"

Some of our readers who have been looking forward to and inquiring about prospective articles on various subjects may well ask, after reading this Report, "What's the mat­ ter with them?" I thought we were going to write about euthanasia methods, or progress on the legislative front, or humane educa­ tions or food animals. We have not. Some have been asking when we will put out another News About Animals, or a complete Humane Legislation Review. We have learned that such reportage is not the kind of material which will appeal to all of you. And we are encouraged to believe that, following passage of the memorable Animal Welfare Act of 1965, progress will be made. As significant developments occur, we will continue to keep our readers advised.

(Continued in second column)
GRATIFYING PROGRESS OF H.I.S., INC.

This issue marks the completion of the sixth year since Humane Information Services was incorporated. This past year has been devoted to a great many of our major plans and other equipment, getting our mailing list started, assembling research materials, and doing research in preparation for our series of analytical articles about humane problems and alternatives to these Reports. The first Report to Humanitarians was issued in September of 1967, and since then it has been issued quarterly.

These have been six years of most gratifying progress. It has been gratifying for three reasons: first, because our costs have been reducing, although much of our work has been devoted to laying long-run plans and preparing action programs to carry them out; (2) we have established a very pleasant personal relationship with many of our members, and their involvement in going gets them experiencing exceeding our fondest expectations.

Growth in Members

Our membership and readership have reflected this acceptance, growing substantially. We now have members in every state, and our Reports reach a large percentage of individual humanitarians and practically all humane societies in this country. We have used bulk mailing lists, telephone books, dog license lists, newspaper advertisements or any other source of information. Practically all of the 15,000 names on our mailing list were sent to us by members. That is, we have not sent one single uninterested person, but mostly dedicated animal lovers who take an active part in humane work. It is, therefore, natural that they do not receive our Reports. We deeply appreciate the help of those members who have assisted us in obtaining our 15,000 names. Our success has been based on no small measure upon this cooperation. Please keep it up.

If our mailing list were three times as large, derived from miscellaneous sources, our Readership and membership would not gain more influence. From the standpoint of agitation, the number of names is about as large as any other national humane society. And we have plenty of evidence that the Readercordist contains names, who receive our Reports, because they contain the kind of material that means something. So, we have growth in all things, and more than in members of humanitarians reached.

Influence in Humane Movement

The influence is shown by the continuing flow of letters received from all over the world, complimenting our work and thanking us for publications and other assistance. In our last Christmas issue we included excerpts from a few of these letters, and could use quite a number more. The fact that we have received in 1971. But this might be seen as being rather the point. These complimentsoplained that their friends don't learn what is going on to our heads! We exist not for personal ego-satisfaction but to help the animals.

We are proud of our Readership Percent.

Until 1971 the only regular members of our staff were Emily P. Gleckler, secretary-treasurer, and Arthur "Burt" Brainerd, director, chairman and president. This year, however, we added another full-time officer, Arthur "Burt" Brainerd, director, chairman and president. This year, however, we added another full-time officer, Arthur "Burt" Brainerd, director, chairman and president. We have represented a 50 percent increase in our staff but do not judge our progress by the number of employees. Each of our staff works many hours over the conventional 30-hour week, including weekends. We have but one paid field man, with travel expenses, to try and do the work that would require an amount of money as large as our entire operating budget. If they desire, we can do most for the animals by giving until it hurts -- a little! We don't want you to suffer when Santa Claus comes to your own domicile -- but neither do we want the animals to suffer because of giving too little or in the wrong way.

Influence in Humane Movement

The influence is shown by the continuing flow of letters received from all over the world, complimenting our work and thanking us for publications and other assistance. In our last Christmas issue we included excerpts from a few of these letters, and could use quite a number more. The fact that we have received in 1971. But this might be seen as being rather the point. These complimentsoplained that their friends don't learn what is going on to our heads! We exist not for personal ego-satisfaction but to help the animals.

Humane Information Services is so means only a source of information about humane problems and alternative solutions of these problems. We try not to duplicate the work of other societies, but when other societies have performed some highly important work we conduct our own action programs.

These include (1) developing better methods of euthanasia for animal shelters and pounds, and promoting their adoption; (2) developing and implementing humane methods of killing the millions of milk utilized for fur garments; (3) developing new ways of reaching the public with humane education; (4) developing and promoting new programs for control of surplus breeding of dogs and cats; (5) developing and furnishing technical materials and coordinating the National Association for Humane Legislation and other societies in obtaining much-needed humane legislation.

All of these and other action programs are underway at Humane Information Services. Progress sometimes is painfully slow, almost entirely because of lack of funds. We have carefully prepared, complete plans of action in each case. The elements that are lacking are manpower and money for expenses. We have run out of qualified people who are willing to work for nothing! What we desperately need for our actions to become "results" is not, like a paid field man, with travel expenses, to try and do the work that would require an amount of money as large as our entire operating budget. If they desire, we can do most for the animals by giving until it hurts -- a little! We don't want you to suffer when Santa Claus comes to your own domicile -- but neither do we want the animals to suffer because of giving too little or in the wrong way.

Action Programs Need Support

Poor old Doc! Emily puts him to work repairing a shed roof.

Budget Does Not Measure Accomplishments

If Humane Information Services had to hire all of this work done, paying competitive salaries, and hiring office expenses ordinarily required to provide what we have here, our budget for present operations literally would be tens of times greater than it is. So, dear members, please do not judge our contribution to the humane movement by the small size of our budget, which is little more than one percent of the annual expenditures of some other humane societies. We are glad to compare our record of actual accomplishments with that of any other national humane organization, even the most wealthy.

Urgent Needs for Additional Funds

Above all, do not conclude from the general tone of satisfaction expressed in the preceding paragraphs that we are at all content to rest on our present accomplishments. Quite the contrary! We have reached a point where important projects must be given a halt, and others just can't be undertaken, because we have already reached or passed the limits of our present capacity, so that we need much more money and more manpower for specific programs. Some of these needs are described in an accompanying article.

LET US KNOW IF YOU FAIL TO RECEIVE A REPORT

Recently we received a really soothing letter from a member who said she had failed to receive a dollar association membership dues but had failed to receive any subsequent issues of our Report to Humanitarians. Poor old Doc! Emily puts him to work repairing a shed roof.

Investigating, we found that the disgruntled member's name and address on our mailing list were incorrect. We have help us to keep to a minimum the sizable expenses involved in address changes by not waiting until they have received a Report to Humanitarians before one sends us an address correction.
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