

WellBeing International

WBI Studies Repository

12-1971

(No. 18) – More Hope for Laboratory Animals

Humane Information Services, Inc.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.wellbeingintlstudiesrepository.org/rephum>

Recommended Citation

Humane Information Services, Inc., "(No. 18) – More Hope for Laboratory Animals" (1971). *Report to Humanitarians*. 12.

<https://www.wellbeingintlstudiesrepository.org/rephum/12>

This material is brought to you for free and open access by WellBeing International. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the WBI Studies Repository. For more information, please contact wbisr-info@wellbeingintl.org.



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 be as great as your devotion to the animals!

LABORATORY ANIMALS A CONTINUING PROBLEM

When the Rogers-Javits bill died in Committee in the 91st Congress, the noisy controversy among humanitarians about what should be done to reduce animal suffering in biomedical laboratories seemed to die with it. But the humane societies that have been leaders in the effort to deal realistically with this problem have not forgotten the need, and considerable progress has been made toward an eventual solution.

If all of the major sources of animal suffering were to be listed in order of importance (according to the number of animals affected, the average amount of suffering per animal, and the potential proportion of this suffering that is capable of being eliminated), laboratory animals

surely would rank among the first five. Humanitarians certainly are not going to permit some temporary setbacks to discourage them from continuing the effort to bring more effective relief to the suffering of these animals. If it proves possible to approach this subject with less bickering among both humanitarians and scientists than in the past, substantial accomplishments may be looked for in the next decade. Humane Information Services is more hopeful at this point than at any time in the past.

Conditions Necessary for Success

For this hope to be translated into reality, however, will require several conditions:

(1) At least some letup in the internecine warfare among humane groups that has fatally divided their efforts to obtain effective laboratory legislation or other action in the past. This subject has been discussed in many issues of Report to Humanitarians. Recent developments offer some hope for improvement in this phase of the problem.

(2) Greater communication between humanitarians and scientists, so that each group understands the other's viewpoints and proposals. In the past, scientists have tended to identify all humanitarians with antivivisectionists, whom they hate and fear with an intensity clearly out of proportion to the influence and past accomplishments of the latter. Far too many humanitarians, likewise, identify all scientists with the "animal butchers and poisoners", and are suspicious of any constructive proposal with which the scientific community will agree. As will be shown later, the direction in which improvement in conditions is moving makes mutual understanding by humanitarians and scientists even more important now than in the past.

(3) More facts about and capable analyses of conditions relating to laboratory animal usage in the laboratories. Many of the observations of laboratory conditions upon which both humanitarians and scientists have based their judgments in the past now are out of date. Both groups are very much in need of updating these observations and analyses. In this aspect of the problem, also, there is now much more hope for the future, as will be evident from later portions of this article.

(4) A sincere effort on the part of humanitarians and scientists to work together in preparing and conducting laboratory improvement programs, not merely reacting to the proposals of others. The punitive aspects of laboratory legislation and other proposals must be soft-pedaled, and the constructive aspects emphasized. There is reason to believe, in the light of recent events, that more may be gained from voluntary than from forced action. The whole emphasis of these programs is changing in this direction, with much potential benefit for the animals.

The last of these four conditions will be the most difficult for many humanitarians to accept. They feel so strongly about past abuses of laboratory animals that their main

(Continued in second column)

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS

No. 18 - December, 1971

Humane Information Services
Incorporated

EDITORS:

Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen
Miss Emily F. Gleockler

A NON-PROFIT SOCIETY FURNISHING INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
FOR USE IN PROGRAMS FOR THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

4521 - 4th Street South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

goal sometimes appears to be revenge and retribution rather than help for the animals. They hate all scientists with the same indiscriminating resentment and distrust that features all too many scientists' reactions to humanitarians. We know that because of these deep-seated feelings many of our members will resent the thoughts expressed in this article. In the past, we have been able to predict the effects on membership and contributions of various articles that have appeared in these Reports. By omitting things to which we know some of our readers with very strong beliefs will object and including other things which we do not believe but know would be popular

facilities for the animals. If we insist that the laboratories provide more humane accommodations for the animals, then fight against the provision of money for this purpose, there is little wonder that some members of Congress may be led to question our sanity!

Nevertheless, any humanitarian familiar with these events must take a great deal of satisfaction in this marked progress achieved in dealing with the procurement, housing and care of laboratory animals.

On this first phase of the laboratory animal front, our cue is to rest on our oars and give the Act time to work, meanwhile keeping our eyes open to the need for adequate

appropriate appropriations and effective administration.

(2) The

More Hope for Laboratory Animals

with some humanitarians, we could substantially increase our dues and contributions. But that would merely be benefiting the society at the expense of the animals, and our uncompensated officers are not interested in that kind of accomplishment. So, we hope that all of our readers will go through the rest of this article with an open mind, and forgive us if we express some viewpoints with which they find it impossible to agree.

Three Potential Fields of Improvement

All of the potential ways of reducing the suffering of laboratory animals can be grouped under three categories. This section is devoted to a review of developments in and future possibilities of each category.

(1) Improving the procurement, housing and care of laboratory animals. During the past year the United States Department of Agriculture has been drawing up plans and regulations for implementing the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, which greatly improved and extended the provisions of Public Law 89-544, 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 good illustration of what can be accomplished by cooperation as opposed to fighting among humane societies and scientists. Although much of the credit for passage of this Act through Congress can be given to Mrs. Christine Stevens of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the Humane Society of the United States, the National Association for Humane Legislation and the Committee for Constructive Laboratory Animal Legislation actively participated in formulating the provisions of the Act and helping to get it passed. A few humane societies, as usual, were in opposition, but only mildly so. However, even this comparatively united front would not have sufficed had the scientific community offered any strenuous opposition. This illustrates the value of cooperation to obtain action.

Although not every aspect of the procurement, housing and care of laboratory animals will be immediately 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 proved necessary, by way of amendments. One of the biggest stumbling blocks yet to be overcome is the much-too-small appropriation for administration of the Act which was provided by Congress. Here, again, it seems likely that a more concerted campaign for a larger appropriation, if it had been made by humane societies, could have succeeded. Passage of any act needs to be continuously followed up by the humane movement to see that it is properly implemented. One of the most remarkable demonstrations of the misunderstanding of the needs and purposes of legislation was the fight put on by some humane societies against another appropriation intended to provide funds needed for improved housing

(Continued in third column)

treatment of animals during experiments and tests. The key point of difference between humanitarians and biomedical scientists is anesthesia during all painful experiments or tests, followed immediately by a painless death. Most humanitarians would be satisfied with this single requirement, and some will not be satisfied with anything less. But scientists point out that such anesthesia would defeat the purposes of some of the most important experiments and tests, which depend for significance upon the use of an animal in normal condition. Observation of the results of drug tests, for example, including convulsions, other body movements and reflex actions could not be made if the animals were anesthetized. In that case, say some of the humanitarians, the tests should not be permitted. So long as this impasse prevails, there can be no progress toward a solution of the problem. The suffering of laboratory animals while undergoing the experiments and tests.

But many -- probably the great majority of -- humanitarians can see the utter futility of such an attitude. They recognize the very evident fact that the scientists, Congress and the public are not willing to give up the hoped-for benefits to people arising from these experiments and tests that involve pain for the animals. No realistic person can anticipate any appreciable change in this situation during the foreseeable future. But it is equally certain that none of these groups would hold out against a requirement that all unnecessary pain be eliminated by anesthesia or in other ways.

Several questions then arise. What does "unnecessary" mean? Some would say that it is pain inflicted during the conduct of an experiment or test which itself is unnecessary. But who is to judge this? Many of

(See LABORATORY ANIMALS, page 2, column 1)

December, 1971

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
St. Petersburg, Fla.
Permit No. 5675

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS No. 18

HUMANE INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.
4521 - 4th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

Postmaster: Address Correction
Requested, Forwarding and
Return Postage Guaranteed

LABORATORY ANIMALS — from page 1

the most important scientific discoveries have been made as the direct or indirect result of fortuitous findings in the search for knowledge for its own sake. There is one thing certain: The scientists will never agree to permit humanitarians or bureaucrats or any other authority to determine what is a legitimate or an illegitimate research project, since all of them have the indefinite search for knowledge as a goal or excuse, whichever one wishes to call it. Tests, on the other hand, being conducted directly for the benefit of people, certainly can be legitimately evaluated by non-scientists from the standpoint of whether or not their people-benefits more than offset their animal-suffering effects. 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, the public, Congress and humanitarians is the following: Unnecessary pain or suffering is that which could be eliminated without preventing attainment of the substantive purposes of the experiment or test.

The Reverend Charles N. Herrick, Sr., who exudes an aura of rectitude and reasonableness which usually can disarm the most intransigent person, has discussed this subject with a good many biomedical scientists. The net result of these discussions, conducted while the Reverend Herrick was a staff member of the HSUS, was to reveal that the best scientists, recognized authorities in their fields, differed quite substantially on such points as whether or not anesthesia would seriously affect the outcome of certain experiments. These differences about procedures can be highly important in affecting the amount of pain experienced by the animals used.

To these observations, Humane Information Services would add these questions: Can any informed scientist deny the use in some laboratories of curare-type drugs, which in no case can be considered an anesthetic, as a convenience in animal preparations? Can any informed biomedical scientist deny that animals have been dumped into cages after operations, and left to gradually expire or recover in pain and discomfort, when there existed no overriding need for post-operative

(Continued in second column)

Humane Information Services will send a receipt for dues or a contribution in the amount of \$5.00 or more or in a lesser amount if the sender so requests or if same is received in cash, by money order or from a foreign country. Otherwise your cancelled check will serve as a receipt.

RETURN COUPON
To: Humane Information Services, Inc.
4521 - 4th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33705
 I wish to be kept on your mailing list for Reports to Humanitarians (I understand that I do not have to become a member or make a contribution to receive them).
 I do not wish to be kept on your mailing list.
 My name and address on the reverse side are correct.
 My name and address on the reverse side are not correct and should read as follows:

 I wish to become an Associate Member and enclose annual dues of \$ (\$1.00 to \$4.99).
 I wish to become a Patron Member and enclose annual dues of \$ (\$5.00 or more).
 I wish to make a contribution and enclose \$ _____ to be used for _____
ZIP _____

observation? Can anyone who has worked in or visited animal laboratories claim that the animals always receive the kind of post-operative care they would receive as private patients in a good veterinary hospital? Can any scientist experienced in biomedical laboratories deny having observed many instances of unnecessary mistreatment or misuse of animals that not only inflicted unnecessary suffering but also sometimes doomed the "research" to insignificance even before it was undertaken? And have they failed to speak up because of the "code of professional ethics" which forbids one scientist to openly criticize another?

Humane Information Services concludes, not on the basis of its own layman's direct observations, but on direct and indirect statements by scientists themselves, that a significant amount of "unnecessary" suffering goes on in many laboratories, which could be eliminated without any adverse effects upon the results of the experiments or tests.

The Rogers-Javits bill sought to deal with this unnecessary infliction of pain in two ways: first, by setting up procedural standards which would be enforced by the federal administrative agency. Secondly, recognizing that with many thousands of experiments and tests being conducted daily in thousands of laboratories it would be a physical impossibility for even an army of bureaucrats to "police" the observance or non-observance of these standards, the bill provided for setting up "in-house" committees of scientists in each laboratory, responsible for enforcement of the standards. If spot checks of the laboratories by the administrative agency disclosed serious and consistent infractions of the standards, the in-house committees as well as the laboratories and the individual scientists involved would be subject to serious penalties.

These reasonable and potentially effective provisions were rejected both by many scientists and by many humanitarians who failed to understand the complexity of the problems and the impossibility of finding simple solutions. So the bill was defeated by opposition from the more intransigent members of both the scientific and humane groups. The chances of successfully reviving it in the near future are not good.

But the "near-miss" has given rise to some second thoughts on both sides. Some scientists have recognized both the need for some such arrangement and the desirability from their standpoint of taking some voluntary action to attain these objectives of the Rogers-Javits bill without at the same time incurring the dangers of legal accountability and possible over-zealous and unreasonable enforcement by some government bureaucrats.

Some humane groups, on the other hand, recognizing the continuing difficulty of obtaining legislation containing these provisions, are interested in the possibility of voluntary action by the scientific community to achieve the ends without government regulation.

These sober second thoughts seem to offer a potentially fruitful means of reaching mutually-acceptable objectives.

We understand that many laboratories already have set up in-house committees for the purpose of giving more peer-examination of projects and procedures than has been true in the past. These committees undoubtedly will find it desirable to set up standards of their own, in order to avoid basing findings solely on the specific individual circumstances applying to each case. Obviously, advantages would be derived by the in-house committees if they met occasionally to compare notes, assisted by some informal or even formal federating group. From this might very well come some arrangement for reaching peer agreement on voluntary standards which would serve as a guide to the in-house committees of individual laboratories.

If some voluntary arrangement of this kind could be brought to pass, it is possible to conceive even of some informal yet regular communication between reasonable and informed humane groups and any federated organization of the in-house committees. That would indeed be a potentially rewarding arrangement, leaving the laboratories to accomplish the needed reforms without looking down the muzzle of a government shotgun, and for humane groups to be in communication

(Continued in third column)

with the laboratories for the purpose of presenting their views about various problems.

Although this may now appear to be a visionary possibility, certain recent developments to be discussed later offer hope that it may be attainable.

(3) Reducing the use of laboratory animals. Only a few years ago the attention of most humanitarians concerned with the plight of laboratory animals was centered almost exclusively on anesthesia and associated problems of experimental and testing procedures. But more recently this attention has done a flip-flop to focus upon what has come to be known as "replacement". This is the replacement of laboratory animals used for experiments and tests by other, non-sentient, or less sentient, biological models such as tissue and organ cultures, lower forms of animal life having poorly-developed central nervous systems, and non-living devices such as mathematical models.



Teddy knows our members will contribute generously at Christmas, but that many lean months come afterwards. So he thriftily buries his bones in our back yard. Unfortunately, they are milk bones, and the squirrels, not Teddy, will benefit.

Actually, replacement is only one of two ways of reducing the number of animals used in laboratories. The other is called "reduction", which refers to the use of smaller numbers of any given type of sentient biological model in attaining a given objective. It includes, also, the use of too few animals to provide any valid testing of an hypothesis, so that the animal suffering involved is in vain, requiring repetitious experiments to validate the unreliable indications.

Of these two ways of reducing the number of animals used in the laboratories, "reduction" and "replacement", the former seems to have much the greater potential in the present stages of development of the respective techniques involved. Probably "replacement" has received so much more attention in humane circles because, first, it meets the test of the antivivisectionists for complete elimination of animals, and, second, because it is possible to describe some of the techniques involved in the magical language of fantasy-land. "Reduction", on the other hand, involves the use of highly complicated statistical techniques and experimental design, 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 both "reduction" and "replacement". He commissioned a reputable professional firm specializing in experimental design, Westat Research Analysts, to make a scientific study of reduction of the use of animals in biomedical laboratories by means of better experimental design and statistical methods for analyzing the data.

Westat drew an authentic random sample of 4,826 articles from Index Medicus for 1961, of which 253 reported research involving experimental animals, of which 173 were reported completely enough to permit some judgment concerning the adequacy of their experimental design. After careful analysis it was found that 129 of these experiments, or 74.6 percent, could have, by use of proper statistical design, employed reduced numbers of animals with essentially no loss in statistical significance. Many of these could also be criticized on the grounds of inadequate or improper analysis of the data. In fact, only four percent of the 173 articles were judged to have been both well analyzed and well designed. When one considers

(See LABORATORY ANIMALS, page 3, column 1)

LABORATORY ANIMALS — from page 2

as statistically deficient the articles which did not report numbers of animals, 217 of 226 experiments employed inadequate or inappropriate statistical design, analysis, or reporting procedures. Remarkably large reductions in numbers of animals used in these experiments could have been effected by proper design and analytical procedures.

When one considers the great amount of totally unnecessary animal suffering represented by this failure to follow established research procedures, not to mention the great waste of professional time and funds, scientists as well as humanitarians must be appalled.

Of all matters related to the use of animals in biomedical laboratories, by far the most sensitive is the freedom of researchers to plan and conduct their experiments without outside hindrance of any kind. There are some very good reasons for this sensitivity. Censorship of science is as fraught with dangers as censorship of the press. But does this mean that the researchers should continue to be permitted to plan and 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 animal usage? Are there not so many potential uses of available funds for biomedical research of real benefit to the public which must go unfunded that those charged with supervision of the research should stand by apathetically while animals are used by the millions in conducting projects 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 biomedical research, when he categorizes all humanitarians concerned with these matters as antivivisectionists and crackpots?

Forced conformity to presently accepted good statistical procedures in biomedical research, although it would produce some very beneficial results, also carries the danger of stifling initiative, and of preventing some highly original and productive thinker from developing an idea, however crudely, which may lead others to come up with some tremendously important discovery. But voluntary assistance by scientific peers, to alert the researcher to the dangers of poor experimental design and statistical analysis and call his attention to resources for assistance in these fields, could be of inestimable value to the researcher as well as the potential public health beneficiaries of the work. And it could certainly lead to a great reduction in the number of animals used.

Here, again, the finger points to the potential role of effective in-house committees.

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 realized by many scientists and by a few humanitarians for well over a decade. The writer made a trip to Europe in 1964 especially to learn about these possibilities by consulting scientists and humanitarians who had done pioneer work in this field. And he has insisted that provisions designed to discover and promote the greater use of replacement methods be inserted in every laboratory animal bill dealing with research and testing methods that has been introduced into Congress since then. The Rogers-Javits bill did contain such provisions (see page 3, last column, of Report to Humanitarians No. 8). The bill was defeated partly because of the opposition of those who would now have us believe that they are fighting the battle for replacement.

The possibilities and limitations of replacement methods were rather fully covered in our Report to Humanitarians No. 10, issued in December, 1969. Because it dealt with the subject honestly and accurately, and without exaggeration, some humanitarians thought that it failed to do the "selling job" which they consider desirable. But who is to be "sold"? Not the humanitarians who already have been so over-sold on the subject that they passed up the greatest chance to do something about it by getting behind

(Continued in second column)

the Rogers-Javits bill. Those to be "sold" are Congress and the general public, and the scientists whose evaluations will be accepted 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 organizations that in recent years have specialized in advocating replacement. We have solicited critical analysis. In all that time, not one communication has been received disagreeing with any specific statement in the Report. Scientists have called it the best popular analysis of the subject they have seen. Even the technical adviser to a foreign antivivisection society said he could find nothing in the Report with which he would seriously disagree.

Despite the exaggerated and astoundingly uninformed 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. To achieve these possibilities requires at this time, not laws or regulations requiring the use of replacement methods, but the funding and official encouragement of research looking to the development of new and improved methods, and the extension of all available knowledge on the subject to the scientific personnel of biomedical laboratories everywhere. This will require action by the federal government, which finances and exerts a significant degree of control over biomedical laboratories.

One of the most effective ways of getting such action would be to enlist the cooperation of those scientists who are most aware of the possibilities of replacement methods, and have been conducting pioneer work 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 to improve conditions for laboratory animals, stress has been placed on the desirability of working for voluntary action by the biomedical scientists and laboratories. Certainly there is little prospect of obtaining the needed action by legislation in the near future, partly because of the seeming impossibility of ever persuading humanitarians to agree on any potentially effective measure which has a real chance of passage. Voluntary action, on the other hand, can be promoted by individuals contacting individuals. There is 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 communication, it must be initiated by humane societies that have not built up reputations, deserved or not, for intransigence and violent antagonism to scientists. And the individual or individuals representing the humane movement must be acceptable to scientists as well informed and objective. Such a representative must first know what he is talking about, and be able to use the scientists' language. He should have desirable personal characteristics such as compassion and ability to get along with and influence people. And he must be able to devote full time to this specialized assignment for an indefi-

(Continued in third column)

nite period of time, with necessary funds for travel.

Obviously, nobody now active in the humane movement fulfills all of these requirements. If such a man is to be found, 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 problem and financial resources to fund such a project is the Humane Society of the United States. At the HSUS annual convention it was learned that the board of directors had voted to provide funds to employ a specialist in this field. Humane Information Services, of course, cannot presume to speak in any way for the HSUS, but we hope that they will proceed in the directions outlined in this article.

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

The first job is to get the needed facts and to try to find some consensus of opinion among well-informed and interested scientists regarding the possibilities, limitations and priorities of different approaches. That should take at least a year of hard work after a suitable man is obtained. He should be free of the kind of pulling and hauling in different directions of which some humanitarians with more enthusiasm than knowledge might be guilty. He must have the opportunity to exercise great independence of thought and action if he is to do what is expected of him. Above all, he should not have to start balancing off the viewpoints of different groups and trying to please everybody.

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

One potential result of this project is to bring together the latest scientific findings needed to bring up to date the very fine and useful book published in 1959, The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique. This was a report of work conducted under university research fellowships sponsored by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, of London, England. With this book brought up to date, all concerned will be in a much better position to sift the wheat from the chaff and come up with some workable programs.

Humane Information Services from its beginning has been particularly interested in improving conditions for laboratory animals. We are encouraged to believe that, following passage of the memorable Animal Welfare Act of 1970, progress will continue to 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 matter with them? I thought they were going to write about euthanasia methods, or progress on the legislative front, or humane education, or food animals, or spay programs." Some have been asking when we will put out another News About Animals, or a complete Humane Legislation Digest.

All of these, and many more subjects, will be covered in future Reports. The laboratory animal report in this issue is particularly timely because of recent developments. We have not been able to find the time for assembling another News About Animals -- we may be able to do it soon. And we hope that early next year our sister society, the National Association for Humane Legislation, will have more definite information about national humane legislation, which we will pass on to you.

True, Our Officers' Corner does contain some chitchat which might have been omitted in favor of a short article on some specific subject. But this is your humane society, and we wanted you to know something about our progress to date. So please bear with us. The things you have been writing to us about will be covered as soon as we can get to them and space permits.

Our Officers' Corner

GRATIFYING PROGRESS OF H.I.S., INC.

This issue marks the completion of the sixth year since Humane Information Services was incorporated. The first year and a half was devoted to purchasing printing 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 alternative solutions which have been appearing in 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: (1) we already have accomplished a lot in reducing animal suffering, 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, which buoys our spirits when the going gets rough; (3) we have experienced growth, and acceptance by the humane movement, exceeding our fondest expectations.

Growth in Members

Our membership and readership have reflected this acceptance, growing substantially each year. We now have paid members in every state, and our Reports reach a large percentage of individual humanitarians and practically all humane societies in this country, and many abroad. We have never used bulk mailing lists, telephone books, dog license lists, newspaper advertisements or any other form of public solicitation. Practically all of the 12,000 names on our mailing list were sent to us by members. They represent not just casually-interested people, but mostly dedicated animal lovers who take an active part in humane work. It is rare to meet a real humanitarian who does not receive our Reports. We deeply appreciate the help of those members who have assisted us in expanding our mailing list. Our success has been based in no small measure upon this cooperation. Please keep it up.

If our mailing list were three times as large, derived from miscellaneous sources, our publications still would not carry much more influence. From the standpoint of active humanitarians reached, we are just about as large as any other national humane society. And we have plenty of evidence that our "readers" conscientiously read our Reports, because they contain the kind of material that means something. So, we have grown in influence even more than in numbers of humanitarians reached.

Influence in Humane Movement

This influence is shown by the continuing flow of letters received from all over the world, complimenting our work and thanking us for information and other assistance. In our last Christmas issue we included excerpts from a few of these letters, and could now quote from an equal number received in 1971. But this might seem to be laboring the point. These compliments please us, naturally, but we don't let them go to our heads! We exist not for personal ego-satisfaction but to help the animals.

Staff Increases Fifty Percent!

Until 1971 the only regular members of our staff were Emily F. Gleockler, secretary-treasurer, and Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, our president. This year, however, we added another full-time officer, Arthur "Burt" Brainerd, director of humane education, representing 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 40-hour week, including weekends. We have but one paid employee, our secretary-treasurer, who receives only \$64 per week for doing the equivalent of the work of several persons. Emily handles all of the membership records, keeps the mailing list up to date, writes most of the membership correspondence, maintains a double-entry set of accounts, sets up the type for our publications ready for the offset press, addresses and otherwise prepares for mailing each issue of these Reports, files correspondence and research materials, and types all of "Doc"'s correspondence. She also does the janitor work and all of the yard work, fixes balky doorknobs, and, when she took a few Sundays off from "regular" work this summer, painted the entire interior of our office! On top of all that, she gives plenty of loving care to her dog, Teddy, and takes him for long walks in the park every morning and evening. Doc has not been satisfied with this, however, and recently persuaded her to take over his chore of cleaning those pesky pine needles off the roof! Emily reminds Doc of those super-industrious German housewives he used to see in the row-house sections of Northern

(Continued in second column)

cities, out scrubbing the already perfectly clean marble door stoops. She just loves work!

Burt also has proved to be a great worker. Right now he is on an extended trip to Wisconsin in connection with our very important project of making humane the killing of millions of ranch mink raised each year. And you should see his expense accounts -- models of frugality which would delight any corporation executive trying to hold down expenses. Burt also has been working on euthanasia, filming a documentary, and doing a variety of other things all related to humane education. Burt's wife, Marie, is equally devoted to animals. They have four cats and an overly-active cockapoo, Cookie, who forces any guest to wear armor to fend off too-demonstrative affection.

Unlike his two colleagues, Doc is physically lazy. In this work-oriented environment he sometimes finds himself at a disadvantage, as when Emily caught him unawares and insisted that he repair a leak in the roof of our storage shed (see photo). But generally Doc is able to fall back on one of three excuses: age, brains and education. Every retired man knows how many painful symptoms attributable to age can appear when work is suggested. Doc maintains it would be a shameful waste for him to do work that could be performed by others who are not so smart. And whoever heard of a man with three impressive university degrees working at something that could be done by a woman!

(Continued in third column)



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

However, Emily manages to keep Doc's nose to the grindstone so long as he can do it sitting down.

Budget Does Not Measure Accomplishments

If Humane Information Services had to hire all of this work done, paying competitive salaries, and had office expenses ordinarily required to provide what we have here, our budget for present operations literally would be ten 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 worthy.

Urgent Needs for Additional Funds

Above all, do not conclude from the general tone of satisfaction expressed in the foregoing review of our progress to date that we are at all content to rest on our oars, or that we are not in urgent need of more funds. Quite the contrary! We have reached a point where important projects must grind to a halt, and others must not be undertaken, because we have already reached or passed the limits of our present capacity. What we need most is more manpower and more money for specific projects. Some of these needs are described in an accompanying article.

Action Programs Need Support

Humane Information Services is by no means only a source of information about important humane problems and alternative solutions of these problems. We try not to duplicate the work of other societies, but where others are not caring for highly important problems we conduct our own action programs.

These include (1) developing better methods of euthanasia for animal shelters and pounds, and promoting their adoption; (2) promoting industry-wide adoption of humane methods of killing the many millions of mink 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 needed by the National Association for Humane Legislation and other societies in obtaining much-needed humane legislation.

All of these and other action programs are under way 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 plumb out of qualified people who are willing to work for nothing! What we desperately need for our vital euthanasia project, for example, is a paid field man, with travel expenses, to try out different euthanasia methods under practical operating conditions, and to persuade shelters and pounds to adopt the methods found to be most appropriate for the different conditions encountered.

This would require an amount of money as large as our entire present operating budget! We hope that during this Christmas season some of our more affluent members will make contributions of sufficient size to permit more work on this extremely worthy project. If they desire, we can furnish as-

(Continued in third column)

surances that such contributions will be used only for this purpose.

But even small contributions will help a great deal: for example, in providing answers to questions surrounding the procurement of sodium pentobarbital for euthanasia, now hedged in by new and complicated federal narcotics regulations. We know of quite a few shelters, pounds and others that have not shifted to this humane method of euthanasia partly because of such technical difficulties.

So, with Christmas rapidly approaching, we hope that you will find it in your hearts to give something extra, over and above your regular membership dues or contributions, to help fund these action programs. Remember, "He who is not actively kind is cruel." You 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.

LET US KNOW IF YOU FAIL TO RECEIVE A REPORT

Recently we received a really scathing letter from a member who said she had sent us a dollar associate membership dues but had failed to receive any subsequent issues of our Report to Humanitarians.

Investigating, we found that the disgruntled member's name and address on our mailing stencil were correct, and the Reports had been going to her. The slipup was somewhere in the postal system.

If you fail to receive your copy during the month of issue (March, June, September and December), please let us know. And our members can help us to keep to a minimum the sizable expenses involved in address changes by not waiting until they have received a forwarded Report or missed one before sending us an address correction.