

Miss Solly Butler

Mr. Chenoweth, Father Agius, members and friends of The Humane Society

of the United States:

~~Ed Meyer~~

Alice Morgan Wright

~~I~~ ^{that} It will not surprise you to hear, I make a great many speeches.

I have become quite adept at responding to introductions, whether they be thoughtful and graceful, witty and funny, or just fulsome and foolish--and an amazing number of introductions fall into the latter category. I have a large stock of jokes and anecdotes that will suitably cap almost anything that any toastmaster can offer.

But I have nothing except gratitude with which to reply to the kindness with which you and The Humane Society of the United States have just greeted me. I accept with pleasure and humility the plaque that you have presented to me. No honest man could deny that it is gratifying to be told that he has been useful in a good cause and that he has pleased people whose good opinion he values. I confess freely that I am warmed in my heart. pleased & happy

If it were not so totally without precedent, I would like to reciprocate by presenting a plaque to The Humane Society of the

Mrs Margaret Von Herwarth of Geneva Swiss
World Federation for Protection of Animals.

United States, to the other humane societies of the nation, and,

Miss Butler, to the General Federation of Women's Clubs. You have

generously given credit to me for a great victory. I must say in

reply that the victory was yours. We fought a good fight together.!

I did what I could. But we got a humane slaughter law through

this last session of Congress, and we got it signed by the President,

because you turned on the heat

or the light

(Tribute to Fred
myers)
+ Helen
Jones)

In the four years since I introduced ~~the~~ ^{first} ~~first~~ humane slaughter

bill in Congress, I have acquired a large and abiding respect for

American humane societies. I discovered, during our work together,

that I agree in ~~the~~ mind and ~~the~~ heart with your fundamental

principles and purposes. I learned that you have aggressive vigor.

I found that you have able leaders who know how to get things done.

The flood of mail and telegrams that poured into the offices

of Senators and Representatives almost unceasingly during all of the

four years of our fight for humane slaughter of livestock was

amazing even to the oldest inhabitants of Capitol Hill. To me,

(Thanks to my Ad. Asst. Herb Waters
my Staff)

Good fight!
Knew if
we could
get bill
to Sen. Floor
we could
win!

Good
Job

of course, it was a delight. ^{the} To opponents of our legislation it was dismaying. To everyone, it was a revelation. In Congress we were writing and debating and voting on bills that involved billions of dollars of taxpayers' money--bills that might mean peace or war--bills that could affect the public health, the national economy, the balance of political power. But what legislation did people write to Congress about? They wrote about humane slaughter legislation. There were probably ten or twenty times more letters and telegrams about humane slaughter than about any other subject that Congress was considering. (Your good work)

Vice President Nixon told us all, the other day, that foreign policy isn't going to be influenced by letters that citizens write to the President. Perhaps not--although perhaps yes. But Congress, I can tell you, was decisively influenced toward humane slaughter legislation by what it heard from the public.

I give you my compliments.

Congrats!

not to be
depressed
but
applaud!

It seems to me, however, that it would be mistakenly cynical to believe that Congress voted for humane slaughter legislation because I am a skilled politician or because The Humane Society of the United States and its branches and allies engineered a flood of mail into the Congress. I have my share of cynicism. But I believe that I know when to suppress it and I think that this is one of those occasions.

I believe that we witnessed, during the campaign for slaughter-
house reform, one of those spontaneous manifestations of basic
goodness and decency with which the American people every once in a
while indicate that they may be worthy to lead a troubled world
in progress toward peace and justice.

It certainly would be inappropriate and presumptuous for me to
attempt to define humanitarianism for this audience. But I believe
that the American public is fundamentally humane. I believe
that no humane slaughter law could ever have been enacted were
that not the fact. You and your associates, Mr. Chenoweth, and

you and your colleagues, Miss Butler, in the humane slaughter campaign did an expert job of applying power to a political situation. But neither you nor I created the power; we merely used it. The power existed, all along, in the humane instincts of the American public.

And If I may be pardoned a personal word in this respect: it was not whimsical nor was it digressive from my usual interests for me to sponsor and fight for a humane slaughter law.

Let me amplify this thought and try to clarify it. It is a point that interests me deeply.

Some of you know that besides being a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee I am a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and am Chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament. If I had a single ambition in the Senate, it would be to have some useful part in moving the world toward disarmament and toward peace.

I hope that it will not surprise you to hear that I feel a close connection between my sponsorship of humane slaughter legislation and my efforts to find ways by which the people of all nations can live in peace and work in harmony. In both fields I am motivated by the

same ethic. You will understand me, I think, if I call it the
ethic of humanitarianism.

Someone once said--I cannot recall who it was--that he
would "give not a fig for the religion of any man whose beast
was not the better off for it." I agree with that sentiment. It
was a religious law of the ancient Israelites that a man must feed
his ox before himself. Buddhism and Hinduism forbid that a moral
man harm even the lowliest creatures. That Christianity implies
a mandate to be kind to animals, none will doubt. It was a matter
of great pleasure to me that our humane slaughter law was vigorously
endorsed by some of the major denominations of the Christian Church.
Ages
And I know, Father Agius, that the Vatican has flatly defined the
torture of animals as a sin.

No, I would not give a fig for the religion of any man whose
beast was not the better for it.

But neither would I give a fig for any brand of humanitarianism
that did not tend toward a better world for men as well as beasts,
and for men of all nations as well as for Americans, and for Americans
of all sections and all races, not just for selected groups.

Let me quote Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who once said:

"Only that man is truly ethical who feels the necessity of assisting all life that he is able to help and who shrinks from inflicting harm upon any living creature."

And I quote Dr. Schweitzer again:

"We must never become callous. The quiet conscience is the invention of the devil. No one of us may permit any preventable pain to be inflicted even though the responsibility for that pain is not ours. No one may appease his conscience by thinking that he would be interfering in something that does not concern him. No one may shut his eyes and think that the pain which is therefore not visible is non-existent."

We all worked together to apply that moral principle in our campaign to end the cruelty in slaughter-houses. That same principle is no less at stake when I work in the Senate for world peace. I should like to have your support in that work as I have had it in the enterprise we have just victoriously concluded.

I know, of course, that America must maintain military strength while the world is troubled and divided as it now is. But I

*Arms/peace
dead end*
most earnestly believe that military strength alone can settle

nothing. What we must do to achieve peace, I submit, is to recover

and to make evident that generosity, humanitarianism and compassion

that in the past won for us the world's admiration and respect and

affection. The path to peace is better known to Dr. Schweitzer

than to the Pentagon. It is not brinkmanship that will achieve peace,

but fellowship.

What I think is most important today is that the world regain

knowledge of the true spirit of this country. We now appear to

the peoples of many lands as a frightening giant, unpredictable

and unknowable. We brandish our hydrogen bombs and we panic even

our friends. It is important, it is urgent, that the people of

the world come to see us as a nation that cares, and cares deeply,

about people
~~about cruelty to animals and killing plants~~---a nation that is humane.

With our modern science and technology, we Americans can

devastate the whole world. In a day's time we can kill tens of

millions of people, we can make great areas of the earth barren of life. If we allow war to happen, it is likely that these terrible powers will be used.

I am speaking to a convention of humanitarians. So I expect to be understood when I say that we must not allow war to happen if by any exercise of ingenuity and compassion and decency we can prevent it.

While we develop the new weapons of such terrible destruction, it is morally mandatory that we search perseveringly for ways to secure a just and enduring peace. We must seek a peace that will be more than just the absence of armed conflict. We must find a peace that will carry us ever further toward the ideal of fellowship among all men, a peace that recognizes the brotherhood of all men.

(Guided Missiles to hearts & minds of men,

This is not an appropriate place, I recognize, for a partisan political speech. I shall not afflict you with one. But many of you know that I have long been critical of some of the more

militant--or militaristic--aspects of the foreign policy of the current
national administration. Part of my criticism is founded upon merely
strategic considerations. I think that our policy is bad because it
doesn't achieve even its own objectives. But the really fundamental
reason that I dislike much of our current foreign policy is that its
objectives are so fuzzy as to defy definition. *works of Peace!!*

To paraphrase: I would not give a fig for a foreign policy that
did not clearly aim at making this earth a better planet on which
to live. I fear that we Americans have not yet clearly agreed on
such a policy and certainly we have not made any such agreement
evident to the people of other nations.

Mr. Chenoweth, and friends, it may seem to some that I have
departed from the proper theme of this convention of the Humane
Society of the United States. But this I deny. I am still talking
about the wide implications of your own humane ethic. A new war,
if it comes, will be the most monstrous cruelty that this world
has ever experienced. The creatures of the field, the birds of
the air, and mankind in all lands of the earth will suffer and

perish together. And there ~~will~~^{may} die, at the same time, the humane
ideal which is the highest aspiration of our species.

No man or woman may properly call himself a humanitarian, ~~is~~
~~thing~~, who does not concern himself today with the issue of peace
or war. As Dr. Schweitzer said, no one may escape responsibility
by shutting his eyes or by imagining that this does not concern
him. I am confident that those of you here in this room, and
hundreds of thousands like you, will devote the same dedication and
perseverance to the overall struggle for peace and freedom that
you have so generously given to the great cause we are celebrating
tonight.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org