

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The purpose of this thesis is to present an analysis of the development and present status of humane education in the United States, its administration, aims, and methods. The field of humane education has this peculiarity, that while it has gained almost universal recognition as an important element in the child's experience, it has as a general rule been provided not by the school itself but by an outside agency in cooperation with the school authorities. The reference is to the work of numerous state and city humane societies who have carried on as a part of their activities a program of education.

The material for this study has been derived largely from pamphlets and bulletins published by the humane societies of the United States, from the related experiences of teachers and expressed beliefs of educators as obtained from articles published on the subject, and from personal letters and interviews.

Like most humanitarian ideas, that part of the humane movement chiefly concerned with animals saw its culmination in the nineteenth century. There were, of course, as in all reform movements, individuals who saw and wrote of the need for reform before the rest of the people had even the vaguest idea of such a need. These were the individuals who paved the way for the workers coming after them, who although their own words fell on barren ground made it possible for their successors to find a few willing to listen to them. In England, particularly, the realization or the worth of such a movement was great. Brutal animal sports had for a long time been among the nation's chief amusements. Bear-baiting, cock and dog fighting were common pastimes. In 1857 Thomas Cartwright complained, "If there be a bear or a bull to be baited in the afternoon, or a jackanapes to ride on horseback, the minister hurries the sermon over in a shameful manner in order to be present at the show."¹

The condition of domestic animals was little better. They were beaten, stoned, starved; in general, treated wholly without care or consideration. "The many horrid instances or cruelty practiced by men would almost tempt one to think that a great part of mankind believed that cruelty to brutes is not an act of injustice."²

1. Strutt, Joseph, Sports and Pastimes, p. 241.

2. Rowley, Francis, The Humane Idea, p. 30.

In the eighteenth century, leaders of thought were already realizing that men owed something to the lower animals. Belief in the inviolability of the dignity of man led to the belief in the dignity of animals. It is in late eighteenth century England, however, that the first true agitators of the humane movement are found. They were a small group of men sincerely interested in the questions of animal rights and desirous of placing them before the public. Many are the names of writers of humane literature. It is true that these early writings in behalf of animals neither received a warm welcome nor reached many people. They did, however, influence powerfully the men who came after them, and who succeeded in placing the question not only before the public but before the legislators of the country.

Two of the most influential among the early writers were The Reverend Humphrey Primatt and Jeremy Bentham. Dr. Primatt in 1776 wrote "A Dissertation on the Duty of Mercy and Sin of Cruelty to Brute Animals." In this treatise he said, "See that no brute of any kind whether entrusted to thy care or coming in thy way suffer neglect or abuse. Let no views of profit, no compliance with custom, and no fear of ridicule of the world, ever tempt thee to the least act of cruelty or injustice to any creature whatsoever. But let this be your invariable rule, everywhere and at all times, to do unto others as, in their condition, you would be done unto."¹ Later Lord Erskine in his debates in Parliament for an animal protection law used many of Dr. Primatt's arguments.

Even greater influence was exerted by Jeremy Bentham. It was he who first advocated that legal measures should be taken for the protection of animals. He predicted that acts of cruelty toward animals would be classed as crimes. This was an innovation in the thought of the period, and thus he laid the groundwork for all the humane labors which followed. Henceforth, the pleas on behalf of Animals were placed before the law-making bodies of the country. In 1811 Lord Erskine introduced into Parliament a bill for the protection of animals. This was the first time that a bill dealing with the subject was ever brought before the legislative body of any country. The bill was turned down and its advocate was accused of having introduced the measure only "to have done that which no one yet had ever thought of doing; to have introduced into legislation at this period of the world, what had never been found in the laws of any country"² However, Lord Erskine, though unsuccessful in his attempt, had started the movement which was to gain strength

1. Coleman, Sydney, *Humane Society Leaders*, p. 18.

2. Coleman, Sydney, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

and impetus until it had reached millions of persons and embraced every continent of the world.

It was not difficult to find a new champion for the animal cause. Richard Martin in 1822 for the second time introduced into Parliament a bill for the protection of animals. This time with much difficulty the bill was forced through. The bill was inadequate, a product of compromise. The popularity of certain sports which necessitated ill usage of animals prevented effective legislation. The bill provided for the punishment of persons

“who wantonly and cruelly beat or ill treat the horse, mare, gelding, mule, ass, ox, cow, heifer, steer, sheep and other cattle by a fine of not more than five pounds or less than ten shillings or imprisonment not exceeding three months”.¹

Nevertheless, despite these deficiencies, Richard Martin’s bill of 1822 marks the beginning of the real history of the anti-cruelty movement.

Martin, however, discovered as did all his successors in humane work, that mere legislation was not enough. There was no adequate machinery for the enforcement of the anti-cruelty laws, and flagrant abuses continued. In October, 1822, four months after the passage of the animal protective bill, there was held a meeting at “Old Slaughters’ Coffee House” in St. Martin’s Lane, London, “for the preventing, as far as possible, the cruel treatment of animals”.² The members at this meeting devised a plan whereby the law passed in Parliament could be made effective. They organized a society whose aim was to protect animals and procured for the society police powers with which to enforce the anti-cruelty legislation. The idea of delegated responsibility has characterized humane work ever since. In June, 1824 the first Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was officially organized and the following plan of operations was adopted:

- “1. The circulation of suitable tracts gratuitously, or by cheap sale, particularly among persons entrusted with cattle, such as coachmen, carters, and drovers.
- “2. The introduction into schools of books calculated to impress on youth the duty of humanity to inferior animals.

1. Coleman, Sydney, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

- “3. Frequent appeals to the public through the press, awakening more general attention to a subject so interesting, though so much neglected.
- “4. The periodical delivery of discourses from the pulpit.
- “5. The employment of constables in the markets and streets, and
- “6. The prosecution of persons guilty of flagrant acts of cruelty, with publicity to the proceedings, and announcement of results.”¹

This scheme of action is a combined plan of law enforcement and humane education which covers all the most important lines of activity practiced by the humane societies at the present time.

After its inception in England the anti-cruelty movement spread rapidly. By 1850 societies had been established in Germany, Austria, and France. In America the movement was delayed by the Civil War but followed immediately after its close. It was not mere coincidence that in both England and America the movement against cruelty to animals came directly after a movement for the abolition of human slavery. In 1811 an Act of Parliament stamped out slavery in the British Empire. In 1822 Humanity Martin's Cattle Bill was passed. In 1865, a Constitutional Amendment abolished slavery within the United States, and in the following year the New York State Legislature incorporated the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Anti-cruelty legislation in each country culminated a long period of social reform.

In America, as in England, long before any organized humane activity developed, there were notable pioneers in the field of humane sentiment and expression. The earliest of these was Thomas Paine. In his Age of Reason he says, “The moral goodness of men consists in imitating the moral goodness and beneficence of God manifested in the creation toward all his creatures... Everything of persecution and revenge between man and man, and everything of cruelty to animals is a violation of moral duty.”² These early pioneers were thus laying the foundations for the humane movement and when at last advocates of

1. Coleman, Sydney, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

2. Paine, Thomas, The Age of Reason, Part I, p. 83.

animals' rights come forward, the country was at least in part ready to receive them.

Two men were chiefly responsible for the success of the movement in the United States: Henry Bergh, who founded the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in New York in 1866 and George T. Angell, leader on the organization of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Boston in 1868. Each man worked independently and without the aid of the other. To Henry Bergh, however, should go the credit for the first organized work in behalf of animals in America. He first became interested in animal treatment while Secretary for the Legation at St. Petersburg. In that city he saw so much atrocious mistreatment of animals that he determined to devote himself upon his return to America entirely to the prevention of cruelty. On his way home he visited the London humane society and there gleaned some idea of the activities of an anti-cruelty organization equipped with police power. The two years after his return to New York he spent in trying to win over public sentiment through speeches, personal interviews with prominent persons, and newspaper articles and editorials. On February 8, 1866 in Clinton Hall, New York there was held the meeting which resulted in the formation of the first humane society in the United States. Bergh's appeal was passionate and convincing; "This is a matter purely of conscience. It has no perplexing side issues. Politics have no more to do with it than astronomy, or the use of the globe. No, it is a moral question in all its aspects; it addresses itself to that quality of your nature that cannot be disregarded by any people with safety to their dearest interests; it is a solemn recognition of the greatest attribute of the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, Mercy, which if suspended in our own case, but for a single instant, would overwhelm and destroy us." ¹ At the close of this lecture Bergh was assured of the backing of all those present. Greatly encouraged by this warm reception of his ideas, Bergh went immediately to Albany and there obtained on April 10, 1866 a state wide charter for the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. A constitution was drawn up in which the purpose of the society was stated as being "to provide affective means for the prevention of cruelty to animals throughout the United States, to enforce all laws which are now or may hereafter be enacted for the protection of animals and to secure, by lawful means, the arrest and conviction of all persons violating such laws." ²

1. Coleman, Sydney, *op. cit.*, p. 37

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

The first task which the new society set for itself was to secure the passage of humane legislation. Success in this endeavor came promptly when in April, 1866 the New York State Legislature was persuaded to pass an animal protective law which provided that “every person who shall, by his act or neglect, maliciously kill, maim, wound, injure, torture, or cruelly beat any horse, mule, cow, cattle, sheep, or other animal, belonging to himself or another, shall upon conviction, be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanor.”¹ This law marks the first effective anti-cruelty legislation in America.

The general public was still apathetic, financial aid was slow in coming, the law was vague and tentative and difficult of interpretation. Mr. Bergh patrolled the streets, acted as agent, prosecutor, and chief executive. Frequently he had to pay the bills of the society. Despite these difficulties and discouragements the society continued to grow and its activities to increase. At the present time over one hundred persons are employed and more than a score of trucks and ambulances are used by the society. Among its interests are listed investigation and prosecution of cruelty, fostering humane education, publication of a periodical and other literature, and maintenance of a fully equipped animal hospital and animal shelter.

As indicated above the early activity of Mr. Bergh in New York was paralleled by that of George T. Angell in Massachusetts. Like Bergh, Angell had long been aroused by the cruelty to animals then prevalent in his state. “The cruelties then practiced in Massachusetts would fill a long chapter,” he wrote in his autobiography. “It is not necessary to give many of them here. I will mention a few. Calves taken from their mothers when too young to eat hay were carted through our streets, and lay in heaps at the cattle-markets, tied, and piled on each other like sticks of wood; ... Sheep, from which their fleeces had been taken, stood, in cold weather, about the slaughter-yards shivering for days before they were killed. Nothing had been done to lessen the horrors of cattle transportation. Old horses, long past service, were whipped up and down the streets of Brighton, and sold sometimes for thirty-seven and one half cents each. Worn-out and aged horses, dogs and other animals were ignorantly and thoughtlessly killed, in ways most brutal. A man in my town near Boston, who had mortgaged his stock of cattle to another, quarrelled with him, locked the stable doors and starved them all to death in their stalls to prevent his getting his pay. There was no law in Massachusetts to punish him.”²

1. Coleman, Sydney, op. cit., p. 39.

2. Angell, George T., Autobiographical Sketches, p. 8.

On February 22, 1868 a notorious case of cruelty aroused the indignation of the citizens of Massachusetts and resulted in the founding of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. On that date two horses were driven to death in a race between Brighton and Worcester. So greatly was Mr. Angell aroused that he decided that it was time for systematic intervention. Speaking of his feelings at the time he wrote, "When I saw in 'The Boston Daily Advertiser' of Monday, February 24, the record of this cruel race, my determination was at once taken ... I said to myself, 'Somebody must take hold of this business, and I might as well as anybody.'" ¹ In accord with this resolution he published a letter in the Daily Advertiser of February 25, 1868 protesting against such cruelty and ending with the following challenge, "I, for one, am ready to contribute both time and money; and if there is any society or person in Boston, with whom I can unite, or who will unite with me in this matter, I shall be glad personally or by letter to be informed." ²

As a result of this letter a meeting was held and plans for a Massachusetts humane society were made. On March 23, 1868 a charter was granted the society under the name, "Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals." Once the movement got under way there were few obstacles. The first canvassing for members and funds was done by members of the police force who in three weeks secured twelve hundred members and thirteen thousand dollars.³ At the present time the organization is one of the largest and most active in the country.

As the American and Massachusetts societies grew in reputation, their founders were deluged with requests for help and advice from all parts of the country. Both Mr. Bergh and Mr. Angell responded willingly, conducting lecture tours throughout the country. These trips led to the formation of other anti-cruelty societies patterned after the two older bodies. Even before the end of 1868 Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and California had succeeded in organizing societies and in the next year Illinois and Minnesota followed.

Since the founding of the original societies the anti-cruelty movement has had a steady growth. Hundreds of organizations have been formed ranging from small rural societies which support with difficulty a single agent to the large state-wide societies which employ a considerable staff of agents and maintain numerous

1. Ibid., p. 9.

2. Ibid., p. 9.

3. Ibid., p. 13.

branches. At the present time there are listed with the American Humane Association over nine hundred humane societies.¹ Some of these, it is true, have become inactive and others have ceased to exist altogether, but this figure shows the amount of activity which followed upon the organization of the American and Massachusetts humane societies.

The American Humane Association in its annual report for 1940 lists over five hundred active societies, four hundred eighty of which are interested in animal protective and welfare work. At least one society is reported from every state in the Union and statements of active work come from both Alaska and the Phillipine Islands. The majority of humane societies are interested not only in animal work but also in child work. Three hundred of the societies listed are of this type. This means that the funds and works of the societies must be divided between two important fields. Most of these organizations are limited in their activities since work in both departments usually puts a severe strain upon the resources of the society. As a result it is usual that one field or the other is slighted. The Connecticut Humane Society is one which combines both branches with considerable success. The remaining one hundred seventy-five societies interested in animal work devote their entire time to this aspect of humane work. As a rule the larger and more flourishing societies come under this group; the American S.P.C.A., the Massachusetts S.P.C.A., the San Francisco S.P.C.A., the Pennsylvania S.P.C.A., and the Anti-Cruelty Society of Chicago. This is natural since there is no need for division of attention or funds between two fields of work.

At the beginning of the humane movement the workers in the societies were practically all unpaid volunteers, who were so devoted to the animal cause that they gave their time, effort and money without expecting or receiving any return. As the movement grew, however, it became evident that a large number of experienced and well trained persons would be necessary to carry on the work effectively. At present most societies have at least one paid employee who devotes his entire time to the work of the association. The number of persons employed by the humane societies of the United States is approximately fourteen hundred.² This force of paid employees is augmented by more than ten thousand part-time volunteers. In all, over 250,000 people, employees and members of societies, are actively engaged in the animal cause in this country.

1. Letter from Florence Maher, dated April, 1942.

2. American Humane Association, Annual Report, No. 26

The interest and activities of the humane societies have changed and developed vastly since the days when Henry Bergh and George T. Angell patrolled the streets preventing flagrant abuses to animals. The work of the societies has expanded to include aspects not at all associated with their activities in the early days. It was natural that at first prosecution or cruelty should be the main activity of animal protective societies. With the suppression of the more obvious types of cruelty and with the increased power and respect accorded them, the societies in time round themselves in a position not only to punish but to undertake preventive work through educational means.

This trend is characterized by the manager of the Erie County Society as follows in his 1920 annual report:

“Formerly the humanitarian was more concerned about the enforcement of the law and the punishment of the evil-doer than he was in seeking the cause of things. It has taken nearly a half century of waging warfare upon the cruelist to break down his indifference to the rights of the lower creatures by the law enforcement. It is, therefore, only in recent years that organized humane forces have undertaken another line of attack through constructive methods to make certain his defeat. The punishment of the wrong-doer is not so important in this day as the application of a remedy to cure him of his shortcomings.”¹

The same thought is expressed by the chief officer of the prosecution department of the Massachusetts S.P.C.A., writing in 1940: “Our humane officers have adhered to the principle, whenever and wherever possible, that it is better to convert men from cruelty than to convict them in courts, and that the test of a Society’s usefulness is not the number of its prosecutions but the number of acts of cruelty it is able to prevent.”²

The activities of the humane societies have become so numerous that it is difficult to make a complete list. One of the oldest and most important which even now must be continued, is that of initiating legislation against new types of cruelty not covered by law. There is also the task of preventing the passage of bills which would permit or authorize cruelty or repeal humane measures which have already been enacted. In such a case the societies notify their members either through their

1. Shultz, William, The Humane Movement, p. 99.

2. “Report of Chief Officer”, Our Dumb Animals, Vol. 69, No. 3, p. 43.

periodicals or by circular letter asking them to present a solid front against any such action being taken by the legislature.

After anti-cruelty legislation has been passed, it is the concern of the humane societies to secure adequate enforcement. To this end they undertake to investigate all complaints which are sent to them. Each case is treated individually and if possible is used as an opportunity for preventive education. If the cruelty is the result of ignorance, a better method of caring for the animal is taught. If it is the result of poverty, advice and understanding are given together with financial aid whenever possible. If it is the result of indifference to the condition of the animal, a severe warning is given. However, when a clear case of wanton and vicious cruelty appears, the arrest and punishment of the offender is promptly secured.

A second important activity which the humane societies have taken upon themselves is the maintenance of animal shelters. Every society no matter what its size, has some space set aside for the use of lost or abandoned animals. Many societies have had buildings erected for the sole purpose of housing homeless creatures. Several societies, indeed, were started for the express purpose of providing such places of refuge. The Boston Animal Rescue League was the earliest of these societies; it was the first organization in the country to establish an animal shelter. The older societies were not long in following suit.

These shelters contain spacious and well-ventilated kennels and runways. Good wholesome food is provided and when necessary medical treatment is given. Lost animals are kept at these shelters for a certain definite time, thus giving their owners a chance to recover them. After this period of time has elapsed the animals are either humanely destroyed or new homes are found for them. Most societies keep very complete records of the animals they deal with. Prospective owners are carefully investigated before animals are allowed to leave the shelter and in many cases the society keeps in touch with the family for a time to see that everything is satisfactory.

Closely allied to the shelter idea is that of the rest farm. Not as many societies are able to finance these farms nor are they as absolutely necessary as are the shelters. The rest farms are farms owned and operated by the humane societies and used as places of refuge for the larger animals, particularly the horse. Overworked horses are sent to these farms to rest and to be made fit to work again. Owners are usually very glad to avail themselves of this privilege. Animals unfit for labor are sometimes sent to the rest farms for a well deserved vacation. Most societies concentrate, however, on making the animal again fit for service through

rest and good care. Typical examples of these farms are the forty acre farm of the Animal Refuge Association of Baltimore and "Pine Ridge", a home of rest established by the Boston Animal Rescue League. The principal object of these farms is to give, free of any expense, rest and care to horses belonging to workingmen who cannot afford to have their disabled or tired out horses cared for. This is an activity confined to a few of the richer societies, for not many have either the space or the funds for such a project.

Realization of the importance of medical care for animals is resulting in more and more care and money being devoted to this work. Early in the history of the American S. P. C. A. and of the Massachusetts S. P. C. A. hospitals were erected by these societies. Since then a well equipped hospital has become an important part of the work of many societies, particularly those societies which already maintain shelters. Some societies have on their staff two or three veterinarians who devote their entire time to the work of the societies. These organizations usually have free clinics two or three times a week where persons unable to pay for medical care can obtain it for their pets without expense. Oftentimes the veterinarians give lectures to owners and prepare leaflets on the care of animals for distribution by the society. The city of Boston has two large societies (Massachusetts S. P. C. A. and the Boston Animal Rescue League) both of which maintain shelters, hospitals, and a staff or doctors. Smaller organizations unable to support hospitals and to pay veterinarians full time usually have arrangements with local doctors who care for the societies' animals and take charge of free clinics. For example, the Providence Animal Rescue League has a clinic every Tuesday and Thursday morning at which one of the Providence veterinarians administers care.

One of the most important aspects of the humane work done by the societies is in the field of humane education. This work takes various forms. Talks, illustrated lectures, moving pictures, plays, and puppet shows are given before both adult and child audiences. As a part of this program large numbers of leaflets and pamphlets are prepared and circulated by educators employed by the societies. These leaflets may be kindness to animals stories, rules for the part of particular pets, statements concerning the work of the society, or detailed directions for teachers. Junior Humane Societies or Clubs are formed among children to awaken their interest in animal welfare work. Distribution of posters and calendars, the annual celebration of Be Kind to Animals Week, essay and poster contests, awards of medals for particularly meritorious deeds are all part of the general humane education program. All humane societies have developed some plan of humane education program. So important has this aspect of the work become that several

societies whose sole purpose is the teaching of humane education have been organized. Among them are the American Humane Education Society in Boston, the Rhode Island Humane Education Society, The Humane Education Society of Denver, and the New York State Humane Education Society.

This by no means exhausts the list of activities carried on by the various humane organizations. It but mentions a few of the more general projects engaged in by nearly every organization. There are many types of work which have been adopted by various societies because of the peculiarities of their location. The western states are much occupied in trying to better the condition of range animals and investigating the transportation of these animals. Other societies (like the Illinois Humane Society) are concerned with the inspection of slaughter houses and the methods of killing food animals. A grave problem to the California society has been the treatment of movie animals and the prohibition of cruelty in the making of moving pictures. Some societies have made conservation and the protection of wild life their chief activities; others have become principally interested in the antivivisection problem.

The Humane Society of Baltimore County printed the following list of activities engaged in by them. It is typical of the work done by an average American society.

“What we do:

- “1. We collect stray animals in Baltimore County.
- “2. We give information as to proper treatment and care of animals.
- “3. We maintain a modern hospital where animals receive excellent care and medical treatment. A resident physician is in attendance.
- “4. We give a course in nursing for persons desiring positions in animal hospitals.
- “5. We have Humane Education classes for children.
- “6. We have a committee on Bird Protection that will supply sanctuary posters and bird feed.
- “7. We accept old and overworked horses and all unwanted animals.
- “8. We have an animal cemetery with perpetual care.

“9. We publish a quarterly magazine, “The Humane Endeavor.”

“10. We give 24-hour service.”¹.

The sources of the finances of humane societies are almost as varied as are their activities. The chief single source of income is the dues and donations of members. In 1941 the total income was \$3,329,000 and something over a fourth of this was derived from dues and donations of members. The small, particularly rural, societies which have been unable to build up a large endowment are almost entirely dependent financially on this source of income. The active members are, therefore, the mainstay of the movement financially as well as in the carrying out of its objectives.

Every society has a differentiated membership list graduating from the annual member who pays a dollar a year to the life member or benefactor who contributes anything from a hundred dollars up. Representative lists are those compiled by the American Humane Education Society and by the American Humane Association.

“Rules of Membership in the American Humane Education Society

Active Life	\$100	Active Annual	\$10
Associate Life	50	Associate Annual	5
Sustaining	20	Annual	1 ² .

“Individual Membership Fees in the American Humane Association

\$2	Non-voting	\$500	Life Member
5	Annual	1000	Patron
10	Associate	5000	Benefactor
25	Contributing	25000	Founder” ³ .

A second source of funds is the income received from invested money. The amount is considerable and shews the advantage of building up endowments whenever possible. The largest part of this money goes to a relatively few societies. Those which receive it are the larger and older urban organizations. It is the aim of

1. The Humane Endeavor, July, 1940, back cover.

2. Our Dumb Animals, Vol. 74, No. 5, p. 40.

3. American Humane Review, Vol. XXX, No. 2, p. 27.

the younger and smaller societies to build up similar endowments as quickly as they are able. Societies with endowments are able to survive years of depression and war when contributions to the animal cause are greatly diminished.

Money received from state, county, or municipal appropriations is a third important source of income to the humane societies. Of course, not all humane societies are recipients of such public aid. Indeed, the number of organizations which receive substantial amounts are few. The reasons for and the amount of these appropriations vary for each locality. Most of the societies which receive funds do so because of the performance of some particular duty which they have taken over for the city or state and for which they receive payment. A large number of organizations have charge of the dog pound and run it as a part of their animal shelter program. In return it is customary for the city to pay to the society the money that would otherwise be spent to pay a city dog officer and to support a dog pound. Many societies have also taken over the licensing of dogs and are given for this work the license fees.

In some states it is felt that “the societies are actually doing state work and thereby saving the state the cost of paying extra police officers and social workers; therefore certain funds are advanced to the societies to help defray their expenses. The Minnesota Society for the Prevention of Cruelty receives a biennial grant of 13,000 dollars.¹ The state of Wisconsin gives 10,000 dollars every two years to the Wisconsin Humane Society and its branches.² The Colorado State Bureau of Animal Protection receives an annual sum of 10,500 dollars.³ In California provision is made by law that societies “might be paid a sum not exceeding 500 dollars per calendar month from the city or county general funds by the board of supervisors or other governing bodies thereof.”⁴ This was felt to be just payment for the police work performed by the humane societies’ agents.

In other cases no exact sum is appropriated by the state, but the societies are allowed to keep the fines paid by the lawbreakers whom they arrest and prosecute. This formerly was a sizable amount, but the number of prosecutions has dropped to a very low figure and it is no longer an important source of income.

1. Schultz, William, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 79.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

The number of societies receiving funds from the local Community Chest is relatively few. In some cases this is through preference, the societies being unwilling to forego any of their independence and feeling that greater support can be secured by a separate appeal for help. In other cases, however, animal protective societies have been refused permission to participate in the chest on the ground that societies giving aid to people are more important than those which help animals. On the whole the chest has not been a large factor in the support of animal welfare societies.

The progress which the humane movement has made in the seventy-five years since the founding of the first humane society in America is best recorded on the statute books. The first effort of the humane organizations was toward securing a standing in law for the rights of animals to freedom from cruel and abusive treatment. As the activities of the societies developed to include wider aspects of animal welfare so the laws of the states were changed and added to, to give the new aspects of their work legal support.

The first activities of the societies were directed toward the prevention of the grosser acts of cruelty; likewise, the first anti-cruelty laws forbade such acts. Then the societies became interested in the general welfare of animals and the law promptly followed suit by making failure to provide proper food, drink and shelter a misdemeanor. The societies became aware of the importance of humane education and extended their activities to this branch of welfare work; the states made laws requiring that humane education be included among the subjects in the school curriculum.

Necessarily, there is much variation in the anti-cruelty legislation of the various states, but this diversity reflects for the most part the difference in attitude of the societies. However, the law has followed a certain general pattern in all the states.

Without exception every state has a general anti-cruelty law "which forbids overloading, overdriving, unnecessary or unjustifiable beating, killing, mutilation or maiming".¹ All but six states have a law which provides for punishment for failure to supply necessary and proper food, drink and shelter. Usually provision is made giving permission for an outsider (usually a humane agent) to procure food at the expense of the owner.

1. Shultz, William, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

Forty three states have laws punishing the abandonment of disabled and decrepit animals. Permission is given to peace officers to humanely kill such animals.

Save for a few exceptions all the states have laws punishing those who wilfully or maliciously kill or injure another's animals; practically the same number forbid animal fighting, particularly cock-fighting and in several states not only the owners and trainers or the animals are punishable but also the spectators.

Most states have provisions made against the docking or setting-up of horses' tails. As recently as 1941 the humane societies of Massachusetts had difficulty in preventing the annulment of this law. The annulment bill was proposed by horse-show men who were nearly successful in getting it passed.¹

The transportation and treatment of livestock has been a matter of great concern to the humane organizations. The states have based their stock transportation legislation upon the federal Transportation Act of 1873. This act was amended in 1906 and in its new form provided that "no interstate land or water carrier shall transport cattle, sheep, swine or other animals for a period longer than twenty-eight consecutive hours without unloading the same in a humane manner, into properly equipped pens for rest, water, and feeding for a period or at least five consecutive hours." ² Some states have added clauses regulating the minimum rate of speed to be maintained and the maximum number of hours that may elapse after arrival at destination before the animals are unloaded. The question of humane treatment of food animals has not yet been answered to the full satisfaction of the societies. They feel that much can still be done toward providing better conditions of transportation and better methods of slaughtering. They are constantly on the alert in their attempt to put through more humane legislation.

Practically every state has enacted laws defining the powers and duties of police and humane officers. In general these laws provide that the officer may enter any building where animals are kept for unlawful purposes or where a law dealing with cruelty is being violated and that offenders may be arrested without warrant. Usually the additional provision is made that the officer must prosecute all violations of anti-cruelty laws coming to his notice. Officers and agents of humane societies are given police powers with regard to the enforcement of anti-cruelty laws.

1. Our Dumb Animals, Vol. 74, No. 5, p. 83.

2. Shultz, William, op. cit., pp. 109-110.

There is much miscellaneous legislation to be found on the statute books of the various states. These cover a wide range of cruelty from the forbidding of the exhibition of bears except in a menagerie by Maine law to the punishment of careless exposure of barbed wire near livestock which appears in the acts of Oregon.

One branch of humane legislation which is of relatively recent date, dating for the most part from 1900, is that providing for humane education. This has taken a variety of forms in the different states and these differences are reflected in the varied procedures of the societies in conducting a program of humane education.