

interest by coordinating their local society activity. Perhaps in another state where insufficient numbers of effective local humane societies exist, a more autonomous federation would be required.

Please don't allow the words "advise," "coordinate," and "distribute" leave an incorrect impression of this type of federation. These words smack of staff operations as distinguished from actual action in the field. Our officers are not members of a "passive resistance" movement. We are hard-hitting in our field of endeavor, and our board of directors contains personnel who are the officers of the most active societies in the state. But, we do believe that humane treatment of animals can be achieved by people convincing their neighbors through their own local society.

If I may end with this observation, I shall like to state that the Indiana Federation of Humane Societies will accept advice, help, and comfort from all national organizations. We will carefully weigh all material, we use most of it, and thank the offeror even if it is not used. It gives me great pleasure to advise this group that we in Indiana have never rejected any advice, material, nor offer of use of personnel from this magnificent organization, The Humane Society of the United States.

Protection for Animals in Biomedical Research

**By F. L. Thomsen, Ph.D., President
Humane Information Services, Inc.
St. Petersburg, Florida**

Now, I know that some of you are not going to like what I have to say about laboratory animal legislation. I can only describe the situation as confused. It reminds me of a sign on the desk of a business friend: "If you can keep a cool head, then you just don't understand the situation." But whether or not you agree with me, let's keep a cool head. I don't hate anybody, and I hope you won't hate me.

By every rational standard — numbers of animals involved, the average amount of suffering undergone by those animals, and the comparative feasibility of remedial measures — laboratory animal protection is by far the most important humane project of this or any other decade.

Yet, little more than lip service has been given to this project by many or most humane societies. The HSUS and Humane Information Services are the only two large societies that really have gone to town in behalf of this much-needed improvement in animal welfare.

I am not going to review here the need for some kind of laboratory controls. If there are a half dozen people in this audience who are not already thoroughly convinced of this, I would be greatly surprised. With at least a hundred million animals used by the laboratories annually, in all kinds of ways involving a great deal of completely unnecessary suffering, anyone who is content to let the situation continue to ride along is indeed lacking in any compassion for animals.

Nor am I going to review in detail all of the things in the Rogers-Javits bill which would result in eliminating or reducing this

suffering. Permit me to make this categorical statement about it: Nobody, but nobody, has gone into the subject more thoroughly than the group of people most intimately associated with the attempt to obtain laboratory improvement. Oliver Evans, Pat Parkes and Frank McMahon of the HSUS, The Reverend Charles Herrick, formerly Vice President of the HSUS, Frances Holway and Charlotte Parks of the Committee for Constructive Laboratory Animal Legislation, and I have devoted years to studying and working on this question. We have visited countless laboratories unannounced. We have talked at length with many biomedical scientists who are quite sympathetic to our cause and who are professionally aware of conditions which lead to unnecessary suffering by laboratory animals. We have read numerous highly technical books and articles dealing with possible ways of reducing animal suffering in the laboratories.

Our conclusion from all of this work and study is that not just a small part, but that *most* of the suffering undergone by laboratory animals in "unnecessary" under the terms of the pain provisions of the Rogers-Javits bill. Granted, it will take some time and effort to bring about the necessary interpretations of these provisions. The Act, when passed, offers us the medium through which to obtain such interpretations.

This unnecessary suffering results mostly from the indifference, and from the inertia and the lack of proper scientific training and technical knowledge, of many of those conducting laboratory animal experiments and tests. If only this *unnecessary* suffering were eliminated, I sincerely believe that 95 percent of all the suffering of laboratory animals would be eliminated. Who would want to wait another hundred years to attain 100 percent elimination, when we can get 95 percent soon?

The Rogers-Javits bill is directed specifically and effectively at those operations which result in unnecessary suffering. It would not interfere with legitimate and humane biomedical activities. It would not prevent *all* pain, because some of it is incurred in painful research or testing which the public and the Congress as well as biomedical people consider to be necessary and desirable. They will never, for example, agree to forego painful research which might lead to a cure for dreaded cancer. But over a period of time, the Act would gradually eliminate a large part of even the suffering which now is considered to be necessary.

During the past year the leaflets and newspaper advertisements of some societies have generated among humanitarians a renewed hope that the use of animals in laboratories can be entirely eliminated soon by the use of computers and tissue cultures. Now, nobody in the humane movement in this country antedates me in their interest in this possibility. I have for years been studying this

subject. In 1964 I toured Europe in an effort to learn more about it, and had several long conferences with Professor Aygun of Turkey, a biologist and humanitarian well known for his work in this field. It was partly because of my insistence that strong provisions for the promotion of replacement and substitution were incorporated in the original Rogers bill of 1965. I have worked hard to give technical information to Congressman Rogers and others, which has resulted in similar provisions being incorporated in the present Rogers-Javits bill.

But, friends, why do we humanitarians so frequently seem to go overboard for some new idea or fad like this, rather than to consider it in proper perspective which takes into account not just what we would *like* to see done, but also what is *possible* to get done? What good can it do to make demands or plans which have no chance of fulfillment? There is no prospect whatsoever that we are going to get some law, or some administrative action by the government, that would result in the sudden substitution of computers or other technical methods for the use of animals in laboratories.

This replacement will come about, but gradually. That has been the history of all improvements in research and professional practices. It required years to persuade physicians to abandon use of the blood-sucking leech, to understand the significance of bacteria and viruses, and to adopt aseptic methods in surgery. Who was it that discovered the potentialities of computers and tissue cultures in biomedical research? Not any humanitarian, but the scientists themselves. Those scientists who understand these methods and their possibilities are writing the papers in the medical journals that are quoted by humanitarians. It is to their personal interest to promote the use of these methods, which would enhance their professional prestige and emoluments. There is a division in HEW that has been working on this for some time. They issued a bulletin advocating the use of computers in biomedical research as long ago as 1965.

The real question is, how can we best assist these and other progressive scientists to more rapidly advance their ideas? Certainly it is not by writing letters or placing advertisements in newspapers denouncing scientists for being ignorant, untrained, stubborn and sadistic. That will only antagonize the scientists who need to be persuaded. No, the best way is to offer help and encouragement to the scientists who *are* working in these new fields. *They need most a directive from Congress, implemented with legislative authority and funds.* And the best way to get that is to pass the Rogers-Javits bill, Sections 8 and 9 of which would give assistance in the further development of these new techniques and provide for educational activities at a professional level to persuade the scientists to move more rapidly in the direction we want them to.

So, there is no doubt whatever in the minds of those humanitarians whom I mentioned as being most knowledgeable in

this field of laboratory legislation that, if the Rogers-Javits bill is passed, it will do more than any other feasible action to promote replacement and substitution. But in addition to accomplishing this highly desirable objective, passage of the bill would accomplish a great many other things to relieve the suffering of the animals. It is a *good bill*, a really *strong bill*. It is the *best bill* that humanitarians can ever hope to get through Congress in the foreseeable future. Yet, a considerable segment of the humane movement is either very lukewarm or opposed to the bill. Why?

Those who are familiar with the history of the humane movement know that this cleavage of opinion can be traced to personal and organizational rivalries which have nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of the bill itself, and to the traditional anti-vivisectionist stand against any regulation as a "legalization" of the use of animals in laboratories. The arguments used against the bill are merely rationalizations of these deep-seated emotional responses. If one argument against the bill is demolished, as when the provisions amending P.L. 89-544 were eliminated, the opponents merely shift to another argument.

Those who have taken the lead in opposing the bill have constructed a whole series of straw men representing what they have claimed to be fatal weaknesses in the Rogers-Javits bill. As fast as one straw man is demolished another is erected.

The opponents of the Rogers-Javits bill say that humanitarians who have devoted years of work to this attempt to get effective laboratory legislation are "venal" (that is the word they have used) "enemies of humane treatment of animals," in league with the laboratories to destroy P.L. 89-544, the petnapping act. As most of you know by this time, the Rogers-Javits bill does not amend in any respect whatever P.L. 89-544.

The other objections that have been raised to the Rogers-Javits bill are just as silly and untrue. These objections have been rather thoroughly reviewed and answered in past issues of the Reports to Humanitarians published by Humane Information Services. We have shown that enforcement of the proposed Act would not be by "the vivisectors" themselves, but from beginning to end would be under the control of the administrative agency. We have shown that the use of in-laboratory committees of scientists to assist in the enforcement procedures is one of the most effective provisions of the bill. And we have shown that the penalty provisions and other features of the bill have been very carefully worked out to promote effective enforcement.

The objection that the bill gives responsibility for enforcement to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare rather than to the Department of Agriculture reaches about the limit of absurdity. Now, I have nothing against the Department of Agriculture person-

ally. On the contrary, I was a responsible official of that Department for 20 years. I am thoroughly familiar with the way in which the Department operates. I also know, after decades of informed observation, about the attitudes and operating policies of the other major government departments. With respect to attitudes toward animals, unfortunately, I would put Agriculture toward the bottom of the list. Let me read you an excerpt from the Department's official Yearbook for 1960, p. 236: "There has never been much doubt as to how the comfort of farm livestock should be evaluated. Aside from humanitarian considerations in extreme cases . . . the 'comfort' of the animal must be measured by . . . things that actually affect the net return from the animals. In other words, if an animal is gaining weight, laying eggs or producing milk at its highest rate, comfort is assumed."

Who was it, when the federal humane slaughter law was first proposed, who echoed the meat packers' position that nothing should be done except to appoint a "study committee" to investigate the problem? The Department of Agriculture is well known for its policies of supporting the "establishment," of carefully avoiding anything which might "rock the boat."

The Department of HEW, on the other hand, has a reputation for being an even too-liberal, fire-eating bunch of do-gooders, always seeking to upset the establishment's apple cart. If I wanted sympathetic administration of a liberal law to help animals, that is the Department to which I would turn. We who have really studied this matter know that this Department has, even in the medical divisions, a number of scientists and administrators who really understand and are sympathetically interested in the problems of animals in the laboratories, but are hamstrung by lack of authority and financial support from Congress. This, the Rogers-Javits bill would provide. And I would like to add that, had it not been for the sympathetic consideration and help of people in HEW, we could not even have begun to obtain serious consideration of laboratory legislation by Congress.

But regardless of how some might differ with me on this point, they cannot seriously believe, if they know anything at all about the way things are done in Washington, that Congress would grant authority to the Department of Agriculture to supervise medical research in laboratories.

Those who use this argument against the Rogers-Javits bill either are completely ignorant of the facts or deliberately trying to draw a red herring across the path to passage of effective laboratory legislation because of personal or organizational interests to which I have referred. Now, please do not misunderstand me. There are plenty of sincere humanitarians who believe the propaganda of the organizations opposing the bill. No doubt a number of those in this

room are followers of these opponents of the bill. I am not questioning your sincerity in the slightest, but that of the so-called leaders who cook up these phony objections.

Many things are debatable. But the statement that the Rogers-Javits bill would contribute substantially to the alleviation of laboratory animal suffering is not. Only the blindly prejudiced or those who are unfamiliar with the provisions of the bill and what they are designed to accomplish would make such a claim. If any of you still are unconvinced, you cannot have read with an open mind the detailed analysis of the bill, section by section, which appeared in our Report to Humanitarians No. 8, issued last June. I notice that the National Society for Medical Research in a recent bulletin has quoted extensively from our Report, evidently in an attempt to scare physicians into opposing the bill, by showing that the bill is not a "paper tiger." Evidently our explanations were more convincing to researchers than to some humanitarians!

But there still remains the valid question, "Even if the Rogers-Javits bill would do a lot of good, shouldn't we attempt to get something stronger, different or better?"

Even if the Rogers-Javits bill were not as good as its supporters think, it is better than nothing unless there is some more satisfactory alternative. Is there such an alternative? For the answer to that you will have to depend upon two pieces of evidence. First is the fact that those behind the bill are experienced in legislative matters and have talked with scores of Congressmen and other informed people. Nobody consulted has even suggested that stronger legislation could pass Congress in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, some think that the provisions of the Rogers-Javits bill are so strong that it cannot be passed now.

Secondly, as of now, October, 1969, even the humanitarians who oppose the bill are not advocating any specific legislation which they believe to be stronger. They all seem to want to "wait" for some vague time in the future when conditions will be more favorable. Meanwhile, hundreds of millions of laboratory animals would continue to suffer needlessly, year after year, because we failed to act now.

There has been one intelligent, rational suggestion of an approach which could be considered an alternative to the Rogers-Javits bill. We suggested this alternative in our Report to Humanitarians No. 6, issued last December, but a better statement of it has been made by Mr. Michael Moukhanoff, who for 22 years was President of the International Conference Against Vivisection, Inc., until forced to resign because of his statement reviewing the ineffective position of the anti-vivisection movement. In our Report to Humanitarians No. 9, issued this past September, we have reproduced the famous letter written by Mr. Moukhanoff, and his

summary of the kind of laboratory legislation, focused exclusively upon replacement or substitution, which he thinks might be more effective than the Rogers-Javits bill. Sections 8 and 9 of the Rogers-Javits bill would, in my opinion, accomplish essentially the same results as those contemplated by Mr. Moukhanoff's well-reasoned suggestion, and in addition the bill would accomplish a great many other things to alleviate the suffering of laboratory animals.

So, I can see nothing on the legislative horizon that would be stronger or better than the Rogers-Javits bill. I sincerely believe that there is no possibility whatever of any other action during the foreseeable future to curtail the suffering of laboratory animals comparable to what would be achieved by passage of the Rogers-Javits bill. If you disagree with that, I hope you will, during the discussion, state specifically what measure you think would accomplish more. If everyone would be constructive, instead of merely trying to tear down what is suggested by others, we would get farther in the humane movement.

In the few minutes of time left to me, I would like to deal with our chances of obtaining passage of the Rogers-Javits bill.

Very frankly, and with great regret, I must say that unless humanitarians and humane societies who profess to be in favor of the bill do some really hard and effective work, we don't stand a very good chance of winning. The so-called humane organizations and the medical research interests that oppose the bill have much more money behind their opposition, and they have been far more active than the humanitarians who are favorable to it. As a result, members of Congress think they see a group of humanitarians who don't amount to much politically anyway, and who are more or less evenly divided in their support of, or opposition to, this bill. And the opponents can bring to bear on Congress many more people with influence and money — campaign contributors and leading citizens — than are found in the ranks of supporters. So, the only way the bill's supporters can succeed is by seeing to it that the overwhelming majority of letters to Congress are in support of the bill.

Most humane societies have been doing little or nothing to generate such support. How long has it been since your own society — local, state or national — has sent to all its mailing list a comprehensive analysis of the bill and a really strong appeal to write favorable letters to the President, to their own Representatives and Senators, to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Committees to which the bill has been assigned, and to all of the newspapers and magazines circulating in your area? I could name names and give some specific examples which might make some people here today feel uncomfortable, but I won't.

Just writing a few letters yourself is *not* enough. If you really want to help, you should put pressure on your local and other society officers to circulate their mailing lists with such appeals. Only by a united effort such as this can humanitarians hope to obtain passage of controversial legislation such as the Rogers-Javits bill.

You say you have written in the past? That makes no difference – nobody is going to check the files.

You claim you are too busy rescuing stray animals or conducting rummage sales for your local animal shelter? You could engage in such activities for 50 years and never accomplish as much in preventing the suffering of animals in such great numbers as by writing a few letters which turned out to be the straw that broke the camel's back of opposition to laboratory legislation.

You say you have heard so much on both sides of this question that you are confused and don't know what you should do? Then get the recent excellent special bulletin of The HSUS dealing with this subject, and Reports to Humanitarians Nos. 7, 8 and 9 of Humane Information Services, and take enough time to really read and understand them.

Ignorance of the law is no excuse in the eyes of a judge. And ignorance will be no excuse in the eyes of your own conscience if you do not, now, do everything in your power to become informed and to act intelligently and vigorously.

Cruelty for Fun

By Cleveland Amory

President, Fund for Animals

New York, New York

Just before I came up here I was handed a letter from Mrs. David Crosland of the Montgomery Humane Society, Montgomery, Alabama. "I hope this will reach you in time," she said. "Last Saturday, in a clearing near a pond well off the main road south of Andalusia, Alabama, men, women, and children gathered to enjoy the spectacle of 50 dogs tear to pieces 3 raccoons. From across the state they came, over 100 strong, with chairs, food and beer, to watch and participate in the Alabama State Championship Field Trials and Water Races, and to the delight of all but a little girl, the coons were torn to pieces. The little girl buried her head in her mother's dress and cried softly.

"One of these euphemistically called 'special events' was the coon-on-a-log. The cooners anchored a box in a pond about 20 feet from shore with the open end facing the bank. Wearing large protective gloves, two cooners took a coon from its cage, tossed it by its tail into the water, and then two others put it in the box. All the spectators gathered along the bank, some sitting in chairs, others standing, most drinking. The air was pregnant with talk and excitement.

"Holding their dogs on the shore, the cooners worked them into a frenzy. The dogs, foaming at the mouth, strained to break free and attack the coon. When the signal was given, a dog leaped into the water and paddled toward the coon. As the dog neared the box, the coon stood up on its hind feet, making cat-like screams. The dog grabbed the coon, tearing it from its box and into the water. 'A coon can drown a dog in 3 cups of whiskey,' said one of the cooners. Two cooners near the box tried to break the dog's hold. The coon tried to swim away but the cooners grabbed its tail and slung it back into the box. Over 10 dogs got their chance. By the fifth dog the coon no