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measures bore little relation to the most effective programs for relief of animal suffering. In fact, effectively dealing with humane problems frequently meant abusing the minds of the society's members of some long-cherished beliefs, going against the advertising wisdom and lack of knowledge, of which many humanitarians are as guilty as other groups. This would not encourage contributions. For example, euthanasia was for long a taboo subject. The members of humane societies preferred to believe that a good home could be found for every dog or cat except those diseased or injured. Animal lovers even (and still support) the spending of scarce humane funds for veterinary treatment of badly injured stray animals, the while millions of perfectly healthy animals are being "put to sleep" in the decompression or gas chambers of the same societies. So, the society members are kept from knowing just what proportion of animals received that had to be destroyed. This cover-up, dictated by the desire to avoid losing contributors, had much to do with the failure to deal effectively with the pet population explosion.

The societies adopted realistic policies designed to actually get results in dealing with this and other humane problems. They were confronted with the large proportion of animals received that had to be destroyed. This cover-up, dictated by the desire to avoid losing contributors, had much to do with the failure to deal effectively with the pet population explosion.

The circle became even more "vicious" because all of this take-believe work for the animals required money for staff and expenses. As the organization grew in size, the budget also grew. This in turn required increased fund-raising efforts, with consequently a greater proportion of the society's efforts devoted to what is euphemistically called the "fund-raising activities and a lesser proportion to real animal welfare work.

The vicious circle falls victim to the vicious circle finds, as it grows, an increasing need for personnel good in the field of public relations, getting publicity for the society, and doing the spectacular but ineffective things that result in more members and contributions. Prospective staff members who are equipped to handle the many technical and imaginative tasks are passed over in favor of those who can be counted on to bring home the bacon. That is why, among the animal societies, there are so few staff members capable of doing effective advertising. There is enough about the five principal humane problems hereinafter outlined to even formulate rational plans, much less execute them.

Laboratory animals received no money, but brickbats.

DIRECT-MAIL APPEALS

In recent years still another factor was added to fund raising. Many people—people with money—had long since discovered the gullibility of generous and emotionally-motivated people. They had learned that people bury their heads in an activity which costs them nothing but a few dollars, a cause which is sponsored by the good people of the earth, which gives them a right to feel that they are helping others with one device or another.

The first of these devices was hard-sell direct-mail campaigns. Engineered by master merchants drawn from the ranks of the advertising profession, mail-order experts and public relations (PR) psychologists, these campaigns were as coldly laid out to take in the money as are the sales gimmicks of book, magazine and comic peddlers. Some of the contributions received went to fund legitimate charitable activities, but a large part frequently was siphoned off to pay the salaries, commissions and expenses of the fund raisers. But these gimmick efforts were so effective that even legitimate charities were forced by the pressure of competition to adopt them.

ADVERTISING

As the costs of direct-mail fund-raising campaigns went up, their relative effectiveness to generate a dollar's worth of the increased competition among charities for the available dollars. So another gimmick came into play—advertising. A thousand-dollar advertisement in The New York Times or Christian Science Monitor would reach many more people than the same amount spent in a direct mailing. But would it bring in as much money? That depended on the kind of appeal carried by the advertisement. Generally speaking, the more phony the appeal the more effective it is. The object is to give the impression that the contributions received will serve to end or greatly ameliorate the condition described in the ad, which actually may be one of long standing with no real hope of a solution by any humane program contemplated by the society doing the advertising.

The early-bird humane society advertisers encountered little or no competition in the media from similar ads of other humane organizations, a situation that will not prevail for long if the use of this fund-raising device continues to expand rapidly.

Few things carry more emotional appeal (See Ripoff, page 2, column 1)
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societies. Efficiently conducted, these new
fund-raising campaigns, have been criti­
critically received among humane societies (HCs) for so many years that its ori­
 inception has become lost in antiquity, recently use the devices of the advertising
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trap (this particular picture, which has been widely used among humane societies
publications for so many years that its ori­
 gins have become lost in antiquity, recently appeared in the advertisement for a newly
and apparently generated many contri­
 butions). Some humane societies have skillfully
employed the devices of the advertising
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and membership among the hundreds of
societies struggling to meet their limi­
ted budgets.

ENDOWMENT FUNDS

Until this development, the wealthy hu­
mane societies generally were those which had built large endowments from the
continuing bequests of a relatively small
number of affluent members. Such be­
quests, and the endowment funds they en­
gendered, still are the mainstay of a num­
ber of well-known societies. The existence of these large endowment funds, however, has
enabled societies to:

1. Have a margin of safety in incase of losses
2. Plan on a long view, rather than simply
3. Have a more systematic approach to their

work. The raid arouses the indignation of
the media, which will present a sounding
alarm to regularly receive the society's propa­
ganda, hopefully to renew their member­
ships and contributions indefinitely.

THE SAME OLD STORY
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in its own membership lists, by means of soci­
ety publications.
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methods to deal with the major
sources of animal suffering. They have found that in the way of these contributions
will be received by appealing to the emotions
of their members. Only a few of the
most difficult, serious, and costly of current humane problems involve the
most difficult, serious, and costly of current humane
problems. The latter offers only hope and much hard
work. Contributions come first because they are needed
immediately, cat lovers and lose contributors.

Today, however, most of the societies have learned what produces reacts—mean­ing new
members and more contributions, not reduc­
tion of the organization's work, which con­
tinues to necessitate the destruction of
many millions of animals yearly.

The national societies have been learning that in order to keep the contributions
necessary for their survival and growth it
seems only necessary to denounce cruelty
critically. A recent case involving a Los Angeles pet shop
with the destruction of a cat by cat licensing, because that would offend
even fewer cat lovers and lose contributors.

Over the years, some societies have come
to regularly receive the society's propa­
ganda, hopefully to renew their member­
ships and contributions indefinitely.

And so, the real ripoff of the humane
movement has not been primarily by the
societies, but by the public, which has
responded to the appeal of the media,
The latter offers only hope and much hard
work. Contributions come first because they are needed
immediately, cat lovers and lose contributors.

Some charitable organizations, includ­ing
some humane societies, with aggressive
fund-raising campaigns, have been criti­
cized for pledging the need for more con­
tributions when they already have large
endowments. This is misconception.

The real question is how the money is spent
not how much the organization has on hand.
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H.I.S. Operating Statement for 1975

Income

Regular Dues and Contributions $11,910.11
Non-Requiring Contributions (Special Gifts, Bequests) 27,744.28
Interest 1,967.51
Total Income $44,622.90

Expenses

Wages and Salaries $7,132.18
Travel Expense 731.87
Automobile Expense 535.70
Building Expense 730.64
Office Supplies 442.42
Postal Charges 1,228.76
Printed Publications 1,689.55
Loss on Foreign Exchange 1.27
Depreciation of Buildings 1,492.88
Depreciation of Equipment 1,028.68
Equipment Maintenance 157.04
Utilities 746.30
Taxes (Social Security, Real Estate) 551.62
Miscellaneous Expenses 122.60
Total Expenses $17,773.40
Increase in Net Worth $26,848.50
$44,622.90

Humane Information Services is one of the few national societies to publicly disclose its financial statement each year. This year doesn't take a CPA to see that HIS, at least, is no ripoff! It combines a comprehensive national humane program, which serves more than most local societies; incurs for operation of a single shelter. Our operations are wholesale, not retail. We operate no shelter, and do not engage in the various kinds of activity which are the situation is a part of some national condition which we are attempting to change. We advise local societies and individuals to pass on requests and within our limited funds. There is more to be gained by many help already are beyond our financial ability to meet them. Because of some unusual business trans-
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assigning priorities to different humane programs, the number of cases involved; (2) the average amount of suffering per case; (3) the proportion of cases which could be eliminated by feasible humane programs.

EXAMPLE: HUNTING

An example may be used to illustrate these three criteria. Hunting is one of the chief targets of many animal lovers, and a number of humane societies, who wage a vigorous war on hunters but do little or nothing about other important programs. Humane Information Services has been criticized by some of its members for not jumping into this battle with all four feet. But look at the facts. Based on years of aggressive education and propaganda, backed by excellent statistics and reasoning, we have been unable to stop the manufacturer, sale and ownership of handguns, how can we expect to ban rifles, shotguns and hunting? Those who utilize the resources of the humane move-

time are either completely out of touch with the public pulse, or more interested in venting their anger against the cruel hunters than in actually helping to reduce animal suffering. These humane society officials themselves are hunters. And the vested interests involved and the many different kinds of members which they feel a greater emotional kinship to these animals. HIS does, too, and we do not condemn such anthropomorphic bases for establishing priorities, if they are frankly recognized as based on sentiment rather than animal suffering. Here we are discussing how to maximize the reduction of animal suffering.

A HUNDRED YEARS OF NON-ACCOMPLISHMENT

The human movement is over a hundred years old, and it is still as important to recognize that the humane movement has made no more progress against cruelty to animals than the crusaders against the infidels. The crusaders were unable to rid the world of the infidels; the humane movement has been unable to rid the world of cruelty to animals. As long as there are humane individuals, and as long as the public is interested in humane issues, the movement will continue to grow. The human movement has made some progress against cruelty to animals, but it has been slow and steady. The movement must continue to work to achieve its goals, and to make the world a better place for all animals.
to the much higher priority given to activities which help more in fund raising; (4) the phenomenal ineptitude of the programs initiated to deal with what may be termed, in part, for want of a better term, "big business" for its sins of omission and commission, but at least it has learned how to present itself from the media to produce material results. But if one reads the publications of humane societies, they sound remarkably like those of other societies who have failed. They are still filled with the same old stuff about "man's best friend," how we need our legislators to do this, how they need to do that, how the society took to court some animal abuser who was fined fifteen dollars, how the society can be proud of the shelter's, ponders to dear departed. The publications of the national societies, with few exceptions, are filled with materials of no intellectual level.

Recently when a humane society conference was held in Maryland, the discussion of factory farming, it felt constrained to pay the expenses of the well-learned and thoughtful programs initiated by the Council for Livestock Protection, about the embryonic development of the conveyor system for used in ritual slaughter, where and when do you see anything about food animals? There were no programs, the organizations had failed to travel all the way to this country, although they could hardly be expected to have done so. The whole issue of animal shelters, and many state, regional, and national humane societies have tried to take a mid-ground position, have been the subject of animal use in laboratories to the newer technology, and the new chemical "models" is an insufficient indication of the public interest in the way those same animals are to be destroyed in the shelters and pounds.

Human and other animal societies have tried to present a program to deal with the humane problems associated with food animals. But we don't really expect most other national societies to do anything about this. The humanitarians and the general public are not sufficiently interested to respond with generous contributions to help them make any dent in the suffering of food animals. So, we will continue to make little progress in this field, unless it is a more successful attempt at winning the interest and support of humanitarians than in the past. As it is, there is little or no congratulatory support for such activity to warrant any real effort by contribution-hungry humane societies.

LABORATORY ANIMALS

Humane and antivivisection organizations in the United States, Great Britain and some other countries have been telling humane societies that their activities are directed at laboratory animals since long before the writer was born.

Fortunately, for antivivisection societies, there is an inexhaustible supply of horror examples contained in the technical articles published by the professional biomedical journals. For antivivisectionists, the organization does not have to employ anyone with professional qualifications to undermine the vainglorious claims of scientists who can read need merely go to the nearest medical or university library and find such publications and illustrations and descriptions of what animals were used and what was done to them. The result of this, as one of the most adamant "all-or-nothing" antivivisectionists who were willing to take the scientists' word for anything possible already being done to eliminate any suffering by laboratory animals.

Human societies, knowing little about the political techniques used in the laboratory, and not wishing to alienate potential members and contributors by conducting laboratory animal programs that would please them, mostly do nothing. The number of animals used, and of experiments and tests, continues to increase. And more and more commercial products are now tested for safety in animal—using another for its own benefit, has converted a sufficient number of animal lovers and believers in non-medical research to make the antivivisection forces bigger than the remainder of the humane movement. The head of the largest American antivivisection organization that our society has more paid-up, active members than all the major humane and antivivisection societies combined.

But there are many humanitarians and animal lovers who do not go all the way with the antivivisection movements, who do not accept the killing of animals for meat, dogs for which no homes can be found, and rats which are a public nuisance. Pigs, dogs and cats are not "desirable" animals; those killed with as much suffering for other reasons are another. Thus, any effort to tell people the purpose of making dogs and cats available to laboratories is met with instant and quick acceptance of:laboratory animals. More are being used for various kinds of "psychological" or behavior experiments which had even been the subject of laboratory animal program years ago. And many more commercial products are now tested for safety in animal—using another for its own benefit, has converted a sufficient number of animal lovers and believers in non-medical research to make the antivivisection forces bigger than the remainder of the humane movement. The head of the largest American antivivisection organization that our society has more paid-up, active members than all the major humane and antivivisection societies combined.

These conditions in the United States, or to be able to offer any constructive programs in this category adapted to conditions here. But the American Antivivisection Society, its book Animal Machinery, and her name on the program could be expected to be a tremendous success, and satisfy the conference and other meetings in which she appeared. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject. Because the societies have almost nobody on their staffs capable of dealing with this subject.
PERMITS FOR PET ANIMAL OWNERS VERSUS LICENSES FOR INDIVIDUAL ANIMALS
Report on the National Conference on Dog and Cat Control Denver, February 3-5, 1976
All around the country there is renewed interest in pet animal control measures and considerable activity to develop measures that would be independent of other local governments. City councilmen, county commissioners and administrative officials are pet animals. These complaints partly represent protests over the depredations of roaming dogs and cats against private property, and their acts of both commission and omission (excuse the pun on sidewalks and in public parkways). Some of these complaints also are on the side of the animals, protesting residential building rules against the keeping of pets, failure to pick up stray, inadequate or inhumane shelter or pound facilities, or failure to institute birth control measures to control the burgeoning pet population.

Both a result and a contributory cause of this interest in pet animal control measures was the "Control of the Pet Animal Problem," held in Chicago in May of 1974, and the follow-up conference entitled the "National Conference on Dog and Cat Control," in Denver in February, 1976. Both conferences were sponsored by the HSUS, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the Pet Food Institute. Dr. Thomas was invited to both conferences, and reported on the first one in our Report No. 28 (June, 1974). This article will comment on some important developments from the Denver conference.

Any conference sponsored by organizations with such divergent views as those involved in this field, and the other societies represented by inviteses, is likely to give birth to little that is significantly high percentage of dog bites result from human errors, not animal errors.

One of the obvious purposes of both conferences was to avoid rocking the boat. Regardless, any group of people placed in a room for a few hours and expected to come up with a fully analytical report and significant recommendations on a controversial and complex subject is not likely to satisfy anyone, even under the best of circumstances. But there is great value in merely existing conferences, and the conference was worth every bit of its cost to the sponsoring organizations and those who donated.

The conferences were assigned to nine workshops dealing with "Values and Limitations of Ownership," "Public Health and Regulations," "Production and Supply," "Education," and "Animal Control Officers Training," "Reproduction Control," "Chemical and Mechanical Methods," "Surgical Neutering Programs," "Production and Supply," and "Education." The workshops in turn dealt with regulations and laws, and surgical neutering programs. However, by questioning participants in the workshop on chemical and mechanical methods of control and control, we were able to get the latest information in this field.

REPRODUCTION CONTROL

Some of the research in the field of chemical reproduction control still is under heavy wraps, and Doc is not at liberty to discuss some of these developments. However, we do know that this is an area of growing importance to humane organizations. The who's who of the HSUS has expressed interest in the possibility of establishing a Pet Animal Control Board, which would set up the control programs and particularly, would have the authority to enforce the administration of the ordinance, and of the Board's rules and regulations, by a Pet Animal Control Authority which would be independent of other local government divisions.

As it now is in most communities, the "control of the pet animal problem" is placed under the jurisdiction of the local health department, the county sheriff, the city police department or the sanitation department. These people usually know little or nothing about pet animal control, pound operation, and means of controlling the pet animal population. They are equally ignorant of the serious problem of rabies, and realize the seriousness of the pet animal problem.

As readers of our Report to Humanitarians No. 35-1976 published in February, 1976, we will present in Report to Humanitarians a summary of these papers and of the conference conclusions about PET ANIMAL CONTROL MEASURES AND ORDINANCES
As readers of our Report to Humanitarians No. 29 (September, 1974) know, after extensive and intensive analysis of the pet population explosion and measures designed to deal with the "Pet Animal Problem," Humane Information Services has reached the definite conclusion that the most effective and simple way to deal with this problem is a pet animal control ordinance. This article will comment on some important developments since the first one in our Report No. 28 (June, 1974).

Objections to the proposed ordinance received by us since its publication have been directly these: that the proposal is gratuitous, and that no municipality or county could be persuaded to pass it. That surely will be true if humanitarians admit defeat before starting any program.

PET ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD AND AUTHORITY

A feature of our suggested ordinance that draws immediate fire from nearly everybody is the Pet Animal Control Board, which would set up the control programs and particularly would have the authority to enforce the administration of the ordinance, and of the Board's rules and regulations, by a Pet Animal Control Authority which would be independent of other local government divisions.

As it now is in most communities, the "control of the pet animal problem" is placed under the jurisdiction of the local health department, the county sheriff, the city police department or the sanitation department. These people usually know little or nothing about pet animal control, pound operation, and means of controlling the pet animal population. They are equally ignorant of the serious problem of rabies, and realize the seriousness of the pet animal problem.

The idea of licensing owners rather than animals actually originated, we understand, with the late Fred Myers, first president of the Humane Society of the United States, and has been weakly espoused by the HSUS through the years since then. Yet, the two representatives of the HSUS present at this workshop apparently were not aware of this suggestion, or coupled with accompanying the declaration for each pet animal owned (similar to declarations for various tax purposes).

The idea of licensing owners rather than animals actually originated, we understand, with the late Fred Myers, first president of the Humane Society of the United States, and has been weakly espoused by the HSUS through the years since then. Yet, the two representatives of the HSUS present at this workshop apparently were not aware of this suggestion, or coupled with accompanying the declaration for each pet animal owned. This is a proposal ordinance which was published about a year ago.

It is doubtful, however, that the permit system would have been well received in this event; there was no enthusiasm for a system with a vested interest in retaining the essential features of the existing ordinance. But, for the information of those concerned, we will publish in this report the model ordinance that was published in 1974, here are some of the advantages of the permit over a strict licensing system:

(1) Responsibility for the animal's condition and actions is placed directly upon the owner, where it belongs, not upon the animal.

(2) With a straight licensing system, if a dog is caught without a license or rabies inoculation tag, it is impounded. If the owner does not wish to pay the redemption fee, buy a license and have the dog released, he simply puts the animal to death chamber, and picks up another from some neighbor with puppies to live away, or from some other source. This is akin to the nose of the animal owner. But under the permit system the owner would be penalized for having an unlicensed animal (if the animal would have been required to pay the license fee and other requirements of the ordinance, and otherwise can be prosecuted for making a false declaration).

(3) There is an increasing desire to bring pet shops under license control. However, merely licensing them to operate, and trusting to the anti-cruelty laws to bring compliance, may do little good. Under owner-permit control, the owner-permitter would be forced to make the declaration of pet animal owned the same as any individual owner, who would be required to pay the different license fee for unsterilized animals, and would be subject to the same requirements for good health and ownership as the other. The pet shop would have to pay the license fee for each pet animal sold. Under the permit system, the year, the same as an individual owner. This would increase revenues for operations of the control authority, and discourage the keeping of forlorn, unsterilized animals, etc. The way it would work may be illustrated by the common practice of some pet shops buying up abandoned animals from neighborhood children or adults, to be sold for a few dollars each, thus adding to the supply of breeding pet animals.

even if it does, these officials must have the authorization of law to arrest the individuals and magistrates, who must function under arcaich laws and law enforcement provisions. Why should the humane society have to stand the expense of this enforcement function, when other agencies re­ ceiving police and fire protection do not? Both a result and a contributory cause of this interest in pet animal control measures was the "Control of the Pet Animal Problem," held in Chicago in May of 1974, and the follow-up conference entitled the "National Conference on Dog and Cat Control," in Denver in February, 1976. Both conferences were sponsored by the HSUS, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the Pet Food Institute. Dr. Thomas was invited to both conferences, and reported on the first one in our Report No. 28 (June, 1974). This article will comment on some important developments since the first one in our Report No. 28 (June, 1974).
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as cat licensing, large license fee differenials for unsterilized versus sterilized animals, and restrictions on pet ownership permits rather than simple license for the animals (see article in this issue), public spay clinics, and sterilization programs "for a fee," all of which will support only a few or none of these improvements. They will tell you they "can't afford at this time" to do it. Recently a city council operating a shelter received a national award for excellence, although it violates almost every one of the foregoing principles, and in addition has opposed efforts to encourage such a program in the city. So, again, the desire to maximize membership and contributions overcomes the wish to really do something about the pet animal problem. A comparison of average contributions from shelter managers to breeders, self-interest from the financial standpoint comes before the welfare of the animals.

FURBEARING ANIMALS

If you will read the humane literature dealing with furbearing animals and trapping, you will see that quite a bit of it dates back many years. Even before these protests were being published in the United States, British and Continental animal lovers had been propagandizing against trapping. Yet, there is still a market for all of the fur animals, which in many cases is humane. This also calls for research, in order to encourage the more humane society engaged in this country.

This approach to the trapping problem, however, will never succeed as long as the humane movement, because it would not elicit contributions as does full scale campaigns against trapping. To be denouncing the leghold trap without offering any constructive alternative. Once again, the need for contributions and the type of emotional propaganda is as important. Humanitarians respond mitigate against real progress in achieving a major humane goal.

RAT AND MOUSE POISONS

What people do to rats and mice puts in the minds most of the people of the animals which they are guilty. There is a whole array of cruel poisons commonly used to destroy untold millions of rats. Right in your own city there is probably a division of your local health department which uses these inhumane methods of "controlof rodents in biomedical laboratories, because the rats and mice there are white and clean. But an ordinary rat is brown and supposed to be flea ridden and vermin, like snakes, lice, bears, and foxes, are not the very thought of them. And since they have never been tamed and used as pets, people have no emotional involvement to them at all. So, they ignore or condone any treatment of rats without even a whisper of concern. The only recent humane society publication describes a snake owned by the executive director of a large humane society shelter. The snake was said to be "a pet house pet." Now, in your city, what will happen to the "house rats?" Now, in your city, what will happen to the "house rats?"
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control!
So, following the scent of the contributor rather than the solution of a humane movement, a contributor has demonstrated why there has been so little progress in stopping the infliction of suffering on animals.

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE
If humane Information Services thought that the record of the next hundred years would be the same as for the past hundred, we wouldn't be inclined to look ahead and leave the members and contributors to others. There is a certain amount of fun and feeling of accomplishment in merely being active in the humane movement, but there are other ways of enjoying life with less wear and tear on the nervous system.
So continuing to work because we see some signs of a change in the basic conditions that have been responsible for the lack of accomplishment in the past.
First, we encounter more and more individual humanitarians who are greeting the idea of declaring their pets. They are part of the impetus of the humane movement with a jaundiced eye. They are reading our reports and thinking, and lending more of their support to constructive programs. Approximately 17,000 humanitarians on our mailing list, whose names we received from other like-minded humanitarians, create a great many encouraging letters indicating that people constituting the backbone of the movement are beginning to see the light.

Secondly, there are signs that a few other humane societies are sincerely looking for a way out of a paralyzing mess, and that they put greater accomplishment at least on a par with growth of memberships.
Among these is the Human Society of the United States, with which we maintain friendly relations, but who have hesitated to call a spade a spade. And the Animal Welfare Institute and its sister society, the Society for Humane Legislation, have made constructive bills to prevent or to mitigate the very sorts of things that we have been trying to get them to realize are happening.

As we more and more encourage the national humane organizations could at least agree to sit down around the table and discuss amicably the foregoing and other problems which can be finally satisfactorily solved only if and when the humane movement presents to its opponents a more united front. We don't have to agree on everything to work together on many things.

In the final analysis, however, real accomplishment will come only when the individuals who are members of and contribute to humane organizations are better informed.

The organizations at present will not endanger their existence and growth by going against the emotion and misinformation which have influenced the societies to take the course of least resistance. They will adopt strong, well-planned programs only when they believe their contributors want it that way.

That makes the old dilemma: Which came first, the chicken or the egg? The societies will not change until their members change, and the members will not change until the societies take some risks of offending members by providing the kind of leadership that is called for in the third of these articles of articles.

"Humane education," about which so much has been heard, is ordinarily thought of as making over the public. We think of the national, the state, the local, the general public, the media, legislators and children. But by far the most important kind of influence is that which will apply to those who are emotionally dedicated to helping the animals, but have not been given a clear idea of education that will permit them to pick and choose among the societies which do or do not deserve support, and among the humane programs which are offered for their approval or disapproval.

This is the kind of humane education in which humane Information Services has been chiefly engaged. We will get to the general public later. If you agree with the conclusions of this article, then you should throw more of your support to Humane Information Services. If you don't agree, then you may be able to find some other organization which the particular criteria you have in mind.

LETTERS ASKING US TO NAME NAMES
Since publishing the first in our series of articles on ripoffs we have received many letters asking for our opinion of specific societies, or to suggest the names of several societies we consider to be worthy of support.

Even after explaining the reasons why we are unable to name names, we get letters like the following. They can't help but feel that you owe it to your readers and contributors to give them some constructive suggestions as to who is making future contributions. Are there any humane organizations that merit approval -- which ones are they? I'd appreciate an answer.

We sincerely wish we could help these people by naming names.

That, as we said before, could get us embroiled in lawsuits. If there is any humane society that should avoid like poison, it is expensive and generally futile lawsuits. One society that we have been reporting on by the newspapers already is said to be threatening lawsuits against the publication involved.

This, however, is not the only or even the main reason why we refuse to name names. The main one is that we do not wish to be unfair to any society.

A statement that we think Society X is one of the best of the national societies might imply that Society Y is no good.

Still another reason is that any mention of a society's name might have the effect that it is all good or all bad, when such is not the case. If we thought that any laudable-general-purpose humane society was not in significant degree of the tendencies analyzed in this article, we would never have organized Humane Information Services.

And when we say that, we mean it. We do not belong to any society that recently was unfavorably reported. We would have similar ideas, to form Humane Information Services!

All of his permissible years won't save a superfluous humane society from the curse that we will his very substantial estate to provide for employment of a competent successor and new headquarters.

That should not be taken to imply that no other societies are worthy of support. A little sheep is as entitled to our care than none at all. But why settle for a little, when you can get so much by giving to Humane Information Services? That is a biased judgment, good friends, but so are all judgments of a particular society might imply that we think Society Xi is one of the best of the national societies, or to pungently state that we think Society Xi is one of the worst.

And the members will not agree with you in this matter.

That is the kind of humane education the humane Information Services has been chiefly engaged. We will get to the general public later. If you agree with the conclusions of this article, then you should throw more of your support to Humane Information Services. If you don't agree, then you may be able to find some other organization which the particular criteria you have in mind.

CONFERENCE — FROM PAGE 5
Under the permit system, the pet shop window, the county pound and the shelter, each animal so acquired, raising its cost by several times over the present nominal amount, and discouraging this traffic in these third parties.

(4) The licensing of cats now is advocated by many of those seeking new ordinances. We have found the essence of such ordinances is impractical and dangerous to make cats wear collars or license tags, so enforce- ment of the permit system can be easily as do dogs, since they must be declared and the license must be signed. The permit is not directed against the cat, but at the owner.

(5) The real trouble with animal control, which has been discussed so much with the specific provisions attached to the licensed animals, but with enforcement and the permit system, cats can be licensed as easily as dogs, since they must be declared and the license signed and the declaration. The permit is not directed against the cat, but at the owner.

(6) By eliminating many deadbeats and cheaters from the permit system, the permit system would be far greater than those from any straight licensing system. These revenues should not go into the general fund, but be reserved entirely for covering the expense of a greatly improved pet animal control system and shelter or pound.

(7) The threat of revocation of the pet ownership permit in case of failure of the owner to declare and inoculate the covered animals can also be used to make the owner comply with regulations of the Control Board specifying required housing, care and feeding. The permit system can be used to cover the permit. Thus, it becomes increasingly
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

In recent months we have received an unusual number of really excellent letters to the editor, and wish we had room for all of them. It is one of the major benefits of our membership to the House that a number of letters are now appearing regularly in the pages of the Journal...we note that you read our reports “with great interest.” Do you also find “great interest” in the brief, “passaport” type of publication so commonly found in the humane literature?

PLEASE RUSH!

“On January 15 I asked you to RUSH...25 copies of ‘Let Us Live,’ (and) enclosed my check...Nearly four weeks have passed, and I have not received the book. Please let me hear from your Service without further delay.”—Ms. Elise Fullenlove, New Albany, Indiana.

REPLY

Your first letter was not received until January 21. Three days later we mailed you the copies ordered. Evidently you are not very familiar with the postal service! When your second letter was received, we immediately mailed you another package by first-class mail.

Humane Information Services is not a commercial organization selling something, from which you can expect to receive one-day service. We do not handle a large enough volume of orders to permit speed in handling costs. We also have a lot of other things to do, some of which are even more important than mailing pamphlets! Let us, for instance, try this: Don’t say that we are too busy to deliver your book. Let us show you the entire correspondence, and if you feel that any delay was our fault, we’ll provide you with a copy of the next year’s volume next month. Our policies are designed to help you, not to frustrate you or make your correspondence more work than it needs to be.

NAHL is a private, non-profit corporation, entirely separate from the House of Representatives. It is not a tax-exempt organization. We do not have access to the House staff that helps us, nor are we closely aligned with them. If you are interested in a legislative result (and no one really is), you must write to your Congressman and Senator. We have no power of our own! If you want to change a legislative result, you must get your Congressman and Senator to do so. We do not have power over the legislative process. It is the people who have power. We are merely a channel for the people’s views into the legislative process. We cannot use force to get what you want. We can only assist you in communicating with our Congressmen. We are not a political organization. We are a humanistic, non-political group.

Some people have asked us if our policy is to support ideas or to support political candidates. We try to do both. We support candidates who support humane policies, and we try to influence bills in that direction. We also try to support humane ideas. We try to present major humane ideas to Congress in our Journal. Some of these ideas are based on political views, and some are based on humanitarian views. We do not try to force a political view into legislation, even though we may think that a bill is bad. We try to present the facts, and let the Congressmen decide for themselves.

RECENT HUMANE LEGISLATION DEVELOPMENTS

When some of the supporters of Humane Information Services (HIS) several years ago incorporated the National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL) as an entirely separate non-profit, non-tax-exempt organization to deal with humane legislation, it was not something done for their own amusement. The Internal Revenue Service had been petitioned by the House to incorporate its “own humane legislation act,” and some of the bills passed by the House had been incorporated into effective and humane legislation. NAHL is at an disadvantage in this regard. With a relatively small income and budget, any significant expenditure on legislation might have been a “substantial” part of its activities. So, the founders and early members of NAHL have decided that they will not continue to send in the lobbying reports and income tax returns, and otherwise comply with the law. They have not, however, removed themselves from the activities of NAHL.

It is not clear whether NAHL has resigned itself to an illegal status, or whether it will continue to function as a non-profit organization. It is not clear whether the House will continue to receive lobbying reports and income tax returns, or otherwise comply with the law.

When some of the supporters of Humane Information Services (HIS) several years ago incorporated the National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL) as an entirely separate non-profit, non-tax-exempt organization to deal with humane legislation, it was not something done for their own amusement. The Internal Revenue Service had been petitioned by the House to incorporate its “own humane legislation act,” and some of the bills passed by the House had been incorporated into effective and humane legislation. NAHL is at an disadvantage in this regard. With a relatively small income and budget, any significant expenditure on legislation might have been a “substantial” part of its activities. So, the founders and early members of NAHL have decided that they will not continue to send in the lobbying reports and income tax returns, and otherwise comply with the law. They have not, however, removed themselves from the activities of NAHL.

It is not clear whether NAHL has resigned itself to an illegal status, or whether it will continue to function as a non-profit organization. It is not clear whether the House will continue to receive lobbying reports and income tax returns, or otherwise comply with the law.

MEMORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

...will be recorded in the June issue.

HUMAN Slaughter BILL

Congress, and particularly the Agriculture Committee of the House, on its agenda a considerable number of complex issues, that are not necessarily of the highest priority than any humane legislation. It may be that with this load of bills in the hands of the Agriculture Committee, the House will not get to the Slaughter bill for consideration this year, and the short time remaining for actual consideration of legislation, Congress will not get around to the Slaughter issue. As it is, the Agriculture Committee now has a number of important humane measures on its agenda, and it is quite possible that none of them will be acted upon before the next Congress. NAHL supports the House’s efforts in this regard, and encourages all of its members to write their Representatives in support of humane legislation.

The Slaughter bill is ironed out by the House-Senate conference committee, and the resulting bill is passed by both branches of Congress and sent to the President, there is the definite possibility of a veto, particularly if the cockfighting provisions are included. It is possible that the final version, unless letters from NAHL members and others persuade the Senate conference to accept the House version.
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