

21st Century Animal Resource Education Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DESIGNING COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

INCOME FOR THE TOP 13 ANIMAL PROTECTION ORGS IN 2003.

AKC Can no longer be seen as trustworthy

ANIMAL JUSTICE My declaration to the giants in this animal movement.

ANIMAL PROTECTION WARS

BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION

WE CAN LEARN FROM DETROIT

IRRESPONSIBLE PUBLIC IS GIVEN A FREE PASS By Ed Durvin

DYSFUNCTIONAL PATTERNS

EARLY SPAY NEUTER STUDY

FACE OFF

IDEAL SYSTEMS

IGNORANCE OF THE LAWS THEY WRITE

IN YOUR FACE STYLE TECHNIQUES WORK

JOSEPH PASTORE An incredible author of articles

JUST KILL THE DOGS

LOCAL ANIMAL WELFARE FAILURE

THE MAIN 3 AND THEIR SALARIES

MERCY ON ANIMALS

MISBREEDING

A NEW APPROACH TO SOLUTIONS

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

NO EDUCATION PROGRAM FOUND TO BE THE CAUSE

PET LIMITS DISCUSSION

PROOF THAT NOBODY REALLY WANTS TO SEE SOLUTIONS

RENTERS CAN BENEFIT FROM WISE LANDLORDS

RESCUE EDUCATORS COULD HELP

RESPECTIVELY THEIRS

WHAT IS THE HSUS? Oh My!!

=====

Designing Community Education Programs to Promote Animal Welfare

By ANNE HINDLE

Abstract

In the past responsible pet ownership education has been performed by many groups interested in animal welfare. This was done in response to ad hoc requests from concerned teachers and interested group leaders. These schools and groups were often (generally) in the higher socioeconomic areas with low evidences of animal welfare and animal control problems. Such initiatives were 'preaching to the converted' and consequently made little impact on the growing number of animal welfare and animal control problems. A review of data concerning cruelty complaints directed to the RSPCA Inspector and animal control complaints reported to several local authorities revealed close correlation. Hence those regions in most need of urban animal management education were easily identified and targeted. A strategic plan emphasizing the need for a co-operative approach by those professionals and organizations involved in urban animal management was formulated. It aimed to educate the whole community about responsible pet ownership in a program tailored to address the particular needs and problems of that community. This paper draws from the experience of the RSPCA in community education over 10 years and gives practical guidelines for those wishing to achieve an improvement in animal control or animal welfare through

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

education.

Monday

10.00am: A uniformed Animal Impounding Officer loads a cringing cattle dog into the Pound Truck to join six other dogs.

Meanwhile, back at City Hall, a weary animal control officer hands a pile of infringement notices to an already overworked Environmental Health Officer who is fighting his way through stacks of files relating to inspections concerning licensed premises, multiple dwellings and animal control matters.

11.00am: The local Alderman with a phone glued to his ear has, in the last few hours answered a series of emotional calls from constituents ranging from a sleepless resident complaining of his neighbor's noisy dogs, another bewailing the loss of a good pair of shoes soiled by dog feces, and still another angrily demanding the immediate return of his dog impounded while on its early morning neighborhood stroll.

11.30am: A Doctor in Casualty at the local hospital involuntarily shudders at the sight of a small child's face torn and bleeding after being savaged by a dog wandering in the local playground.

12.00 noon: An RSPCA Inspector called out to investigate a complaint about a neglected abused dog is appalled at the sight of the cowering emaciated animal chained to a post with no sign of food, water or shelter.

12.30pm: The RSPCA Ambulance Officer gently lifts yet another badly injured dog off the roadside and into his vehicle to rush to the University Veterinary Clinic.

1.00pm: One of the RSPCA Veterinary Officers removes her gloves and disposes of the syringe that has sent yet another healthy dog to its death.

6.00pm: A National Parks & Wildlife volunteer sadly picks up the tiny bloody body of a young ringtail possum attacked by someone's much loved pet dog.

3.00am: A frantic telephone call sends a local vet from his warm bed to the house of a regular client to treat a cat which has just been hit by a car.

Introduction

These seemingly fragmented and unrelated scenes represent some of the consequences of current urban animal management policies throughout Australia. Systems, attitudes and actions relating to urban animal management are extremely

varied ranging from low priority hit and miss schemes to highly organized efficient working modules which achieve remarkable results.

Urban animal management must no longer be synonymous with dog control methods. In fact the very definition of "urban animal" must now be expanded to include a wide range of domestic animals such as cats, birds, horses, guinea pigs, mice and fish as well as native fauna. Many of these animals are frequently kept as pets, yet most of them were originally introduced to Australia from overseas. This raises an important ecological concern if a healthy balanced environment is to be maintained and strengthens the need for an organized Australia-wide urban animal management policy. The recent emergence of a strong 'green' feeling in the community also highlights the need for controls on the keeping, movement and breeding of the animals to be enforced by all levels of government to prevent environmental imbalances. Urban animal management has suddenly become a very serious issue indeed.

Key organizations and personnel involved in urban animal management programs

The key players in any efficient urban animal management program have now emerged:

The federal government departments concerned with animal welfare and conservation/environment

The state government departments involved with animal welfare, the state Animals Protection Act and its enforcement

The state government department relating to national parks and wildlife and the environment

local government - aldermen and women, environmental health officers, animal control officers (ACOs), animals impounds and environmental officers

animal welfare groups - especially education officers, animal refuge staff and RSPCA Inspectors empowered to enforce the Animals Protection Act

conservation groups concerned with ensuring a balance between human development and environmental concerns

suppliers of pets and pet services

educational institutions.

The above mentioned personnel and the organizations they represent are all interested and concerned with varying aspects of animal welfare and animal control in the field of urban animal management. Any successful community education program in responsible pet ownership needs their ongoing cooperation, expertise and support.

In summary, all the above groups have similar goals, they want "happy animals" as a result of their endeavors and when animals are happy so are those humans who, through choice or otherwise, have to interact with those animals.

As an educationalist I believe that it is important to discuss several of the key issues of responsible pet ownership and animal control prior to detailed discussion

of education strategies.

Responsible pet ownership

DEFINITION OF RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP

The term "responsible pet ownership" has been bandied around so much by various organizations that it has become an almost meaningless cliché. However, since the RSPCA Education Program is based largely on disseminating the principles of responsible pet ownership to the community in order to ensure the on-going welfare and compassionate treatment of companion animals, it is essential to examine firstly the meaning of the word "responsible" and secondly the principles involved in responsible pet ownership.

The meanings for "responsibility" and "responsible" are defined below according to the Macquarie Dictionary:

"Responsibility" n, pl,

1. the state or fact of being responsible
4. something for which one is responsible: a child is a responsibility to its parents

"responsible" adj,

1. answerable, chargeable or accountable, as for something within one's power, control or management
4. having a capacity for moral decisions and therefore accountable: capable of rational thought or action

Thus when the term "responsible" is applied to pet owners as in "responsible pet owner" the owner has to be accountable and chargeable for the on-going care, actions and welfare of any animal under the owner's management and control.

An owner must:

1. Comply with the Queensland Government laws under the Animals Protection Act by:

providing sufficient suitable food, water, shelter and appropriate exercise to keep the animal well and happy

ensuring suitable treatment is given to an animal that is sick or injured

not abandoning any animal or failing to provide for an animal's proper care in the owner's absence.

2. Comply with relevant animal control by-laws of the appropriate local authority - in the case of dogs this usually requires:

the owner to register their dog annually after 3 months of age

the owner to confine their dog to their property

the owner to keep their dog leashed when walking in public places.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP

The principles of responsible pet ownership include:

- planning for a suitable pet to suit the owner's budget and lifestyle
- understanding and meeting the needs and habits of that particular pet and providing a lifestyle which satisfies and enriches the pet's life
- complying with legal requirements at state and local level
- undertaking correct husbandry practices relating to diet, shelter, exercise and grooming
- following a regular preventative health care program
- ensuring appropriate treatment for a pet in case of sickness or accident
- providing for responsible care in owner's absence
- desexing of male and/or female animals where these animals are not part of accepted responsible breeding and placement programs
- exercising controls on movements of pets to preserve native fauna
- training and guidance to ensure the development of appropriate behavior.

Responsible pet ownership may also be considered at several levels with each being a particular stage to be reached within the community as part of any education strategy.

LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY

For practical purposes the principles of responsible pet ownership are divided into three stages by the RSPCA in Queensland. The stages are listed in Table 1. Each is part of the RSPCA Strategic Plan for education to address problems in animal welfare in the target area.

In designing any education program, the first task is to ensure the minimum care message is received and understood by the audience and progressively, as community attitudes or understanding improves, stages 2 and 3 can be implemented. In most cases stages 1 and 2 can be dealt with at the same time.

Table 1. Levels of Responsibility.

STAGE 1 - MINIMUM CARE

care as dictated by the Animals Protection Act or similar legislation and thus a level of care which satisfies the legal requirements of pet ownership
provision of most elementary needs, generally the need for food, water, shelter and treatment for disease and injury

STAGE 2 - BASIC CARE

care of a higher level which will cater for the basic needs to make an animal

content and healthy
care at the level of the Code of Practice for the species
provision for preventative health care needs, higher levels of treatment for disease
or injury, some elements of control and behavioral satisfaction
STAGE 3 - OPTIMUM CARE

care of the best level, resulting in happy contented pets that cause no risk to
neighborhood amenity
catering for all of the above but especially environmental enrichment, solutions to
problem behaviors and a high level of training, guidance and control.

Animal control

It is difficult to find a universally accepted definition of the term "animal control"
although the Bureau of Municipal Research Toronto (1976), produced one which
may be acceptable. This paper defined "animal control" as that vast array of
services and programs that are intended both to protect people and their
environment from damage or harassment by animals and to protect animals from
cruelty by people.

So in the Toronto example, animal control and animal welfare are intimately
blended.

It is interesting to note that once a local authority simplifies and enforces its animal
control laws in a community, not only is there a better quality of life for the human
inhabitants but there is also a corresponding improvement in the welfare of animals
in the district.

It is obvious to animal welfare groups when local authorities don't practice
effective animal control, for it is the animal welfare groups that drown under the
flood of unwanted, mistreated or injured animals.

The RSPCA believes that by-laws are only effective when they are properly
enforced and calls upon local authorities to commit far greater efforts into policing
the existing by-laws.

For example, compulsory registration of dogs, when properly enforced, is a useful
identification system. But it also makes owners legally accountable for their
actions and the welfare of their animal.

Mount Isa City Council (Moore & Brennan, 1991) has clearly demonstrated the
many benefits associated with enforcing basic by-laws relating to animal (dog)
control, including dog registration:

noticeable decrease in number of cruelty complaints directed to the RSPCA
Inspector
marked improvement in animal health

sizeable improvement in dogs both male and female, desexed at owner's expense
few dogs are killed or injured on roads
a notable decrease in the number of dogs ending their days at animal welfare
refuges
a decrease in number of backyard breeders with a concerted council campaign to
address this issue
a pleasing decrease in the number of dog attacks on people and other animals
(including native fauna)
a newfound community acceptance and support for a higher quality of life for pet
owners and pets that uniform enforcement of council by-laws brings.
To promote responsible pet ownership, there should also be a marked difference,
at least 75%, in registration fees for those that have their dogs desexed or for other
positive owner actions such as obedience training or the provision of dog proof
fencing.

It seems appropriate at this stage to mention that to any local authority a stray dog
or dog at large is any dog outside its owner's property and not under control of its
owner on a leash. The public perception of the term stray is quite different and this
causes confusion and anger.

Local authorities need to be aware that the public has a totally different perception
of the term "stray". Many other terms that are in common use in animal control
circles are certainly not in the vocabulary of the man in the street.

The difficulty the public has in understanding the language of local authorities is
further compounded when the problems of literacy and aliteracy are examined.
Illiteracy refers to those who are unable to read or write, aliteracy refers to those
who can read and write but choose not to because they lack time, energy or
inclination. This concept is dealt with later in the paper in more detail.

Promoting the legal aspects of pet ownership OVERVIEW

No matter how much positive education the community is exposed to, there will
always be an element of our society that is unresponsive to community pressures
and that fails to conform to conventional and respected codes of behavior when it
comes to animal treatment and management.

In a previous paper on education published by the RSPCA (Day, 1989) the term
"education by prosecution" was coined. For those who don't respond to
community norms, prosecution is often effective in changing attitudes.

However it seems that the laws relating to animal protection and animal control
are neither widely known nor clearly understood. This is especially so in those
regions identified by both the RSPCA Inspector and local authorities as having
biggest problems in animal welfare and animal control. These regions are generally
low socioeconomic areas where there is often a large non-English speaking ethnic

community and widespread difficulties with basic literacy skills.

STATE ANIMAL PROTECTION LAWS

It could also be argued that the basic animal protection laws outlined previously are really a matter of common sense, conscience and moral responsibility. Realistically though, it must be acknowledged and accepted that some people operate outside the parameters of conscience and morality; others have different cultural attitudes to animals or simply give animal welfare matters a low priority. Frequently these inherent attitudes are associated with a "disposable attitude" towards companion animals.

In Australia RSPCA Inspectors are empowered by government to enforce the legislation that protects animals from mistreatment while local authorities are empowered to enforce their animal control by-laws or ordinances. None of these laws have effect with those that cannot read or those that cannot understand English.

Therefore there is a very real need for the basic animal protection laws in each state to be widely promoted in simple graphic multi-lingual terms (e.g. posters, television and radio ads). Such posters should be prominently displayed in such places as schools, veterinary surgeries, pet shops and animal refuges. Radio and where possible, television, advertisements on popular media outlets would further reinforce these important issues.

However in addition to simply worded printed matter, more detailed information should be available on specific problem issues (e.g. solutions to the barking problem) for those needing information relevant to the second and third levels of responsibility as detailed in Table 1. Information sheets relating to common pet problems are available from RSPCA Queensland.

ANIMAL CONTROL BY-LAWS

Dogs, dog owners and local authorities

Local authorities must also adopt a similar approach to promoting their animal control by-laws in the community. Brisbane City Council has moved away from the traditional brochures outlining animal control by-laws. These were usually only available in such places as the Town Hall, ward offices and council libraries. The Council has produced an innovative flyer on the subject of owning a dog (Appendix A), in which the key aspects of responsible dog ownership are outlined clearly and simply.

This resource has been well received in the community and is used by ACOs, many veterinarians, pet shops and the RSPCA Refuge to educate not only prospective dog owners but current ones as well.

Cats, cat owners and local authorities

Cats seem to generate extremes of emotions in the community and most attempts by local authorities to address the problems of irresponsible cat ownership and to control the movements of domestic cats have been relegated to the too hard basket.

Dr Victor Menrath, a noted feline specialist practicing in Brisbane assisted me in the development of a draft proposal for a responsible cat ownership flyer similar to the Brisbane City Council's guide to owning a dog. A brief overview of the on-going responsibilities of owning a cat as a pet was given in this brochure. The brochure focused on the need for action being the onus of the owner and by targeting the loving bond that exists between cat and owner and by appealing to their social conscience to preserve wildlife, it was hoped that favorable voluntary action would result. The brochure (Appendix B) can be copied and used freely by any group who have a need.

How to assist in planning for a pet

It is clear that any successful community education program in responsible pet ownership must focus on owner onus and accountability. In simple terms this means that potential pet owners and current pet owners alike must understand that pet ownership is a privilege not a right. At this point it should be emphasized that the type of community education program discussed in this paper is not aimed at those responsible people who love their pets. Rather, this program aims to protect the welfare of animals, owned by those who have very different attitudes to owning a pet and who often fail to comply with the basic requirements of the State Animals Protection Act and animal control by-laws.

Acquiring a pet should not be the result of a spontaneous or unplanned action. It must be the result of careful planning and a clear understanding of all the legal and other responsibilities involved. A pet is chosen which is suitable to the owner's budget and lifestyle. The animal is happy and contented because such an owner has considered its natural behavior and habits and his ability to meet those needs before actually taking the creature home.

Using the simple analogy of responsible motor vehicle ownership with that of responsible pet ownership is very useful and can be understood by very young children.

Most people approach the purchase of a motor vehicle carefully, taking into consideration their budget, lifestyle, transport needs together with the capabilities, design and practicalities of various models. Motor vehicle owners also realize that they will have to outlay money on a regular basis for service charges to keep the vehicle roadworthy as well as keeping in mind the possibility of having to meet repairs in the case of accident or mechanical breakdown. Motorists usually have a relationship with a particular mechanic who attends to these specialist

requirements for which the owner pays. Few motor vehicle owners would dream of asking such organizations as St Vincent de Paul or The Salvation Army for financial assistance to pay for mechanical services or repairs.

The responsibilities associated with pet ownership are very similar. The pet owner should pay the professional - the veterinarian for regular "service" checks such as vaccinations, worm treatments and desexing as well as for treatment of injuries or disease. Vets and vet nurses are generally pleased to offer advice about diet, exercise, behavior needs and training of the pet to their clients. When designing an animal welfare education program, analogies such as this are very useful.

Programs should also concentrate on the following:

selection of a species of animal that best suits the family (e.g. dog, cat, horse, mouse, fish, bird)

selection of most suitable breed within the species selected (e.g. Dachshund or Shepherd, Burmese or Persian)

considering the facilities needed to care for the pet contemplated

considering the ongoing care and expense involved.

The simple equation, the bigger the pet the more expensive it is to look after, is quite correct and cannot be too highly stressed. In planning for a pet, prospective owners should receive proper guidance in one form or another.

Resources on pet care (e.g. books and brochures) currently available in the community generally assume a high level of literacy skills and while quite appropriate for most of the community, they may not be totally appropriate for many in the target areas. For this reason, the language used in written communications needs to be carefully selected.

In addition, existing and prospective pet owners should be pointed towards those with proper knowledge that may be able to help with selection and ongoing care of a pet. Such people include:

veterinarians and veterinary nurses

animal welfare groups such as the RSPCA

pet shop employees

pet breeders

animal interest groups and club members.

Knowledge and understanding of a pet's origins, natural behavior and habits together with the owner's ability to satisfy those needs has been an aspect of pet ownership which has been sadly neglected to date, often with disastrous results. It is a very important aspect of planning for a pet.

When selecting dogs, those breeds that are working dogs, those that are large or those breeds which have a history of aggression and those with long or dense coats need an extra measure of responsibility to ensure they adapt correctly to suburban life and that their ongoing care is not going to be too onerous.

Hart (1985) discusses the behavioral traits of dog breeds with respect to their genetic tendencies towards reactivity, aggressiveness and trainability. His principles make selection of suitable dog breeds for specific purposes more scientific.

Dogs with high reactivity, high aggressiveness and low trainability can be problem pets because they are likely to over-react aggressively to stimuli and are difficult to train to prevent such reactions. Examples are Bull Terriers and Cattle Dogs and Chihuahuas. Such dogs need owners with a higher level of responsibility and knowledge.

Dogs with high aggressiveness and high trainability can be a problem if no training is given but can be good dogs with training. They make good guard or protection dogs. Examples are German Shepherds, Dobermans and Rottweilers. Owners need to be aware of the training requirements for such dogs.

Dogs with low reactivity, low aggression and high trainability make good family dogs. Examples are the Golden Retriever and German Shorthaired Pointers. Owners often find these dogs the easiest to control. Analyzing breeds with respect to these three criteria often helps in the selection process and also help to focus on the behavioral and training needs of some of the problem breeds.

Suggested practical methods of implementing responsible pet ownership community education

For those intending to implement a responsible pet ownership community program the following steps are suggested to achieve maximum effect.

DEFINE TARGET AREA

For maximum efficiency of effort, it is sensible to target an educational program to the area of most need. Areas to be targeted for an intensive community education program can be identified using the following sources:

animal control statistics from local authorities relating to number and type of complaints on a suburb or area basis

animal cruelty complaints from RSPCA Inspector relating to number or type of complaints on a suburb or area basis

The Australian Bureau of Statistics publication, Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas. This document usually provides more detailed information relating to areas in question. The indices produced give an indication of the wealth of an area. As stated, RSPCA has determined that most welfare and animal control problems occur in areas of lower socioeconomic standing. The document is available from the Bureau in Brisbane for \$15.

DEFINE NEEDS OF AREA

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Determine the nature of animal control or animal mistreatment complaints in the area and use these to provide a theme and focus for the content of the presentations.

DEVISE AND IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM TO SUIT NEEDS

Having achieved the above a 'tailor made' program to create a change in the attitudes of the target population can be created more easily. For best effect, a saturation campaign in responsible pet ownership principles for the whole community should be formulated involving both community and school education elements to target both adults and children. The elements to be achieved if possible are:

state government animal protection laws and local government by laws should be actively promoted and enforced. All levels of Local Authority staff involved in aspects of animal control (aldermen, environmental health officers, ACOs and animal impounders) should be committed to the promotion and enforcement of council animal control by-laws. Concentration of field staff in target areas to conduct blitzes would initially achieve results via infringement notices. When examined, it has been found that such blitzes are revenue positive through penalties and especially registration fees for unregistered dogs. It appears that the level of registration of dogs in target areas is generally lower than 50%.

All forms of media outlets should be used as discussed earlier.

Printed material for distribution should be produced in the correct language style.

For school talks, consider that lesson times in schools are usually 35-40 minutes each for a special topic such as responsible pet ownership. It could be expected that two lessons would be the maximum time allowed for the subject so the contact time for students could be limited although some other activities such as drama or art may supplement the time available but this is dependent on teachers' priorities. For this reason, when presenting a talk to schools, the effects will be optimized if printed lesson plans are submitted to teachers prior to the talk so that general concepts of responsible animal care can be introduced. After the talk, follow up activities or competitions will reinforce the general themes and concepts of the presentations.

To support school or community talks, consider using others in the community whom are willing to give presentations. Local vets, vet nurses and other qualified personnel should be considered.

As part of a targeted approach, educational displays can be conducted in shopping centers and in association with community pet promotions such as Pet Week.

When Pet Pep is introduced in schools increased opportunities for presentations to schools will arise.

ASSESS RESULTS

Once the program has been implemented, its effectiveness needs to be assessed. The assessment could include:

analysis of number of post-campaign infringements, complaints and repeat dog registrations

analysis of changes in overall registration levels

analysis of changes in reports of animal mistreatment

assessing community attitudes by surveying population through:

- telephone surveys

- attitudinal surveys in competitions

- surveys during a door-to-door animal control campaign.

Development of appropriate resources to enhance education programs must be a top priority. The principles of care and social responsibility that underlie responsible animal care education programs and are also important in human relationship education currently being taught in schools. It may be possible for funding to be achieved through a literacy grant from the state government.

Conclusion

Education is certainly one of the important tools in achieving effective urban animal management programs in the community. It is also one of the most potent weapons the RSPCA and various government organizations associated with animal welfare and animal control have to address problems in these areas.

But the concept of 'education' must go beyond instruction given in schools by teachers or education officers to knowledge, training and skills in a particular field given to the community at large by every available practical means. Not only does this mean using simple posters, flyers and the media but it also embraces the precept that effective education often occurs through the process of prosecution.

In these times urban animal management has become a very serious business. Urban animal management policies, or lack of them, affect the whole community in a positive or negative way. Urban animal management is more than stray dog control dealing with dangerous dogs or even dog feces. Serious urban animal management policies require a committed co-operative approach from all levels of government and "animal people" to ultimately achieve a high quality of life for people and animals.

In the words of Herbert Spencer, "The great aim of Education is not knowledge but action". We must all strive to impart the necessary knowledge to pet owners to ensure responsible action ... resulting in their pets being maintained in optimum fashion.

Animal People News

Is widely respected and recognized as the 'watchdog' reporting publication for the world's animal protection movement.

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

News for People Who Care About Animals

POB 960 Clinton, Washington email <mailto:anmlpepl@whidbey.com> website
<http://www.animalpeoplenews.org/>

Out of a total of 136 organizations listed in the most recent edition of Animal People News December 2003 - 3, here are a few of the more recognized groups along with some financial information. For the full layout and explanation, please subscribe to Animal People News or visit their website above.

ORGANIZATION

\$ EARNED IN 2003
NET ASSETS
TANGIBLE ASSETS

AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION
\$10,764,961 8,901,022 2,692,768

ASPCA
39,120,286 53,983,597 19,816,877

ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND
2,786,313 2,407,032 66,576

BEST FRIENDS UTAH
17,902,455 20,885,895 4,982,378

DELTA RESCUE 6,141,397 5,350,640 2,690,428

DORIS DAY ANIMAL LEAGUE 2,359,853 753,186 16,185

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE LEAGUE 43,127,154 49,159,966 NOT
AVAILABLE

FARM SANCTUARY 3,116,750 4,088,219 2,598,596

HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES 65,222,618 85,810,587
80,786,874

NORTH SHORE ANIMAL LEAGUE 30,342,594 21,586,126 18,443,960

PETA 16,466,199 5,079,120 3,690,686

PETSMART CHARITIES 11,976,473 7,215,975 6,354,905

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY 102,271,637 550,070,491
360,594,372

DONATIONS FOR 2003 --> 351,598,690 Just for the 13 listed. There are over
3,000 non profits in America dedicated to this effort!!!

The American Kennel Club Cannot Be Trusted

Years of lies and malfeasance have harmed man's best friend and duped the public, and the American Kennel Club (AKC) is responsible.

In 1989, the AKC was presented with the unfavorable results of a large consumer fraud investigation involving its registration of countless "AKC-certified" purebred dogs and its cover-up of fraudulent activities. Since being officially notified of their flagrant fraudulent business practices almost fifteen years ago, the AKC continues to sell certificates affirming information about "purebred" dogs that it knows is false. And, no charges have been brought against the AKC for doing so.

The AKC says it isn't responsible for any fraudulent activities. It doesn't buy, sell, kennel, or keep dogs. What it does, however, is certify the accuracy of unsubstantiated information submitted by third parties, and then it resells that information.

Consumers have spent billions of dollars on dogs who have been misidentified by AKC certifications. The AKC knew or should have known what it was doing when identifying animals because, in some cases, it does check the background information.

Previous findings of its inspectors, senior staff, administrators, board members, and court transcripts indicate that registration papers should not have been issued in 50%-90% of the cases actually investigated. In a 1995 court submission, the AKC stated it had erroneously registered 600,000 dogs and made approximately \$5 million dollars by selling the certification papers to unsuspecting consumers.

Because of its practices, puppy mills continue to breed dogs which (if they survive the abhorrent conditions of their birth) may suffer from chronic diseases for the duration of their short miserable lives. AKC supports such breeders and has renamed them "High Volume Breeders" in a new public relations effort to increase registration income. There is no progeny testing, no follow-up on puppies sent out by the breeders, and thus no controls on breeding genetically defective animals.

Correcting the problem isn't difficult but it could drastically lower AKC's revenues and damage its reputation, both of which AKC jealously defends with collusion and threats. Meanwhile, the market in illicitly-produced and inaccurately identified dogs takes a huge emotional toll on hapless owners and causes veterinary costs to skyrocket. Consumers shouldn't have to pay for it.

Current lawsuits in Florida, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee confirm the problem with victim consumers who purchased puppies based on the false perception that an AKC-certified puppy has some assurance of health, quality, or even that the dog is

the breed the papers say the dog is. Such deceptive practices are promoted by the AKC and should not be tolerated.

AKC is a not-for-profit and, therefore, is different from an Enron or Tyco. But it's no charity. And it isn't required to open its books to regulators because there are no shareholders or individual members. It is accountable to no one. It's corporate culture has become one of secrecy and deception. This once prestigious social club protects its image by donating a small portion of its tax-free registration income to veterinary schools and by making contributions to its own foundation. It thereby silences critics and deflects attention from questionable business practices.

Please contact your Congressperson and ask that the Federal Trade Commission investigate and prosecute potential consumer fraud being committed by the AKC. Alternatively, if you have any personal experiences with AKC's practices, let them know. Your personal request as a constituent is the most effective means for pressuring the FTC to take up this matter.

To Find Your Congressperson:

Find Your Senator __ www.senate.gov

Find Your Congressperson __ www.house.gov

Federal Trade Commission __ www.ftc.gov

ANIMAL JUSTICE

Commentary on the efforts of the national animal organizations

**TO THE LARGE NATIONAL ANIMAL RIGHTS, ANIMAL WELFARE
AND ANIMAL PROTECT ORGANIZATIONS**

For 20 years that I've worked and lived, Americans have spent \$1billion annually on animal control efforts in their communities.

That is \$20 Billion

For 20 years, Americans have pleased you with \$1billion annually in charitable donations under the misguided assumptions that you are there to help the animals. That is another \$20 Billion - Total of \$40 billion!

Over the same period of time more than 3,000 non profit organizations dedicated

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

to their own idea of animal protection has logged nearly 25 Billion man hours - many struggling to survive when they are the ones who are putting in the time, money and efforts to actually save the animals that are considered 'excess' - something that after 20 years and \$40 billion, we should no longer be burdened with had you done even half of what you suggest you do. You offered little or no real substantial support to any of them from your air conditioned offices or your luxury homes.

That is a D minus report card and if this is offensive to those who are employed by you or support you, I do not apologize. Regardless of your highly paid public relations department who will no doubt put a very different spin on this letter, the facts are in and they are not very complimentary to your efforts.

You are large organizations. You are not THAT large. You are no longer respectable or the nationally revered organization you once were. You are really no longer a big deal to those of us who see the light at the end of the tunnel - the light you shield from your supporters in order to continue receiving their financial donations even though you have no intention of ever solving any of these problems. Like our fanatical minority and religious leaders, our large animal protection organizations need their victims to survive. Absent crimes and imaginary situations against their people and teachings, these organizations disappear. This means jobs. As long as they can convince those who don't know better, they will survive.

Let me explain this to you: We are not afraid of any of your size and will no longer view you as the respectable "God-Like" entities you would like us to. To give you that reference, to even call you respectable, gives you far too much stature.

It is politics that prevents most of the good and compassionate efforts to help the animals, not be implemented, as well as envy, jealousy and all the human foibles that haunt us. Yet we think our mission noble and righteous. You know honor and good conscience would have handled many things differently, that would have helped us all to enjoy a happier, safer place for all to exist. The animals who lost their lives over the past years only wish you had a little more honor and conscience.

There is all too much talk here, with a tremendous lack of action. And I say that to everyone with the utmost respect. We are dealing with actual lives here - lives that are no less important than ours in the eyes of those up above. We are not your enemy or combatant, but the ones who will make the truth known in order to save our society the agony, the billions of dollars and the embarrassment of assuming these problems just can't be solved, when in reality, they can be. The citizens of this great nation have been lead down the wrong path by your rhetoric. We will come and lay out evidence on which specific matters can be judged - to mold and shape and refine our sense of compassion and responsibility

We now know they can be.

What was it that led me to this outburst? When confronting the larger organizations with questions, I have been lied to when looking for the delicate answers. When approaching the same with some very worthy ideas to bring more people to our level of understanding the importance of appropriate education to raise the level of compassion, I've been told that for political reasons, your organizations could not support our efforts. That for reasons of ego, could not be associated with 'that' organization. And for reasons of anger would not work with 'those people' and still claiming to be devoting your lives to the animals.

I have listened respectfully to what you have to say over the years. And I asked you to search your heart and ask yourself what sort of unfathomable morals have led you to do what you are guilty of doing. Promising to so many to help the animals by deceiving the public for so many years. We remained ignorant due to the spewing of your gruesome statistics and confusing programs and simply lead to believe that any solution was simply out of reach and that not much could be done, "but that you were certainly the entity that would trust with this effort."

Do you really wish to be viewed with respect - even in heroic light?

Then, I have an answer for you..

It may not satisfy you. But as I search this entire record it comes as close to understanding as I know. It seems to me you fear the one thing that is most precious - TRUTH. Be honest. Here, in this society, the very winds carry freedom based on truth from coast to coast. We can speak out and we aren't arrested for being stupid or wrong. It is because we prize individual freedom so much that you are allowed to do what you do. So, it is this I suggest in order to hold your heads up high and prove once and for all that the 'animal rights' fanatics have finally scored one for the sane.

Alert the public that NEXT year you will be dissolving a major portion of your fictitious store front of an operation and will donate the necessary costs to fund spay/neuter programs nationwide for one year. NATIONWIDE. That includes Tuscaloosa, Fremont, Boise and even Mason City. So that everyone can see, truly see, that solutions to these problems are known, can be attained and are even more cost effective than the follow-up, clean - up rat race we burden ourselves with now - simply by default. THEN your organization and efforts will be remembered, revered, respected and will even be able to continue your foundation, although at a lower level. But your 'come-back' or regrowth would be astronomical and historic in magnitude simply for doing something that the world could witness and to prove that you are not a false, hollow body of cold hearted money grabbers, but truly see that this is the right thing to do. The truth will surface with or without you and if that means that you must relinquish your exorbitant salaries, so be it. It will be your decision.

We are Americans. We are a noble society - proud of most everything we stand for and certainly about truth. We have been through the fire before with other elected politicians and large corporations who defrauded their clients and

supporters as well. We've watched as politics have ruined the respectable and seen that hatred and egos have brought down the mighty. It will happen to you as well. As politics is a way of life in almost every other area of our society, it is also politics that is certain death to the animals you pledge your very existence to.. Americans put a man on the moon, can cure diseases, win wars in under 100 days and have the marketing prowess to change mankind's behavior on a global scale, but are told that we cannot convey the important message to the public of the subsequent consequences that result from how we treat and care for our companiona animals - the very information that would grant us the solitude of compassion and honor.

Though we've been mislead, misguided and shaded from any truths in these matters by the large animal organizations for all these years we still need your involvement in this battle. We need everyone to possess the knowledge and put forth a unified effort. We are becoming more uneasy, less respectful and feel betrayed by your warring factors as well as the greed to keep yourselves funded as opposed to actually solving these problems. Because we all know that the way we treat our animals - those we share this blessed earth with, is a true reflection of the level of civilization we boast of, we will not give up, but push harder for the answers and efforts necessary to weed out the unnecessary and revere that what is dear to us, as it is the measure of our own liberties as well as pride.

Make no mistake though: It is true that we will bear any burden, pay any price, to see that these problems can find resolve and without the political wrangling that the larger animal protection organizations seem to embroil themselves in. So, if you should decide to scoff at this letter in the uncanny assumption that it means nothing, then I suggest you look around this nation. Remember it well. For in the near future, the animal protection movement will finally take the effort to see that changes be made. For if you are not a part of that, you will most assuredly not be a part of any high, medium or low level efforts to help the animals. The world is not going to long remember what you or I say here. Day after tomorrow it will be forgotten. But this, however, will long endure. We know now that the solution to pet overpopulation and even most animal abuse is more easily within reach, less expensive than holding onto you and will give us the pride we deserve once it is solved without your involvement. Here, and all across America, the American people will gather to see that justice, justice for all - including the animals - justice is in fact being done. With or without you.

Randy N. Warner
President
21st Century C.A.R.E.S.

The Animal Protection Wars, Where Your Money Goes.

Animal rights groups are in power struggles instead of handling the problems we've paid them \$\$ Billions to solve. Here are the facts - reasons why we still see so few results. Checking some of the prominent news sites that tend to cover animal related issues, this is, unfortunately not the exception. Do you want your hard earned dollars to go to these groups so they can hire attorneys to battle with each other? Things to think about. We have the answers. We know what to do. So, why aren't we doing them?

Ingrid Newkirk and the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) have taken aim at the larger, well-heeled Humane Society of the United States (HSUS).

The Fund for Animals wants a piece of the Audubon Society's hide.

Paul Watson of the lightly financed but virulently anti-hunting Sea Shepherd Conservation Society is on the Sierra Club's board of directors and plans a takeover attempt.

Wayne Pacelle jumped ship a while back, moving up from The Fund for Animals to the mighty HSUS. Now the executive vice-president of HSUS is caught in the middle.

PETA's Newkirk has chastised the HSUS for bedding down with Iams, a dog food company, to boost the HSUS's \$116 million in assets. Iams is sponsoring Pet Fest America in six cities and HSUS is a happy partner.

PETA also took jabs at HSUS for joining Pet Fest America sponsors Veterinary Pet Insurance and PetSafe. It's bad enough that PetSafe makes pet containment systems and bark control collars that could stress out a pooch. Veterinary Pet Insurance CEO Jack Stephens is a big-game hunter.

PETA may be jealous of the \$65 million that HSUS is given each year by millions of animal lovers. PETA's outrageous antics generate only a paltry \$17 million. But both are in the business of animal rights.

The Fund for Animals, which reported \$8.5 million in revenue last year, is trying to

steal a little limelight by going after the venerable Audubon Society. They obviously didn't know that John J. Audubon, the group's founder, hunted many animals in order to illustrate them.

The Audubon Society recently opened a 285-acre piece of property it owns in Greenwich, Conn., to bowhunters. Too many deer is a common problem all over America and the Audubon Society should be praised for allowing hunters to help solve its problem.

The most amazing power grab is taking place in California. Watson, who relishes the title of captain and doesn't mind being called a pirate, is in the thick of a takeover of the 112-year-old, 750,000-member Sierra Club that has, most important, an annual budget of almost \$100 million.

Watson, 53, was a founder of Greenpeace. He moved on to create the more radical Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, which has a meager \$1 million budget. Watson says his group has sunk 10 "illegal" commercial fishing boats around the globe.

Watson is not hiding an attempt to take over the Sierra Club, which has anglers and hunters as members, and push his animal-rights agenda. He claims he is only three votes shy of a majority on the 15-member board. A recent letter signed by 11 former Sierra Club presidents expressed concern over a takeover by Watson and a trio of confederates vehemently opposed to immigration and population growth.

It is quite noble to work for the welfare of animals and many do around northern Ohio. To send hard-earned dollars to pay for exorbitant salaries, addled wildlife schemes, naked protesters or a vitriolic campaign against fishing, hunting and the consumption of meat is proof Americans can be soft-hearted suckers.

PETA's latest comic book (see it at www.furisdead.com) for kids, "Your Mommy Kills Animals!" should be required reading for them.

To reach this Plain Dealer reporter:

degan@plaind.com 216-999-6136

Letter Regarding Breed Specific Legislation

Promoting the theory that certain “breeds” of a particular species are genetically or inherently more likely to be “bad” is not too far away from the theory that certain races or “breeds” of human beings are genetically or inherently “bad”. As most people now know, there are some people who are born with certain genetic predispositions to be aggressive in nature, but these people are randomly and evenly distributed throughout the population of human beings and their aggressiveness does not necessarily lead to violence. Instead, violent behaviors are typically learned behaviors and therefore are typically a product of the environment; except for extreme cases of brain damage, for example.

As with human beings, non human animals are also unlikely to exhibit violent behaviors due to their genetic make-up or breed specific characteristics. Violent dogs are almost always a product of their environment. The exceptions, as with human beings, are cases in which the dog has certain medical conditions, such as brain trauma, that create violent behavior.

Legislation that discriminates against certain breeds of dogs is therefore nothing more than discrimination, similar in nature as that done with human beings. Although not all violent dogs can be traced to a “bad” owner *, violent behavior in dogs should be a key indicator or predictor of an owner that has criminal tendencies him or herself. Therefore, the breed of a dog should not dictate legislation, policies, etc. Instead, a violent dog should warrant an investigation of the mental faculties and criminal propensities of the owner. With that being said, I continue to ask, why do we keep blaming the dogs?

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeanette Shutay Ph.d.

Board of directors for 21st Century CARES

jeanetteshutay@msn.com

* The word owner is used to reflect one who is not acting as a guardian of the animal. In most cases, the label guardian is preferred over the label owner.

We can learn from Detroit

by Margaret Anne Cleek

(From ANIMAL PEOPLE, November 1993.)

An open mind is damned near impossible either to have or to find. The response I've received to my September ANIMAL PEOPLE guest column, "Don't call me a pimp" bears out the opening premise of it: that we all have our own perceptual set which colors our view of reality. This leads to stereotyping and prejudice, which in turn can produce polarization and counterproductive strategy in pursuit of mutually accepted goals.

To re-introduce myself, I am by profession an industrial/organizational psychologist. I am by avocation a dog enthusiast--not just a purebred dog enthusiast. While I have concerns about the adoption of unsuitable dogs, the true mutt is just plain fine in my book, and I would urge the adoption of the right mutt over the wrong purebred in a heartbeat.

I feel that what I know about dogs and what I know about social science can be integrated in a manner useful to all of us who are concerned about pet overpopulation. And I see a likeness in the evolution of approaches to this issue and the evolution of strategies in the automobile industry, for which I was a consultant in the early 1980s, when U.S. auto makers were at the depths of crisis. The purpose of my work was to break down existing culture and attitudes, to demonstrate the pointlessness of blaming, and to refocus the adversarial relationship between management and unions to develop a new, more effective social technology. In specific, when the U.S. auto industry hit the wall, the reason for their problem was labeled, "Japanese Imports." With the problem thus labeled, the solution was set as import restrictions and trade tariffs, and it now became the U.S. government's responsibility to impose restrictions. I can't tell you how many times I heard this song-and-dance. The rank-and-file believed we needed to stop the flow of imports, PERIOD---situation solved.

Once a problem is labeled and blame placed, many people feel their work is completed. The belief that the problem is caused by the blamed party is continually

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

reaffirmed with rhetoric. Attention is now focused on a simple, one-step solution: changing the behavior of the blamed party. The development of alternative approaches is ignored. But most problems are not amenable to simple, one-step solutions.

If the U.S. auto industry had succeeded in placing the blame for its woes squarely enough on Japanese imports to obtain a trade embargo, I suspect I would now be driving a piece of crap from G.M. that cost me \$50,000. Instead, the U.S. auto industry gradually recognized that the problems it faced were multifaceted, complex, and influenced by the larger context of economics. Reviving sales of U.S.-made cars required responses to many issues, not just one, among them high interest rates, the strength of the dollar, government regulation, poor labor/management relations, outmoded technology, lack of touch with consumer needs, a centralized decision process, and awkward work design.

Much as the auto industry initially focused upon simply placing blame, I feel many humane organizations have focused too intently upon purebred breeding per se as the cause of pet overpopulation, and consequently have promoted legislative action to halt breeding before fully understanding which animals are surplus, where they come from, and what approaches are most likely to effectively reach the people responsible for their existence.

Help needed

While there is no question that we need to encourage and maintain a lower birth rate, the humane community has to learn which births are most essential to reduce, much as the U.S. auto industry had to learn what kind of cars to build. I do not believe the expertise the humane community needs in order to do this is to be found in the advocacy sector, whose raison d'etre is campaigning rather than doing analysis. Nor can shelter and animal control staff be expected to have the necessary overview: like the garage mechanics who could readily diagnose the repair and maintenance problems with Detroit cars a decade ago, the people in shelter work and animal control often have an excellent street-level understanding of the symptoms of the problem they deal with, but cannot be expected to have equal perspective on matters of economics and sociology that have a long term hidden influence upon how the cats and dogs they handle came to be there. Unfortunately, until recently hardly anyone else has cared about homeless animals. In the absence of leadership capable of taking a multidisciplinary open-systems approach to pet overpopulation, the humane community has focused understandably but somewhat naively upon simply reducing euthanasia numbers by preventing births. This approach has brought dramatic positive results, yet the widely accepted philosophy that all dogs and cats are created equal and are therefore equally worth preventing from being born has resulted in some rapid and unintended shifts in dog demographics that may make further progress difficult.

We must bring the expertise of epidemiologists, operation control experts, marketing specialists, responsible breeders, and industrial/organizational

psychologists to bear, along with that of the humane community. We have to consider what segment of the population is neutering pets and what pets are being neutered, which has an immense if unseen influence on the nature of the animal population still out on the streets, un neutered.

I have never maintained that only the purebred dog population should be allowed to continue. The purebred simply increases the odds of predictability of type and temperament, in turn increasing the odds that a person will choose the right dog. My family could never have afforded a purebred when I was a child, yet getting a dog was the most important event of my childhood. (Paradoxically, my first dog was a purebred, given to me free by a show breeder who knew I was bonkers for dogs. This dog was much loved and never bred.)

I have always been in favor of affordable and even free dogs to approved homes. And just as I maintain that healthy, wanted purebreds do not displace shelter dogs, I believe shelter adoption does not affect the show breeder's market. People have different reasons for getting one dog or the other. I do have definite concerns that people buy or adopt the right dog, and am concerned that as surplus numbers drop, more unsuitable dogs will be placed in homes. Animal behaviorists and knowledgeable dog people can help shelter workers develop means of more accurately assessing dogs. We need experienced people who can tell the difference between a good dog in the wrong home, a snooty juvenile delinquent who needs to be shown how to straighten up and fly right, and a dog who is truly unable to function as a family companion.

Some of my best friends are mutts. I really like the "Heinz 57," as dogs of indeterminate ancestry are often called, and would never suggest that they have less intrinsic value than a best-in-show purebred. But not all dogs are created equal. There are bad dogs, including purebreds, crossbreds, and mutts who are genetically bad, not just bad as the result of having bad owners. In our efforts to reduce the surplus, we have not addressed which dogs have been removed from the breeding pool and which have not. I believe that current practices are creating a demographic shift in the dog population that can result in a crisis of vicious and unsuitable dogs.

I maintain that our shelters had mostly surplus dogs 20 years ago, but our past efforts have created a situation where more and more, shelters contain unwanted animals. We have created an overnight change in the evolution of the dog, producing not an across-the-board reduction in the dog population, but rather a restriction of range, skewing the distribution toward larger, more aggressive dogs.

If all factors were equal, as the surplus numbers dropped we would have had an across-the-board decrease in the dog population. But all factors are not equal. For example, large dogs may average nine or ten pups per litter. Small dogs may have only two or three pups per litter. There are many other factors, such as ability to live in semi-feral conditions, which favor the large dog over the small dog, even though fewer and fewer people are able to afford or accommodate large dogs.

Whelping small dog pups is often difficult, and medical problems necessitate spaying mothers who were intended for breeding. One commonly advanced suggestion, that breeders should be limited in the number of litters that they register, would assure the demise of some small breeds. Two litters of Salukis may be 22 pups, but two litters of pugs may be only four pups, and there is a much greater market for pugs than Salukis.

When random breeding occurs, larger and more aggressive dogs are more likely to cover bitches. Add to this the human element. Certain segments of the public want large, aggressive dogs, who to some degree may vicariously live out their sexual fantasies.

The role of mutts

If we are successful in eliminating the mutt, as some advocate, then the only dogs available will be expensive purebreds (both well-bred and poorly bred), and accidental liaisons between purebreds. A recent Massachusetts SPCA survey indicated that a whopping third of dog births are accidental, which argues for education about the difficulty of confining a bitch in season, as well as about neutering. I believe that some combinations of purebred dogs are inherently unpredictable and potentially dangerous because of the combined characteristics of the two breeds. Individually the parents may be sound representatives of their breed type, but the cross may be risky.

Shelters have a responsibility to protect the public from any combination of breed traits that have the potential to result in a dangerous dog, such as a highly reactive herding dog crossed with a large guard dog, or a terrier and large guard dog cross. Who needs a 90-pound family pet who is easily pissed off?

Multiple factors have worked in favor of the large aggressive dog. Now I'm not saying there is no place for the large aggressive dog, but anyone with any shelter experience will tell you that while there may be a waiting list for small dogs, there is never a shortage of big dogs. In my community some individuals are purposely breeding small mixed-breed dogs and selling them for up to \$125. There is a wanted ad for small mixed pups run continuously in our paper by a local pet store. We have created a shortage of small dogs and easily adaptable family mutts. And when a demand is created, people will produce pups to meet the demand.

Let me illustrate how this demographic shift has come about. Back in the days when parents could send their children to the store without worrying that their faces would turn up on milk cartons, neighborhoods had dogs like Suzi and Buddy--each a Heinz 57. Whatever breeds were among their ancestry were so mingled that no specifically developed traits were evident. They were just plain dogs. And they were great. Suzi stayed in her front yard without a fence, and Buddy had his route, which he set out on every morning, but he knew just when to come home so he could meet Billy and follow him around his newspaper route.

Suzi and Buddy hadn't been to obedience classes, yet despite the crude and unsophisticated methods of their respective owners, they learned how to please the family and be good dogs.

Suzi's family and Buddy's family loved them and were good people, but in those days people were not aware of the need to neuter and responsibly confine their pets. In fact, Suzi's family was thrilled when she had pups, and of course Buddy was the dad. Suzi was a great mom, and so proud when all the neighborhood kids came to see her litter. Those pups spent more time in someone's arms than they did on the ground. And every kid in the neighborhood pestered his or her parents for a Suzi pup. A grieving Billy carried home one pup, as poor old Buddy was killed by a car. The streets were getting busy.

There were far too many Suzis and Buddys, and ever-increasing numbers of pups were being destroyed because the number of available homes could never match the number of pups being born. Accordingly, concerned groups including breeders initiated the LES program (Legislation, Education, and Spaying). People like Suzi and Buddy's owners, being caring and responsible, responded. Suzi and Buddy's grandbabies if not babies were neutered. And that was the end of Suzi and Buddy's gene pool.

Meanwhile, in the heart of the city where Queenie and Spike lived, crime was increasing and people were scared. Tough dogs became a symbol of empowerment and a mode of defense. It wasn't long before they became a mode of offense, too. Queenie and Spike and other kick-butt dogs became the dogs of choice in deteriorating urban areas. Their owners were not as easily reached by the LES message, and these dogs were not neutered. Because of high population density and lack of fenced yards, random breeding was frequent. Offspring were given away and they too reproduced. Many were marginal members of their families and became semi-feral. Unlike Suzi and Buddy's pups, Queenie and Spike's became fruitful and multiplied.

This is just one element of the broader picture that emerges when systems analysis is applied. Going to a systems approach to pet overpopulation would allow us to break out of presently unproductive approaches to the problem, and would enable us to anticipate and monitor the effects of our policies on dog population. It would enable us to assess and intervene to assure that appropriate dogs are available to accommodate the needs of the dog-owning public.

Alternatively, if people either buy or adopt inappropriate dogs, shelters will be dealing with an endless flow of dogs that they may label surplus, but are in fact recycled: unable to adapt to any family situation, they are returned to a shelter (often not the same shelter), or are abandoned or left to wander for eventual pickup by animal control. Humane advocates then blame the people, who certainly are not blameless, but it must be recognized that the dogs themselves may be unsuitable. The policies and practices that we adopt to control dog populations should assure the survival of the fittest in loving homes, not the survival of the

fittest when left to their own devices by the irresponsible.

Taking a systems approach requires that we keep data bases on the type of dogs wanted and the type of dogs available, and intervene with educational programs as needed to keep dog populations in line with demand. We may determine that we need to educate specific groups of owners and provide incentives to stop breeding of certain populations more than others. Certainly we must provide neutering service, along with incentives to neuter, in the communities that animal control records indicate have the highest rates of stray dog and litter pickups. We may need to inform people about the availability of recently developed chemical abortion technology when accidental breeding is suspected. We must transport dogs as needed to accommodate market shifts, and we must market shelter dogs effectively to insure that all those who could be placed well are placed in good homes.

The transport of shelter dogs is a controversial topic. The North Shore Animal League initiated the practice on a large scale some years ago, and has been under continuous attack from some quarters ever since. But we should expect to find different dog demographics in different areas. If my hypothesis is correct, high density urban areas would have a shortage of small dogs and an excess of large dogs. If the demand for small dogs is not met, people may adopt large dogs who don't work out and end up back in shelters, or people will intentionally breed small pups for sale. In another area, there may be a surplus of smaller dogs. It is a waste of life to euthanize dogs in one area and create a need for breeding in another, when market analysis, communication, and transport could meet the need.

If we maintain that we do not have the time or the money to do a systems analysis and address the multiple issues involved, we are doomed to face an unending stream of unwanted animals as we burn up our energy and resources on misplacing blame.

An open systems approach requires hard work and detailed analysis. I am encouraged that the Council on Pet Overpopulation recently formed by the leading national humane groups and breeders' associations includes noted epidemiologists. I hope this task force does not take the usual "my agenda versus your agenda and let's compromise" approach. I am an advocate of collaborative problem solving, not compromise and accommodation to appear politically correct.

I would urge the inclusion of an even wider range of professionals. The complexities of pet overpopulation are mind-boggling, and the contingencies extensive. But I am convinced that only such a complex approach complete with flow chart analysis, good data, and continuous monitoring and adjustment of tactics in line with shifting needs will bring us control of the problem. Pet overpopulation is a continuous phenomenon, and continuous phenomena require continuous monitoring and flexible response. Properly approached, dog breeding and the prevention of overpopulation are not mutually exclusive.

[Margaret Anne Cleek, of Sacramento, California, is a fancier/breeder and breed rescuer, and a member of the Alaskan Malamute Club of America. This is her third guest column for ANIMAL PEOPLE examining various aspects of pet overpopulation, following "Alternatives to breeding bans" in June and "Don't call me a pimp" in September.]

Another incredible submission by In Defense of Animals. This article by Ed Durvin who writes for Animal Lines, has finally spoken so eloquently about some points I have screamed about for years. He has hit the nail on the head. His point is that the irresponsible public is being given a free pass. They are allowed to abandon and surrender animals while others are left to clean up and pay for the mess they create.

IRRESPONSIBLE PUBLIC

The statewide requirement for all animals to be sterilized, or have breeder permit, will put the focus on animal owners. It will legislate owner responsibility and eliminate the need to build bigger and bigger Gas Chambers. It is critical that the spay-neuter portion of the bill be passed.

It's clear that if you are a 'respectable' breeder, then the annual fee of \$100 is not going to kill your business. Every other business in the world pays fees and taxes. They pay neither. It would do more to keep the quality of the breed 'standard' as well as increase the value of their animals.

" Having devoted much of my research in past years to the historical dynamics of social change, I was intrigued by what seemed to be an inexplicable anomaly. In most altruistic endeavors, those closest to the suffering are the loudest and most persistent voices for change — eager to pursue creative risks for life, as the eyes of the victims are daily reminders of the miles left to travel. Regrettably, I saw precious little of this openness and urgency among the shelter leadership. I draw this conclusion not only on the basis of my personal experience, but from an extensive review of the literature prior to writing "Mercy." To my amazement, I was unable to locate a single article in a shelter publication that raised fundamental questions vis-a-vis policies and programs.

This conformity of thought and dismissive attitude toward "outsiders" who challenge the prevailing values saddened me, as these very same leaders should

have been climbing the highest mountaintops — railing not against their critics, but at a populace that condones the killing of millions upon millions of healthy beings as an acceptable means of population control. How I agonized, could animal advocates arrive at an emotional and ethical place that allows them to participate in a process whereby their friends are killed in the name of kindness — providing the larger society with a free pass in terms of moral culpability, as humane societies obligingly "clean up the mess."

I hasten to add that the early pioneers in our movement were courageous in their efforts for homeless animals, and I have an abiding respect for them. It was a different era, and holding their values to contemporary standards would clearly be unfair. Equally important, the thousands of compassionate shelter workers who presently work in the trenches under difficult circumstances have my deepest admiration. My concerns are solely addressed to a leadership that I respectfully submit has followed, not led, and the reasons are as varied as they are complex. Within the limitations of space, what follows is an attempt to shed some light on the underlying dynamics that have impeded innovation.

The crucial historical process for humane leaders was moving from compassionate oversight of governmental agencies to directly operating the majority of kill shelters. Motivated by the best of intentions, they sought to improve conditions and provide gentler ends to tragic lives by assuming the traditional animal control functions. They didn't foresee the damaging long-term effects of devoting most of their energy to collection, processing, and killing, leaving sparse resources for bold preventive measures; nor did they realize the devastating consequences of the mixed-message they were sending to society about the value of non-human life; and, most significant to this analysis, they couldn't have known what they were doing to themselves — and to all who followed them in subsequent years.

Bountiful research exists on the profound effects of taking another life, even when that behavior is sanctioned by law — such as in war. In these forms of state-sponsored violence, those perpetrating the acts rarely know the victims and virtually never have deep feelings for them. This is obviously not the case in animal shelters operated by humane societies, and placing the caring and disparity between word and deed not only makes a mockery out of animal rights, but it sends a message that life is cheap.

Given this kind of reinforcement to the "killing them kindly" mentality by prominent animal rights figures, it is hardly realistic to expect shelters to serve as — using the business vernacular — change agents. Quoting from the aforementioned Disposable Animals: "Self-congratulatory for accomplishment, self-exculpatory for failure, [shelter leaders] present it all as operating under inexorable and probably eternal necessity. That same voice has been heard for decades. Meanwhile, perhaps 30,000 dogs and cats are killed in shelters every day, seven days a week." Companion animals have been waiting in vain for a war to be waged by activists on their behalf — not the tiptoeing-through-the-tulips that characterizes our current efforts, but hard-hitting and relentless campaigns to

thoroughly stigmatize the culprits.

It is often stated that the public is indifferent to this tragedy, but that is precisely what was said about drunk driving, cigarette smoking, and a myriad of other social issues before intense and unremitting pressure was brought to bear. People are initially unresponsive to most issues that fail to touch them personally, not simply because they lack adequate information, but because they either disagree with the position stated or just don't care. It is our responsibility to make them care. We have reached the public with "cute and cuddly" spay/ neuter messages for decades, but, without the necessary stigma to fundamentally alter entrenched behavior patterns. With no price to pay in terms of social censure, people continue having litters of animals with little regard for the devastating consequences. We must sharply raise the price, stigmatizing irresponsibility to such a degree that social condemnation is its constant companion.

Our outreach efforts must be commensurate with the magnitude of the carnage, articulating a message that leaves nothing to the imagination. In the midst of a silent holocaust, anything less is inadequate and we need to move light years beyond the present euphemisms and explicitly convey the public's complicity in the slaughter. Let them see that we will continue to express our outrage until this nation becomes so uncomfortable with the blood on its hands that it finally ends the madness.

There are approximately 124 million cats and dogs residing in households in the United States. If our movement can't awaken the collective conscience of this country to end the mass killing of its closest companions, then what hope is there for other species? We profess to be a voice for innocent beings, and it is our responsibility to make that voice heard. In the words of the eloquent Spanish philosopher, Miguel Unamuno, "Sometimes to be silent is to lie." Our movement hasn't been silent, but whispering at a barely audible level hardly represents the brutal truth. We might be able to live with this passivity, but homeless animals cannot".

Dysfunctional Pet Owners & Patterns to look for.

Unintentional Owners

Most thought of the pet as a temporary guest. They were keeping the animal until they could find it a good home. Were not seeking a pet but acquiesced when

petitioned by other people or an orphaned animal came into their life.

Non-consenting Ownership

No consensus on owning and caring for the pet by everyone in the household. When attachment is not shared, indifferent family members quickly become intolerant of annoying behaviors and the pet becomes expendable.

Incompatible Matches

Temperament, size, grooming, energy level and personality problems. Also, children conflicted with the pet.

Time Constraints

Adult attachment depends, in part, on the time and energy available to the adult and the amount of nurturing required by the pet(s). (Kidd, Kidd & George) Time constraints were often realized after the pet was obtained. Owners are tired when they come home from work and often cannot exercise, groom or play with the pet. (Dogs experience pet-up pet energy that is not expelled, causing hyperactivity and other behavior problems.) Dogs, primarily larger breeds, are kept alone in the backyard. Boredom ensues for poor social interaction and the animal takes to roaming.

Regular duties, like walking the dog, became time consuming and difficult, especially for children. Human interaction with pets has decreased do to more work, household and parental demands on individuals time.

Health Problems

Allergies/health problems forces the owner to relinquish.

Unfulfilled Expectations

Owners become disappointed when the reality of the pet doesn't live up to the dream. Major areas are cute puppies that turn into uncontrollable big dogs with attitudes, dogs that will teach responsibility to children (parents teach responsibility to children using dog care as an example), gift pets that are not wanted after the newness wears off.

External Pressures

Landlord objects. (Fewer apartments and condominiums where pets are not accepted.) Animal behaves negatively to people outside the family (neighbor complaints, animal control impoundment, etc.)

Stage-of-Life

Pets can play different roles in their owner's lives at different stages of life. Our involvement with pets, in particular dogs, expands and contracts as we move through phases of the family lifecycle. Thus, a pet may be acquired as a teaching aid for children and end up as a companion, or be bought as a watchdog when, in fact, it becomes a child substitute. The relationship between an owner and their pet(s) is, thus, not static and it can be influenced by the personality of the animal as well. Personal life changes effect pet relationships like, new baby, divorce, marriage, death, kids going away to school, new home, ability to travel ("pets tie you down")

Consider Pets as Livestock

Some owners (usually from rural areas) see companion animals as livestock and peripheral to their homes and lives. They are outside animals, with low social

interaction and little training. (Often these animals are intact and roam.)

Guard Dog Mentality

People, paranoid about crime, acquire dogs for protection — obtained not for companionship but to guard the property and scare-off intruders. Usually, the dog obtains no house manners and, do to poor training methods, becomes hard to control and aggressive. The unwittingly abused animal is soon cast off.

Heartache

Distress caused by the loss of a pet that was loved and died. Owners are hesitant to replace them

A Winn Feline Foundation Report On ...

EARLY SPAY/NEUTER IN THE CAT

Are fears of negative side effects of early neutering warranted? Background and medical issues including a summary of an ongoing Winn Foundation funded project to evaluate the long term effects of early altering.

Developmental and Behavioral Effects of Prepubertal Gonadectomy. Mark S. Bloomberg, DVM, MS; W.P. Stubbs, DVM; D.F. Senior, BVSc; Thomas J. Lane, BS, DVM; University of Florida at Gainesville. Funded by the Winn Feline Foundation, February 1991. Continuation funded February 1992.

A progress report on a study funded by The Winn Feline Foundation

Summary prepared by Diana Cruden, Ph.D.

The concept of early spaying and neutering (e.g. before the animal is sexually mature) is not a new one. In the early 1900's, early neutering was the norm and it was not until much later that questions were raised about the negative side effects of such a procedure. Today most of the experts acknowledge that there has not been enough scientific information available about the most appropriate age to neuter a pet. Until recently, there was no research data that either supported or disproved the idea that neutering dogs and cats at ages younger than five to eight months was deleterious. There is, in fact, little scientific basis for selecting this age group as the most appropriate time for neutering. Indeed, one investigator points out that many veterinarians have been practicing early neutering for years, since there is an incredible range of ages when puppies and kittens reach sexual maturity.

Large animal practitioners have long practiced early neutering on their livestock and consider it not only acceptable, but desirable in many cases. Even before concerns for the burgeoning population of unwanted pets raised our collective consciousness, there were many scientifically documented reasons to spay and castrate. Spayed females are protected against mammary cancer and uterine infections. In males, castration reduces the risk of testicular cancer and enlargement of the prostate and related infections. From the pet owners point of view, the spayed or castrated pet is a much better companion. They are less aggressive and more affectionate than their unaltered counterparts. Since they are not driven by the urge to reproduce, they are less likely to roam and fight.

Controlled studies into the short- and long-term effects of early neutering have been sadly lacking until recently. While there had been numerous anecdotal reports of early spaying and neutering, these cases were generally uncontrolled from the scientific viewpoint. Most reported cases were random bred, unrelated animals from a variety of backgrounds and no attempt was made to control for these variations. There have been few university based studies in this area. M.A. Herron of Texas A&M reported in 1972 that neutering before sexual maturity had relatively little effect on the diameter of the urethra in male cats. Studies have more recently been conducted at Angell Memorial Hospital in Boston, the College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Minnesota, and the Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences at the University of Florida. The Florida project, begun in 1991 and completed in 1992, was funded by the Winn Feline Foundation in conjunction with the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). A serious attempt was made in this study to limit background influences and genetic variation. The kittens were bred especially for the project and litter mates were divided among the three groups. The queens were bred and housed in quarantined facilities since both pre- and post-natal nutrition and other factors can contribute to the ultimate size, weight, and overall health of the kittens. Dr. Mark Bloomberg indicates that although long-term follow-up results are incomplete, the initial results are extremely positive. Prior to undertaking the Winn Foundation study, Dr. Bloomberg had completed a similar study in dogs. Animals involved in that study have now been followed for over five years, with no negative side effects reported. In the Winn Foundation study, there were a total of 31 domestic shorthair kittens from 7 litters born on the Gainesville campus.

The kittens were divided into three groups:

Group 1 (11 kittens) were neutered or spayed at 7 weeks of age.

Group 2 (11 kittens) were neutered or spayed at 7 months.

Group 3 (the control group of 9 kittens) were not neutered until maturity and after the completion of the first phase of the study at 12 months.

The investigators reported that the surgical procedures in the Group 1 kittens were straightforward and uncomplicated, and that the kittens recovered even more rapidly than the Group 2 kittens and Group 3 cats. Dr. Bloomberg notes that although there is very little material on pediatric anesthesia in animals, the pediatric patient in human medicine is generally considered to be a very good surgical

candidate and there is no reason why this should not also be true for dogs and cats. The major concerns in pediatric surgery are: preventing hypothermia (maintaining body heat); utilizing proper doses of anesthetic agents (since the respiratory centers are not as well developed in the pediatric patient); and maintaining proper blood glucose. The investigators did not fast the pediatric patients as long as adult patients and administered small amounts of Karo syrup prior to induction of anesthesia as a precaution. It should be noted that due to the rapid recovery of the pediatric patient, the common practice of reducing anesthesia during final stages of the surgery was modified.

Critics have claimed several possible detrimental side effects from early neutering. It is commonly believed that neutered animals are less active and more prone to obesity than unaltered animals. It was also suggested that neutering at an early age would stunt normal growth. In male cats in particular, it was feared that early castration would affect the development of the urinary tract and lead to an increased incidence of cystitis or urinary obstruction. Concerns have also been raised as to the effect of early neutering on behavior, food consumption and dietary requirements, etc. The investigators attempted to answer most of these questions by evaluating several parameters in the three groups of kittens. In particular, they looked at weight and body composition (i.e., percent of body fat); bone length and the age of physal closure (the age when long bone growth stops); behavior; food consumption; development of the urinary tract; and the development of secondary sexual characteristics and degree of sexual maturity.

The results of the comparisons of weight showed some differences between the three groups. Males weighed consistently more than females, but this was uniform in all groups. The studies of body composition and body fat indicated that Group 1 (neutered at 7 weeks) and Group 2 (neutered at 7 months) were identical and were generally fatter than Group 3 (neutered at 12 months, after they were sexually mature). Investigators point out that by 12 months, the male cats in Group 3 were already exhibiting the normal adult male characteristics of decreased weight and the development of jowls, which accounts for some of the differences. It has also been noted that in the course of follow-up, the differences between the weight in cats from Group 1 and 2 and Group 3 are becoming less apparent. All these cats have been placed in selected and supervised pet homes and are more active than they were in the University facilities. A three-year follow-up exam was to be conducted in May of 1994.

OBSERVATIONS

There was generally no difference in food consumption between the three groups other than the differences between males and females, which were consistent in all groups. There was no difference observed in the growth rates in all three groups, although the males grew faster in all groups. Increased long bone length was observed in both males and females in Groups 1 and 2. This appeared to be due to the fact that physal closing (closure of the bone growth plate) was delayed in Groups 1 & 2. This explains why cats neutered and spayed as kittens are frequently larger (longer and taller) than unaltered cats or cats altered later in life.

This seems to be particularly true for males.

In terms of behavior, after 7 months, the cats in Group 3 were noticeably less affectionate and more aggressive prior to altering than the cats in Groups 1 and 2. Contrary to popular opinion, neutered animals were as active as their unaltered age mates.

Observations of urinary tract development showed no differences between the three groups other than the differences related to sex and these were consistent across all groups. The investigators measured the diameter of the urethra in the male kittens only and found no differences between the groups. Concerns have been raised that early neutering would result in smaller diameters in the urinary tract, resulting in an increased incidence of cystitis and related problems. This does not appear to be the case. The main differences observed between the groups occurred in the comparison of secondary sex characteristics. Males were examined for differences in the development of the penis and prepuce (skin covering the penis), as well as for the development of penile spines. The penile spines were absent in Group 1, smaller than normal in Group 2, and normally developed in Group 3. In the examination of the female kittens, investigators found that the vulvas were more infantile in Groups 1 and 2 and normal in Group 3. None of these differences had any impact on the ability to catheterize the kittens. Concerns that development of the urinary tract might be arrested or impaired by early spaying and neutering proved unsupported.

The results of this study so far indicate that the differences between cats neutered at 7 weeks and 7 months are insignificant. The differences observed between animals in Groups 1 and 2 and the animals in Group 3, while in some cases statistically significant, are not differences which appear to affect the health of the animal in a negative way. While the final results will depend on the analysis of long-term follow-up, the indications are that early neutering is not detrimental to the overall health of the animal. From the perspective of shelters and particularly in respect to the problem of surplus puppies and kittens these results are encouraging. If all the animals adopted from shelters, including puppies and kittens, are neutered prior to adoption, there should be a corresponding decrease in the numbers of animals euthanized each year in this country. Preliminary results from Alachua County, near the University of Florida at Gainesville, would seem to support this theory.

Alachua County Animal Control has been working with the investigators at the University and have had an early neuter policy in place since 1990. No animal leaves the shelter without being neutered. In 1987 the county euthanized 1,250 cats and dogs per month. Since implementing the early neuter policies they have seen the numbers drop to 940 per month in 1992 and there has been no increase in morbidity or mortality associated with the program.

In the last year, recognition of the safety and efficacy of early spay/neuter has grown rapidly. The American Humane Association has endorsed early neutering

prior to adoption as a "feasible solution to decreasing pet overpopulation and the tragedy of resulting deaths." In July 1993, delegates to the American Veterinary Medical Association Annual Meeting voted to give AVMA's support to the concept of early neutering. Work done by veterinarians at Angell Memorial Hospital for the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals supports Dr. Bloomberg's observations. Other organizations involved in early neuter programs include the Denver Dumb Friends League in Colorado, the Miami Humane Society and Alachua County Animal Control in Florida, The Humane Society of Austin and Travis County in Texas, the Chicago Animal Control in Illinois, the King County Animal Control in Washington state, the Vancouver SPCA in British Columbia and the Southern Oregon Humane Society in Oregon. The Dekalb Humane Society in Decatur, Collie Rescue of Metro Atlanta, the Georgia Alliance of Purebred Canine Rescuers, The Haven (dog rescue) and Dog River Sanctuary in Douglasville are among the Georgia organizations working with early neuter in dogs and cats, as well as exotic species.

The Cat Fanciers' Association (CFA) has changed its show rules to permit altered kittens to compete. Many breeders of pedigreed cats are working with their veterinarians to neuter pet quality kittens prior to placement in new homes. Those breeders who have adopted this policy report that they are very happy with the practice. New pet owners indicate that acquiring an already neutered animal relieves them of the worry and expense of scheduling the surgery at a later date, enabling them to relax and enjoy their new companion. As is the case for shelter managers, breeders can relax in the knowledge that the kitten they place today is not going to contribute to the surplus pet population tomorrow.

FACE OFF

We Know What The Solutions Are. We Can See Them. But, too many of us tolerate the large national animal organizations' efforts to disguise them with fancy graphics and to hide them behind the illusions that we must send them money in order to resolve these issues - leading us to think that the results we all hope for are out of our reach. For those who question this, scroll down this page.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 17, 2004

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Rachel Query: 301-258-8255; rquery@hsus.org

NATIONAL GROUPS ISSUE CONGRESSIONAL SCORECARD ON ANIMAL PROTECTION MEASURES

WASHINGTON - The Humane Society of the United States and The Fund for Animals, in cooperation with other major national animal protection organizations, are releasing a “Mid-Term Report on the 108th Congress,” providing a detailed picture of animal protection issues that emerged in Congress between January of last year and February 2004.

The Congress made progress on a number of fronts, enacting the Captive Wildlife Safety Act and providing meaningful funding for animal welfare programs, including enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act. It did, however, leave several other important issues unresolved, including measures to increase penalties for animal fighting and to ban the slaughter of horses for human consumption, and it rejected some measures that should have received resounding approval.

“One of Congress’ biggest missteps was its failure to adopt an amendment to halt the slaughter of downed animals – livestock too sick or injured to walk - for human consumption,” stated Wayne Pacelle, a senior vice president of The HSUS. This became a major national issue after the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that a cow tested positive for Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) in December in Washington State. The HSUS, The Fund, and other groups had long warned that abused downed animals are far more likely to test positive for BSE than ambulatory livestock.

“Had the no-downer policy been in place, the mad cow in Washington would have never made it into the food supply and the economic repercussions for the cattle industry would have been considerably mitigated,” added Pacelle. The Congress’ work on the downer issue did, however, set the stage for the Bush Administration’s announcement on December 30 of a ban on the processing of downed cattle for human consumption.

In addition to bowing to cattle and dairy interests on the downer ban, the House also caved in to the National Rifle Association’s demand to allow a particularly unsporting and reckless type of hunting: bear baiting. A free-standing bill to stop bear baiting on federal lands was gaining momentum and had attracted nearly 190 cosponsors when the NRA targeted the measure, causing 26 members to take the unusual step of withdrawing their co-sponsorship for the legislation and leading to the defeat of an amendment on the Interior Appropriations bill.

“All federal land management agencies tell visitors never to feed bears, but they allow trophy hunters in nine states to set up thousands of dump sites – consisting of rotting meat, jelly doughnuts, and grease and honey – to lure bears to shoot them at the bait sites,” said Michael Markarian, president of The Fund for Animals. “Besides being cruel and unsporting, this is a blatant and irreconcilable conflict in federal land management policy. It was sad to see so many members of the House capitulate to the demands of the NRA even though their instincts told them that banning baiting was the right ethical and public safety response.”

In terms of numeric scoring, while there were many exceptions on both sides of the aisle, there was a glaring disparity in scores between Democrats and Republicans. Senate Democrats averaged a score of 74.3, while Senate Republicans scored a poor 16.9. House Democrats scored 72.6, with House Republicans averaging just 26.7. Members of Congress from the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Pacific Coast regions were generally the most reliable supporters of animal protection, while members from the Interior West, Great Plains, and the South were the least supportive. Members from the Midwest fell somewhere in between.

Nineteen senators scored a perfect 100 (pro-animal on five of five issues) and 16 scored 80, while 34 senators scored zeroes and seven had a low 20. There were 59 House members who scored 100 (pro-animal on nine of nine issues), with another 47 scoring 89. There were just five zero scores in the House, but there were 125 House members who scored 11.

The groups are mailing copies of the scorecard to their supporters. The full text is also available on The HSUS’ web site at www.hsus.org/legislation. It is also available on the Fund for Animals’ site at action.fund.org.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation’s largest animal protection organization with more than eight million members and constituents. The HSUS is a mainstream voice for animals, with active programs in companion animals and equine protection, wildlife and habitat protection, animals in research and farm animals and sustainable agriculture. The HSUS protects all animals through legislation, litigation, investigation, education, advocacy and fieldwork. The non-profit organization, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2004, is based in Washington, DC and has 10 regional offices across the country. On the web at <http://www.hsus.org/>.

The Fund for Animals, with the mission to “speak for those who can’t,” was founded in 1967 by author and animal advocate Cleveland Amory, and is one of the largest and most active animal protection organizations in the world. It has spearheaded some of the most historic efforts for animal protection through litigation, legislation, education and direct rescue. The Fund’s world-famous sanctuaries – including the Black Beauty Ranch in Texas and Wildlife Rehabilitation Center in California – provide hands-on care and a safe haven for thousands of abandoned or abused wild animals including horses, chimpanzees, elephants, mountain lions and coyotes. On the web at <http://www.fund.org/>.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 22, 2004

FOR AN EXPLANATION ON WHY THEY WOULD DO THIS:
Rachel Querry: 301-258-8255; rquerry@hsus.org

CITIZENS ISSUE SCORECARD ON ANIMAL PROTECTION GROUPS.

AMERICA - Citizens issued their report today on the successes and failures of the national animal protection groups. Being unable to speak without giggling, at the gull and audacity that these groups must have to bring these points to light as if they would receive a positive report from anyone knowledgeable, made this interview quite difficult.

These groups have made progress on some fronts, such as to 'pretend' to work together on this scoreboard in which they 'criticized' the congress. There seems to be no doubt among most people around the nation that they, too, have left some issues unresolved. 1, spaying and neutering campaign which began in 1976 is still a problem in every corner of America, 2, Animal abuse prevention, which could have been greatly reduced had they spent some of the money they used to buy luxury cars, condos and exorbitant bonuses for their top executives. Both of these issues would clearly benefit from actually providing a strong humane education program around the nation in schools, extra-curricular programs, scouting groups and other youth functions with the nearly \$ 1 billion they receive in donations.

“One of the national organizations' biggest missteps was its failure to live up to most all their promises of "We can only solve this if you send us money and more money": Of course, the excuse is that there is just so many issues that need to be addressed. Clearly, this argument could be valid for a period of time, but after 30 or more years of the same begging practices, there comes a time when they should be held responsible for not adopting a more detailed and organized plan of attack so that some of the major problems could actually see resolve, thus allowing for more focus on other problems that could then become successful endeavors of their efforts and our money.

Had the larger national organizations implemented a decent program 20, 10 or even two years ago that would address the problems we face, in a way that would saturate American culture as did litter control, recycling and other social issues of the recent past, we would already see our society moving in a direction more civilized and respected by other nations.

In addition to their complete and total failure to actually provide the services that they have so blatantly bragged of for the past 20 years, they continue to ask for additional funds as the salaries of their top management continue to bloat - all while the animals they claim to protect continue to suffer.

All national organizations continue to gloat on 'their' impressive humane education programs they have available to schools. Clearly, anyone can make something available to the public or the schools, but until it's properly marketed and subsequently implemented into the schools at some level by the designing party or organization, it cannot be used as a "feather" in the cap because, to simplify this argument, if it's not being taught in schools anywhere by the organizations' staff or volunteers, there is no way for them to claim responsibility or for any outside source to justify or critique it's methods or results.

In terms of numeric scoring, while there were many exceptions on both sides of the aisle, there was a glaring disparity in scores between the various organizations as they continue to view this effort of animal protection as a competition through bickering, name calling, finger pointing and generally loose focus on the continued suffering of the animals in place of feeding their financial gullets and over inflated egos. The public fell somewhere in between.

Every organization scored a perfect 100 in their views for the future of the animals (depending on what your personal views are) but still have a horrific - almost total lack of providing solutions they can or will implement in any means or to show any results from their efforts that can't be argued by their 'competition', which in this case is every other animal protection organization.

The groups are mailing copies of the scorecard to their supporters. The full text is also available on The HSUS' web site at www.hsus.org/legislation. It is also available on the Fund for Animals' site at action.fund.org. So, the next time you are having a party with educated guests, this would be a perfectly hilarious party topic to get the laughs rolling. (liquor required for believability)

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation's largest animal protection organization. In 2002, they brought in over \$65,000,000 in donations and could afford to pay \$7.5 million to their top executives. But they didn't even have the highest salaries of the top organizations for animals.

The Fund for Animals, with the mission to "speak for those who can't," was founded in 1967 by author and animal advocate Cleveland Amory, and is one of the largest and most active animal blah blah, blah, blah.

Of 3,000 non profit groups in US committed to animal protection issues, donations received by the top 13. Total was \$351,598,690. That figure does not include 2,977 other non profit organizations and the money they received. Of that \$351.5 million + it is estimated that under government rules that require them to donate a minimum of 10% to their charitable cause, (\$35million) it's likely that only a small percentage of that truly went to the animals directly, but more likely to other charitable funds - some of which are owned and operated by the same organizations that originally provided the \$\$.

Clearly, until they begin working together in an honest and respectable means, their efforts will continue to be lost and sometimes wasted in the bickering that keeps the competitive strength going so strongly.

Ideal Homeless Animal Management System

Here is a model for establishing an effective community infrastructure that will safeguard animals and lower regional euthanasia rates. In this system it is vitally important that organizations have shared goals and understand that no one person or agency will end this problem on their own, it takes a community effort. Everyone's role must be defined and agencies must work within those roles for best results.

Generally speaking, nonprofit organizations do what most nonprofit agencies do, extend the services that governments are unable to provide. They do not provide base animal control service in their area.

Program

Action

Reason

Responsibility

Organization

Separate Animal Control and Nonprofit Organizations

With Partnership

Different missions

Different funding sources

Compromises humane ethic, reduces regional shelter capacity. Underfunds proactive programs

Nonprofit

Goal Setting

Shared Regional Goals to lower impoundment and euthanasia rates, increase spay/neuter and microchip rates

Raise community awareness

Every organization shares in re-homing success and takes responsibility for pet's lost. (No good guys or bad guys, All in this together)

Every companion animal person and organization

Ordinance Enforcement

Government animal control (professional officers)

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Government enforcement and response to citizen calls

Better staffed and equipped to perform these functions.

Empowered by law.

The Government

(By law)

Animal

Control

Funding

\$5 to \$6 per capita

for Animal Control with

25% going to proactive programs like spay/neuter and permanent identification.

Animal control is a public service for the entire community, not just animal owners. This program should receive general fund money.

Local county or city government

Animal Control

Euthanize surplus animals

Maintain the carrying capacity of the community

Animal Control ONLY

Nonprofit Animal Welfare

A No-kill, low-kill, care until adopted, aggressive adoption, non profit organization

Increased public support and resources. Administer proactive programs that prevent animals from becoming impounded.

Increases adoptions and market share.

All Community nonprofits

Stray Animal Impoundment

Take in strays

Keep public safe

Animal Control

Owner Relinquishment

Receive owner released

Limited admissions based on ability to place pet

Provide temporary housing for those who can no longer keep their pets.

Nonprofits

Animal Control Transfers

Transfer animal to nonprofit for adoption (at no cost)

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Nonprofit better able to market and adopt animals

More public participation because animals in shelter are not on "death row."

Nonprofit

Animal Control

Animal Control Adoptions

Nonprofit handles Animal Control adoptions

Nonprofits are better able to market pets available for adoption to community

Nonprofits

Animal Control

Permanent Identification -

Part of license program

Low cost lifetime license with microchip and spay/neuter

80% usage Rate

Lower volume of strays Track ownership Save Animal Lives by increasing return to owner rate

Animal Control

Lost and Found

Lost animal recovery handled by nonprofit with shared data base

Greater staffing resources

Better equipped to administer program

Nonprofit

Microchips

Subsidies for low income owners

Safeguard

pets

Nonprofit

Microchips

ID a thons

Increase microchip use

Nonprofits

Visual Identification

Supply visual

ID Tag (take donations only)

Increase Pet ID Rate

Nonprofit

Spay/Neuter 10,000 spay/neuters per year Reduce supply of surplus pets

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Nonprofits
Animal Control
Spay/Neuter
Low-cost Clinic
Align Supply with demand
Animal Control

Nonprofits

Spay/Neuter
All animals S/N before adoption release
S/N deposits don't work. Shelters can't contribute to the surplus problem
All Adoption Shelters

Spay/Neuter
Mobile S/N van
More accessible to low income, ethnic and rural communities
Nonprofit

Spay/Neuter
Veterinary Vouchers
More affordable for low-income and casual caretakers (People who feed stray cats)
County or City Governments

Spay/Neuter
Feral Cat
S/N Program
Stem volume of kittens from feral colonies
Nonprofits

Spay/Neuter
Spay-athons
Raise public awareness
Nonprofits & veterinarians

Pet Retention
Low-cost Dog Training Classes
Prevent problems Help owners bond
Nonprofits
Veterinarians
Animal Control
Breeders

Pet Retention
Behavior Hot Line
Help owners work out problems

Nonprofits

Pet Retention

Pre adoption Test

Detect high probability of relinquishments and offer training

Nonprofit

Animal Control

Veterinarians

Breeders

Pet Retention New Owner Orientation Get new owners off on the right track and prevent unwitting abuse Nonprofits

Animal Control

Veterinarians

Breeders

Pet Health Care and Rehabilitation

Care for sick and injured homeless pets

Fulfill the humane ethic

Nonprofit

Low income programs

Reduced rates for S/N, Microchips and training

Go right to the source of most surplus animal problems.

Nonprofits

Animal control

Veterinarian Involvement

Offer low-cost spay/neuter

Take government vouchers

Perform early-age spay/neuter

Offer behavior exams at 6 mo

Offer training classes or refer

Key contacts with pet owning community

Veterinarians

Governments

Feral, Free-Roaming Cats

Trap/Vaccinate/Alter/Release

Reduce oversupply of cats from main source, feral cats

Nonprofits

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Breeders

Breeders Certification

Offers a way to distinguish between responsible and charlatan breeders.

Local All Breed Clubs

Pet Acquisition

Local (coalition sponsored) pet acquisition agency

Refer public to available pets. Monitor activity. Eventually be able to align supply with demand for area animals Community Pet Coalition

UNINFORMED ADULTS MAKE UN ENFORCEABLE LAWS

I G N O R A N C E

By Mary Ultz Humane Educator for the City of Huntsville, AL

As a Paralegal, Animal Control Officer, Law Enforcement Officer, Retailer, Humane Educator, and a number of other things, sometimes I sit in wonderment about people. Being in Animal Welfare, we feel like that quite often. I have done many things in my short adult life and I want to ponder and propose in an effort to make people think.....So, pardon me if I seem to ramble...

I've been front line and reinforcement for animal issues. I have seen the large national organizations do nothing and I've seen single individuals move mountains. I know that government is being forced to legislate, moderate, and enforce more than ever. The problem I don't understand is why any agency (public or private) is willing to create legislation and rules about and for animals, yet they don't understand the first thing about animals.

Let's look at legislators for a moment. It really doesn't matter if they are federal, state, or local municipalities. There are laws on the books about dogs and cats across this great Nation. But, do the people who are writing the laws understand animal behavior? Some legislators do look to their local animal welfare agency for guidance...but do they know? Does the local humane society know? Do the local vets know? A vet may know how a cat behaves in a stressful situation, but do they know how to write a law to protect that cat?

Humane Societies are helpful, to an extent....they know about the overpopulation problem, and they surely appreciate the stupid reasons people dump their pets, but do they know what an animal control officer faces in the field? Can an animal control officer adequately convey to the legal department what needs to be included in the actual legislation? We must all pull together and share our information in order to create good, powerful legislation. The attorneys can put all the jargon together, but what use is that, if they don't know or appreciate the need on the street?

Unfortunately, many animal control officers are without professional training (and

they're not attorneys) so they are usually unable to create the verbiage necessary for such a task. When creating legislation, animal behavior MUST be considered. If you're going to hold a dog responsible for biting a human, should the human bitten also be held responsible? Every weathered animal control officer will agree that the person responsible for the dog should be held responsible!!

Every good and knowledgeable citizen SHOULD feel the same way. Each case is individual and is cause for investigation. Each case ought to be examined by someone who understands animal behavior. If a person tries to take food out of a dog's mouth, is it unreasonable to expect the animal to allow it? (I'm not talking common sense stuff, my dog would let me and any responsible owner's dog would accept that) We're talking about the people who do not care for or train their dog....the irresponsible pet owner. If a child trips over a sleeping dog and the dog bites the child, who's fault is it? That is normal, typical behavior for a dog! Where were the child's parents?

Yes, accidents happen....should a life be taken because of it? However, if a child walks by a dog (no food on the kids face, no sleeping dog situations) is it fair to let the dog maul the child while no human is held responsible? I'm not saying euthanize the dog, I'm saying give the owners choices.

I don't believe in "3 bites your out" type legislation, but I also don't think that a truly vicious dog ought to be allowed to terrorize a neighborhood.

Judges are often in this loop of "uneducated" enforcers. They are not in the street and it's not their neighbor's dog that is keeping them up at 4:00 in the morning. Often times, they have no regard for animals (especially if you live in Rural, USA). It's a dog; they have felons to worry about in over flowing jails. I don't care what their excuse is....if they are elected Judges, VOTE!!! If they are appointed judges, then talk with the person that appointed them (Often the Governor or Mayor). **HOLD THEIR FEET TO THE FIRE AND MAKE THEM DO THEIR JOB!** Animal laws are just as important as human laws! Violence breeds Violence!

Cops are on the street to protect the public. Sometimes that protection is from a 400# armed robber, sometimes it's from a 150# Rottweiler. They are there to enforce the laws. It does not matter if that law is a federal law, a state law, or a local ordinance. They are sworn to uphold and protect. Educate the police chief and offer to help. Don't just sit there and criticize....help them understand.

OK, enough about the public sector....let's look at some private issues:

Apartment complexes....all of us know several apartment complexes that do not allow pets. The complexes that do allow dogs often have a weight limit of, oh, we'll say 20#. I can tell you from experience, the average dog weighs in at 55#. The complex claims that a small dog causes less damage. Hogwash! A properly trained dog, no matter what the size, causes no damage! (I'm not talking about during thunderstorms!). Hold the people responsible, not the dog! Ok, so a toy

poodle will pee less than a Doberman pinscher. Either way, the carpet is wet and has to be cleaned! If you have a housetrained dog, that is not an issue anyway!!! Besides, everyone who has a lick of sense knows that a Great Dane or Greyhound is a much better apartment dog than a Jack Russell Terrier! Heck, even a Saint Bernard would be better than a Rat Terrier....it's what is inside that counts! So why do they have the stupid weight limit? I've never understood that!

Here's another situation that dog owners are facing everywhere TODAY! Canceled homeowners' insurance, inability to renew, or flat rejection for coverage. Why? Because they have a certain "type" of dog. What type is that, you ask? BIG! The insurance black list of dogs is growing each day. It includes PittBulls (doesn't matter which type of pitt), Dobermans, Rottweilers, Great Danes, German Shepherds, Dalmatians, Golden Retrievers...wait! Did I say "Golden Retrievers"? why, they are the "American Family Dog"! Yes, that is what I said. Humane responsibility is going down the toilet, everyone wants to blame someone else. Dogs bite....cats bite....give me the right reason, and I'll bite too! Don't hold the dog responsible, hold the people responsible. If you have a dog and you're a responsible owner, you will see to it that the dog will not bite (under normal circumstances – I WANT it to bite if someone is coming through my window at 3 a.m.). Why won't insurance agencies just make stipulations for coverage? Basic obedience, sterilization, socialization....all those things will help teach a dog how to behave in polite society. It has NOTHING to do with the breed!

So, if you're still with me, congratulations!!! I hope I haven't bored you to tears. Here is my challenge to you:

Don't sit on your butt and complain about all these stupid rules and regulations! Get off your duff, contact the people who make these statements and educate them! Help them understand basic animal behavior and why it is in their best interest to consider animal behavior when they are making these laws. Don't go in there with a "holier than thou" attitude because you have the answers; approach them with a helping attitude. By helping the stupid human, you help the dumb animal (dumb, like can't talk, not dumb as in stupid....I've known some really smart dogs! But they still couldn't talk).

Don't even get me started on 'leash laws', 'tied up dogs' so-called "guard dogs" that have had no training and couldn't save your ass anyway cause they're OUTSIDE and penned or tied up – oh I could go on forever. Ask my husband.

It boils down to making PEOPLE be responsible, not punishing animals because their humans are stupid!

Uh oh! Now YOU'RE a humane educator!

"The greatness of a country and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated." M. Gandhi

Mary Ultz

Humane Educator

City of Huntsville, Alabama

“IN YOUR FACE” STYLES HAVE MOST SUCCESS

HERE IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF WHAT AN 'IN YOUR FACE' CAMPAIGN CAN DO IF DONE CORRECTLY. THESE PEOPLE ACTUALLY SAID THEY WERE UNAWARE OF THESE PETS BEING KILLED UNTIL THIS SERIES OF EVENTS. SOMETIMES YOU ABSOLUTELY HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO MAKE THEM SEE WITH THEIR OWN EYES. This is not 'scare tactics', exaggerated figures or limited affects type journalism, but simple facts that do have an impact on each and every citizen.

Dog Euthanization to be Shown LIVE on Television

by Ellen Murray

This should be a mandatory topic for all communities to feature at least once a year.

Video footage of a dog being euthanized at the Guilford County Animal Shelter (GCAS) in Durham, North Carolina will be shown on Saturday during a public access television program produced by the county sheriff. The same footage was featured on a major network news program several years ago and the effects were immediately noticeable. It is a powerful tool to make those who 'think' they understand what goes on with the overpopulation, actually face the truth – to make them wake up quickly.

B.J. Barnes said he intends to show the footage in order to let people know what happens to the thousands of area animals that are not adopted.

The sheriff's weekly program, which is broadcast by WGHP on channel 8, begins at 7 PM.

WGHP also airs a weekly segment featuring one of the animals available for adoption at the GCAS.

The sheriff said that after he showed the footage on local network primetime program five years ago, the initial reaction was outrage as people lined up at the county facility to adopt the dogs and cats and show their distain for what they assumed was a callous and uncaring sheriff, they learned quickly that these had been going on long before his arrival and that he only showed this to 'shock' the

residents into a reality check. It must have worked as well here in North Carolina as this 'In Your Face' style campaign has also worked in various other communities over the past 10 years. Within 6 months of the first showing in 1996, ads for litters in the papers were greatly reduced, adoptions increased and the number of people surrendering animals went down substantially.

© 2002 Animal News Center, Inc.

Please be sure to provide proper credit to Animal News Center when publishing the article. Once you have published it, please either send the URL at which the piece may be found to webmaster@anc.org or mail a copy of the article to Animal News Center, Suite 6E, 153 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022.

ONE OF THE BEST ARTICLES AVAILABLE TODAY EXPLAINING HOW WE FOUND OURSELVES IN THIS SITUATION AND WHAT WE MUST KNOW IF WE STRIVE TO CORRECT THE PROBLEMS

By Joseph Pastore H.E.A.R.T. org in New York City

WHY WE HAVE FOUND OURSELVES IN THIS POSITION TODAY

If you are thinking it's about time to begin solving these problems, you must first realize just what brought us into this situation.....

Simply put, we are failing to effectively reach the mainstream on animal issues. This is why it is imperative for us to reach the next generation and for them to help spread the word throughout their social circles as well. Every time I hear of somebody abusing or neglecting their pet and an adult or young person tell me "Oh, that is just not my place to say that to him or her" I want to scream. They've just opened the door for yet another animal to be harmed or killed. The person who has custody of the pet in question knows this, too. **NOBODY WILL DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT.** Here are some ideas for the club to focus on.

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Unawareness: As we know, the general public not only has little perspective on what the issues are, but also an appalling ignorance of the magnitude and depths of the problems associated with trying to help animals and save the environment as well as extremely poor knowledge on such issues as basic care for companion animals. Raising awareness is always the critical first step for improvements to be made.

Denial: Humans typically either consciously suppress or unconsciously repress painful things that they're made aware of that they either find too painful to deal with or don't want to bother with (especially facing their own failures). Like an ostrich keeping it's head buried in the sand for protection.

Apathy: If and when they fully face them, have they been sufficiently motivated to really care, especially about animals and the environment? Way too often people convince themselves that the problem is too huge and that they, as an individual, can do nothing of any value. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. The fact is, our biggest problem is apathy, because millions of people just don't realize that they CAN make a difference by becoming aware of the situation, the general causes, possible solutions and to share this with any and all people they know.

Abuse: Every community has it's percentages, but for the most part, everyone would be overwhelmed by the statistics and stories given by their local animal control and police department they see every day in their line of work. Again, the majority of these acts are born of ignorance and spewed forth by anger. This is a tragic situation for the animals that have no means of defending themselves or reporting the actions. Then, so many of the humans who did witness it or know of it, simply keep quiet so as not to upset the human.

Irresponsibility: The average John and Jane Q Public feel they already have sufficient knowledge to train their new pet. Yet the largest single problems people list when relinquishing a pet to the local animal control facilities around the nation is their lack of training skills. If, offered guidance on how to possibly improve the pets' behavior prior to this decision, they likely would have snuffed at it, and admittedly never did ask for help from someone trained to do just that. It is NOT a degrading attribute to ask a professional for advice in any situation, but in the pet world, it seems to be black listed and carry a negative stigma. If sufficiently motivated to care, would they then get lazy about meeting their responsibilities? (Fresh water daily for companion animals, walking them regularly and always on a leash, never leaving them unattended in a public place or in a hot car, trying to step in and help an injured stray animal, learning more about local area animal-related laws, taking an interest in animal first-aid, taking personal responsibility to avoid polluting the environment and reporting environmental dangers to authorities, etc). In many cases, law can mandate responsibility, but even then vigilance is needed to remind people not to ignore or break the law.

Pomposity: This frankly is the "anti-animal" and environmentally unconcerned crowd that does not yet relate to or fully accept the fact that this takes Everyone's efforts and involvement through knowledge of the depths of the problems that brought us to this point. EXAMPLE #1: "It's my right to have a litter if I want to." This is just pompous, ignorant and selfish remark from those who simply don't know how to work as a team and feel that everything is 'owed' to them. EXAMPLE #2: "Oh, I'm only going to have one litter and then we'll have her spayed. We'll find them really good homes." Problem is, about 3 million OTHER folks in the US are thinking the same thing this year. 3,000,000 litters this year X 5 per litter = 15,000,000 MORE pets into a society that already has 8,000,000 per year that we have to put to sleep for lack of homes. This will only work as an EDUCATED society working together. We must educate these people however we can.

Greed: The amount of money made on the exploitation of animals is incalculable. The profits are so sickening that they make one want to resign from the human race in the same way that overwhelmingly depressing heinous crimes against animals and the environment, inhumane euthanasia, using them for sport that results in certain injury or death, and society's long-standing practice of killing surplus companion animals do. If the first five barriers were successfully overcome, this would be far and away the toughest (thus the never-ending need for more and more effective legislation).

Property Status: Here is where I wholeheartedly agree with Professor Gary Francione of Rutgers University. As he says, "we're only talking about one right concerning animals, the right not to be viewed and classified as property; if we could achieve that, everything else would fall into place." Also as he says, "every civilized country in the world has eliminated slavery." But, for animals, this last bastion of the ultimate intrinsically evil shame of the human race still exists. Of course the greed factor works hand-in-hand with our greatest hopes of ending the property status of animals.

Definition of OWNER: One who has or takes possession of a piece of property or item. With usual right to alter or care for it in whatever manner the new owner sees fit.

Definition of GUARDIAN: One who adopts a child or pet in order to provide appropriate care in the form of guidance, loving, food, water, shelter and all necessary nurturing required by said child or pet.

There are, of course, animal and environmental horrors that are not discussed here, such as "animal adoption pretenders and imposters" who pretend to offer good homes for companion animals and do otherwise, (Many responders to the FREE TO GOOD HOME ads are now eager to collect healthy pets and then sell them for hundreds of dollars to a dog fighting club or to a research lab) and the whole gamut of "insufficient animal protective legislation at all levels", "lax animal cruelty law enforcement", "lax prosecution, conviction and sentencing of animal

cruelty offenders", and many others to be sure), but we can conceptualize many of the listed issues given as research assignments to students who can quantify many of them and produce eye-opening results for their classes. Some of them have general titles ("sport hunting and fishing", "dog and cat overpopulation", "animals in entertainment", etc.) with some representative examples of each ("fox hunting and hare coursing", "puppy mills and backyard breeders", "circus & rodeo animals", etc). In addition to "substandard animal shelters & pounds", included is "deprived animal shelter living" to emphasize that even shelters meeting or exceeding recommended requirements still represent a deprived life for animals. Hopefully, such an emphasis might help to discourage some people from surrendering their companion animals to any shelter.

I hope you will read the research work done by Professor Stephen Kellert of Yale University entitled "A Study of American Attitudes Toward Animals" where he describes seven distinct views of animals consisting of a "moralistic attitude", a "humanistic attitude", an ecologicistic attitude", a "naturalistic attitude", an "aesthetic attitude", a "scientific attitude", and a "dominionistic attitude", in that order from the center out, with the most empathetic and animal-concerned being closest to "Animal Protection Consciousness").

The visual impact of seeing these issues diagrammed in this manner seems to be having a profound impact on those that view it. It seems to help bring the much-needed perspective to the many issues we deal with in a simplified format that communicates a lot of information in a one-page overview. We are receiving remarkably positive responses from the initial people we've been sending it to as we invite input and feedback. Professor Kathleen Squadrito of Indiana State University plans to use it next year in her course on "ethics and animals".

For amazing graphic on the scope of this problem,

see www.21stcenturycares.org/jpastore.htm

JUST KILL THE DOGS

Randy N. Warner

Throughout every city and state across the country, those who demonstrate volunteerism and good citizenship are highly valued. By supplementing what would otherwise be the full responsibility of local governments, these individuals fill the gaps left by skeleton staff. They withstand undue pressure to do the impossible, and are threatened by downsizing and insufficient funds needed to maintain quality services or even properly execute mandate.

The kill rate in most counties across the nation is embarrassingly high and is one of the worst examples we continue to set for our future generations to come. These agencies, along with the county and municipal governing bodies, could and should view these volunteers and rescues as 'assistants' who help out for no pay or compensation whatsoever.

Instead, when a good citizen steps forward to save the lives of hundreds or even thousands of companion animals, including dogs and cats who would otherwise become staggering statistics, he/she is met with incredible and very encumbering fees, regulations and rules, legal threats and more.. This, while over 8 million adoptable pets are to be killed each year in this country, and backyard breeders choose to have a recreational litter of kittens or puppies with almost no regulation, guidance or structure at all. Yet, they are the people who are clearly the contributing factor in this problem. Again we see the "without victims" theory coming into play; in this case, animal control agencies would loose many jobs. This is mainly due to a seriously inadequate understanding by Americans as to the results of their actions.

Animal control agencies that have a highly questionable record of humane performance and fail to 'market' their commodity as a normal business would , allow this to continue with no thought of any tomorrows. Poor business hours for adoptions and retrievals of lost pets, fall short in reminding their public of the pets

who are adoptable on a widespread, regular basis, frequently unwilling to require mandatory spay neuter to any pet going out the door. Most of the problems stem from a lack of understanding within the community of the restrictions and requirements placed on the underpaid, overworked and under educated animal control staff. It becomes a vicious circle.

But, it's all becoming much more clear recently. The 'lip service' we hear from everyone else is a cover up for their ignorance and refusal to be responsible caring citizens.

Law enforcement agencies, large numbers of elected officials and a surprising majority of our citizens have no respect for the lives of these innocent animals or these things would clearly have been looked into and dealt with accordingly. This also means they refuse to properly acknowledge the proven impact that conditions and actions have on the future generations of children who fall victim to having parents with little or no patience for the obvious. And the subsequent results are allowed to contaminate our future generations with the same disrespect as many other like situations that were quickly outlawed and strongly governed.

We need to be smart. We need to change the way we view and teach the world in a very different way. Not similar to what we've done for 60 years, but differently - a way that works. We need to prove to the legislators at all levels that even though animals don't vote or contribute to campaign re-elections, WE DO! And we should do it volume. Ask each and every person running for office about their views and plans for improvements, and hold them to it.

So, when:

- our congressmen and women, senators and assemblymen drag their feet and vote “no” on important animal legislation,
 - law enforcement continue to claim a lack of time and resources is their justification for not making appropriate arrests,
 - the judges are refusing to uphold current laws by offering lighter sentencing and dismissing charges completely and
 - the local governing bodies are giving themselves up to 35% pay increases annually
- all this, while cutting the animal control budgets,. they are sending a message that America hears.

Until further notice, the general public and lawmakers are sending a strong message, and it is coming through loud and clear – JUST KILL THE DOGS!!

Breakdowns in the Community
Animal Welfare Management System

This could actually be a guide for rebuilding your community and its resources for improving the local animal related problems.

Failure of animal welfare and veterinarians to work together.

Inability to look at the pet overpopulation problem from a community perspective (instead of a shelter perspective) and develop community goals with each organization playing a key role.

Inability to develop coalitions of animal organizations who work together to achieve regional goals.

Inability to develop synergism (total effect is greater than the sum of its parts), define strengths and weaknesses of each organization and work within those abilities for the good of the animals.

Failure of humane organizations to advocate a clear and sensible message to the public that the life of an animal is valued and working to uphold the humane ethic by not taking life, but by protecting life.

Failure to apply political pressure on politicians to adequately address community animal programs.

A lack of understanding of the contradictory missions of both animal control, (to protect the public from animals) and humane organizations (protect the animals from public).

Under funding of animal control programs and capital improvements for animal facilities by local governments.

Failure to recognize that 70% of the cat overpopulation problem is caused by un-owned, intact, feral, free roaming cats and developing an effective humane population control program.

Failure to recognize the importance of trap/vaccinate/neuter/release as a humane way to lower impound rates and instead recommend the "round em up and kill'em" method (that has proven to be ineffective).

Distrust in government animal control by nonprofits

Politically appointed directors instead of professional career pathing from within the profession

Failure to recognize the number one reason why pets are euthanized in shelters, LACK OF IDENTIFICATION and develop a corrective program

Total reliance on dog (and sometimes cat) licensing and ID tags as a means of returning lost pets home. This system is a complete FAILURE.

Failure to implement microchip programs and understand it's benefits

Failure to develop low-cost or free transfer agreements between animal control and nonprofit/rescue organizations

Failure of shelters to use breed rescue.

The assumption that anti-breeding legislation will solve everything.

The assumption that spay/neuter will solve everything.

The liberal interpretation of the word euthanasia to include "lack of space" and "time ran out." True euthanasia means taking a life for reasons of health or temperament and is a true act of mercy. Shelters are not to blame, but by not calling it what it is, we fail to galvanize enough force in the community to stop it.

Lack of understanding and funding for pet retention programs

Failure to set goals, monitor and measure performance to those goals and adjust programs accordingly.

Failure by nonprofits to develop animal social services targeted at low income owners

Nonprofits that assume government contracts and:
fail to allocate a large portion of their revenue towards proactive programs,
do so to alleviate fund raising responsibilities and pressures
The assumption by nonprofits that sheltering and adopting animals is enough

Failure of nonprofits to professionally market their animals for adoption and spend money to do so.

Failure of No-kill shelters to advance beyond sheltering and aggressively fundraise then channel those funds into proactive programs

Government animal control forming nonprofit 501 C3 organizations to raise money (competing with nonprofits) instead of having the money come from the community tax base.

Tendency by boards to accumulate reserves greater than 2 times their annual budget and use these excess funds for investment that supplants annual fundraising activity. (excess reserves should be used for animal programs.)

Failure to use professional fundraising principles and develop charitable trusts.

Failure of shelters to recognize most people don't visit shelters because they become "emotionally overwhelmed" and to extend adoption services into the community

Shelters closed after 5 pm on weekdays and on Saturdays and Sundays, the days when most people have the time to look for a pet.

Failure of the veterinarian community to recognize the importance of training during the critical first year of ownership and intervene to solve behavior problems and help people bond.

Failure of purebred organizations to certify and sanction breeding practices and strongly censure, discipline and ban poor performers.

Failure to recognize the benefits of mobile spay/neuter units that are able to go to problem areas with vital services.

Failure of governments to initiate a subsidized voucher spay/neuter program and realize a dollar spent today will save seven next year.

A LITTLE PERSPECTIVE FOR YOU AS YOU READ THE FACTS AND FIGURES PROVIDED.

Before you read these pages, keep in mind that Americans have spent \$1 Billion each year since 1983 on community based animal control efforts. That is \$20 billion.

Additionally, we have donated another \$1 Billion to our favorite animal protection organizations as they extend their hands asking for more money and "promise" to solve these problems. That is another \$20 Billion.

Most importantly, over 3,000 non profit organizations in this country have logged

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

an estimated 50 Billion man hours on the same efforts and in total, we can only boast a 12-15% reduction of unwanted animal deaths nationwide

A billion dollars is a difficult number to grasp hold of and comprehend, but a billion seconds ago it was 1971. A billion minutes ago was a few years after Jesus died. Many complain about how far we yet have to go in the animal protection movement. We don't have that far to go!!!!

We know what the solutions are and we know how to stop the problems. We just need to stop following the large national groups who have a vested interest in keeping these problems alive and running the rest of us in circles.

The next time you hear how the animal protection movement has taken in \$2 billion each year and over \$40 "billion" since 1983 casually, think about whether you want that movement spending your money so freely with so few results (other than, new cars, luxury office suites and retirement plans)

America's problems with animal abuse and overpopulation is far worse than most other industrialized nations. Also, Americans spend MORE on the "corrections" than anyone else, but still fall very short of our goals. If these guys make \$300,000 a year, why would they want to find a solution? They'd be out of work.

\$ 40 BILLION ago, we had the same problems we do today but 12% greater. We deserve better in 20 years and \$40 billion of O U R M O N E Y than a measely 12% reduction!!!!. We need to do things differently. We need to do things RIGHT.

American SPCA

TYPE	AES
DONATED & EARNED INCOME:	\$ 39,120,286
EXPENDITURES:	\$ 41,357,094
PROGRAM SERVICE:	\$ 32,633,889
FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION:	\$ 8,723,205
% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, AS DECLARED:	21%
% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, OUR ANALYSIS:	29%
TOTAL ASSETS:	\$ 53,983,597
TANGIBLE (DEPRECIABLE) ASSETS:	\$ 19,816,877
CASH & SECURITIES:	\$ 27,394,209

NOTE:

The American SPCA assets include \$12.8 million in "beneficial interests in perpetual trusts held by others." They do this to hids funds as best they can. The ASPCA in 2002 distributed \$1.1 million among 182 other animal care organizations.

Compensation info--

LARRY HAWK President ASPCA \$421,970
(Included four-year performance bonus. Hawk left the ASPCA in April 2003 and now heads the Massachusetts SPCA.)
Steven R Hansen SrVP ASPCA \$139,657
Stephen Musso SrVP/Ops ASPCA \$136,142
Stephen Zawistowski SrVP ASPCA \$134,902
Barbara Garber SrVP ASPCA \$132,140
Stephen Eudene SrVP/CFO ASPCA \$127,890

Total \$2 million

The ASPCA paid 80 additional salaries over \$50,000 in 2002. (Over \$4 million dollars)

Executive salaries paid over \$6 million

North Shore Animal League America

TYPE: S

DONATED & EARNED INCOME: \$ 30,342,594

EXPENDITURES: \$ 32,397,432

PROGRAM SERVICE: \$ 21,586,126

FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION: \$ 10,811,306

% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, AS DECLARED: 33%

% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, OUR ANALYSIS: 49%

TOTAL ASSETS: \$ 21,586,126

TANGIBLE (DEPRECIABLE) ASSETS: \$ 11,851,646

CASH & SECURITIES: \$ 18,443,960

NOTE:

The Pet Savers Foundation is a North Shore Animal League America subsidiary, sponsoring Spay/USA and the Conference on Homeless Animal Management and Policy. Pet Savers had an operating loss of \$175,502.

Compensation info--

JOHN STEVENSON Pres NorthShore \$347,091

Barry Giaquinto CFO NorthShore \$140,047

Perry Fina DirOps NorthShore \$129,806

Lisa Wilson DirDevlp NorthShore \$100,351

Carolyn Brown DVM NorthShore \$ 98,960

Atlee Douglas DVM Northshore \$ 92,999

Total Nearly \$1 million

The North Shore Animal League America paid 24 additional salaries in excess of \$50,000 in fiscal 2002. (\$600,000 extra)

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

Executive Salaries paid over \$1.6 million -(not even a national organization or widely recognized)

Merritt Clifton
Editor, ANIMAL PEOPLE
P.O. Box 960
Clinton, WA 98236

Telephone: 360-579-2505
Fax: 360-579-2575
E-mail: anmlpepl@whidbey.com
Web: www.animalpeoplenews.org

[ANIMAL PEOPLE is the leading independent newspaper providing original investigative coverage of animal protection worldwide, founded in 1992. Our readership of 30,000-plus includes the decision-makers at more than 9,500 animal protection organizations. We have no alignment or affiliation with any other entity.]

Humane Society of the U.S.

TYPE:	AEW
DONATED & EARNED INCOME:	\$ 65,222,618
EXPENDITURES:	\$ 67,272,795
PROGRAM SERVICE:	\$ 38,620,876
FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION:	\$ 23,453,737
% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, AS DECLARED:	35%
% FUNDRAISING & ADMINISTRATION, OUR ANALYSIS:	53%
TOTAL ASSETS:	\$ 85,810,587
TANGIBLE (DEPRECIABLE) ASSETS:	\$ 8,570,833
CASH & SECURITIES:	\$ 80,786,874
NOTE:	

The Humane Society of the U.S. transferred \$5,198,882 to subsidiaries, including the Wildlife Land Trust, Humane Society International, Center for Respect For Life & Environment, Earthvoice International, National Association for Humane & Environmental Education, Meadowcreek Inc. (an Arkansas-based organic vegetable-growing project), and Worldwide Network, Inc. Since the end of 2001 HSUS has also absorbed the Ark Trust, producers of the Genesis Awards for animal-friendly screen productions, and now sponsors the Remote Access Medical project headed by Eric Davis, DVM, who formerly operated under the auspices of the University of Tennessee. In addition, HSUS in mid-2002 took over fiscal responsibility for maintaining Keiko, the orca star of the Free Willy! films, whose care had been funded by Ocean Futures, formed by merger of the Jean Michel Cousteau Institute with the Free Willy/Keiko Foundation. Keiko swam to Norway soon after HSUS took over his supervision. There he lived in coastal fjords until his death on December 12, 2003. HSUS paid \$264,073 to the Free Willy/Keiko Foundation in 2002. HSUS made \$1,321,527 in

grants and payments in 2002 to 271 animal charities and projects in all.

Compensation info--

PAUL IRWIN President HSUS \$315,898
Patricia Forkan ExecVP HSUS \$179,217
Andrew Rowan SeniorVP HSUS \$170,995
G Thomas Waite CFO/Treas HSUS \$160,473
Roger Kindler GenCounsel HSUS \$152,767
John Grandy VP HSUS \$145,124
Jan Hartke ExecDirector HSUS \$133,517
John Kullberg WldlfLandTrst HSUS \$131,453
(John Kullberg died in April 2003.)
Michael Fox SeniorScholar HSUS \$128,419
Wayne Pacelle SeniorVP HSUS \$124,745
Janet Frake AsstSecty HSUS \$ 82,514
TOTAL \$4,541,000

The Humane Society of the U.S. paid 60 additional salaries in excess of \$50,000 in 2002. (Excess of \$3 million more) Executive Salaries paid over \$7.5 million

IN THE NAME OF MERCY
by Ed Duvin

Animalines has often exhorted our movement to meet demanding performance standards, as passion alone is limited unless accompanied by excellence of pursuit. We refer to this integration of commitment with the highest quality standards as "passionate professionalism." Commercial enterprises must respond expertly to the realities of a fiercely competitive marketplace or perish, but our movement has no such accountability. Moreover, our primary constituency-other beings and the Earth-cannot express objections, and thus our only survival imperative is to elicit

adequate financial support from the general public, a populace that is largely uninformed and responds more to style than substance. If our movement spent as much time soberly evaluating our policies and programs as we do polishing our public image, then no doubt the struggle for justice would be on higher ground.

It's very interesting that the word "development" has an entirely different connotation among non-profits than in the profit sector. Non-profits generally refer to development as a fundraising endeavor, whereas for-profits view it as a process for achieving excellence. animalines defines development as the progression of an organization towards realizing defined objectives through planned phases. Successful corporations, albeit driven by greed, have more of a handle on reality than our movement, for they realize that although clever marketing can sell a product or service, only quality and efficiency can assure long-term success. Our movement's purpose is affirming the sanctity of life and Earth, and in many years of assisting non-profit organizations, animalines has yet to encounter a group that has a comprehensive performance assessment program to ensure that stringent quality standards are met.

Nothing illustrates this more vividly than the historical record of the oldest and largest segment of our movement -the animal shelter community. We single them out for many reasons, not the least being that in most smaller cities and counties throughout the country, they represent the only voice for other beings, a voice that is often inaudible. It's important to note, however, that animalines could have selected virtually any segment of our movement-grassroots or national, hands-on or advocacy, mainstream or radical -and the findings would vary only in degree, not substance. The conclusions drawn from animalines' exhaustive review of shelters are distressing, but the lessons to be derived apply equally to all of us.

animalines characterizes the shelter community as a slumbering giant, not in a derisive sense, but to accurately portray the present state of this "industry." Much of what occurs in shelters is so bizarre that it almost defies comprehension, much less vivid description. Let's begin with the statistical nightmare one finds when examining shelters. Although shelters have existed in this country for well over a century, there is simply no reliable statistical base from which even the most basic information can be derived. One does not have to be an applied statistician to understand the gravity of not having accurate information, for without the existence of reliable historical and contemporary data, it's literally impossible to draw any conclusions that stand the test of empirical scrutiny. Surrounded by the deaths of millions of precious beings, this industry has demonstrated neither the concern nor competency to even validate the information upon which it bases life and death decisions.

How is it possible that this multi-billion dollar industry never formed an effective national association, funded and administered by shelter members, to properly gather and validate critical information? Nor has the shelter community established a coordinated national effort to protect the interests of the companion animals they profess to serve. Without any organized pressure from shelters, it's no wonder the

U.S. Census Bureau refuses to include household animals, and the lack of this vital demographic data is devastating in terms of effective program formulation and assessment. As a result, a hodgepodge of crude formulas are used to estimate companion animal population, all of which possess a statistical margin of error so staggering as to render population estimates virtually useless. However, this doesn't deter shelters one iota from predicating and assessing programs on these flawed figures and, adding insult to injury, they freely (and proudly!) publish "success" stories based on data that would give ulcers to even the most tolerant statistician.

Compounding this statistical farce, the shelter community, has to undertake a reasonably accurate count of how many shelters exist or even explicitly define what constitutes a shelter. Sadly, due to this limitation, the best a recent national survey could do was estimate a range of between 3,000-5,000 shelters. Using the mean figure, this indicates that much of widely utilized national shelter statistics carry an astounding 25 percent margin of error-and that assumes accurate sampling and reporting! Given the unreliability of national population and shelter statistics, some shelters have taken local surveys to compile their own data. animalines greatly applauds their initiative, but we have spent wakeful nights reviewing surveys that illustrate good intentions but sorrowful execution. Instead of seeking the pro bono assistance of qualified market research analysts, shelters often develop surveys that are so flawed in construction and sampling methods as to be all but worthless.

Those unfamiliar with program formulation and assessment might think we make too much of these statistical shortcomings, but accurate measurement is an indispensable element in developing, evaluating, and refining effective policies. How can we properly analyze where we have been, where we are at, where we are going, and how we're going to get there without reliable measurement? After hundreds of interviews with shelter personnel and reviewing numerous surveys and program evaluations on sterilization, education, licensing, etc., animalines found that poor methodology, incredible error margins, and highly contradictory findings prevented us from drawing any statistically valid conclusions regarding the efficacy of key shelter programs. It's evident that the shelter community either doesn't know enough or care enough to meet even the most marginal professional standards. We intend no disrespect, but from the perspective of the vulnerable shelter animals, one is sadly reminded of the old adage: I can take care of my adversaries, but God save me from my friends.

Earlier we lamented the absence of an effective national association comprised of shelter members to establish credible statistical procedures, initiate vital research projects, coordinate media campaigns and generally bring shelters into the sunlight. By combining resources shelters could utilize their collective strength to forge formidable alliance. Keeping in mind that reliable data is not available. We estimate on the basis of the latest national survey that there are some 4,000 animal control and humane society with a combined budget of 2.7 billion dollars and a paid staff of almost 50,000 employees. This means that if shelters contributed a mere

one-tenth of one percent of their annual budget, 2.7 million dollars would be available to establish and fund a national shelter association. A myriad of crucial projects could be undertaken and the shelter industry could finally begin to evolve into a force for life.

Perhaps the most troubling dimension of the shelter community is the prevailing mentality regarding the unconscionable death toll, what animalines refers to as an assembly line of slaughter. Even some of the more progressive shelter directors and boards define their preeminent responsibility as preventing suffering rather than preserving life. This position is perplexing on many levels, for although euthanasia cannot be completely avoided at the present time, it borders on the obscene to describe the killing of many innocent and healthy beings as a merciful act. Whether picked up on the street or surrendered at the shelter, the vast majority of these animals experience the kind of psychological trauma and terror that we find so abhorrent for caged laboratory animals but tolerate in our own facilities. Some are exposed to various forms of physical mishandling and abuse, and all suffer from the anguishing ordeal of being processed and warehoused in a foreign and frightening environment. Euthanasia might be a relatively painless end to this journey of terror, but each death represents an abject failure — not an act of mercy.

Shelter personnel incessantly proclaim they have no other choice than to kill, but this assertion cannot withstand careful scrutiny. Indeed, the argument that shelters are merely innocent caretakers and the sole blame lies with "irresponsible pet owners" is not only self-serving but preposterous on the face of it. We've already elaborated on the absence of a reliable statistical base upon which to formulate and assess programs, but this only skims the surface of operational deficiencies among shelters. Management practices regarding strategic planning, program development, resource utilization, and community outreach are woefully deficient, even in most of our largest and wealthiest shelters. Employee screening and selection is an embarrassment by any standard, and some shelters screen potential adopters with more diligence than their own employees and then express great surprise when internal abuses occur. Sound management programs alone could significantly reduce the incidence of euthanasia. Unfortunately, there's no incentive for creative evolution and solution when killing is perceived as an acceptable and merciful act.

Perhaps the most remarkable management feature of shelters is their almost total preoccupation with internal operational components at the expense of community and youth education. How can they have the audacity to primarily blame the public for the killing when only some 4 percent of the total shelter budget is spent on proactive programs! We hasten to add that this disgraceful figure includes both community outreach and school programs, and this combined total represents the lowest percentage of any budget category. Since only about 13 percent of companion animals are adopted from shelters, this indicates that some 96 percent of shelter resources are expended on 13 percent of the overpopulation tragedy! So we pose this question to shelter personnel and boards: If more than 8 million

homeless companion animals are being killed every year, and shelters assign the lowest budgetary, and operational priority toward overpopulation education, then who is the major contributor to the vicious cycle of suffering and death?

Certainly the public is not an innocent bystander, but shelters cannot hold others morally culpable until they have fully met their own responsibility to modify public behavior. Due largely to sparse and painfully ineffectual shelter outreach efforts most of the public has little or no understanding of the horrendous magnitude of the overpopulation tragedy. Compounding the problem, when the public is reached, the message they receive is "sanitized" with enough euphemisms to fill Grand Canyon. Why isn't the unadulterated truth, stripped of any veneer, imaginatively and assertively brought to the public? Perhaps the unvarnished truth would make some uncomfortable, but that is precisely what we should be doing — removing the killing from behind closed doors and informing the public about their role in the massive slaughter of our so-called closest companions.

The most potent and cost-effective outreach vehicle is the development of a creative volunteer program. Were shelters to place a high priority in this area through attracting, training, and skillfully utilizing a volunteer outreach corps, they could begin the transition from a killing site to a community resource center. A true shelter should be a place where life is affirmed, both in teaching and practice, not a building permeated with the odor of death. Talented and well-trained volunteers are the key to the four principal components of effective outreach: efficiently reaching target population segments; establishing credibility among that targeted audience, articulating a clear and compelling educational message; and, finally, follow-up programs toward achieving an enduring attitudinal shift. Volunteers are particularly useful in gaining public credibility, as they can establish critical connections in areas where they already have easy access and respect — family, friends, professional peers, civic groups, etc. Organizations such as United Way learned long ago that neighbor to neighbor and professional to professional opens doors and elicits cooperation unattainable to even the most skilled "outsider." How many more millions must die before shelters - and all of us - begin to establish professional outreach programs?

Another crucial outreach instrument is youth education. This area receives abundant platitudes about youth representing the future, but it invariably receives the lowest budgetary priority. Even accounting for the unreliability of shelter statistics, animalines was stunned to see recent survey results indicating that shelter personnel reach more people through Pet Facilitated Therapy programs than youth and adult education presentations combined! Whether or not one shares our profound reservations about PFT, this misallocation of resources is unfathomable and reflects the prevailing myopia within the shelter community. Our movement has to begin anew with each generation because we fail to effectively reach the preceding one, and the animals and the Earth pay dearly for this refusal to invest in the promise of a brighter day. Why? Primarily because shelter personnel and others in the movement become mired in daily operational and fundraising activities, blinding them to the vision of planting life-affirming seeds in fertile soil.

Our central point is that even if one shelter animal is euthanized, then there is a clear moral imperative to exercise every conceivable outreach vehicle. Overpopulation is essentially a product of ignorance and indifference and only proactive and aggressive community and youth education programs offer the promise of breaking the vicious cycle. As mentioned earlier, shelters will never stop the slaughter if they continue allocating 96 percent of their resources on treating symptoms and a mere 4 percent on fundamental causal factors. Shelters cannot wait for the public to knock on their door. They must think outside the shelter. They must take the initiative by approaching every school, media outlet, club, civic organization, professional association, shopping center, and wherever people will listen. Shelters represent the last line of defense for millions of vulnerable beings, and if they fail to wage a full-scale educational war on behalf of these beings, then they cannot rightfully call themselves a shelter — which, by any definition except our movement's, is a safe haven.

Closer to home but equally critical, shelters have failed to effectively enlist veterinarians as responsible humane educators. Veterinarians have consistently dictated the terms of their relationship with the shelter community, and those terms have been self-serving in the extreme. Just as veterinarians have seldom taken the lead in exposing egregious abuses in laboratories, slaughterhouses, and factory farms, their record is equally lamentable in addressing companion animal overpopulation. Veterinarians must do more than simply participate in low-cost spay/neuter programs as they interact with far more companion animal owners than any other institutional source and that interaction often occurs at a crucial educational juncture. Instead of the deferential posture shelter's generally assume, they should meet with local veterinarians and actively promote those who agree to educate their clients — both verbally and through shelter literature—about the staggering dimensions of companion animal overpopulation. Veterinarians represent the foremost authority in the public's mind, and they must be pressured to use that authority to responsibly sound the alarm. It's essential that shelters and other concerned groups freely publicize the names of cooperating veterinarians, making it profitable to be an animal rights veterinarian—as profit seems to be the language veterinarians understand best.

We recognize that shelter personnel work in the trenches and are often overwhelmed by the daily operational pressures of coping with overpopulation. All we are asking, however, is merely that they shed their shortsightedness long enough to embrace the full range of creative possibilities, for when it comes to precious lives, today's reality cannot serve as tomorrow's excuse. Institutional inertia does not give way easily, but it must give way. We reach out to our friends in the shelter community with respect, and ask only that they demonstrate the same respect for companion animals by categorically rejecting the prevailing shelter value system — a convoluted system that places a higher operational priority on "painless" execution than preventive education. Shelters will continue to be nothing more than processing plants until they begin the transition from sanitation dumps for the public's unwanted "baggage" to vital community education centers.

Shelters cannot continue to be slaughterhouses and friends of animals cannot continue killing healthy beings in the name of mercy. A new and larger vision is needed, a vision in which shelters hold themselves accountable for meeting demanding performance standards that preserve life — not destroy it.

Common Misconceptions About Dog Breeding

New Owner Wants To Recoup their Investment and Make a Little Money Breeding

The majority of responsible breeders do not make money breeding! The only breeders who do are commercial or wholesale kennels. These breeders deal in larger numbers of dogs. People who expect to make extra money from breeding "just one litter" are often times disappointed.

By breeding, you are bringing lives into this world. You place those lives at stake when you are not aware of proper breeding practices and are unprepared for the responsibilities of breeding. New owners who engage in breeding find the experience financially disappointing and physically draining.

Before a person breeds there is a lot to consider. Responsible breeders:

Become involved with dog clubs.

Study the breed standard.

Attend dog events

Honestly evaluates their pets good and bad points

Seeks assistance from respected peers

Safeguard the health and temperament of their stock

Nurtures the puppies

Places puppies wisely

Is responsible for life

Responsible breeders seek to improve their breed. To reach this goal, there is considerable expense. Here is an example:

The dog should be shown in conformation classes sanctioned by a national registry, under the trained eye of a judge. At the very least, the dog should be evaluated by a breeder recognized for producing excellent conformation in your breed.

Even if you don't count the expense of showing your bitch and just start with having her evaluated there is still tremendous expense involved to breed properly.

Health screenings and certifications should be done on all male and female dogs prior to breeding to ensure that hereditary and genetic faults are not passed along to the puppies.

Dogs that are even being considered for breeding should, at the very least, have their hips x-rayed to rule out hip dysplasia. More and more breeders are now screening for cataracts, Von Willibrands Disease (VWD), normal thyroid and even elbow dysplasia.

There are tests recommended for each breed. It will be your responsibility to research which diseases or genetic abnormalities are predominant in your breed. These tests will probably cost somewhere around \$250.00.

Routine checks for any uterine or vaginal infections, such as brucellosis, will help ensure a live litter and prevent the possible spread to or from your dog. Add \$100.

Stud fee to a good quality stud who is right for your bitch and has, himself, passed all the health screenings will run another \$400. Now we are at \$750.

If a C-section becomes necessary, add at least \$350 and probably more.

You now have a nice healthy litter of, approx. 8 puppies. At the age of 6-7 weeks you are likely going through at least 40 lbs. of dog food a week depending on the size of your breed.

These puppies demand your constant attention. They bark, chew and eliminate everywhere.

Add the first and second vaccines (likely \$20 each at your vets), that's about another \$300.00.

Next it's time for the cost of advertising the litter. Add \$100.

Plan on spending hours on the phone qualifying potential adopters.

If you are a responsible breeder, you will need to always keep in touch with adopters to insure your pups receive proper lifetime care.

If there is no market for your pups, chances are you may end up supporting several of these pups. Do you have any idea how expensive this is getting?

Now, even if you have a ready market for your pups, you cannot get the \$700 to \$1,000 that is average for a show potential puppy from top breeding stock. You'll be lucky to get \$300 for half the litter and the other half you will have to give away.

Still think you are going to recoup your investment? No way. Even if you are careless and cut-corners you will only, at best, break even. You'd do better to stick with an altered pet!

It has been well documented that about 75% of 1st time breeders do not attempt to breed again because of the cost, work and time involved.

If you are breeding for money, you are part of the pet overpopulation problem and not part of the solution. Studies reveal a good portion of the litters you produce will not see their first birthday.

A NEW APPROACH TO ANIMAL RIGHTS/ ANIMAL WELFARE ACTIVISM

Urging advocates to get out and learn what others are doing, to see the whole picture and then act accordingly. Only working diligently to save today's animals is simply a waste of time, effort and resources that will only guarantee that millions and billions of animals in years to come will simply suffer the same fate at the hands of humans. Discussing problems we need to overcome such as:

---Changing the moral concept of animals in society

---Attacking the root, not the branches

---The problems arise when people attack or discriminate against AW or AR. Usually through a total misunderstanding of what each is wanting to do.

---Creating unnecessary enemies, assuming our way is the only means of accomplishing our goals,

---Failing to become involved and to court the local and county government's elected officials.

Additional pages on this site that shed light on similar ideas to help move this effort forward are found at www.21stcenturycares.org/whyvote.htm and www.21stcenturycares.org/whyorganize.htm as well as www.21stcenturycares.org/potential.htm All provide eye-opening support for the incredible need to group and become more involved.

Looking around us, we often want to think that things are getting better for nonhuman animals thanks to the work of the many organizations, groups and individuals defending the consideration of their interests as sentient beings. But we tend to see everything done "for the animals" as something positive that will make people change their attitudes towards them. This, far from being true, is the last nail in the coffin for this movement and the animals defended by it. A lack of reflection and criticism has driven us to a point at which we are often considered lunatics or emotional freaks. Due to the actual situation of the animal rights

movement in terms of strategy, tactics and effectiveness, a new perspective on the issue appears to be necessary.

First of all, I want to express my support to all of those who fight against the exploitation, killing, or use of sentient creatures. Although I show certain disagreements with certain views, methods, or campaigns, I do not underestimate the efforts, good intentions, or work of those carrying them out. Everyone really wanting to help animals should be happy to be criticized so that they can analyze their work better and decide if they can improve what they are doing. It is very sad to see that the most widespread attitude towards criticism is: "If you don't like it, don't do it. You do your thing; I'll do mine." That way, the movement will never develop.

Also, there are things that can be counterproductive, which can affect the work of others, and thus animals. So, if someone is doing something that might damage this cause, we should not shut up. Also, if someone has an idea that could improve our effectiveness, her/his comments should be welcomed, not simply ignored or dismissed without any real consideration. Nobody is perfect, and we constantly do things that could be done in a better way. Lots of times we notice it ourselves after a while, but sometimes we just don't think of it until someone says it. Accepting you were doing something wrong (or simply that you could have done it better) doesn't mean accepting you are a bad or stupid person. What actually shows a lack of wisdom is to think that everything you do is fine and that there is nothing for you to change. Wise people realize they can always do things better and evolve constantly to improve their effectiveness.

Activists should have a deeper look at the issue and see the great power they have to change things on a larger scale. It is understandable that seeing animals suffering in front of us is very difficult to cope with, but those who are not there for us to see are probably hidden because they are suffering much more. And the fact that we don't see something doesn't mean it doesn't happen.

Still, trying to achieve nonhuman-animal liberation this way seems not only terribly slow but impossible. And let's not forget that those saved animals need attention, which makes many activists spend their time taking care of a few animals instead of saving millions by campaigning (and the same goes for the large sums of money spent on sanctuaries).

We must not lose perspective, and we shall choose those campaigns that will save more animals in the long run. The animals who exist today are a very tiny percentage of the animals who will be killed and tortured in the coming centuries and millennia. Paying excessive attention to those who suffer today is condemning millions more to suffer the same fate. We can't save them all, but let's save all the ones we can!

Campaigns such as the ones mentioned are wasting enormous amounts of money, activists, time, and other resources in promoting not the egalitarian treatment of all

sentient beings. Not surprising to anyone who actually made it through the entire article, there is simply no better manner of getting more people involved or teaching the masses what they obviously do not know than through humane education. This, my friends, is most useful and effective in our schools, yet most simply cannot see the forest for the trees.

Remember, our primary goal is to save as many animals as possible. That cannot be achieved if the major focus is on today's animals. We need to recognize the millions and billions of animals yet to be born that are simply ignored until it's almost too late for most of them. That in itself shows incredible ignorance on the part of humans.

I hope no one feels offended by the comments in this article and that everyone understands that my only intention is to improve the movement to end all exploitation, use, or killing of beings with the ability to suffer and to enjoy life.

Many activists often say that AR and AW groups should work together and not criticize one another. Indeed, there are many groups who call themselves AR and constantly carry out AW campaigns or use AW arguments (e.g., referring to the regulations not being followed in farms or labs, workers causing animals "unnecessary" pain, anesthetics not being used, cages being dirty or small...).

So-called welfarism is the main enemy of AR. You just need to talk to people on the street to find out that there is practically no one saying, "I don't give a damn about animals suffering in factory farms, or in experiments, or during slaughter." Instead, the most common comment is "Oh, yes! This way of treating animals is horrible. But there are farmers who have them on fields and kill them humanely, and experimenters who use anesthetics..." Many others also say, "I know everything about it; I only buy free-range."

Very few people agree with "outright cruelty." What we have to make clear is that it is unfair to breed, use, or kill someone for your own purposes without his/her consent. And, in light of the practical impossibility of being certain about consent in the case of nonhumans, the idea that they can consent must be completely ruled out.

No one can ever say s/he is on the animals' side when stating that it is acceptable to kill or breed them as long as you do it nicely. It is true that many people that use welfarist methods do actually think that the use of animals should be abolished, but they find their way of campaigning a more effective way of achieving that goal. Nevertheless, for the public, the strategy you follow, and not your objectives, is the idea they have of you. This means that what people understand of a welfarist campaign is that it is fine to use animals if you do it carefully and "humanely." And then, although personally many of us might feel close to those campaigners, publicly we need to oppose them, as they justify the utilization of sentient creatures (or, at least, that is what the public will understand).

Animals are not property; they are not resources. They are individuals with an interest in living their lives, and doing so free from pain, exploitation, or coercion imposed by other actors. Our interest in not being subjected to suffering comes from our ability to feel pain and discomfort. Our interest in living, and doing it in freedom, is due to our ability to feel pleasure and joy. When we die, our interest in not suffering disappears, as we don't suffer when dead. But all our chances of experiencing any further joy or pleasure are ended. That is why all sentient creatures with the ability to feel positive experiences must have the right to live. This should be added to the right to live painlessly and freely (the lack of freedom causes suffering and doesn't allow pleasurable activities to be carried out).

To reach a situation in which public awareness means that fewer animals are killed or exploited is a step towards animal liberation. However, although a change such as animals being killed with less pain or bred in better conditions is not something we should oppose, we must not be the ones to promote it.

Many activists call themselves "animal lovers" and tell others to love animals instead of killing them. This is quite inappropriate, as you can't ask others to feel one thing or another; all that is needed is for people to respect them and to leave them alone. Also, by talking about love instead of justice, we make AR seem like a sentimental issue instead of a very important ethical question. Actually, most people who come up to stalls and say they love animals appear to eat meat or defend vivisection for medical research.

It is more important to teach others that animals matter in themselves and that the fact of harming them is wrong in itself, because they are sentient, not because it is bad for us. Suggesting that the problem of "animal abuse" is that it causes abuse of humans is plain anthropocentrism

CHARLOTTESVILLE RECOGNIZES THE NEED FOR EDUCATION IN THEIR CITY.

Posted on Mon, Jun. 30, 2003



City neglects best solution

Euthanasia - and costs - drop where government backs spay-neuter clinics

SCOTT DODD & MICHELLE CROUCH

Staff Writers

As cities across the country reduce the number of unwanted pets they kill, the euthanasia room at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg animal shelter is getting busier. In a single day recently, it was the last resting place for a litter of gray kittens, a friendly black Labrador and more than 50 other dogs and cats -- all killed with a shot of muscle relaxant that stopped their hearts.

The Observer found that while the city spends more than \$4 million a year to catch, house and kill animals, it has done little to address the cause of the problem: the exploding population of unwanted pets.

Charlotte puts no public money toward spaying and neutering and has done less than many cities to increase adoptions or public awareness of sterilization

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

ABOVE: Young Shepherd mix awaits the same fate as 25,000 others on this day alone in the U.S.

"It's atrocious," said Ron Simons, a former Charlotte Animal Control supervisor who heads a local group pushing for more spaying and neutering. "Every day, we're killing healthy, adoptable animals. I'm tired of putting down this many animals when there's a solution." A report to Charlotte City Council late last year recommended changes. It called the current system -- which kills seven of every 10 animals at the shelter, more than 14,000 last year -- "an unconscionable waste of life and a needless drain on public money."



This investigation found:

- The city kills 19 animals a year for every 1,000 Mecklenburg County residents, one of the higher rates among cities its size in the country. The national average is 16, according to an annual survey, and cities such as Phoenix and Portland have lowered their rates to eight by changing their approaches.
- Seven months after the city report that recommended changes, the most effective reforms have yet to be enacted.

Animal control officials say they need more time to develop a plan, and formed a committee this month, after an interview with Observer reporters.

- The city hasn't invested public money to increase animal sterilizations or target low-income communities that experts say need spay-neuter services most. For two decades, officials have left sterilization to the Humane Society of Charlotte.
- Officials have provided little oversight of the Humane Society, which operates under a city contract. No one noticed the group hadn't submitted a budget, as required, to the city for three years. City officials couldn't agree on who was responsible for monitoring the Humane Society's work.
- The city only recently began considering strategies to help increase awareness of the growing animal population and promote adoption at the city shelter, where adoption rates remain below the national average, according to the city report. Officials say Charlotte's Animal Control Bureau is trying to change its approach, but reform will take time and resources.

"I don't think it's a good idea for us to go in and pump a lot of money into spaying and neutering as many animals as we can willy-nilly," said Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Chief Darrel Stephens, who said a detailed plan is needed first. His department includes Animal Control, which serves the entire county.

The city has other priorities, too, he added, and shouldn't bear the full blame for the problem, which is created by irresponsible pet owners. Animal Control officers see the results often, such as the call last month from an elderly woman in a poor north Charlotte neighborhood. She wanted them to take her dog away. When Officer Shannon Corkwell arrived, the woman said she simply couldn't care for the black Labrador mix named Jasmine. The woman led Corkwell to the back yard, where the dog was tied to a 2-foot metal chain. Instead of a collar, a coat hanger twisted around her neck.

"You know we'll probably put her to sleep don't you?" Corkwell asked as she petted the dog, which licked her face. "Yes, that's OK," the woman said. "When I got her, she was such a little thing, and she curled up on the couch with me. But I can't take care of a big dog like this. I'm 79." Jasmine was killed that night. Her owner didn't plan to grieve. "I'm going to try to get me another little one before too long." A better way of managing

For years, Charlotte's Animal Control officers did little more than catch and kill strays. Then several workers went to an Arizona conference in fall 2000, where they learned the latest ideas used in other cities to curb animal death rates. They wanted to bring those strategies here. The result: The Community Animal Management Program, developed with several animal welfare groups and volunteers from Leadership Charlotte. The plan has five major steps:

- Increase sterilizations and public education, especially in low-income areas.
- Increase the number of animals adopted from the shelter.
- Embed microchips in animals who leave the shelter so, if they're picked up as strays, the owners can be identified.
- Trap and neuter feral cats.
- Help pet owners train their adopted animals so they don't develop behavioral

problems and get returned to the shelter.

So far, Animal Control has made strides on two steps, adoptions and microchipping. It now places updated pictures of animals offered for adoption on the Internet and recruits volunteers who take animals to Wal-Mart on weekends to shop for new owners. It's also spending \$47,000 this year to embed microchips in animals from the shelter, paid through higher fees from the new owners.

But adoptions and microchipping aren't expected to have a major impact. "It is only through spaying and neutering," the plan says, "that shelter admissions will be reduced." Officials initially said they had no immediate plans to spend public money on sterilization programs. As recently as last month, Capt. Tammy Williams, who heads Animal Control, said the city is "not in the business of spaying and neutering, and we don't want to be in that business anytime in the near future." Williams now says the city will take a different approach. The city learned this month it has won a \$25,000 grant that it will spend to help low-income people get their pets neutered. To fulfill the full city strategy, though, will require additional planning, Williams said. A funding request to the City Council could take a year or more.

"You don't just walk across the street and ask for half a million or even \$50 without a strategic plan to validate it," she said. Even so, supporters say one of the most compelling arguments for more spaying and neutering is that it could save city money. In New Hampshire, a statewide program cut the cost of neutering pets to \$10 for poor residents. The state saved \$3 in animal control costs for every \$1 spent on the program. And it saved animals' lives. Over an eight-year period between 1993 and 2001, the state recorded a nearly 75 percent drop in the number of dogs and cats killed.

"The folks in Charlotte don't have to invent anything," said Peter Marsh, a national consultant on pet population who helped implement the New Hampshire program. "The model is right there in other cities."

The International City/County Management Association says dozens of cities have opened government-subsidized spay-neuter clinics or provided vouchers to low-income residents. Others have passed laws requiring all pet owners to sterilize their animals unless they pay for a breeder permit.

Whatever the strategy, it's up to government agencies to take the lead, experts say. "You need public money" to succeed, Marsh said. "It's absolutely critical, because you can't raise enough private money, and you need to have money year in and year out."

Efforts fall behind

Two decades ago, the Charlotte Humane Society and its executive director, Patti Lewis, pushed the city to let the group open the first low-cost spay-neuter clinic in the state. The city began requiring every animal adopted from its shelter to be sterilized at the clinic. And in 1992, the city moved its pound to a new facility and began leasing two former shelter buildings to the Humane Society for \$1 a year. For years, the clinic worked. Immediately after it opened, the annual number of animals killed dropped from 15,079 to 9,551. But in the past decade, the numbers have risen again, and the city has done little to keep up.

The wait for spay-neuter surgeries has grown to more than a month, and Lewis says the society can't handle the volume of pets without more resources. "It's a very tiny clinic," she said. "... I can't put more people in there because they're stumbling over themselves now." One thing that could help keep euthanasias down, experts say, is making it easier for low-income pet owners to get their animals sterilized. That's important because poorer people are traditionally less likely to spay and neuter pets. About 80 percent of animal control calls nationwide originate in low-income communities.

Although pet owners at the Humane Society clinic pay less than half the surgery's cost at a private vet's office, experts say \$30 for cats and \$40 for dogs is still more than many low-income residents are willing or able to spend. "You've got this whole segment of society that's going to have pets, and they're not going to have the money to get them spayed and neutered," said Dr. Marty Davis, a veterinarian at Monroe Road Animal Hospital.

Charlotte's city manager sets the fees for the Humane Society clinic, which are the same no matter a pet owner's income. Other cities have reduced the charges to as low as \$10 or even free for residents who qualify. City Manager Pam Syfert said last week she relies on the Humane Society to ask for fee changes and has never considered a sliding scale.

"You're raising some policy issues about how you handle the animal population, and I'm not the right person to talk to about that," she said. Animal Control has helped organize special clinics in low-income neighborhoods, but they've asked other animal welfare groups to pick up the sterilization costs. At three clinics in the past year and a half, 77 animals have been neutered. At the next clinic, the city plans to pay for the surgeries with the grant money it received recently, officials said last week.

Oversight is uncertain. City leaders have done little to oversee the Humane Society. Under the spay-neuter contract with the group, city officials can inspect

the society's books and should receive annual budgets. Lewis said the city used to visit yearly and look over financial records, but that hasn't happened recently. And city budget officers didn't notice that the society didn't provide a budget for the past three years until The Observer asked for copies last month. "Through miscommunication or misunderstanding of roles, the budget used to come to the budget department for review, then go to police," city spokesman Rick Davis said, "and that has not happened."

City officials couldn't agree who should provide oversight. "I can't answer that," Chief Stephens said. "Our only relationship with them is that they fulfill the spay-neuter contract. We don't even manage the contract. I think that's the city manager's office or the city attorney." The city manager's office, however, said animal issues are the police department's responsibility. "Quite frankly," said Davis after checking with the manager's office, "animal control is really not on anybody's radar screen up there."

Cities that manage to stem their animal kill rates don't stop with sterilization. They often pair those services with extensive public education. Those efforts let the public know the size of the problem and what happens to thousands of unwanted pets every year. Cities have taken out billboards, allowed euthanasias to be recorded and shown by news media, and walked shelter dogs wearing the dates they'll be killed if they aren't adopted.

Charlotte spends nothing on television, print or billboard advertisements, although private groups have occasionally funded such efforts. Williams allowed Observer reporters and a photographer to view euthanasias, but wouldn't permit pictures of animals being injected or dead bodies. "We don't think we need to shock the community by showing them 50 dead animals," said Williams, who added that the bureau is upfront about its euthanasia rates. Speakers spread the word.

The bureau's main method of convincing people to neuter their pets is sending speakers to schools, city events and neighborhood meetings. "Are we in the schools enough now? No," Williams said. "Are we going to try to improve that? Yeah. We've got to do more to get the word out." This month, Charlotte City Council raised pet license fees for the first time since 1992. Owners now will pay \$2.50 more per year for a sterilized animal and \$5 more for an unaltered animal. That will bring in more than \$80,000 a year in extra revenue. Some animal welfare advocates want that money to go toward spaying and neutering. But right now, it's set to be folded into the city's general fund, with none designated specifically for animal programs.

Chief Stephens said it's not good policy to designate fee revenue for a specific use, because the city's priorities may change. Fees, though, are frequently used to fund other local government functions, including parks, building inspectors and utilities. "The license fees are part of the general fund, and that's where our budget comes from anyway," Stephens said. "So you could say we already get that money back." The bureau is trying to find other ways to pay for its efforts, including more private grants.

Animal Control workers say they hate killing animals, and their goal is to do it as little as possible. But as long as the unwanted pet population grows, there's no alternative. Shelters and rescue groups can't save them all. "We do not take pleasure in what we do," Williams said. "But we're the only ones who do it."

Pet Limit Laws

1. SF SPCA
2. GENERAL FINDINGS ACROSS AMERICA
3. EXAMPLE: LOUISIANA JUDGE RULES PET LIMITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL
4. MERRIT CLIFTON OF 'ANIIMAL PEOPLE' SPEAKS
5. ARGUMENTS YOU SHOULD BE AWARE OF BY L J. BARTY ATTORNEY
6. ADDITIIONAL LINKS AND RESOURCES

1.

Pet Limit Laws:

Closing the Door to Loving Homes by San Fransisco SPCA

April 10, 2000

Proponents of pet limit laws argue that these ordinances are necessary to stop animal

neglect and abuse caused by people who take in more animals than they can adequately care for. Others claim that pet limits are necessary to ensure sanitary conditions, or to maintain safe and pleasant neighborhoods.

But are pet limit laws necessary to address abuse, neglect, unreasonable noise, and lack

of sanitation? Or, do they end up limiting the availability of loving homes and putting

the lives of dogs and cats at risk?

The San Francisco SPCA has considered the various claims made for strict pet limit laws

and found little in the way of evidence, or common sense, to support them. What we

found was that pet limit laws:

- are unnecessary to protect the well-being of people and animals
- are arbitrary and intrusive
- penalize responsible pet owners
- force many caregivers to stop providing care to homeless animals
- put the lives of even well cared-for animals at risk

At the same time that household limits discourage responsible individuals from providing a good home for more needy animals, they do not prevent an irresponsible

one from acquiring unlimited animals. Unfortunately, caring can't be mandated, and a

pet limit law will only end up punishing those who care.

Millions of compassionate people provide dogs and cats with food, love, and shelter in their homes. Others may even put aside their own needs in order to care for beloved pets. Still others work tirelessly to feed, foster, and rehabilitate strays and unwanted abandoned animals, all at their own expense.

For every one of these caregivers, a pet limit law may exact a heavy toll. Each of these

individuals may face citations, fines, other penalties, and even confiscation of the animals they love.

For these reasons, The San Francisco SPCA opposes legislation arbitrarily limiting the

number of pets a person can care for in their home.

PET LIMIT LAWS ARE UNNECESSARY

Are pet limit laws necessary to address abuse, neglect, unreasonable noise, and lack of

sanitation? Do pet limit laws protect the well-being of people and animals?

In our view, they do not. Whereas one individual may be able to responsibly care for

and nurture several animals, another may be unable to care for even one. And if problems arise, enforcement agencies already have ample ammunition at their disposal

in terms of animal welfare, health and property rights laws. In fact, unsanitary conditions, excessive noise, and interference with property are all unlawful in virtually

every community—regardless of whether pets inhabit the premises or not.

PET LIMIT LAWS ARE INTRUSIVE AND ARBITRARY

Just how are pet limits determined? In one community, the limit might be two pets. In

others, four, five, eight, even twenty pets might be allowed. More often than not, the

number is arbitrarily chosen.

Enforcement is also arbitrary. In response to concerns about pet limit laws, some communities have admitted that these ordinances “will be enforced on a complaint

basis, and pets which are maintained indoors or do not raise the ire of neighbors will not generate enforcement.” While it may sound reassuring to some, this justification leaves the door wide open for pet limit laws to be used as a weapon of retribution in neighbor disputes over concerns totally unrelated to pets. Laws that regulate a person’s behavior inside their home should seek an appropriate balance between the public's safety and welfare and the individual's right to privacy. But while pet limit laws are highly intrusive, there is little, if any, corresponding benefit to public safety. What good is gained from an uncompromising prohibition against more than a limited number of pets, particularly if they are confined to an owner's property and create no problems? Certainly, if neighbors are totally unaware of their presence, prohibiting pets does not in any way protect or maintain anyone's health, happiness or peace of mind. And what about multi-pet households where neighbors do not mind or even enjoy the presence of these animals? In fact, there is no benefit gained from such a prohibition—nor is there likely to be any enforcement. Should government pass laws that are not going to be enforced? Should communities outlaw behavior that does not impact neighbors or interfere with the rights of others? Local governments have embraced the position that because responsible multi-pet households will not generate enforcement, these residents need not fear violating the law. In essence, local governments are making outlaws out of normally law-abiding citizens and telling them it is OK to break the law as long as they don’t get caught! Passing laws that aren’t enforced or are enforced sporadically is unfair and counterproductive. Few people are likely to comply with a pet limit law that isn’t enforced. And those who voluntarily comply can probably be counted among the most responsible pet owners in the community. There is little equity or sense in enacting a law that only ends up penalizing the very people whose behavior is already exemplary. And such a view undermines our respect for the law.

Page 3 of 4

Needless to say, truly irresponsible pet owners will not be affected. If the law is not enforced, they are free to ignore it. If it is selectively enforced against them, they are

likely to surrender their animals, adding to the numbers of dogs and cats killed, or abandon them, adding to some of the perceived problems the law was intended to solve.

PET LIMIT EXEMPTION PERMITS ARE ALSO INTRUSIVE AND RISKY

Many local jurisdictions enacting pet limit laws allow caretakers who have more than

the allowable number of pets to apply for an “exemption” permit. Therefore, these jurisdictions claim, “responsible” pet owners need not fear the law. This view is shortsighted and would put multi-pet households in a Catch-22: choosing between not

seeking a permit and violating the law on the one hand; or, applying for a permit, but

risking exposure and confiscation of their pets if they are denied. In other words, multipet

households would fear applying for a permit, because to do so would expose them to penalties and possible loss of their beloved companions if denied a permit. And, in

some jurisdictions, the exemption permit requires a “kennel” license—which cannot be

granted in many neighborhoods due to zoning restrictions, no matter how “responsible” the caretaker. In short, no exemption at all!

PET LIMIT LAWS PUT THE LIVES OF ANIMALS AT RISK

It is not uncommon for rescued animals, particularly those who are hard-to-place by

virtue of abandonment or abuse, to be in a “foster” environment for long periods of

time. Foster homes are in critically short supply in almost every community and it is

common for such homes to temporarily house more animals than the average pet owner. In addition, there are countless Good Samaritans who feed and care for neighborhood strays and feral cats. Many pet limit laws define these individuals as “owners” for purposes of enforcing local ordinances. It is ironic that groups and individuals rescuing and caring for homeless and unwanted dogs and cats (often at personal expense) should be targeted for restrictive and punitive legislation.

Of greater concern, caregivers and rescue groups may be forced to stop caring for foster pets or homeless cats, because to do so would violate the local pet limit law, resulting in needy animals being denied care, and also leading to increased euthanasia

at taxpayer expense. By contrast, the maintenance of multi-pet households or the feeding of homeless cats—including sterilization, food, and veterinary care—is uniformly accomplished by private citizens at no cost to local government or taxpayers.

And pet owners targeted for enforcement may be forced to surrender their well caredfor

animals to local shelters where they, too, are at risk for euthanasia and where taxpayers will have to foot the bill.

PET LIMIT LAWS CLOSE THE DOOR TO LOVING HOMES

A town council on the East Coast recently expanded its animal control law to include a provision making it illegal for any resident to own more than five cats. One resident, a 69-year old woman who cared for homeless neighborhood cats, was threatened with fines for violating the law despite the fact that she had sterilized and vaccinated all the cats. She was given two options by local authorities: turn away the cats who came to her back door looking for food and water; or trap them and turn them over to the animal control facility where they would likely be killed. For someone who very much loved animals, this was no choice at all. Distraught by the threat of legal sanctions, however, she was forced to comply. And in a county neighboring our own, an elderly couple who cared for several sterilized and well-cared for cats at their private residence were threatened with citations and fines because of a pet limit law that allowed for the caring of only four cats. Under threat, the cats had to be relocated to avoid the risk that they would be impounded and killed at the local animal control facility. The cats lost the only home and caregivers they had ever known, and the couple lost their beloved companions. Just as pets already in homes may be threatened by limit laws, homeless pets awaiting the chance for a loving new home are also at risk as potential adopters are discouraged from adopting a stray or visiting the local shelter and saving a life. For much of history, animals were considered mere commodities who pulled our wagons, provided the products for our farms, herded our sheep, and kept our barns free of mice. During the last century, however, socio-economic and moral changes in society at large have produced changes in the status of animals as well. Many animals—dogs and cats in particular—are now overwhelmingly companions instead of servants. In addition, government laws and services have evolved from promoting animals as property to protecting them as cherished pets. At the same time, pets do so much good for the community: people of all ages, but particularly the elderly and the young, enjoy their companionship. For single people, dogs and cats can offer a welcome relief from loneliness. For children, an animal in the home provides warmth and unconditional love, and teaches responsibility and consideration for the needs of another creature. Those who suffer from disease or injury often experience a therapeutic benefit from their presence. For the lonely, a pet

can provide an incentive to get up in the morning. Animals can also provide a sense of safety and security, allowing many people freedom they would not otherwise have. While pet ownership may not be a fundamental right, it is unquestionably an integral aspect of our daily life—which cannot be dismissed lightly and should not suffer unwarranted limits. In our view, there is little justification for targeting well-cared for animals and putting them at risk for impoundment and euthanasia.

2.

Ignorance, Greed, Ego, Fear of change

Pet limit laws were proposed and defeated in large and small cities throughout the U.S. in 2001, including Fort Thomas, KY, Richmond, VA, Cherry Hill, NJ, Gwinett Co., GA, and Springfield, IL. Along with nearly one thousand cities, counties and three states over the past five years alone. This success can be attributed to the efforts of concerned cat/dog owners and breeders, rescue groups and feral cat caretakers who spoke out strongly to their lawmakers.

The only reasons why pet limits still exist. The present means have proven across the country not to work at all. The present means of limiting to 3 or 4 cannot be enforced because the licensing approach has been a total failure. Then when good people end up with more pets and are willing and able to furnish the care and attention the pets need, they are faced with large fines, court dates and even watching as the city or county removes them JUST TO WATCH THEM DIE ALONG WITH THE OTHERS.

Presently, the law will only allow compassionate, responsible homes to even become a recognized rescue by paying exorbitant fees to the county or city, (sometimes up to \$10,000 before being issued a 'kennel permit') assuring that the kill rate remain unchanged in that area. Thus, forcing good people to go underground or take on another hobby or cause – again, leaving the number of animals who die to go unchanged.

CARE, COMPASSION, HEALTH, SAFETY AND LACK OF DANGER OR NUISANCE TO SURROUNDING RESIDENTS SHOULD BE THE FOUNDATION FOR NEW LAWS IN YOUR COMMUNITY.

The simple fact that "That's the way it's been done for years" is not an argument you need to listen to. If your community deems them 'property' then they cannot impose the limits per our constitution. If, however, they should change their wording to use the term 'guardian' for the human caretaker and 'companion' for the pet, then you bring in another beneficial means of handling those humans who do not provide the proper and necessary care for the animals they are responsible for.

Over 1,000 communities and counties and three states have now rendered pet limitation laws to either be unlawful for constitutional reasons or raised the limits to more favorable levels to the residents, while changing the responsibilities of those who care for them. (i.e. not allowing pets to be chained as a sole means of containment, no breeding without a substantial breeders permit – regulating this by

enforcing all papers to display this license in all ads for puppies and kitties and a severe penalty for any human who's dog has bitten or attacked any other human or dog.)

3.
NEWSFLASH!

Article from New Orleans, AP wires, May 16, 2003

Judge nixes law that limits Kenner residents to four pets
05/16/2003

By the ASSOCIATED PRESS

GRETNA, La. -- A state judge has overturned his own ruling and a Kenner ordinance limiting households to four pets.

The ordinance violates residents' property rights, Judge Alan Green ruled Thursday.

In February, he had upheld the ordinance and the conviction last year of Patricia Kruebbe, who has 12 cats and spends thousands of dollars a year on cat food and veterinary bills.

She said she burst into tears of joy when the ruling was announced, and she hopes it prompts Kenner officials to rewrite the city's law.

"I'm glad because it's going to allow people to take care of more than four animals and not be prosecuted," she said.

City attorney Kurt Garcia said he will appeal. In the meantime, he said, he will suggest that Kenner code enforcement officers put away their animal citation pads until the appellate court rules.

"It's significant to know that the judge originally agreed with Kenner. For whatever reason, he changed his mind," Garcia said.

Kruebbe was tried in the Kenner Mayor's Court for violating the ordinance, which limits residents to four domestic animals and four birds. It does not apply to animals less than six months old.

Kruebbe said she was fined \$250 and given a 30-day suspended jail sentence and 30 days of probation.

Her attorney, Anthony Ligi, originally argued that the law infringes on the right to own property and was an arbitrary limit. Quality of care -- not the quantity of pets

-- should be the deciding factor, he said.

We found over 1,000 communities who have deemed pet limits to be unconstitutional in the last 5 years and feel the degree of care, minus any nuisance problems for surrounding residents, should be the focus, especially with all the unnecessary deaths in this country.

Green initially ruled that Ligi did not prove that the city didn't have a valid reason for the law. He also said Ligi had not convinced him that the pet limit was unreasonable.

Ligi said he requested Thursday's hearing "to try to convince the judge that the statute really has no relationship to public safety and welfare and therefore is an inappropriate police power by Kenner."

Ligi said he could find only two other municipalities with pet limits: New Orleans and East Baton Rouge Parish, which prohibits more than 12 pets without a special permit. Jefferson Parish has no pet limit, Ligi said.

Jeff Dorson, regional director of the Louisiana Humane Society, said a New Orleans committee voted in April to recommend that the city change the law to one more like the one in Baton Rouge.

New Orleans now allows four pets; the new proposal would raise that to eight, with more allowed if the owner had a permit.

Massachusetts Federation of Dog Clubs - Limit Law position ...

... Unfortunately, politicians believe pet limit laws are a cure-all for all animal control

problems, but in reality they do nothing to address irresponsible owners

This is a brief overview of the issue and a list of alternative solutions.

=====

4.

Pet Limitation Laws

By Merritt Clifton

Despite the great attention paid to anti-breeding ordinances since October 1990, laws have been enacted to fight pet overpopulation for decades. The original form of such legislation, and the simplest, involves attempting to limit the number of animals who may be kept by any one household. This approach has many politically popular features. First, it is easy to understand. Second, it sounds easy to enforce, usually via pet licensing. Third, it promises to cost the community nothing; enforcement costs presumably will be met by licensing fees and/or fines for noncompliance. Further, in many communities, pet limits merely codify rules that have been informally maintained by landlords for generations. Finally, pet limits allow governmental bodies to "address" pet overpopulation without actually having to do anything about it. In effect, pet limits throw the responsibility for

figuring out how to reduce pet numbers back to individual pet keepers, who may take no more action than they ever did.

Statutory limits on animal numbers have even been incorporated into some more aggressive legislation, including the celebrated San Mateo County anti-breeding ordinance. However, while pet limits may restrict the numbers of animals who officially live at any location, they do little or nothing to reduce the overall dog and cat population. Indeed, pet limits might even encourage pet overpopulation by providing an incentive for people whose pets have litters to give away the puppies and kittens as fast as they can to any takers, no questions asked, and to dump the animals if there are no takers, before they get big enough to be noticed by complaining neighbors.

Pet limits have one major virtue, in that they give animal control authorities a means of moving against "animal collectors," who adopt far more animals than they can humanely handle, often to prevent the animals from being euthanized in a shelter. Animal collectors tend to be elderly, socially isolated, delusionary, and generally well-regarded in the community for taking in otherwise unwanted dogs and cats, no matter how poor the standard of care. When prosecuted under ordinary anti-cruelty laws, animal collectors tend to get off easily--and have an extremely high rate of recidivism, often estimated at 80% or more. For this reason alone, weary animal control departments often support pet limits--especially if they haven't seen such limits fail in other communities.

But animal collectors are only a small minority of the people who may have more pets, especially cats, than pet limits typically allow. Cat keepers average four cats apiece in some parts of the U.S. two above the typical statutory limit. Thus cat keepers have turned out in force to fight proposed limits in communities including Syracuse, New York; Gloucester, Pennsylvania; and Akron, Ohio. In some cases, hours of anti-limit testimony from responsible pet keepers have made municipal counselors reluctant to consider any anti-pet overpopulation bills.

Where pet limits are in force, for instance in Denver, Colorado, many responsible pet keepers feel constrained from providing as many good homes as they otherwise might. Many others simply defy the law, since if animals are kept indoors, detecting limit violations can be very difficult. Animal control officers meanwhile discover that trying to enforce pet limits is both thankless and endless work. Consequently the limits have a way of being forgotten as quickly as possible.

Denver tried to get around this problem by prorating the number of animals per household according to the size of the property. The amount of floor space, however, might have been a more appropriate determinant of the pet "carrying capacity" of a house or apartment than the amount of yard space surrounding it. Certainly a three-story Victorian house with little or no yard space will provide more habitat for indoor cats than a modest two-bedroom ranch house, even if the latter is on a ten-acre lot.

Other communities have simply limited the number of animals who may be free-roaming. In May 1992, Natick, Massachusetts, not only adopted strict pet limits (and differential licensing), but also barred free-roaming pets altogether. Because free-roaming pets who have not been neutered often breed with strays and ferals, the latter provision may help somewhat to slow dog and cat overpopulation. But even indoor pets escape once in a while, and sexually intact

dogs and cats are quite as capable of breeding indoors as out, if they get the opportunity.

Finally, pet limits can discourage animal rescuers, especially those who practice neuter/release to control feral cat populations. The neuter/release technique, imported from England and South Africa approximately a decade ago, consists of neutering feral cats, inoculating them against distemper and rabies (and sometimes other diseases), then returning them to their habitat, where they are kept under the supervision of volunteer feeders. The feeders insure that the cats don't become a public nuisance, and detect any fertile newcomers to each cat colony. Neuter/release is highly controversial, opposed as cruel by HSUS, but endorsed by other humane groups including Friends of Animals, Alley Cat Allies, and the Tufts Center for Animals and Public Policy. A demonstration neuter/release project completed by ANIMAL PEOPLE in 1992 and a national survey of cat rescuers undertaken later in 1992 by ANIMAL PEOPLE and the Massachusetts SPCA produced somewhat ambiguous results, from the humane perspective. (See "Cat Project Update," 9/92, and "Seeking the truth about feral cats," 10/92.) The survey did indicate, however, that neuter/release is effective in reducing the homeless cat population. About 75% of the respondents who had tried neuter/release reported that it stopped the growth of the feral cat colonies they observed. Neuter/release may have been included in an official animal control plan for the first time in Cape May, New Jersey. According to Cape May animal control department head John Queenan, neuter/release has helped to reduce the euthanasia rate in his jurisdiction to virtually zero.

As usually worded, pet limits have the effect of putting neuter/release rescuers at risk of being identified and prosecuted as the alleged "owners" of the cats they care for, inasmuch as they are feeding them, providing veterinary care, and often holding them in homes, at least overnight, before and after surgery. This problem could be avoided if existing pet limits were amended to include a special exemption for authorized rescuers, who would have to be registered with the local animal control department and would have to meet various other appropriate conditions, such as guaranteeing neutering, marking the cats in some way for identification purposes, and returning cats only to property where owners are willing to tolerate their presence.

5.

Important Arguments you should know.

By Lawrence J. Barty Attorney at Law

First, a decision made by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, for example, is only binding in Penn., because the decision is based upon Penn. Constitution and statutes. Constitutions and statutes in other States will never be identical, so at best this hypothetical Penn. decision might be used to persuade courts in another State to follow the same approach. Even if a Penn. Court bases a decision on the federal Constitution, that interpretation does not bind other States. Only a decision by the US Supreme Court can do that.

Second, the substantive issue of property rights under the federal and State constitutions is indeed in flux to some degree. The current US Supreme Court has issued a series of decisions over the last several years that, taken as a whole, have elevated the rights of property owners to a limited degree versus State power. This trend has typically shown up in cases examining zoning and other land usage questions. It typically arises when a State imposes use restrictions that have the effect of making a person's property less valuable – for example, forbidding property owners in a certain area from draining swampy ground, etc. The Court has said that under some extreme circumstances, the restrictions could amount to constructively “taking” the property away from the owner – which could amount to a violation of the Fifth Amendment's ban on taking property without due process of law. In other words, if the local government adopted new rules that so restrict the potential use of your property that the property thereby becomes significantly less valuable, perhaps that government would owe you the difference in value.

Please note that this legal development, which is far from set in concrete, does NOT limit States' powers to adopt use restrictions. It simply might make a particular use restriction too expensive to be worth adopting. Also, this theory would not apply to restrictions that were already in place when you acquired the property.

Rules prohibiting excessive barking, noise, smells, and other types of nuisances are measured under a different approach. Every State possesses police powers that it can use to maintain peace, order and tranquility. I have not heard of rules of that type being overturned as unconstitutional. States have broad authority in this area of the law. So long as a rule has at least some rational basis, a court must enforce it. The burden is on a citizen to show that a particular rule is arbitrary and capricious, which historically has been very tough to accomplish.

Larry J. Barty Attorney

6.

Additional Links and Resources

When Good Laws Go Bad... When properly written, these laws ensure that no one's pet cat can interfere with another person's enjoyment of property, such as odor or howling but harbor total disregard for the level of care they receive as opposed to their removal and subsequent death.

Animal Law navigate the maze of legalese involved in all aspects of your pet's legal problems or Regulatory Law includes things like leash laws, animal limit laws, city or county.

Resource Center

Oakton Park Apartments 3347 Willow Crescent Drive ,Fairfax City, VA 22030
1-888-263-1501 or 101 ,Reston, VA 20194 1-888-681-4868 35lb 20lb pet limit. not legally enforceable.

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

American Kennel Club ~ Animal Limit Laws: Better Alternatives

Ohio Valley Dog Owners oppose number limits

Ohio Valley Dog Owners handout on number limits

Ohio Valley Dog Owners

Massachusetts Federation of Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners Position Statement on Limit Laws

National Animal Interest Alliance Quality or quantity?

Dog limit called unconstitutional in Minnesota

Dog limit called unconstitutional in Minnesota (same info as above, different site)

Pennsylvania Court Strikes Down Ordinance Limiting Number of Cats Per Residence

"Pet-limit" laws serve neither the animals nor the city

Pet Limitation Laws

Best Friends Pet Adoption ~ Pet Limit Laws

American Dog Owners Association Policy

Dogs at Risk Sample letter to the Mayor of your city.

The Cat Fancier's Association, Inc.

Also, lots of people recommended the Animal Legal Defense Fund at

<http://www.aldf.org>

<http://www.aldf.org/resources.asp?sect=resources>

Their resources page has some info, and a lawyer referral search feature for various states. However this is an animal rights site, and the lawyer that I found on this site wasn't up on pet limit laws being unconstitutional. I am told it's because he's a member of PeTA, and they aren't too helpful if it doesn't further their agenda. Much like the HSUS, who recently made an offer to a gentleman in NV to create a nationwide campaign to stop zoophilia and promised to raise \$1,000,000. When asked how they would

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

spend it, they brought the number down to \$100,000 they would spend, but would apply the remainder to other programs. Oh, like paying your top officials salaries of \$200,000, \$300,000 or more plus bonuses.

Or, contact the legal department of the akc. Go to <http://www.akc.org> and when the page comes up, type in "dog limit laws" in the search box. They can send you info that you won't find online unless you are a lawyer.

P R O O F

Ten reasons will clearly prove that nobody really wants to solve the animal related problems!!

"Like a Non-Profit Enron, the large National Animal Protection Organizations rake in Millions but can show very very little in 25 years'

Today's animal protection efforts have recently come under fire by various media groups and animal protection organizations. Many within the ranks are confident that most of the problems we work so diligently on, could have and should have been solved and corrected years ago, but for one problem: Human Beings! With over 3,000 animal protection organizations in this country,boasting millions of

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

'members' and logging an estimated 50 billion man hours since 1979, one must wonder . On this page you will find the top ten reasons why Americans really do not want these issues to see resolve. After all, We are Americans. If we honestly wanted this problem to be solved, it would have been by now. No doubt about it.

If anyone has any honest expectations of actually seeing changes and truly solving some of the basic problems that plague our animal friends, then we must make changes. We can no longer afford to argue our egos, explain away our failures, defend our agendas and continue to waste billions of dollars to continue fighting a battle with the same ammunitions that have consistently brought defeat in the past. It's no secret, that if unified, the animal protection movement would be the largest lobbying effort in Washington and we would be able to see many changes.

1 - Most Americans do not know much at all about the proper care and treatment necessary for a dog or cat to have the good life they deserve and they refuse to learn. There is no comprehensive educational program to provide reliable information regarding proper care and instinctive habits that surface in our pets' activities. Most humans misunderstand their pets actions, refuse to 'listen' to them and only provide the same treatment as what they witnessed when growing up. Unfortunately that still holds true today. Their egos seem to win out over compassion and willingness to be educated. No body asks professionals for guidance, rents videos or reads websites to get the proper care for their pets because they refuse to be reminded that they don't know. The animals suffer.

We can put a man on the moon, place a robotic rover on mars, cure diseases in record time and win wars in under 100 days. We have the marketing prowess to change human behavior around the world with incredible success, but we can't or won't get together in one movement to clearly inform the masses of the importance of spay and neutering. We have not shown American residents, corporations and local governments that they will see personal as well as financial benefits by working to solve these issues. We have not stopped backyard or puppy-mill breeding, stopped dog fighting lowered the level of abuse in our inner city or suburbia neighborhoods. We have not insisted that the courts enforce the laws already on the books. And by no means has this generation been stellar at teaching compassion.

2 - Schools continue to deny offers for humane education - even though most programs are free. And even though it can and will affect each and every person in that building sometime during their lives.

Our nations' schools are so under funded and constantly being driven by test scores, they are rarely welcoming when organizations offer to bring a humane education program into their classes - even though a few states have mandatory humane education laws and many of the humane education programs offered are at no charge to the schools. These programs have multi-level benefits to all the young people who attend. When it's brought into the class through the guidance counselor program of character development, the young people have higher

achievement scores, improved attendance rates and frequently adopt a less violent conflict resolution technique which leads to a more compassionate future for everyone.

But, the Animal Foundation in Las Vegas laughingly argues that they DO provide Humane Education to their local and area schools and proudly point to the 3 days they had a volunteer at the school for the mentally handicapped last season as proof. Of course, the educated reader will ask, 'Well what about the rest of the 800,000 students in the district? Where was your organization the other 230 school days?' To which they will have no answer. We don't think they actually gave that any thought, so we dropped the subject.

3 -- This brings us to the Large National Organizations and the fact that most of them are much more interested in raising money, pointing fingers at other national organizations, avoiding the real problems, and use the money to money to pay over-inflated salaries than to actually educate the public or make a true noticeable difference. But they still know how to 'pat themselves on the back' so they can rake in another \$1 billion of your dollars this year. It's practically unheard of for them to work together. They seem much more interested in top billing as opposed to the end results and actual accomplishments. How far along do you think the space program would be today if NASA was actually 7 competitive entities who refused to share their knowledge and combine efforts for a common goal?

We need to point out that Americans have paid \$1 billion in taxes to animal control efforts annually for the past 20 years and subsequently donated an equal amount of nearly \$1 billion to their favorite animal protection organizations annually. With that, you would think that we could proudly say "See all the problems we've solved" but have we have solved even one thing! They've made the same promises for 25 years and never kept a single one. But they can sure take our donations each year with a big smile. Then, blindly, we give again.

Politics, Agendas, Egos and Greed tend to lead to the continuing demise of the seemingly noble efforts. So my first concern is, knowing all this, why haven't the larger animal organizations taken on a project and SOLVED IT? They have the manpower, the legislative votes and the financial resources to do so. What has become of the more than \$40 billion from the past 25 years? Like a non profit Enron. Unfortunately, their primary goals are to keep their organization financially strong while ignoring the potential they have to actually do what they've promised their contributors. After all, if they should actually solve one or more of the major problems, they would be forced to downsize, layoff employees and would also be forced to abolish their cute little pictures of dogs and cats behind bars awaiting certain death - 'the money shots' as they are called. They spend the billions of dollars we've given them over the years on over inflated salaries, luxury offices and even allow millions to simply sit in their bank accounts (per their 2002 IRS Tax returns) to collect interest. Yet, they fail to show any results or true nationwide success stories.

4 - Animal controls are notoriously under funded and under educated, yet over worked because of humans who refuse to be responsible and caring. They are caught in the middle. The citizens want better animal control, but the agency is never properly funded by their supervisory boards. . Many animal control agencies profit from the animals they kill, but the community doesn't know or won't take proper steps to make the necessary changes. Again, though, the animals suffer.

*PRESS RELEASE:
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE*

*We, the larger national ANIMAL organizations declare our differences with Randy N. Warner of 21st Century CARES and strongly disagree with his claims that we have failed to resolve any of the animal related issues were for political reasons. We are shocked by his allegations and hope that all our loyal supporters recognize the black eye he is giving to the animal movement as a whole. We assure the public and media that we are here for one reason and one reason only - that is to help the animals and will do any and everything possible to show our determination in the future.**

**Providing of course, that anyone we work with agrees with our agenda and nobody elses, don't try to judge or criticize our self righteous attitudes against all others, that they have had no working relationship with any other animal protection group over the last 2 years, always say nice things about us, don't bring up the nice salaries we make, never mention 'political' in the same sentence as us, are of the same religion as we are, and of course, no republicans are allowed, no language that may offend the Zimbabwe national Forrest rangers, that none of our employees get their feelings hurt since we are the ONLY animal organization that really matters, that all GOOD ideas are made to appear as if they are ours, and all BAD ideas be pinned on other organizations, that the public does NOT find out about the fact we spend 95 cents for every dollar on our private jets, large corporate office buildings and combined annual printing costs of over \$250million EACH AND EVERY YEAR just so we can continue to make money ...(5 additional pages of demands deleted due to space limitations)..... and that nobody in our midst has worked for or purchased products from any of the following companies in the past 40 years.*

Alcoa

AT & T

IBM

Texaco

Lowe's

Firestone

Proctor and Gamble

The Gap

Hickory Farms of Ohio

Ford Motor Company

Nordstroms

*Iams
General Motors
ABC
Nutro
Hartz Mountain
Sony
Volkswagen
Ralph Lauren
Roto Rooter
Dish Satellite
Brach's Candies
Kellogg's
Campbells
Levi-Strauss
Chiquita
McDonalds'*

(Remainder of the list of 11, 476 American companies banned by the larger animal protection groups has been deleted for lack of space.)

Nope!!! No politics here, huh

5 - The city governments around the nation just poo-poo any animal related upgrades or additional funding. But are quick to give themselves substantial pay raises on a regular basis. Much of this comes from simple ignorance as well as greed. They don't even believe in themselves, let alone the residents in the given jurisdictions. They do NOT protect the animals, and have the audacity to charge volunteer rescuers money for every little thing - MUCH of it having little or nothing to do with the safety and well being of the animals, but everything to do with trying to prevent rescues from forming and to squeeze as much money out of them as possible if they do.

6 - Rescue groups and individuals around the nation work their butts to the bone, devote most of their lives, spend thousands of their own dollars, only to waste hours and hours gossiping online to harm other rescuers or to be back-stabbed by a co-worker, forming modern day witch hunts or be ram-sacked by animal control officers, and, with no appreciation or even respect by the majority of the citizens, become bitter and apathetic. Much too much ego boosting and again, forgetting what their goals actually are too much of the time. They rarely do more than clean up yesterday's mess - almost never considering tomorrow.

While these noble individuals who actually put in all the work get paid nothing - even spend thousands of their own dollars each year on this effort, the bulk of publicity and praise seems to go to the larger national organizations who continue to battle each other for positioning, the rescue community refuses to organize or

develop an agency of their own making to regulate, provide a voice in government and protect the rescuers as well as help the animals. When presented with an opportunity to make a difference, they tend to explode initially, but fail to make a presentation that is affective nor have any follow-through. In spite of the incredible level of commitment, time, energy and money, they know little about how to accomplish other than placing their rescues. There for, nothing in regards to organizing, future planning, setting standards and guidelines, having a voice in congress, providing insurance and protection for their rescues is being done - and it all needs to be done. All the while, they simply assure themselves and the animals that nothing will change for tomorrow because non of them made any arrangements and gave only yesterday and today any thought.

7 - Most courts refuse to uphold the laws that are in place and fail to prosecute those who harm or even kill innocent animals. This, in spite of the facts that we KNOW through research that those who begin early life with abusing animals are much more likely to grow up and continue by committing more severe crimes against humans. There is no secret our jails are overcrowded today. However, there is also no secret that the links between animal abuse and more severe criminal activity and violence against humans are well researched and proven. These acts of violence need to be addressed by the courts to prevent so much violence and criminal behavior in the future.

8 - All mainstream religion refuses to discuss the brutal treatment of the companion animals we all call Man's Best Friend, knowing that abuse, neglect and death happens within each congregation on a regular basis, but it's OK for them to tell us what to eat, who to sleep with and even clear guidelines of what to wear. All this while asking for donations and the animals continue to suffer. With a local rape case or child molestation, they move mountains to show their compassion. Knowing that hundreds of animal abuse cases happen in the same area each week, they choose to ignore them. Maybe we should donate to our places of worship in the names of our pets. \$\$\$\$\$

9 - THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA REFUSES TO TELL THE REAL TRUTH BECAUSE IT UPSETS TOO MANY VIEWERS TO HEAR HOW MANY DOGS AND CATS WE KILLED YESTERDAY. You know what? I'll bet all those animals dragged into the little room to be killed yesterday were a little upset, too, and would have gladly sat back and forgiven us if we'd upset some people if only they could have lived another day. Additionally, it is MOST LIKELY those who are causing the problems, that don't want to be reminded of their repeated mistakes.

10 - Obviously corporations have not been smart enough to recognize the value of their roles in this, nor how they could all benefit by working to correct these problems. The fact is, nobody has been smart enough yet to clearly show the public, local governments and even corporations, how finding solutions to these problems would actually benefit their 'bottom line' by paying fewer taxes, charging responsible guardians with acceptable fees, bringing a more compassionate

community and work force - all while saving lives. A MUCH MORE COMPASSIONATE WORLD IN WHICH TO LIVE! "BROUGHT TO YOU BY XYZ CORP. A SPONSOR OF HUMANE EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS"

I am more and more convinced that NOBODY truly wants to see these problems of animal abuse and pet overpopulation solved. There are good reasons why. It pad a large number of egos, supports a substantial number of jobs and would simply take an honest, mature effort of 'sharing' ideas and working 'together' - something the animal protection movement in this country is simply not capable of doing. Everyone wants an easy fix. The claim that "it takes money" to get this done is just stupid. If that were true, you would certainly think that we would have reached that dollar amount by now. Everyone insists on lining their pockets while demanding to do it 'their way' without ever listening to other ideas. But, without at least listening to all the ideas, then how would you know which way is best?

I really hope the public will finally recognize that they need to speak out when they see someone who's mistreating or neglecting their pets. It is not only their right to report their neighbors and friends for not providing the appropriate care for these creatures, it is their responsibility to do so. Undoubtedly, our nation must give serious consideration to including a substantive and powerful humane education program in our curriculums very soon. By not doing so, they are literally allowing these poor pets to suffer - even die. Teaching our decision makers of tomorrow that compassion, nor education is really all that important.

Finally everyone also needs to recognize that although the larger animal orgs have a strong and substantial place in our society, we cannot depend on them to solve any problems, as has been proven over the years. Recognizing that all these problems are OURS to solve through becoming more educated and responsible in how we view our companion animals is the only way. We have the ability to make changes WHEN WE WANT TO!!!!!! We just really haven't wanted to up until now.

When the large organizations can begin working together, the rescue efforts can stop bickering and feeding their own egos, the local governments will be held to the fire when they fail to protect their local animals by upholding the existing laws, the media can finally have a strong and informative story to tell, schools aren't afraid of a one hour program for fear of affecting their almighty test scores and corporations can finally see that solutions actually offer additional \$\$ to their bottom line, we may begin to see improvements - even solutions. It's called "working smarter, not harder".

Should it be that we are unable to handle our differences within this movement with more direction and less immaturity, we will be forced to leave these problems to our children - admitting we were incapable of solving the problems we have spent so much time and effort on. Here is the story we will tell them. www.21stcenturycares.org/storybook.htm

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

For those of you who still have doubts, go to www.21stcenturycares.org/natexp.htm to see over 30 magazine and research articles from major newspapers lending additional support for these views.

Another good idea for keep pets and people together. Information on how you can get a program like this in your community at the bottom of the page.

Also See Landlord/Tenant Suggestions for ideas and even classified ad ideas as well as Apartment Dogs for which ones are good apt. dwellers and low energy.

: Companion Animals Renters Program

SOURCE: FIREPAW

Millions of companion animals are abandoned by their family members every year. Many of these innocent victims never get adopted and are senselessly euthanized. One of the leading reasons people abandon their companion animals is related to the limited rental housing options available to people with animals.

In an effort to redress the shortage of pet-friendly rental housing--thereby reducing the amount of abandoned and euthanized companion animals--FIREPAW is pleased to announce the Companion Animal Renters Program. This is a multi-level program comprised of (1) a national research study of landlords and pet-friendly rentals (the Companion Animal Renters Study--CARS] and (2) a unique, applied three-prong program to encourage and assist rental property owners to offer pet-friendly housing. The customized landlords program is tailored to meet the unique needs of all types of rental properties--from single unit buildings to large complexes. In conjunction with the program for landlords FIREPAW has also developed an information and resource packet for tenants: "How to Find, Keep and Enjoy a Pet-Friendly Rental".

Anecdotal evidence and findings from pilot study interviews indicates that tenants with animals mean good business for rental property owners. To begin with, offering pet-friendly rentals doubles a landlord's tenant pool. Additionally, with the right conditions tenants with animals tend to stay longer (that means less turn-over, and fewer costs and hassles), be more loyal, have less complaints, and have stronger bonds within their rental community. Dr. Pamela Frank, co-researcher on the national landlords and pets study and developer of the Companion Animal Renters Program said, "An increasing amount of savvy landlords already know that pet-friendly rentals can mean good business. One of FIREPAW's goals with the national study and the three-prong landlords program is to get the

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

word out to many more rental property owners about the economic advantages and the overall attractiveness of renting to tenants with animals."

While they are hoping for donations to help defray some of the costs, the Companion Animals Renters Program is free to rental property owners and managers. The same goes for renters with the Tenants Information Packet. FIREPAW is a charitable, nonprofit organization and donations are tax-deductible. For more information contact FIREPAW, Inc., 153 N. Allen, Albany, NY, 12206 at 518-438-5939,

email: firepaw@earthlink.net or visit their web site at:
<http://www.firepaw.org>.

THE OFFICIAL VERDICT IS IN.

GUILTY!!!

Yes, we are all guilty of not doing enough and not

Embracing changes that could benefit the animals.

Co-authored by Randy Warner and Mary Ultz, Humane Educator City of Huntsville

To answer the question, I would say an emphatic YES!! There is no other group of people who devote more time, effort, compassion or personal finances into a job or hobby than do most rescuers. But, educating just one family at a time, as opposed to 50 families at a time is obviously not as productive. And lets face it. Trying to convince an adult to change their ways of handling and caring for their pets is about as successful as convincing your spouse you are 'right' during an argument.

Rescuers are concerned with education, they just don't know it.

Should Rescuers be considered humane educators as well?

They ARE! Sometimes they just don't know it. They speak from the front lines of the dog and cat rescue battles. Rescuers have the most, as well as the best, information regarding pets and their unique stories, along with the reasons why....

Rescue is a passion-driven field. Logic and business sense are frequently put on hold because some little angel needs some extra care today. I mean, it's not like your profit margins are going to be factored by investors on Monday, right?

Now, I'm quite sure that accomplishing an education effort takes different strategies than what most of the public assumes, but I believe it can be done. Not everyone will agree, not everyone will wish to participate, but at the very least, nearly everyone can read this and think about it.

From 1985 'til now I've done rescue primarily for Dalmatians—and others when needed. I know how difficult it is, how expensive it is, to what extent you can be drawn into an effort that never seems to end.

It's the "never seems to end" part that I want to ask YOU about. I'm addressing this to all those who devote their valuable and wonderful time and assets toward saving dogs' lives, the rescuer. I have a challenge for you...

I'd like to suggest that you give 20% of your time, efforts and money to getting a strong and substantial humane education program into your area schools. I do not mean to infer that your present efforts are not necessary or important. I know it is crucial to so many animals' lives to continue what you're doing.

But, that being said, if you ONLY do rescue, you are simply making it easier for those who are borderline about keeping their pets, and you are also assuring that your children's generation and your grandchildren's generation will be forced to do the same level of rescue as you do now. You must do everything you can to educate this younger group of people before they head down the very same path as their parents.

Each and every one of you has the knowledge, experience, compassion and everything else needed to make a HUGE difference in the next generation!!! You can't do it by saying "I don't have time" or offering other excuses. Spending 100% of your available time rescuing simply puts all future dogs in jeopardy, because you did NOT do enough to resolve the underlying problems for the future. You will continue to clean up the mess after yesterday's parade. I would hope that you would rather see the front of the horse once in a while.

If you are willing to work toward this momentous effort, I don't want you to be overwhelmed. Try 5% per year for humane education over the next five years and increase accordingly. Some of you are not comfortable as public speakers. If that is the case, consider recruiting a friend or neighbor who supports your efforts and wants to do more. Many schools (even in this economy) have "speaker" funds and

will write you a check for \$100 as you leave. You could bring in as much as \$500/week for 5 hours' work. We all know how helpful money is in our pocket. Why not earn money for our rescue endeavors while we spread the message to make rescue unnecessary? As a rescuer, you can send information to schools of your choice and follow up to see which class got that information.

What if you spent only one hour a weekend handing out information to the public? Minimal cost for copies, countless contacts to pet owners!

If you have a website, place some information there as well. One more link about the overpopulation and how people can help end it will not take too much effort, but will save lives in the end! Everything I have on my site is for public use. The more people that check out my site, the more their awareness and information levels increase, thus they act more responsibly. If you don't have the time for another page, PUT A LINK TO MY PAGE ON YOUR PAGE! Everything on my site will resound loudly in the ears of anyone who has helped with rescue and listening to the idiots make up excuses for these poor innocent pets.

Some principals tell me that I'm not needed at their school, because most of their students already have pets. WELL, A BIG STUPID DUH TO THEM!! But once I'm invited into a school, you would not believe the impact that my 45-minute program has on these young minds. I take all five of my dogs: 2 dals, (one deaf) a coyote, a pit bull and a beagle-basset mix. My presentation is blunt, direct, fun, AND VERY INFORMATIVE. I barely mention what they think they'll hear. When we depart, each face looks so much different from when we first arrived. It's amazing. The kids are motivated to form a humane education club or at least take on a year long project to accomplish something to help animals. Amazingly, teachers and staff tell me how much even they learned and then thank me.

You need to be well versed in supportive information to check all claims, suggestions and rules enforced in contracts. I'll bet every rescuer out there knows exactly what I'm talking about.

I just hope that some of you see that we all have room for growth, change and expansion of our duties. If we are creative, we can accomplish so much more. If only 20% of the rescuers who read this decide to do SOMETHING, that would be over a thousand people. Now, a thousand people visiting schools just 3 times a year is 3,000 MORE classrooms visited. 3,000 classrooms this year with 40 students each is 120,000 EDUCATED youth who will not likely need to services of rescuers or animal control agencies except for adoptions. Then, I've surpassed my goal considerably!!

For all those who say 'we can't' for whatever reason, would you rather be part of the Rescue Janitorial staff than the Engineering or Research Departments who will be a vital part of the solution?

When you pass on, can you guarantee that someone similar will step into your

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

shoes and take over with the same fervor and compassion to save the dogs of tomorrow?? Wouldn't you like to try and save some of them NOW while you can? With every good presentation you give, you are likely to save 10-50 dogs depending on the number of ears listening. And it only takes an hour and maybe \$15. (gas, 50 copies and lunch at McDonalds on the way home)

CAN YOU MEET THE CHALLENGE OF EDUCATION TO CREATE PROBLEM RESOLUTION?

I would love nothing more than NOT to do rescue because it is not necessary. Until then, I will continue along my path of education for solution. I choose to be pro-active to end overpopulation, not just re-active to current demands.

We also welcome any and all creative and successful projects you may be aware of to put on the site and share with others.

I would love nothing more than NOT to do rescue because it is not necessary. Until then, I will continue along my path of education for solution. I choose to be pro-active to end overpopulation, not just re-active to current demands.

"I am only one, but still I am one. I cannot do everything, but still can do something: and because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse to do something that I can do."

Edward Everett Hale, 1794 –1865, American Orator and Statesman

Anyone interested in gaining materials for humane education, strategies for gaining access to schools (which will become the most challenging part of this) topics to discuss, whether to bring dogs along, etc. can email 21stcares@citlink.net. You will be provided with any and all information we can offer to get your questions answered and help you successfully present these points and reach your goals. No charge for any service.

We also welcome any and all creative and successful projects you may be aware of to put on the site and share with others.

WORK SMART NOT HARD

RESPECTIVELY THEIRS

This is truly one of the problems we have with humane education today. The larger orgs who have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in "making humane education available to the public" has no statistics to prove its validity. Therefore, showing no benefits to the programs. Well, duh!!!! They are required to involve themselves in this effort by those who send them money. They don't have statistics to prove anything because they have not done anything to provide statistics except to send fliers and brochures. This is so very sad that a large national group would suggest such ignorance. Top half is Best Friends "expert" showing his ignorance. Lower down is my response.

Question from Amanda:

We do a lot of different programs that we feel are very important-we have a voucher program for spay/neuter, obedience classes for anyone adopting from us, taking pets into nursing homes, and humane ed. However, we don't know how to measure results to see if these programs are worth the staff and volunteer time, effort, and energy that goes into them. I know some things can be intangible and still having an impact, but that doesn't work for our board when they ask us to prove these programs are worthwhile. How do you measure your programs to know if they are actually making a difference and if you should continue them?

Nathan Winograd's response:

The primary difference between for profit and non-profit organizations is not the mission, is not the quality of the people who work in them, is not a different principle of doing business. It is, quite simply, accountability. Non-profits, at least many shelters don't seem to aspire to any. The CEO of a for profit business that failed to meet his bottom line would not survive, nor would the business. In the non-profit world, however, very few CEOs feel they need to be accountable to the public for their mission. They could merely decry the "sad state of affairs" and continue to ask for money without ever being required to get results. "Look," they are fond of saying, "how many children we visited this year under our humane education program," despite an ever increasing body count as the animals continue to be killed.

So your question is inspiring in that you seek to make the shelter accountable. To do that, you need to focus on the bottom line, like a for-profit enterprise would. For me, the bottom line is how many animals the shelter saves. You should have one primary goal: reducing the number of animals that are being killed. And to do that, you need to do two primary things: adopt more animals and lower the number of animals surrendered to the shelter.

When you are looking at your programs and services, you need to make sure they have measurable, life-saving results. There is too much to do, and unless you are flush with cash, too little money (at least at first!) to spend it on "intangibles." First on the chopping block should be those programs and services that are merely

duplicative. If there are 20 other obedience classes in your community, why do you need one of your own? If you are concerned about cost, with every adoption we do, we give people a list of available classes. We also list them on our website. In return for the free advertising, many of them offer discounts if the pet is adopted from the shelter. No cost to us (except paper), and we don't have to offer the program. I said this earlier, look for the gaps in the safety net and fill those.

Second, figure out if the programs are paying off in some way. Not all results have to be direct, but they have to be tangible. For example, under Avanzino, the San Francisco SPCA had a program to train hearing dogs for the deaf or hearing impaired. It was a noble program, but I couldn't see why we should focus on that since there were other groups like Canine Companions for Independence who were doing the job of matching service dogs with individuals who needed them. But, alas, I was young, impetuous, hot-headed, short-sighted and foolish (I am proud to say that I am no longer any of those things, except the young part.) I was informed by a wiser man than I, that not only was the hearing dog program taking dogs out of pounds were they were on death row (and hence we were saving them), but the revenue brought in was greater than the cost of the program and the extra was being used to subsidize other lifesaving programs at the shelter. So while my focus was on reducing the death rate in San Francisco shelters, we obviously needed money to do that, and this program--in a small way, directly by saving dogs from pounds, but in a greater way, indirectly by providing cash--did that. Direct or indirect, it was tangible.

Going into nursing homes and humane education are nice programs, but I believe they are people programs. In other words, I am not convinced they help animals, either directly by saving lives or making people keep or neuter their pets with any degree of measurability, or indirectly, by providing needed revenue streams. Unless they are revenue generating (directly by payment for services offsetting costs, or bringing in donations), frankly the benefits are too intangible to have any meaning for an organization struggling with resource allocation issues for saving lives. In communities nationwide, shelter employees, often with dogs and cats in tow, enter classroom after classroom across the nation where overworked teachers needing a break met them with relief, and wide-eyed school children petted animals while grinning from ear to ear.

Meanwhile, generations of shelter directors boasted to their constituents about the number of school children they were reaching with their humane message and promising that the light at the end of the tunnel, the mythical place where animals were loved and had lifetime homes, was as close as the emancipation of these kids. It was, and remains, a lovely thought.

But this effort was never challenged to see if it could actually get results. In fact, no shelter director—not a single one—could point to any: Were more animals being sterilized because of these efforts? Were people keeping their pets longer? Was the death rate at the shelter declining because of it? Would these children grow up to be more responsible pet owners? No one had any answers. Despite

tight budgets and cuts in the areas of animal care, shelters continued to send legions of staff members into classrooms without any proof that it has was having or ever hoped to have an impact whatsoever on the death rate in shelters. Over twenty years of humane education has yet to produce a single study showing it has made any bit of difference. I am, in short, no fan of this program.

Finally, break down your programs and services into: short-term impact, medium-term impact, and long-term impact. Your primary focus should be on saving the most animals today. So the bulk of your resource allocation should be to those: adoption, foster, TNR, pre-release sterilization, etc. A good chunk on reducing numbers over time: spay/neuter for low-income pet owners (you are not simply going to adopt your way to No Kill). And finally, over the long-term: building an endowment for the future and more spay/neuter. Some people say Humane Ed falls into the latter, but I haven't seen the results. And when it comes to saving lives, accountability is this key. If, when all is said and done, all you have are platitudes: "children are our future," "we must educate future generations to be responsible pet owners," you'll be spinning your wheels forever. In short, show me the money.

Dear Mr. Winograd,

In regards to Humane Education possibly having little or no results to the children and other students in it's audience, I would be inclined to agree with all you've said here. Absolutely not a single study available showing any results in humane education by any of the larger national groups who send magazines and publications into thousands of classrooms across the nation for a period of 10 years. They are forced to involve themselves in this to satisfy those who donate. I know a lot of professional humane educators at the large national groups and NOT ONE OF THEM GOES INTO THE SCHOOLS, nor do they have employees who do. They have never really done a study nor asked a teacher how much of the info has been provided to any given set of students nor tried to follow up with the students themselves. Additionally, the programs the larger national groups tend to give are so sugar coated, in order not to offend anyone (they gotta keep those supporters happy so they give more money you know) it does indeed paint a picture of 'no emergency, but someday a fairytale picture

On the other side of the picture, for those of us who are individual or smaller grass roots programs and efforts who actually see what kids can learn and the changes they make right in front of our very eyes with a hard-hitting program that lays out all the facts clearly at the onset of the program and then keep their attention with stories of how they can make a difference, we know differently. WE KNOW THAT A SUBSTANTIAL, fact based and blunt program with no sugar coating CAN AND DOES have an effect on the students that could literally change the world within a 20 year time period. THEY KNOW NOTHING. Even the staff and teachers step up and tell us that they were unaware of most of our

facts and info provided. The question and answer period (usually an after school addition to the original presentation) brings a flurry of well thought out questions by kids 5th - 12th grade who would normally much rather be out playing, but have decided to come back for more info.

I've been in 9 western states recently speaking to over 5,000 students and helping them form humane education clubs to older students and I have been in direct contact with these students. Of course I cannot afford to do a professional study or survey and am actively trying to help 68 volunteers around the nation become active humane educators with the program I've developed with a new Yahoo group <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CreativeHumaneEducation/>. My program is active in 11 states and 5 foreign countries.

I would be absolutely thrilled for you to come and watch one of my programs so you could see for yourself that a good strong program given by someone who still has faith in the human species can, and really does make an enormous difference that very minute. For a short condensed version of my lesson presentation, see www.21stcenturycares.org/spayn.htm. The site has nearly 300 pages of information that shows why the program is necessary and how to help local folks gain the confidence and information needed to get into their local schools and give humane ed to their students as well. The main humane education section is at www.21stcenturycares.org/he/humaneed.htm

After all, rescue is only working on yesterday's problems. WORTHWHILE, YES. But, if we forget about our future, we will only assure our children and grandchildren that they too will be forced to face the same problems because we were too egotistical, full of agendas and ignorant to see the whole picture. See the sad, embarrassing story we will have to tell our children www.21stcenturycares.org/storybook.htm

Why would we trust the large groups anyway? It does NOT take money to change the future. It only takes knowledge. New ideas brings new results.

Remember just like our religious fanatics and minority leaders, absent crimes and imaginary situations against their people and teachings, these organizations disappear -- this means jobs. If the HSUS really solved one of these problems, they would have to lay off a large portion of their employees.

Is the American public is too damn stupid to recognize that?

FACT: Since 1983, Americans have spent \$1 billion annually on community animal control efforts.

FACT: Since 1983 Americans have also donated approximately \$1 billion annually to their favorite animal protection organizations.

FACT: With more than 3,000 non profit organizations in the United States dedicated to this cause and the countless millions of man hours put into this effort in addition to the incredible figures of \$40 billion since 1983 have not lead to one single solution. We still see dog pounds in every community across the nation scrambling to make room for the increasing numbers of dogs and cats.

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

"This is not rocket science - we just need folks to recognize change is necessary. We put a man on the moon; we can cure a new disease in record time; we even win wars in 100 days or less. Americans have the sophisticated technology and successful marketing prowess to make miraculous changes in the human race, on a global scale, yet, we can't seem to successfully convey the reality of our behavior and the subsequent consequences when it comes to how we view and care for our companion animals

People could work smart instead of hard. That would be the single greatest step this movement could take to see improvements. Improvements that have been brought to the public's eye by the national groups, but in diluted form.

Tell Amanda to rediscover her program. have an outsider tell her if it's strong and entertaining enough.

then tell her darn board to get off their butts and attend one of the HE programs and see for themselves. If she is using a weak and sickeningly sweet program it will have no effect. So, it won't be measured in the correct column. Kids today are savvy and mature and can see if you are a silly bleeding heart sweetsy sweetsy type person. If you are, you're dead in the water before you start. And trying to teach students under 5th grade will have little or no impact to the larger picture. They just don't get it.

Again, I will end this with the fact that our world is much better off with these organizations and their efforts, than it would be without them. However, it is now time for them to strive for a much better report card in the future. Afterall, "TO WHOM MUCH IS GIVEN, MUCH IS EXPECTED."

I would love to hear back from you.

Belonging to all our future decision makers, I remain

Respectfully theirs,

Randy N. Warner

President

21st Century Animal Resource and Education Services (21st Century CARES)

For additional details on HSUS income and salaries,

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

see www.21stcenturycares.org/2003natexp.htm

and www.21stcenturycares.org/main3.htm

What IS The Humane Society of the United States?

By Christopher Aust

August 2004

I was rather amazed at the number of people who wrote to me about my opinions regarding the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) when I did my last few articles. Then again, maybe I shouldn't be. Before about two weeks ago, I myself was rather ignorant as to the real goals of HSUS, and where their, (actually your) money goes. As I always do though, I decided to educate myself about them.

I also conducted a poll of 100 average people. Just the average Joe in the street. 94% of the people thought HSUS ran the local shelters in their community. 4% knew about their other programs and the remaining 2% had no idea who they were. Of the 94% all said they would donate to HSUS based on what they knew about them. I'm betting HSUS is banking, literally, on these types of individuals.

I also went online and found some rather interesting, at times quite scary, information on several web sites. I would have interviewed a HSUS representative, but after last week's newsletter, I got an email from one that was little more than hate mail and very offensive!

Founders

Coleman Burke, then president of the American Bible Society, Cleveland Amory and Helen Jones, founded HSUS in 1954. As far as I have been able to tell, Mr. Burke served as their President until 1970 when John Hoyt, a Presbyterian minister, took over as President and CEO until 1996.

Until just a few months ago, the President and CEO was Paul Irwin, a Methodist minister. The current CEO and President is Wayne Pacelle who admittedly has had ties with some radical (and I mean radical) animal rights groups in the past.

Now, is it important I mention the religious background? Maybe and maybe not. What I noticed though is the organization, at least to me, has an evangelical feel. Is this a bad thing? No. I don't see why unless you are running the finances in a manner similar to Jim and Tammie Faye Baker! That sure is the way it looks to me.

Officers and Directors

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

HSUS is an organization with their primary focus being animals. As I reviewed the names and titles of the Board Officers and Directors, I found it curious they had no DVM's (vets) on either. They have three MDs', three PhDs' and six attorneys. Am I the only one that finds this odd? Plenty of lawyers, but no vet. Hmmmm... Maybe it's just a typo.

Comparative Financial Operations Report

When I conducted my interview with Kathy Bauch a few weeks ago, she refused to answer any questions regarding HSUS' finances for a "newsletter." She did offer to send me their 2003 financials though. This is what they send whenever someone has questions about their finances. As I mentioned last week, if it was similar to what they have online, it would be vague and difficult to decipher. What I got was much more.

What I received is their 2003 Annual Report. It is a twenty-one page "report" that was obviously very expensive to print. Tucked way in the back is exactly what I expected. A vague and difficult to read one page financial report. The rest appears to me to be a very expensive sales letter and nothing more, complete with a postage paid envelope to send in your donation.

Now you might say, "So what? They have to promote themselves." I agree. However, this publication has six pages of calendar quality photos of nothing but animals. Two and a half pages of self-glorifying articles from HSUS staff, none of which was necessary. How much donor money could have been saved by deleting this junk from the thousands and thousands of these reports they printed?

According to the Comparative Financial Operations Report for 2003, the HSUS has \$116,205,882.00 in total liability and net assets. Over \$5,000,000 of that is in cash and cash equivalents, and another nearly five and a half million in receivables. They also have nearly \$93,000,000 in market value investments. Not too bad.

In 2003, in revenue, additions and transfers, HSUS made \$76,923,670. Of that amount, sheltering programs received \$10,551,527 and it was shared with animal habitat and wildlife programs. Now, assuming it was an even split, sheltering programs received \$3,517,175.66

Now that's a lot of money, but not when you consider a good sized shelter can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to run, three million is really a drop in the bucket. They spent \$21,145,769.00 in fundraising and membership development. Six times what they put into their shelter programs, which is what most people I talked to think HSUS does with the money donated to them.

Providing Help or Selling It

I'm not sure what they spent the money on for their shelter programs, but I will assure you they didn't fund any shelters. In fact, they charge shelters and Animal Control offices for their assistance and instructional material. I have been able to find little and or nothing HSUS doesn't charge for when it comes to helping a shelter and their educational programs.

For instance, lets say you or your town runs an animal shelter that is struggling for one reason or another, which most are, HSUS is ready to come in and help. For between \$4000.00 and \$20,000.00 they will send their experts to your shelter through their Animal Services Consultation Program. The fee depends on the size of the agency and the complexity of its programs, charged on a sliding scale based on your agency's resources. In other words, the more you have, the more they'll take.

Youth Programs

Now, lets go back to our youth. You're in middle or high school and want to start a club to promote rescue and do things to help companion animals. HSUS can help you with that, too. Just go to humaneteen.org. There you can buy a package full of all kinds of propaganda and learn to be a full-fledged animal activist. They will sell your child a club starter kit for \$22.00 and then give activity suggestions like their "Fight Fur" program.

Here they encourage kids to make flyers and hand them out in front of businesses to protest against shoppers buying fur. HSUS will also give your child cards to distribute at such events. They'll show your child pictures of dead animals in traps and direct them to other sites where they can see pictures of hunters beating seals over the head.

They will also promote vegen/vegetarian lifestyles to your child. Just go to the message board for kids and you can read how many of the kids are distressed, after reading the material HSUS SOLD them, because their parents will not let them go vegen. You will also see posts promoting PETA!

Now I want to be fair here. They do have some decent material that is age appropriate and educational in nature. I think it's overpriced; for instance, your child can rent a video to show their class for \$25.00, but some of it is good material. However, there is little promoting appropriate training, grooming or responsible ownership of companion animals. It seems to me the whole focus is turning our children into activists, vegens and extremists.

Now if I want my child to be a vegen, or an activist, I will make that decision and not HSUS. Our kids have enough on their plate without having to be weighed down with this information or agenda. Additionally, kids are kids and don't always make appropriate decisions. When dealing with complex issues like activism and protesting, it would be easy for them to get into trouble or hurt. Doesn't PETA

target children too?

Ethical Financial Practices

Let's get back to the money:

Former President John Hoyt once instructed his members on becoming more humane: "We begin, I suggest, by living more simply, more sparingly." Let's see how he did. He made around \$200,000.00 in the late 1980's running HSUS. In 1986, HSUS bought his house in Maryland for \$310,000 and allowed him and his family to live there, free of rent, until 1992. When he retired as CEO, HSUS gave him a \$1,000,000.00 bonus.

Paul Irwin, another former President, while making \$300,000.00 from HSUS, was given an \$85,000.00 interest free loan to renovate his cabin in Maine. The cabin was held in trust by HSUS, however his family continued to use it until he died. This is just the tip of the iceberg. Makes me wonder.

Guilty by Association

Let's look at some of HSUS' associations:

In April of 2000 HSUS sent J.P. Goodwin as its emissary on an anti-fur mission to China. Goodwin is not just any animal rights zealot, he was an avowed member of Animal Liberation Front (ALF), a group once called one of the biggest domestic terrorist organizations by the FBI. He had been convicted for vandalism of several fur retailers and their property. Less than a year later, he was formerly identified as a HSUS legislative staff member.

If you don't know about ALF you should check them out. They truly scare the heck out of me. They are, in my opinion, every bit as much a threat to people as Al Quida. I cannot believe HSUS would hire such a person. When asked questions about an arson fire at a slaughter house in Petaluma, California, and a Utah feed co-op that nearly killed a family, Goodwin stated, "We're ecstatic!"

Then, there is the PETA connection ...

HSUS has repeatedly hired PETA employees in their organization. Their head of investigations, several investigators, a computer programmer, just to name a few. Sorry folks, my opinion is, once a terrorist, always a terrorist. When HSUS hires these people, they appear to support the crimes these individuals may have been involved in.

In 2003, HSUS VP Martin Stephens was asked to recommend three people to

This document was created by Print2PDF

<http://www.software602.com>

serve on an EPA ““pollution prevention and toxics” panel. Two of his three choices were PETA employees.

All Talk and No Action

While HSUS will admit they don't run or fund any shelters, you usually find it at the bottom of the page or tucked away somewhere near the end of a statement. As I mentioned before, they don't put their money where their mouth is. Get this ...

In 1995, when the Washington DC animal shelter was going to have to close due to a budget shortfall, HSUS (based in DC) offered to build and operate a DC shelter at its own expense to serve as a national model. There were, of course, conditions.

HSUS wanted the city to give it 3-5 acres of land and tax exempt status for all of its real estate holdings in the District of Columbia. (Remember, they buy some executives homes to live in among other property holdings.)

The DC government offered a long-term lease but HSUS refused to proceed unless it would “own absolutely” the land. The district declined, and the only HSUS funded animal shelter never materialized.

HSUS, who makes and has enough money to fund a shelter in every state, as well as subsidize spay/neuter programs, declined to help the dogs in its own back yard. Why? Money is all I can think of. Perhaps they were afraid they would soil their Armani suits by actually working with a dog.

The New CEO

Rather than go on a tirade about the new President and CEO of HSUS, I have put some quotes from him below. Read them, and you decide.

"I think they wanted the aggressive approach," he says. "They wanted someone who was going to think things up. And they got him." June 2004, Washington Post when asked about his selection as CEO.

“We have no problem with the extinction of domestic animals. They are creations of human selective breeding." Quoted in Animal People, May, 1993

Overview

I could go on for days about HSUS, but I will stop here. In my opinion, they are little more than an organization whose main agenda is filling the coffers and

pushing an extremist agenda through misinformation and exploitation. Again, my opinion, they have done nothing but profit from the contributions of people who don't know any better. I have tried to see it otherwise, I simply can't.

I highly recommend you go to activistcash.com and see what they have there about HSUS and their connection with PETA. There are several other sites I found interesting, as well as many stories about HSUS in the archive of the Washington Post.

Would I give anything to the Humane Society of the United States? Yes I would. A pooper-scooper, they can use to go clean my yard. At least then we would know they actually have done something for a dog this year.

This article may be republished using the following attribution box:

Copyright ©2004 Christopher Aust, Master Dog Trainer & Creator:

The Natural Cooperative Training System (NCTS) for Dogs

The Instinctual Development System (IDS) for Puppies

Subscribe to the BARK 'n' SCRATCH Newsletter:

subscribe@Master-Dog-Training.com

VISIT NOW: <http://www.master-dog-training.com/>