(No. 34) -- Can Anything be Done to Stop Rodeos?

Humane Information Services, Inc.
Rodeos are bad, from two standpoints: (1) they involve cruelty to and suffering by animals; (2) they teach the droves of children who attend and participate, and who see snatches of rodeo performances on TV, that adults find it amusing, exciting and acceptable to inflict suffering on animals.

RODEO IS A MAJOR "SPORT"
According to the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), "more than 3,000 commercial rodeos are held in the US every year." The American Humane Association (AHA) estimates "more than 2,000 performances held each year." By anybody's guess, it is a very large number.

The AHA estimates that contestants representing 40 membership circuits in 13 states, and no doubt has extended to its use in rodeo but not in handling livestock generally. The presence of severe rodeo abuses.

Some of the propaganda against rodeo has been exploded, supported by the defenders of rodeo to counteract the claims of its critics. It is always best to lean over backwards, a practice that can be proved to be false or exaggerated.

(1) The use of cattle prods. When the animal is put in the chute, procedures as one of the authors of the brochure on rodeo, or write a letter signed by the principal or veteran present, ready to give what sounds like an authoritative rebuttal. For example, the HSUS has an official policy of not responding to requests from humane organizations, medical professionals, veterinarians, and others, which the Association claims it is would help the animal in ways that often are not protected by the rib cage. Just before the chute gate is opened the strap is imailed such that the animal cannot move. For example, it has been found that the flank strap as tight as humane organizations, medical professionals, veterinarians, and others, which the Association claims it is a very large number. It is one thing to write a humane society brochure on rodeo, but quite another to stand up before a legislative body and successfully make such claims with a rodeo clowns present, ready to give what sounds like an authoritative rebuttal.

The undoubted fact, which the rodeo people cannot deny, is that the animal bucks because it is under stress from being in the narrow chute, the preliminary preparation (Doc saw one horse which had its ears pinned back with a piece of plastic and its tail pulled hard to avoid claims that can be proofed about rodeo, but quite another to stand up before a legislative body and successfully make such claims with a rodeo clowns present, ready to give what sounds like an authoritative rebuttal.

The undoubted fact, which the rodeo people cannot deny, is that the animal bucks because it is under stress from being in the narrow chute, the preliminary preparation (Doc saw one horse which had its ears pinned back with a piece of plastic and its tail pulled hard to avoid claims that can be proofed about rodeo, but quite another to stand up before a legislative body and successfully make such claims with a rodeo clowns present, ready to give what sounds like an authoritative rebuttal.

The undoubted fact, which the rodeo people cannot deny, is that the animal bucks because it is under stress from being in the narrow chute, the preliminary preparation (Doc saw one horse which had its ears pinned back with a piece of plastic and its tail pulled hard to avoid claims that can be proofed about rodeo, but quite another to stand up before a legislative body and successfully make such claims with a rodeo clowns present, ready to give what sounds like an authoritative rebuttal.
It is claimed that the bucking strap does not physically injure the animal, but it surely must be painful (Photograph courtesy of The Humane Society of the United States.)
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kicked violently and went down in the chute merely in response to placing the bucking strap gently on its flanks before tightening, the sudden pull on the strap, the gate being opened, and the rider's belt. Even those who believe their claims will not do this.

(3) Roping events. This is where the real undeniable cruelties of the rodeo are found. This is where rodeo opponents should come down hardest. Roping events, which include calf roping, steer roping and team roping, are full of cruelty and suffering. The worst of these is called "steer busting," in which the cowboy first lassos the running steer around the horns or neck, then loops his rope over the steer's head and body to the rear and throwing his legs with great violence. Many steers are killed outright or badly injured, and must be hauled from the arena on a sled. If the steer survives, it is kept prone by a tight rope to the horse while the rider ties three legs. This event is so obviously savage and brutal that only about a dozen rodeos today still have steer roping, and they are found mostly in the big Western rodeos. But steer and calf roping still are "optional" events at rodeos approved by the Rodeo Cowboys Association.

Because steer busting is so cruel, and makes such a good talking point against rodeo, many humanitarians who protest rodeos in Eastern and other states where steer busting is not encountered use it as a descriptive example in writing letters to the editors of newspapers or to local humane society committees. This plays right into the hands of the rodeo promoters, who can indignantly deny that no steer or calf busting is permitted in their events, indicating that the promoters do not know their business. One instance of this kind, and the public or legislators may be led to believe that nothing else the protesters say is credible.

Team roping is another roping event that is obviously cruel. The steer is roped by two men, one of whom throws the lariat noose over a hind leg and the other over the neck. The animal may be stretched so much that muscles and ligaments are torn. This is most popular in California, Arizona and Nevada, where, according to the RCA, bankers, doctors and dentists are among the ardent competitors. Again, before citing team roping as an objectionable feature, be sure that it is part of the rodeo being protested. Unfortunately, many of the rodeo descriptive leaflets put out by humane societies have failed to make these distinctions, getting a credibility gap that is hard to overcome when proponents and opponents face each other before a legislative body.

Calf roping is a feature of rodeo found everywhere. A calf weighing several hundred pounds is tossed out of the chute at a speed claimed to be in the neighborhood of 25 miles per hour or more, depending partly upon the means used to start him through the gate. In the end of a calf about 25 feet long is tied to the saddle horn; the other end is the calf's loop. The calf goes over the calf's head and around its neck. As the rope becomes taut, the running calf frequently but not always is jerked into the air and off its feet (see photo). The trained horse rates the speed of the calf, stops on cue, then backs up feet to keep the rope taut. If the calf struggles halfway to its feet and/or moves toward the horse, the latter is trained to back up, rapidly tightening the rope and sometimes dragging the poor calf by the neck over the arena floor. Meanwhile, the cowboy has dismounted and runs to the calf. If the latter is still standing, he throws the rope to the ground violently and crosses any three legs which are tied with a short rope that had been tucked in the rider's belt. (Photograph courtesy of St. Petersburg Times.)

No steer or calf busting is permitted in rodeos approved by the Rodeo Cowboys Association. This is a "conveyance," which the RCA rules require for removing injured animals from the arena. Well, it's better than hauling them off at the end of a rope! (Photograph courtesy of The Humane Society of the United States.)

The RCA-approved rodeos undoubtedly represent a substantial improvement in the treatment of rodeo animals. It is harmful rather than helpful to claim otherwise, as many humanitarians do in the heat of battle.
NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN REDUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Symposium Gives Scientists' Views About Reducing Use of Laboratory Animals

The Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources of the Assembly of Life Sciences of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences (yes, that's a mouthful, representatives of this august body) has made a valiant effort to demonstrate to humanitarians that (1) animal models are necessary in biomedical research and testing, and (2) that they already are making all possible efforts to reduce their use. The symposium, entitled "NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN REDUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS," held in the magnificent auditorium of the National Academy of Sciences (yes, that's a mouthful, representatives of this august body), on October 22 and 23, 1975, Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, president of Humane Information Services, attended.

ORGANIZING GROUP

The organizing group for this symposium consisted of seven scientists and a lone humanitarians, Mrs. Christine G. Stevens, president of the Animal Welfare Institute. They seem to have had no real effort to obtain scientists of genuine professional competence to discuss the various subjects completely, and the scientific quality of the papers read was generally excellent. The speakers knew what they were talking about. We MAY TRY TO OPEN THE GIFT HORSE'S MOUTH!

It is not polite to look a gift horse in the mouth. We hope the scientists responsible for presenting this gift to humanitarians will not object to a rather frank but objective description of what we observed when we opened the horse's mouth.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

From the standpoint of decreasing the numbers of animals used in biomedical laboratories, Humane Information Services for years has tried to point out to humanitarians that "reduction" has more possibilities than complete "replacement" of laboratory animals by other models such as cells, tissue and organ cultures, and computer models. This conclusion may seem to well with antivivisectionists and humanitarians who have as their immediate goal the complete elimination of the biomedical laboratories. By refusing to recognize the facts, and continuing to claim nearly all the time that complete replacement, these humanitarians are overlooking what is by far the most vulnerable aspect of animal use in biomedical research. It would not be difficult to find some eminent researchers who are convinced that the average doctor has a better chance of catching cancer now than he did 20 years ago. But the new cancer research is so complex that it would not be possible for most doctors to understand its intricacies. Humane Information Services has a number of plans for specific actions designed to get the public to want to follow rational and objective approaches to the problem. We badly need not only to insist that biomedical research be performed by reasonable methods, but also that humanitarian critics of the laboratories learn enough about the issues involved to be able to make a discriminating critique of the animal laboratories. The symposium's theme is remarkably concise, but much of the sub- ject matter frequently designated by humanitarians as "reduction," with only partial attention given to the representation of the complete substitution of mathematical models for animal models. If all biomedical research and testing laboratories were to cease employing in these subjects as the Department headed by Dr. Newton, there undoubtedly would be a remarkable improvement in both the quality of research and the more appropriate and reduced use of animals. She showed what matters, don't you know? She made no effort to discuss the extent to which it is being done in laboratories throughout the country. Dr. Thomsen tried to rectify this omission. He asked her to give the best answer she could to three questions, concerning whether they would be happy to discuss. It would be good for the scientific community of dragging its feet in the development and use of these new technologies. It was a defense of "animals" as an "essential tool" to convince both humanitarians and the increasing number of scientists who have been questioning the quality of biomedical research and the appropriateness of the tests used in the development and evaluation of new drugs.

This was evident in the fact that practical all scientist-speaker at some time in his discussion went out of his way to claim that nothing he had said would be taken to mean that there was no longer a need to use animals. It was evident in the fact that most of the methods of research dealt with animal models, and half with alternatives. It was evident in the fact that the presentation of the claims of those who believe that alternatives could and should be used was very weak. It was evident in the fact that the presentations of the several excellent scientific papers, which through audience questioning of scientists and questions for the speakers down to earth to be faced frankly and openly.

REDUCTION OF NUMBERS

The Animals Used

A good example of a few of these points was to be found in the unusually fine paper read by Dr. Carol Newton, chairman, Department of Biomathematics, University of California School of Medicine, at Los Angeles, on the subject of "Computer Simulation." Dr. Newton very remarkably concise form much of the subject matter frequently designated by humanitarians as "reduction," with only partial attention given to the representation of the complete substitution of mathematical models for animal models. If all biomedical research and testing laboratories were to cease employing in these subjects as the Department headed by Dr. Newton, there undoubtedly would be a remarkable improvement in both the quality of research and the more appropriate and reduced use of animals. She showed what matters, don't you know? She made no effort to discuss the extent to which it is being done in laboratories throughout the country. Dr. Thomsen tried to rectify this omission. He asked her to give the best answer she could to three questions, concerning whether they would be happy to discuss. It would be good for the scientific community of dragging its feet in the development and use of these new technologies. It was a defense of "animals" as an "essential tool" to convince both humanitarians and the increasing number of scientists who have been questioning the quality of biomedical research and the appropriateness of the tests used in the development and evaluation of new drugs.

This was evident in the fact that practical all scientist-speaker at some time in his discussion went out of his way to claim that nothing he had said would be taken to mean that there was no longer a need to use animals. It was evident in the fact that most of the methods of research dealt with animal models, and half with alternatives. It was evident in the fact that the presentation of the claims of those who believe that alternatives could and should be used was very weak. It was evident in the fact that the presentations of the several excellent scientific papers, which through audience questioning of scientists and questions for the speakers down to earth to be faced frankly and openly.
merce any animal which is used or intended to be used for any of the purposes of steer wrestling, calf roping or steer wrestling, or to be subjected to the various devices such as the bucking strap, flank strap or electric prod. The proposed Rodeo Stock Protection Act would have made unlawful the buying or transporting in interstate commerce of these devices when the "buyer or transportee had reasonable cause to believe they would be used in the course of a public performance."

Aside from the obvious impossibility of getting such a bill through the House Committee on Agriculture, much less the entire House, such a statute would have countered insuperable obstacles to successful enforcement. Cattle prods, for example, are used throughout the livestock-handling industry. How could you pick out any one prod in transit and claim it was intended for steer wrestling performance? The proposed act was full of such loopholes. Stock contractors supplying the rodeos with animals would merely have been forced to go more intrusive. The effect of such an act would be minimal. Any possible approach to the problem via the route of regulation would appear to be ineffectual. Any humane society proposing such an approach to the problem must be squarely faced with the credit from potential contributors more willing to help the animals.

STATE AND LOCAL ACTION

The only partially successful action to deal with rodeos was through acts passed by the Ohio legislature in 1965, and a few instances in which humanitarians have been able to obtain local (county or city) action.

The Ohio act essentially consisted of a ban on the use of bucking straps and electric prods. It was believed that if bucking broncs and bulls are the pièce de résistance of rodeo, this would so reduce the entertainment values of the "sport" that rodeo promoters would have to curtail.

To our regret, we have not followed developments in Ohio since this act was passed due to our own misgivings. We do know that rodeo and affiliated interests later banged up on the legislature, and we understand that no attempt was made to have the act repealed or so modified as to be ineffective. If any of our Ohio members has information to the contrary, please write us.

The City of Baltimore, Maryland, passed a similar ordinance. Our files, still not in good shape after the move, indicate that in good shape after the move, indicate that the City Manager's staff responded nobly, as indicated by the attached clippings representing a few installations of this kind. Several humanitarians supported NAHL by writing letters to the editor and attending meetings.

The City of Charlotte, North Carolina, which had won the 1966 action protected us from the empty box.

In Pinellas County, Florida, home base of both HIS and the National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL), formerly held a rodeo annually in conjunction with the county fair. In 1966, all of the humane societies in the county, as well as individual humanitarians, attended the Pinellas County Commission with such determination and force that the Commission banned the rodeo (see accompanying clipping). This, to our knowledge, is the only instance in which a rodeo was banned in Florida. Perhaps we have overlooked some other case. If so, will some member please enlighten us.

There are independent humanitarians in Florida, Federation of Human Societies from time to time, as recently as this year, as was asked for the UWU at an annual convention of the AHA, but the Federation has taken no action. Many of the local societies in Florida that compose the Federation are affiliated with the AHA and advocate supervision of rodeos. Some of these local societies participate in such supervision.


Much to the consternation of both of NAHL (our sister society that handles all legislative activities that otherwise might be the responsibility of HIS), the City of St. Petersburg's Bayfront Center, a 1,500-seat, auditorium, scheduled a rodeo for October, 1975. According to press reports back in 1966, action at that time by the Pinellas County Commission applied to the entire county; but when we recently had occasion to write the county Commission meeting, we saw that the ban did not apply only to the fair. This, in our belief, was not the intent of the Commission. In any event, the City of St. Petersburg, humanitarians had been too slow in thinking that the County Commission's 1966 action protected us from such an event.

Immediately NAHL sprang into action, first by contacting the vice president of the RCA to urge an attempt to introduce rodeo into St. Petersburg, then putting on a publicity and letting-to-the-editor campaign against the rodeo, and then to our regret, we have not followed developments in Ohio since this act was passed due to our own misgivings. We do know that rodeo and affiliated interests later banged up on the legislature, and we understand that no attempt was made to have the act repealed or so modified as to be ineffective. If any of our Ohio members has information to the contrary, please write us.

The City of Baltimore, Maryland, passed a similar ordinance. Our files, still not in good shape after the move, indicate that in good shape after the move, indicate that the City Manager's staff responded nobly, as indicated by the attached clippings representing a few installations of this kind. Several humanitarians supported NAHL by writing letters to the editor and attending meetings.
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Thomsen and Arthur B. Brainard, representing NAHL, Miss Emily F. Gleckler, representing HIS; Dr. Harold F. Albers, president of the Pinellas County Veterinarians Association; Matt C. Dryden, the rodeo stock contractor; Duwayne Martin, executive manager of the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association; and representatives of the City's auditorium management. Nobody representing the SPCA of St. Petersburg, which loaned the stock to the rodeo promoter, was present at the meeting. After the meeting, a representative of the AHA implied he would not get them to write a letter saying that the rodeo should be abolished.

RODEOS - ST. PETERSBURG TIMES - WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1975

By JILL MAUNDER

In an appeal to the St. Petersburg City Council to stop a rodeo scheduled for the Bayfront Center, Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, president of the National Association for Humane Legislation, said the exhibitions depend on the public for their survival.

"It's all poppycock that they are wild, vicious bucking animals, and another thing, the people in this city in Tennessee stating that they had inspected the horses held in their cities by the stock company, and found nothing to justify the claims made in those pamphlets. NAHL immediately telephoned one of its members, a long-time director of the Jack-sontee Stockyards, and asked him how they were able to get him to write a letter saying that they do not endorse rodeos; but the damage already had been done."

These two letters, together with the repeated references to the AHA implied endorsement of the rodeo, was able to show an excellent color or motion picture of the rodeo taken at the County fair in 1966 just before rodeos were abolished. This film is the property of the SPCA of St. Petersburg, which loaned it to the rodeo promoter. The film showed the HSUS were distributed, and much of the time of the meeting was taken up by a debate between Doc and the NAHL representatives concerning some of the claims made in those pamphlets.

Things seemed to be going very well for the humane side. Thomsen and Arthur B. Brainard, the veterinarian, was asked to make his trump cards: two letters, one from the school board, and found nothing they do not endorse rodeos; but the damage already had been done.

Then the Bayfront Center official played his trump cards: two letters, one from an official of the humane society in Jackson, Tennessee, and another from the same stock company. He told the councilmen as to the humane treatment of animals, finally decided to accept the Manager's recommendation.

Thomsen described two rodeo practices that he said are "cruel" and "inhumane," the use of a "bucking strap" and calf roping.

He said the bucking strap is a two-inch-wide leather strap that goes around the lower part of the abdomen, He said the strap is pulled tight by a man brushing his feet, and that is cruel.

The other practice he protested was calf roping in which the calf is thrown around his neck and tightened jerking him into the ring. While the calf is moving, Thomsen related, a lariat is thrown across the back of the animal. The administration's report on whether rodeos are cruel is due Oct. 16.
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"The rodeo business is not as bad as people think. Things are getting better all the time. There is a more fitting family event, Mrs. Gleckler said.
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LABORATORY ANIMALS—FROM PAGE 3—clearly showed that the computer is merely a tool to aid in storing the data in readily-available form and in the solution of the mathematical equations which constitute the model. Before setting up these equations, there must be some hypothesis or theory to indicate which equations are appropriate for testing. This means that there usually must be some observed relationships in vivo (observations of life) that will assist to serve as the basis for the hypothesis. That usually means some preliminary, at least, observations of animals. Usually you don’t just reach up and pull a hypothesis out of thin air.

When sufficient observations in vivo (that is to say, at hand with the computer) are available to formulate a theory or hypothesis, sufficient specific quantitative data representing all available observations must be programmed into the computer. You can’t get anything out of the computer, in the way of facts, that has not been put into it. The only additional raw data that may be obtained represent relationships among the data programmed into the computer. These relationships are represented by the mathematical equations which constitute the mathematical model. The computer can interpolate and extrapolate values of the various parameters and extrapolate what would be the variable V, most likely would be if the variables X, Y, etc., had certain values. This is normal mathematical interpolation or extrapolation from the data originally programmed into the computer.

In biomedical research, all of the observations which must go into the computer necessarily are from either human or animal studies conducted beforehand. After the computer has done its work, the results may or may not be reliable, depending upon the sufficiency and accuracy of the original data, the appropriateness of the mathematical equations constituting the model, and the reasonableness of the interpolation or extrapolation which the computer is asked to give. For example, if observations representing the effects of 3, 7, 10 and 13-gram doses are used, and the computer is asked to give the probable effect of an 18-gram dose, the extrapolated figure may be far from the true one, since the relationship between the doses and effects may be curvilinear.

So, after the equations are solved and the results are at hand, still steps must be taken if anyone is to have confidence in the findings. They must be tested on humans or animals. Since people do not wish to be used as guinea pigs for such tests, although they sometimes are without knowing it, these amounts make tests in the laboratory with the mathematical models and computers that have appeared in the antivisionestic and humane literature, this emphasis, which might appear to a knowledgeable participant, is not necessarily defensive, was justified.

Dr. Newton’s paper showed that mathematical models and computers can contribute a great deal as a team approach to biomedical problem-solving. But it also showed that this approach is not the whole story. For instance, Dr. Mary Dawson, of the Department of Pharmaceutical Technology, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland, dealt with the use of cell, tissue and organ cultures (in vitro systems, as opposed to the use of whole, live animals, which is called in vivo) in biomedical research and testing.

Dr. Newton’s paper will appear in an early issue. We know you will reserve this issue for a few of the many nice letters received from members located in foreign countries.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR . . .

We reserve this issue for a few of the many nice letters received from members located in foreign countries.

"I personally received your HOST informative newsletter with eager anticipation, and read every word immediately, and file them for future reference. I find your information practical and down to earth. I have asked our offices to send you copies of our bi-monthly humane Viewpoint on a reciprocal basis."—Mrs. Stephanie Higham, President, The Toronto Humane Society, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

"Your view of point is easily understood and accepted. We are very interested in receiving your reports, hoping to develop the living bodies and health of our fellow creatures and protection societies throughout the world."—George Jacobsen, Chairman, Norges Dyrebeskyttelseforend, Oslo, Norway.

"For years I have read your report and have been enlightened on so many subjects. Mrs. Arnold H. Redman, Steve Hill, Bermuda.

"I am particularly impressed by the careful evaluation of priorities in your paper; I wish we had something like it here!"—Mr. J. Curtis, Cook, Hospital of St. Cross, Anglican Society for the Welfare of Animals, Rugby, England.

"I believe so implicitly in your ideas, that I am using the phraseology as a Bible. I am often asked for your opinion. so with Ripoffs—FROM PAGE 8—evaluate what is most important, what really is wrong and what process can most effectively overcome the obstacles to progress. In short, the societies tend to say and do what their uninformed members and contributors want them to say and do, rather than provide the leadership to channel humane funds and efforts where they will do the most good.

Even the sincere, dedicated organizations have been guilty of this proliferation. Perhaps they may now begin to grasp their condition. It is not a state of affluence which can be brought to a head on any one occasion or by any one organization. Time is required for the mutual education which must precede effective action.

SLAUGHTER BILL NUMBER CHANGED

The National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL) informs us that the humane slaughter bill described in the September issue of Report to Humanitarians has been revised, making it much stronger. The new version was introduced by Representative George E. Brown, Jr., of California. Representative Brown recently circulated the new bill among other members of the House and the Senate. The Representative stated that it was a strong piece of legislation. As we go to press, the names of these cosponsors and the number of the identical bill bearing their names are not yet available. NAHL informs us that full information about this revised bill, as well as all other revisions, will be made to fill this gap in articles which will appear in future issues of Report to Humanitarians. This is a move which can be brought to a head on any one occasion or by any one organization. Time is required for the mutual education which must precede effective action.

COMING UP—A FOURTH ARTICLE!

And now, fellow humanitarians, we must break off this discussion at a critical point, since we have been unable to give our full attention span of the average reader, and we need the space for other articles found in this issue. We had intended making this a three-part series of articles, but must extend it to a fourth article, which will appear in an early issue of Report to Humanitarians. We now will try to read it carefully. Please bear with us.

AN EARLY CHRISTMAS PRESENT

In a recent issue we mentioned our great need for an unaltered dictionary. No sooner said than done! Mrs. Nadine E. Kobayashi, of G.K. Kobayashi, American Society for the Welfare of Animals, Naga, Japan, paid just what we needed, thus saving a wad of money which we now can use for helping the animals in other ways. It makes a most appreciated Christmas present. Now, if one of our St.
HUMANE INFORMATION SERVICES FIGHTS TO OBTAIN ADOPTION OF ITS RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of our readers see the importance of Humane Information Services as a highly-specialized organization devoted only to research on humane problems and the implementation of solutions. Many and actions of humane societies and individual humanitarians were based upon personal experience and on the past experiences of others. Opinions varied greatly, depending upon the personal backgrounds and practical experience in handling the work of those who held them.

Many of the actions were notional reactions to a narrow field of observed conditions, rather than an objective and case-by-case analysis of the capabilities pertinent to a problem.

THE HIT-OR-MISS APPROACH

Take, for example, euthanasia. Shelters and pounds put millions of animals "down" every year, which management had observed in a few shelters they had been able to visit, or based on incorrect, generalized impressions conveyed by local veterinarians and others who never had any study of the subject and were not familiar with the pros and cons of different methods of humane euthanasia.

Such hit-or-miss choice and use of inappropriate methods has caused untold suffering and unnecessary destruction of animals.

Likewise, if a local society was organized to build and operate a shelter, the shelter committee might employ a architect to draw the plans. The architect, in turn, would visit one or a few shelters in the same area, without realizing that they were on a collision course and might not be efficient, and with that knowledge sent diseased animals out into the community, as well as unnecessary discomfort and costs, for a "research study".

SUBSTITUTING RESEARCH FOR GUESSWORK

The research and educational efforts of HIS have made it possible to substitute considerable experience from those who have experienced others for personal opinions and emotional reactions of inadequately-informed individuals. This has been true for all of the more prominent fields of humane work, not just shelter management.

An example is the article contained in the Animal Protection Institute of America, NW.6, discussing the use of succinylcholine chloride in the euthanasia of animals.

Mrs. King sought our help in suggesting a substitute method of euthanasia for her animal, which was trapped in the form of a detailed letter which we attempted to mail to the Garfield conditions. Since then

but this emphasis on research and the development of more effective humane programs to which the leaders of Repairs To HumaneANtarians is not the sole function of Humane Information Services. We are engaged now, and will be to a much greater extent in the future, in many other humane activities.

You may have noticed recently the campaign by a major automaker to bring home to automobile owners the idea that it is not just engaged in the business of producing vehicles, but also operates "full service" stations offering a variety of products and services. During its early years, HIS may have been a "limited service" organization in the humane field, but it now is branching out into the work of implementing its suggested programs. Although we have yet to be a "full service" national humane organization, we are rapidly becoming such because: (1) We realize that merely recommending new policies and procedures, based on our research, is not enough. Society wills these recommendations to the field, the more important fields of humane work, .

We believe that a program of this kind may be able to accomplish nearly as much, in some cases even more, than a single visit by a field director to the community where the problem exists.

But even this approach calls for more funds than we now have, due to the fact that many of our members reali ze to their personal assistance, we do the next best thing: offer a program of help by mail that is tailored to fit the local circumstances. Such mailings can be of three kinds: (1) detailed letters to those who request them; (2) letters from officers designated by our correspondents, trying to convince them of the value of our recommendations; (3) multiple mailings to people on our mailing list in the communities, or to local humanitarians nished by the correspondent, explaining the circumstances and the action by them that will be taken.
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Third article in a series

In two previous articles in Report to Humanitarians we have dealt with some of the fundamental questions of whether or not a given society is engaged in the non-doing of anything, and in such an event the purpose or the non-purpose of hurting any other society, good or bad. The present question is whether or not a given society is engaged in the non-doing of something, and if so, the purpose or the non-purpose of doing it.

THE PERSONALITY-ORIENTED SOCIETY

Still other candidates for the non-ripoff honor, in the opinion of some humanitarian officials, are the local humane societies which exist primarily to look after the well-being of some particular animal or group of animals, with whom they are known to be sufficiently familiar to have a say in their future. The cases of these societies are numerous, and for the sake of brevity could be designated as "ripoffs." It is the combination of circumstances that must govern the evaluation.

OBVIOUS RIPOFFS

The organizations which most obviously deserve the right to a non-doing ripoff are well known to the managers of other societies. For example, an official of one of the large national societies working for the benefit of animals described to this writer his conception of the division of work of another organization which takes in well over a half million dollars annually: about one-third goes to animal shelters, and the other third goes to fundraising activities, one-third to general administrative expenses, and one-third to the founder and chief officer in the form of high salary, expense accounts, and other remuneration.

Another national humane society (we might call them "by-products") are in the business of doing very little, if any, of what they claim they are doing. Their founders enjoy the opportunity to "expose" it..

The organizations which most obviously deserve the right to a non-doing ripoff are well known to the managers of other societies. For example, an official of one of the large national societies working for the benefit of animals described to this writer his conception of the division of work of another organization which takes in well over a half million dollars annually: about one-third goes to animal shelters, and the other third goes to fundraising activities, one-third to general administrative expenses, and one-third to the founder and chief officer in the form of high salary, expense accounts, and other remuneration.

Here we find the unspayed female and male, who will have to be killed if they do not want to face the facts and do something to change the situation. Only by confronting such doubts can we begin to make the conclusion itself obsolete.

Again, any intelligent evaluation of such societies must be based upon appraisal of numerous factors as they are encountered in a particular combination representing a specific society.

THE REAL RIPOFF

Although many of the humane societies that have been described border on the ripoff category, only a few of them have frightened us as we've watched them. Their funds set up solely or mostly for the benefit of their founders and officers. We think it no coincidence that these are the organizations that have run into the greatest number of organizational problems and attempts to deal with them could come up with any conclusion other than this: almost the whole humane movement is a ripoff. Now, we know that we will receive quite a few letters criticizing us for making that accusation, and we suggest that all who claim that expressing such a pessimistic conclusion, even publishing the analysis of more specific situations, will be better off. It will be easier in the future to discuss in previous sections of these articles, may cause some confused animal lovers to withhold contributions from any source that is mentioned. We have been criticized for not being precise about the situation to discriminate. They will point out that even Humane Information Service has not done anything that it is not a ripoff, may be affected. Cast doubt on some, or most, of the humane movement, they will say, and you cast doubt on all.

Please believe us when we say that this possibility has been studied carefully and closely. But if our conclusion is correct, what will it do? To diminish the flow of funds which go directly to the support of the humane movement, they will say, and you cast doubt on all.

Please believe us when we say that this possibility has been studied carefully and closely. But if our conclusion is correct, what will it do? To diminish the flow of funds which go directly to the support of the humane movement, they will say, and you cast doubt on all.

LACK OF LEADERSHIP IS THE PROBLEM

What justification do we have for saying that the whole humane movement is a ripoff? Briefly, after decades of organized humane activities the amount of cruelty and suffering has increased for practically every important species of animals, and it reflects partly the increase in population and national income; and if the humane movement really is helping the animals, why would it have been offset by increased humane awareness on the part of the general public. The influence should be such that the ability to be more humane. The pioneer was forced to be harsh in dealing with animals, but the elements were harsh in dealing with him.

Why have humane societies failed to meet this challenge? Why have conditions affecting animal welfare become worse rather than better?

The answer, we believe, is that those who control the humane societies have failed to provide the leadership required to meet these problems. The "leaders" of these societies have been surrounded to the winds of reaction from members and contributors who are not in a position to