

WellBeing International

WBI Studies Repository

12-1970

(No. 14) – Disunity in the Humane Movement

Humane Information Services, Inc.

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

Recommended Citation

Humane Information Services, Inc., "(No. 14) – Disunity in the Humane Movement" (1970). *Report to Humanitarians*. 6.

<https://www.wellbeingintlstudiesrepository.org/rephum/6>

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



HOLIDAY
GREETINGS

★
★ From
★ Teddy,
★ Emily and
★ Doc. We hope
★ all our great
★ family of friends
★ and co-workers in
★ the humane movement
★ had something for which
★ to be thankful on Thanks-
★ giving Day. We did. And
★ may you have a really enjoy-
★ able Christmas and successful
★ New Year. Tell your pets that
★ Teddy wishes them Happy Holidays.
★ Aren't they lucky not to be among the
★ millions of animals who know only mis-
★ ery and suffering? At this joyful season
★ let's promise ourselves that in the days
★ ahead we
★ will work
★ even harder
★ for the less
★ fortunate ones.

Discouragement Over Disunity

One of the most frequently recurring themes in the many welcome letters we receive is discouragement over disunity in the humane movement.

This being the issue of our Report to Humanitarians which comes closest to Christmas, a season which should bring peace on earth, good will toward men, a discussion of this subject of unity should be most appropriate. Even for any of our members who may not be affected by the Christmas spirit it is particularly timely, because we are rapidly approaching a New Year when a more coordinated approach to a number of important animal problems appears possible and highly desirable.

Those who have been active in humane work for many years have become accustomed to the disunity which permeates humane activity like a deadly poison. But newcomers to our ranks, and those who view us from outside the movement, are puzzled and dismayed by the bitter accusations and in-fighting among humane organizations, and the almost complete failure to coordinate policies and programs.

Lack of Accomplishment Reflects Disunity

In our continuing review of accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of the humane movement, which began with our Report to Humanitarians No. 11 (March, 1970), it already has become evident that failure of humane organizations to pull together in their common causes is a chief reason why so little has been accomplished. For example, the ever-continuing surplus of dogs and cats, the symptoms of which hundreds of humane societies deal with as if operating a treadmill, could have been practically eliminated long ago through a determined and coordinated approach by these same societies. And the need for a more coordinated approach to the solution of many other humane problems has been obvious to nearly all.

But it is one thing to recognize the need for greater unity, and another to achieve it. Any success in doing so will depend upon knowing just what it is we seek, and the steps necessary to reach it. Just talking about unity will get us nowhere. We offer the following analysis as a beginning in the direction of better understanding of the problem.

What is Unity?

We must not confuse disunity with some closely related conditions that may be highly desirable. Exactly what is the "unity" everyone assumes to be desirable?

The dictionary defines unity as: (1) state or fact of being one or united; (2) a whole, as combining all parts into one; (3) freedom from or absence of diversity or variety; (4) concord, harmony or agreement.

Which of these kinds of unity is sought by those who advocate it?

The first three definitions above imply a single organization, or at least a very much reduced number of humane societies. Is that what we need -- drastic consolidation of the existing societies? For example, we might

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS

No. 14 - December, 1970

EDITORS:

Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen
Miss Emily F. Gleockler

Humane Information Services
Incorporated

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

4521 - 4th Street South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

have only one or a few large national organizations with branches in the local communities to operate animal shelters under unified policies and methods, as Texaco and Standard operate gasoline filling stations. Or, we might have one national society, such as the American Humane Association, serving as an exclusive federation of local societies and one national society such as the Humane Society of the United States to handle all humane problems of more than local incidence. Many other possible combinations suggest themselves.

Regardless of just what kind of organization of the humane movement they may have in mind as more desirable than the present hodgepodge, there is no doubt that quite a few humanitarians equate disunity with the existence of too many societies. What they really would like, one may suspect, is to have only one society having the particular set of goals and methods of operation that they believe to be best!

Unity, Yes! Unification, No!

Humanitarians and humane societies, like

resistant to change and unfavorable to proliferation of humane groupings, is to be congratulated for publishing this analysis. We may not agree with the implications of Dr. Gerlach's address with respect to militant black and student groups, but the case he makes for avoidance of unity through unification, for diversity of ideological groupings, and for social progress through institutional competition, is indeed impressive.

How Can We Achieve Greater Unity?

So, the evidence is against trying to achieve unity by consolidating all humane societies into one or a very few groups. I now turn again to the dictionary definitions of unity quoted above, we are left with "concord, harmony or agreement".

Those words do not imply having exactly the same ideas, goals or methods. They do mean recognizing that we are all working for a common cause, and although reserving our rights to individuality, innovation and competition, should operate in harmony, always attempting to reach agreement which permits the maximum degree of coordination. It

means realizing the advantages of intersociety communication and joint action in activi-

Disunity in the Humane Movement

other people and human institutions, are far from perfect. Any one group of humanitarians constituting a humane society tends to attract others with similar backgrounds, ideas, prejudices and objectives. Once it becomes established, it tends to operate in a certain groove, any major deviations from which are frowned upon by the majority in control. Minorities suggesting new or different goals or operational concepts encounter great resistance to change. This is true of governments, business corporations, churches and educational institutions, as well as of humane societies.

It would be unfortunate, indeed, if all of our human institutions should become fixed in a single unchanging pattern or mold. Real improvement would be blocked. Diversity of institutions, with freedom of choice, is essential for progress. Monolithic one-party governments show clearly the undesirable effects of such freezing of institutional patterns. So do highly authoritarian religious institutions. And anyone familiar with the appalling rigidities of university faculties and curricula must admit the student dissenters have some very legitimate points to make, however illegitimate the manner of making them.

The folly of depending upon continuing monopolies or oligarchies to achieve progress also is daily demonstrated in the business world. If any given manufacturing process or type of product were controlled by a single company, how many inventions of products and methods that have led to improvement in our economic standards of living would have been bottled up to preserve the status quo? If anything has been proved in the years following establishment of large communist economies, it is the economic superiority of free enterprise and competition. Contrast Japan and China!

Why, then, should we expect monopoly or oligarchy to achieve more for the humane cause than diversity, innovation and free choice? Unification, in the sense of absence of differences of opinion, goals and procedures, would stifle initiative and progress. It is the antithesis of achievement.

This viewpoint has been effectively delineated in a paper presented at the 93rd Annual Meeting of the American Humane Association at St. Paul, Minnesota, October, 1969, by Dr. Luther P. Gerlach. Although couched in the professional jargon of the sociologist, and written by a man obviously unfamiliar with the humane movement, this keynote address brought out very clearly the need for encouraging innovation of ideas, and of procedures for implementing them, in social institutions such as the humane movement. The AHA, which itself has been pictured frequently as an institution highly

ties where coordination is advantageous, without losing the advantages of initiative and new ideas.

What this really amounts to is: (1) putting the welfare of the animals above the apparent welfare of individual organization and the prestige of individual humane leaders; (2) trying to understand the viewpoint of others who disagree with us on some things, keeping an open mind and avoiding intransigence as if it were a plague; (3) avoiding personalities, bitterness and violent denunciation of others who are sincerely trying to do their best, even if we disagree with them; (4) attempting to work together in every way possible, taking advantage of every evidence of common ground for united action, even though we may choose to take different paths in pursuing other goals; (5) basing our actions on as objective analysis of our problems as is possible in view of the fact we are human beings subject to all of the personal imperfections of our species.

These precepts appear so obvious that our notation of them here may seem superfluous. Nearly everyone believes that he or she is fairly free of selfishness, false pride and intransigence. It is always the other fellow who is guilty of violating those principles. It is difficult for any of us, as
(See DISUNITY, page 2)

December, 1970

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

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS No. 14

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

Postmaster: Address Correction
Requested, Forwarding and
Return Postage Guaranteed

DISUNITY — from page 1

Robert Burns said, to see ourselves as others see us. In the following two sections we try to look in the mirror!

Sources of Disunity

In discussions of disunity in the humane movement there seems to be a failure to distinguish between three distinct sources of dissension.

First, there are the differences of opinion which result from differences in knowledge of conditions affecting animals and of the practical ways available to influence those conditions. This, which we believe to be the most important source of disunity, can be overcome only by humane education. When humanitarians use the latter term they usually think of educating others. Actually, the kind of humane education most needed now is the education of humanitarians. That is the principal purpose of these Reports to Humanitarians. The more we know about humane problems and alternative means of dealing with them, the less likely we are to be divided in our ideas and actions.

Secondly, there are some much more basic reasons for our differences of opinion. Some of these are based upon religion and other factors which are unlikely to be fully resolved. For example, a Christian Scientist approaches laboratory animal questions from an entirely different viewpoint than do those of other religious faiths. Some religions teach that only human beings have souls, putting humans in an entirely different class from animals, which are said to exist only for the benefit of man. They look upon animal welfare in a different light than those who believe that the difference between man and animal is only one of degree of development, and that if man has a soul, so do animals, and that if there is a heaven for people, there is also one for animals. Many other kinds of basic differences which go to make up the mores of any society contribute to the attitudes of that society toward animals, the goals of animal welfare, and what should be done in trying to achieve those goals.

This is well illustrated in the Latin countries. Many humanitarians are horrified over the way animals are treated in some Latin nations. Yet these peoples are exceptionally kind to children and are known for courtesy and consideration for other people. A host of factors, including religious training, cause them to look upon animals in an entirely different way than do people, for example, in the Anglo-Saxon countries.

Similar differences of mores among different groups of people also result in different attitudes toward animals of people within a country such as the United States. Members, directors and officers of humane societies come from many different walks of life and sections of the country, are the products of different religious, ethnic and cultural environments. These differences show up in the differences over objectives and alternative means of reaching those objectives. And these differences are much

more difficult to resolve than those based upon differences of knowledge about humane problems.

The important point for all of us to remember is that intolerance and intransigence will not help to iron out these differences. If we consider them calmly and tolerantly, they may continue to exist without becoming a source of acrimonious dissension within the humane movement.

Are We "People Haters"?

A third source of the loud dissension, bitter recrimination and destructive bickering in the humane movement is the defects of human personality, defects to which all groups of people are subject in greater or lesser degree. Getting along with each other seems to be the most difficult feat of all for human beings. That shows up in all human relationships, from those among countries to those among members of a family. Humanitarians are not exempt from this perfectly normal human tendency to quarrel. The organizational jealousies and personality clashes found in the humane movement also are found in churches and political, social and business organizations.

To some, however, it may appear that this tendency to quarrel, to follow divisive tactics, is more pronounced in the humane movement than in other social institutions. The psychologists even offer an explanation of these destructive tendencies among humanitarians. They claim that it is a reflection of the fact that many individuals who love animals intensely -- in other words, humanitarians -- are "people haters". Because of some traumatic childhood experiences, they have developed a subconscious inferiority complex which makes them feel unaccepted by society. They feel that most other people in some undefinable way are against them. They may get along with others in the superficial aspects of people-to-people contacts, but deep down inside they believe that other people dislike them, and so they dislike other people. Dogs, cats or other animals, which give them unquestioning acceptance, serve as substitutes for people in their affections. And, since other humanitarians are people, by attacking them they are satisfying the subconscious urge to strike back at people in general. What to "people lovers" would be mere differences of opinion or judgment, to be ironed out amicably by discussion and compromise, to the "people haters" become intolerable evidences of perfidy. So they denounce those who hold differing opinions as "venal traitors" to the humane cause and the animals, without realizing that by so doing they themselves are doing harm to the animals.

We at Humane Information Services have never been able to make up our minds as to whether the psychologists' explanation of our personality defects, which may account for part of the disunity in the humane movement, is correct or a figment of some overworked professional imaginations! When we consider the fact that we work ourselves to death seven days a week for no other reward than the satisfaction of helping the animals, there may be some truth in it. We certainly wouldn't do it for people!

In any event, it won't do any harm for us to think about what the psychologists say about us. It may help to keep us from engaging in the kind of vicious dissent which puts us in the same class as students who bomb campus buildings and engage in other acts of violence. Violence can be mental and verbal as well as physical. The one is just as ineffective as the other in achieving our goals. For the good of the animals and our cause we must curb these tendencies and at all times try to use persuasion rather than force or abuse of those who do not see things our way. And that applies to our contacts both within and without the humane movement.

Disagreement Over Objectives

In our thinking about unity and disunity, it is of utmost importance to distinguish between objectives and the alternative means of reaching those objectives.

The primary objective of most humanitarians is the prevention or reduction of suffering by animals. As has been discussed in preceding Reports, many humanitarians substitute for this primary objective the saving of the lives of animals. These are the people who object to putting dogs and cats to sleep in shelters, and in other ways greatly influence humane policies.

Also falling in this general group are the conservationists and wildlife enthusiasts, who spend their energy and money on preventing species from becoming extinct, or in saving the predators and prairie dogs from man's depredations, but do little or nothing to prevent the acute suffering of far greater numbers of domesticated animals.

But all of these groups which might not agree that the prevention or reduction of animal suffering is our primary objective will at least agree that it is an important one, although their neglect of the most important sources of suffering might indicate otherwise. Repeated efforts to obtain the active support of those interested in the preservation of wildlife for other humane programs frequently have elicited only lukewarm response, if any. Nevertheless, the latent interest and agreement is there. The active humanitarians, more concerned with "the prevention of cruelty to animals" than with saving lives, nevertheless are interested in conservation. The differences in objectives are a matter of degree or emphasis, not principle.

A closely related basic difference of objectives among humanitarians is found in the case of "vivisection". Some view the goal as the complete abolition of the use of animals in laboratories, while others center their attention and efforts upon the elimination of as much as possible of the suffering by animals used in the laboratories. This really is partly another manifestation of the difference between those whose primary goal is to avoid animal suffering and those who put life saving first. The latter would not agree to anything which permitted the sacrifice of animals' lives, even if all suffering should be avoided. They would object, for instance, to painlessly killing an animal in order to use its body for dissection in medical schools. They object on moral grounds against any life-taking exploitation of animals. It is difficult to discern the consistency between such moral objections to taking an animal's life in the laboratory, regardless of whether or not any suffering is involved, and taking its life in an abattoir to obtain meat. To be consistent, those antivivisectionists who take this particular stand must also be vegetarians.

But regardless of these subtleties, there seems to be no real difference between antivivisectionists and other humanitarians who would not now demand complete abolition because it is unattainable. We have discussed this with many humanitarians, and most of them have agreed that they would be willing to forego any possible health benefits to themselves or other people, if there were any possibility of attaining the A-V goal of complete abolition. Most humanitarians, we believe, are abolitionists at heart. Their differences with the antivivisectionists are not with respect to the moral issues involved, but with the practical questions pertaining to the means of reaching the objective. Should we follow an "all or nothing" or a "step-by-step" approach? Thus, what at first might seem to be a difference in objectives becomes in reality a difference in means of attaining the common goal.

Priorities Most Important

The most important differences of opinion among humanitarians over objectives are with respect to priorities. Quite obviously, the humane movement does not have the resources to effectively attack all humane problems at the same time. It is necessary to establish priorities. This should mean dealing with problems in order, according to the following criteria: (1) numbers of animals affected; (2) the average amount of suffering per animal; (3) the feasibility of action to reduce or eliminate the suffering.

This may sound theoretical or abstract. Actually, it is highly concrete. For example, let us take two sources of animal suffering: (1) slaughter of the baby seals on the ice in Canadian waters and of adult seals in Alaska, and (2) the trapping of wild fur animals all over the world.

The seal harvest involves less than one percent of fur animals killed yearly, and on the average they are killed with far less suffering than that experienced by other fur animals, and by far greater numbers of "baby" food animals, which have just as appealing big eyes and are even more lovable. In fact, thousands of puppies and kittens,

(See DISUNITY, page 3)

RETURN COUPON

If you did not return a coupon from one of our previous Reports, please place check marks in the appropriate spaces below and return in a stamped envelope to: Humane Information Services, Inc., 4521 - 4th Street South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705.

- (1) I wish _____ (do not wish _____) to be kept on the mailing list for future Reports to Humanitarians (you do not have to be a member or contribute to continue receiving them).
- (2) My name, address and ZIP code on the reverse side are _____ (are not _____) correct. If not, they are as follows: _____

(3) I wish to become:

- (a) an Associate Member and enclose \$1 annual dues _____; (any amount over \$1).
- (b) a Patron Member and enclose \$ _____ (any amount over \$1).
- (4) I am _____ (am not _____) able and willing to write occasional letters and report local conditions to you on request, in connection with programs for the protection of animals.

DISUNITY — from page 2

not to mention dogs and cats, suffer more during "euthanasia" in many humane society shelters. Moreover, there is not a great deal that can be done to eliminate the suffering of these seals. If the slaughter of the Canadian baby seals is eliminated, they will be taken later, while in the "beater" stage, with much more potential suffering. If the Alaskan seal harvest is eliminated, the seals would be taken on the open ocean with much greater suffering, under conditions which, until the Alaskan agreement went into effect, almost made the seals extinct. And even though the price of seal-skins may be reduced by propaganda, there still will be a market for all of the skins taken. So, not only is a comparatively negligible amount of suffering involved, but the possibilities of eliminating it are not good.

Now, in striking contrast, the trapping of wild fur animals involves vastly greater numbers of animals, killed in ways producing far more suffering per animal, and with a potential for doing something to end the cruelty much better than for seals. Yet, during the past few years some American, Canadian and world humane societies have made the seal harvest a major project, absorbing much of the limited resources of the humane movement, and diverting the attention of humanitarians from other humane problems of far greater importance and about which little or nothing has been done during these years of "baby seal" agitation.

Many other examples exist of the almost complete failure of the humane movement to establish priorities which would make our efforts very much more effective. Actually, with few exceptions, we have been frittering away the resources of the humane movement on activities which are relatively inconsequential, and almost totally neglecting the problems involving the most appalling amounts of animal suffering. Beyond any doubt, this is one of the most important reasons for the ineffectiveness of the humane movement since its formation. Humanitarians have fiddled while the great sources of cruelty to animals continued to burn.

What has been the matter with humane organizations? Why have they permitted this shocking situation to continue?

It is not because their officers and directors are unaware of the problems. For those who are, these Reports to Humanitarians are furnishing the needed information. No, it is the fact that humane societies, in the struggle for members and contributions, have been pressured into doing what is most popular among animal lovers, and have been unwilling to take the organizational risks of providing greater leadership in regard to priorities. They do what their contributors want them to do. And these contributors, few of whom understand what the problem of priorities is all about, more often than not demand action on the least important problems.

Members of humane societies tend to base their demands for action on what they can see themselves, such as what they read in the newspapers or see on TV, which usually feature animal problems involving relatively few animals and comparatively little total animal suffering. To them, individual animals are more interesting than large categories of animals, and specific cases more interesting than types of suffering. Every time humanitarians encounter some abuse of animals, no matter how relatively unimportant, they fire off letters to their humane societies demanding that something be done about it now, regardless of the effect of this upon much more important and basic humane work. Because humanitarians very rarely visit meat packing plants or fur trap lines, for instance, and are unfamiliar with other sources of the greatest amounts of animal suffering, the latter rate the lowest priorities in allocating humane society resources.

Disagreement Over Means of Implementing Objectives

Even more important than disagreement over objectives, as a source of disunity in the humane movement, are differences regarding the best means of reaching our goals.

A good example of this is furnished by the tremendous, continuing surplus of dogs and cats. Practically everyone agrees on the desirability of eliminating the surplus.

But there are almost as many opinions about the best way of doing so as there are humane societies and humanitarians. This subject was rather thoroughly examined in Report to Humanitarians No. 12.

Similarly, humanitarians and humane organizations cannot agree on what kind of action will be most successful in eliminating suffering by laboratory animals. The suggestions range from the strictest regulation to the promotion of voluntary efforts by the laboratories to solve the problem. In between are the various laboratory animal bills that have been introduced in Congress and various approaches to the promotion of replacement of animals in laboratories by other methods of research and testing. Since only portions of the humane movement can be rallied around any one of these proposals, it has been impossible to effectively bring to bear the total humane resources in an effort to obtain effective action.

And so it goes, right down the line of programs proposed to achieve our objectives. Most humanitarians, knowing little or nothing about the practical problems of obtaining legislation or inducing other action, form very decided opinions on all these questions about "how to do it". And they soon come to look upon any other proposals as no good, even as motivated by ulterior designs. This is in marked contrast to the comparable situation in business. It is difficult to imagine an industrial corporation in the electronics field having to argue with all of its stockholders about the technical processes and marketing problems involved in trying to make profitable use of the laser beam!

One reason that most humanitarians have difficulty in comprehending the practical problems involved in "marketing" our programs is the fact that they have no political or business experience, or any factual knowledge of the institutional conditions and public relations involved. To them, the maneuvering of humane societies in trying to affect governmental action on some problem may appear labored and ineffective. They visualize the problem as a simple matter of direct action.

Yesterday, for example, we received a very nice letter from a well-meaning member, who urged us to call on President Nixon and get him to set up an administrative agency to force the scientists to replace animals with tissue cultures and computers. "I would see him about this myself," she said, "except that I don't have the money for travel to Washington or clothes suitable for a call at the White House!"

Please understand. We are not making fun of this lady's earnest desire to do something which to her seems the simple act of calling something obviously desirable to the attention of the President. The obstacles to the proposed visit seem to her to be little greater than those attending a call on the mayor of a small town.

Many of the innumerable proposals about "how to do it" which are made by plenty of other people in the humane movement who should know better are hardly less impracticable. And when others with more experience do not immediately accede to these suggestions, they are likely to be denounced as indifferent to animal suffering or a tool of the establishment.

The only possible solution to this source of dissension in humane ranks is for all proposals to be offered and considered as objectively as possible, with the kind of critical analysis and scrutiny which would be given such proposals if made within a large industrial corporation. Humanitarians must learn to accept such examinations of current and proposed humane programs not as destructive or pessimistic, but as a constructive means of sifting the kernels from the chaff, of avoiding the impractical and the ineffective, without at the same time losing the potential benefits of the innovative.

That is one of the principal reasons why Humane Information Services was organized. No other humane society was doing the kind of research and development work, or making and publishing the kind of constructively critical analyses, required to make the activities of humane societies and humanitarians really effective.

This analysis may seem to some to be theoretical and academic. But we believe that most of you will conclude, as we do,

that "disunity" in the humane movement is a very much misunderstood subject, that the conditions which give rise to this disunity also contribute to the extreme ineffectiveness of humane society activity, and that it is time we began giving more attention to "theoretical" matters of this kind.

What Can You Do About Disunity?

What can you do about it? First, do not be taken in by societies and humane leaders who engage in bitter denunciation of other societies or humanitarians. Distinguish between constructive criticism, which is very much needed, and destructive denunciation. Secondly, think objectively, not subjectively, and rationally, not emotionally. Remember, the only reason that disunity exists among humane societies and humane leaders is that their members and followers support the divisive words and actions. The individual animal lovers who make up the humane movement could soon put a stop to disunity if they refused to support, with memberships and contributions, those organizations which indulge in name calling and other divisive tactics, and refuse to get together for amicable discussion of common problems.

FLORIDA BULLFIGHTS

The first so-called bloodless bullfights held in Florida under the new law were at Orlando in October. Dr. Thomsen attended and, with representatives of local and other societies, took the necessary steps to see that the "exhibition" was conducted without violation of law.

There was no physical cruelty in the ring, although the bulls were obviously frightened and bewildered by the noise and lights. Most of the time they ran around the ring looking for a way out. There was apparent abuse of, but no physical injury to, the animals in the stockade before entering the ring.

The "spectacle" was a drab, boring affair. Considerably fewer than a thousand people attended. Many left early, and some of those who remained booed the performance. Obviously, the promoters lost thousands of dollars, but say they will try again. An attempt to obtain use of public facilities to hold similar fights in Tampa was turned down. (All residents of Hillsborough County should note that Mr. Frank Neff, chairman of the County Commission, has expressed unalterable opposition to any bullfights.) And it is quite evident that few people will pay up to \$5 to attend such lackluster exhibitions, so long as the humane societies continue to prevent infractions of the law.

All of this was reported in detail by the National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., to its several thousand Florida members, who also received the names and addresses of those candidates for the legislature who responded favorably to NAHL's request for a pledge to repeal the bullfight law. Members of NAHL were urged to work for the election of these humane-minded candidates, and were given detailed directions on how to do so. The fight by NAHL for repeal will continue. NAHL has requested us to thank all of those who sent contributions for this purpose, which fund already has been practically exhausted. Six cents postage is required for all mailings by NAHL, which is not tax exempt and has no reduced-rate mailing permit. NAHL must again write to all legislators, and there will be the expense of lobbying at the State Capitol.

ABOUT NEUTERING TEDDY

In response to the request contained in our last Report, Emily received many more letters than expected, telling about the writers' experiences with neutered male dogs and cats. (To several who inquired, Teddy is a black and white toy collie.) These letters are so well written, and offer such excellent evidence of the effects of neutering, that we would like to reproduce all of them here. Since lack of space precludes, we are saving them for other important uses.

Nearly all of the correspondents reported no adverse effects from neutering, and pointed to various advantages for both owners and pets. Doc believes the letters fully support the position taken by many humanitarians in favor of neutering all male pets, from the standpoint of the welfare of the animals. Yet Emily remains adamant. The older Doc gets, the more difficulty he has in understanding women!

Our Officers' Corner

Good Advice - Unheeded!

One of our best friends, an experienced and capable officer of another national humane society, some time ago gave us good advice. Translated freely, it went as follows:

"You have made a fine impression during your first two years of operation. Everyone is talking about your Reports to Humanitarians. But you are making a big mistake by giving the impression that you are small and 'poor', and by being too personal. Your little homey references to Emily, Doc and Teddy make you appear to be a small society, when actually you are one of the largest in terms of people reached by your Reports and the influence you have on the humane movement. When my society was small, everybody on the staff wore several hats, acting as 'director' of this and that department. People won't give large sums to a small society, no matter how much good you are doing. They especially won't leave you sizable bequests in their wills, because they will be afraid that the continuance of the society in future years depends too much upon the continued good health and work of one or two officers. So my advice is to be much more formal in your Reports. Cut out the Doc and Emily stuff. It may help to get some of your members to identify with you, but they usually are the little contributors. The big contributors will support only the large, stable, continuing societies. They don't care about Doc and Emily and Teddy, but about Humane Information Services. They evaluate you as they would a business corporation."

We genuinely appreciated this excellent advice. The financial statement given below shows that it was sound. After three years of operation we receive in dues and contributions an amount which is only a drop in the bucket compared with other national societies having a comparable volume of operations, and which would not maintain a small local society. Only by keeping every penny of expense to a minimum, and running an annual deficit which reduces our nest egg contributed by Doc to care for emergencies, are we able to continually expand our mailing list and activities.

HUMANE INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.

Operating Statement

Twelve Months ending June 30, 1970

Income	
Contributions	\$5,676.07
Interest	962.59
Decrease in Net Worth (deficit)	1,436.76
	<u>\$8,075.42</u>
Expenses	
Automobile	\$ 49.60
Building Maintenance	259.76
Depreciation--building and equipment	977.34
Equipment Maintenance	29.63
Insurance	31.00
Loss on Foreign Exchange	3.19
Miscellaneous	171.26
Office Supplies	234.86
Postage	1,175.64
Publications	885.16
Taxes--Social Security	159.80
Travel	577.39
Utilities	192.79
Salaries and Wages	3,328.00
	<u>\$8,075.42</u>

This low state of our finances is not because our efforts are not appreciated. We believe we receive a volume of mail from our readers which compares in size and compliments with that of any other society. It shows that we really are influencing the thinking of the humane movement, and helping to accomplish concrete improvements in the welfare of animals. We have increased our selected mailing list to over eleven thousand, and have paid members in every state, and quite a few in foreign countries. But most contributions are quite small. They come from people who say they would like to give more, but live on very small incomes. One lady sends us a dollar every month when she receives her Social Security check, bless her heart. The large contributors, however, are few and far between. If a check for even \$100 arrives, it is a cause for celebration. Yet, we know of some societies which frequently receive checks for one or several thousand dollars.

EXCERPTS FROM A FEW OF THE MANY HIGHLY COMPLIMENTARY LETTERS FROM READERS

"I have just finished reading your Report to Humanitarians and am very impressed with your combination of compassion and intelligence."--A humanitarian in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

"Your (Reports to Humanitarians) provide much needed information to people in the (humane movement)."--Official of an international humane society.

"I want to tell you that the HIS reports are most informative and worthwhile. When an article starts real 'thinking'--and your reports do just that--the time and effort spent in research and writing is of benefit to both mankind and animals."--A professional writer.

"I have been a constant admirer of your publications, and, whenever I have mentioned this for instance recently in Washington, I have evoked enthusiastic agreement."--Foundation officer.

"Almost daily, as I visit people, I continue to hear praises heaped on the Report."--Field representative of a national humane society.

"Your Report is tremendous. Thank you."--A California humanitarian.

"We appreciate the fine work that Humane Information Services is doing in all fields of animal welfare--in keeping us up to date and knowledgeable."--Officer of a Canadian humane society.

"I miss you on the board but I feel that the work you are doing with the Humane Information Services, Inc., may well be more valuable to the humane movement."--Member of board of directors of a national humane society.

"Thank you very much for 'Report to Humanitarians'. I read every word and may I congratulate you on behalf of all animal welfare workers on a really excellent and very informative report."--Official of a humane society in India.

"It is gratifying to meet up with an Animal Society willing to tackle the big problems, and I wish you success in every field--but it's going to be a battle!"--A South African humanitarian.

"I write you from Australia to say how much we appreciate your lucid reasoning, and the extreme lengths you go to to explain your viewpoint and to set out the matter in discussion and how much this can and should help others. Your long article on the fur trade is also very much appreciated as a guide and help to those vitally concerned, as very many in this country are."--President of a humane society in Australia.

"Thank you very much for sending (Reports to Humanitarians). It is a most valuable document. It should be read by everyone."--Officer of a British humane society.

"Your (Reports to Humanitarians) are the most refreshing things in humane literature I have seen in years! I thoroughly appreciate your objective and dispassionate treatment of the problems, especially in contrast to the maudlin emotional appeals and self-congratulation that pervade the issuances of many humane groups."--A New York State humanitarian.

"Your reports have been of great interest to me, and I congratulate you on your positive work."--Official of a world-wide humane organization.

"Another terrific issue."--A Massachusetts humanitarian.

"Your excellent Report to Humanitarians has just been received. Kindly accept our deep appreciation of the contents as well as the manner of presentation."--Government official in India.

"I have the greatest admiration for your work and especially for the Reports to Humanitarians. You provide a unique, highly intelligent and much-needed service."--Widow of a noted pioneer in the humane movement.

"Yours is the most thorough, realistic and informative publication on humane information possible approaches to the problems I have come across."--An Ohio humanitarian.

"Thank you very much for sending us your most interesting reports! They are put to good use in our society."--A South American humane society officer.

"Sitting in the office yesterday, I was trying to compose something like publicity on the surplus animals and excoriating the humane societies for not telling the truth. Upon arriving home last night, I discovered you had said it all and then some."--Executive director of a world-famous humane society.

Why haven't we followed our friend's well-meant and sound advice? Well, it is because only one of our staff receives any monetary compensation, and that only sufficient to keep the wolf from the door. We work very hard, every day. We have not had a day's vacation since we started operation. Our only reward is the secure knowledge that we really are accomplishing something, and the satisfying personal relationship we have with so many fine people who, like us, are true animal lovers. We wouldn't want to give up these personal relationships even if it did result in getting more contributions. We feel that we know personally hundreds of humanitarians, their families and pets. And they feel that they know us, and can trust us not to let them down.

That kind of feeling makes it possible to say some critical things in our Reports which are necessary to help the animals, but which without this feeling of mutual trust and regard would be resented. We "tell it like it is", but receive remarkably few complaints or criticisms. Elsewhere on this page are some excerpts from a few of your fine letters which make our days, and pep us up when we feel tired or discouraged. We wouldn't give up this feeling of being part of a big family united in a common cause,

for any amount of money. So Emily, Doc and Teddy will continue to enter your homes as in the past, not wearing any hats or other pretenses.

However, we wish to assure any potential big contributors, and especially potential legators who may wish to remember us in their wills, that we are fully aware of their need for continuity, and for a staff large enough to carry on action programs in addition to our research and analyses covered these Reports to Humanitarians. We are able to give positive assurances of continuing financing and professional direction to support at least the present level of activity when Doc may be no longer able to carry on. An extremely well-qualified successor to take over the work now performed by Doc already has been selected. Emily is young, and will continue to keep Humane Information Services honest and devoted only to the animals, long after most of us are gone.

So, you potential big contributors and legators, let's hear from you! Anything we receive will be used to carry on action programs which are extremely urgent and potentially useful. Your money won't be frittered away on inconsequentials, or in paying big salaries and expenses. Every penny will go for really helping the animals.