

Selected Articles

WHY NOT COERCIVE LEGISLATION?

By Joan Wastlhuber and Karen Johnson

We are concerned about the pressure for coercive legislation as a means to solve the problem of pet overpopulation throughout the country. Euthanasia of healthy adoptable animals is tragic and the numbers appear to be excessive. The reasons for this are multifarious, therefore solutions are complex and will differ in each community and state. We would like to pass on some thoughts which may be useful in your area. Awareness and involvement in this issue will help you determine if the proposed ordinance is the best alternative for your community. First ask questions.

1. Does your city/county/state require that all adult dogs and cats being placed from your pounds/shelters be altered before adoption and prior to release from impoundment? This is a critical factor in reducing irresponsible breeding. Is the shelter aware of "early altering" and the number of humane organizations already altering kittens and puppies prior to maturity. A scientific study is underway to determine any long term effects of early altering. (1)
2. Is there a provision for the shelter to collect a deposit for future altering but no contract to enforce this and no follow through procedure? The HSUS Guidelines for Responsible Pet Adoptions state that "the shelter must be able to confirm that at least 90% of its adopted animals are sterilized to ensure that the shelter itself is not contributing to the pet overpopulation problem." (2)
3. Assure that you receive an accurate count of the real number of animals euthanized at your shelters because they are UNWANTED. Distinguish this statistic from those euthanized because they are UNADOPTABLE. The unadoptable count will include healthy animals who are otherwise unsuitable for adoption.
 - a. Go to your county or city clerk's office (depends with whom the shelter contracts) and ask to see a copy of the contract between the shelter and the city/county.

In this contract you should find a paragraph requiring the shelter to make a quarterly/annual report to a government office. Get a copy of the contract and take it to the office specified in the contract. Ask for a copy of this required report for the last few years. **THIS IS PUBLIC RECORD.** Analyze (or let us analyze) the numbers and send a copy to the CFA Legislative Committee, c/o Jerry Woolard, 13411 West 57th Avenue, Shawnee, KS 66216; and the National Pet Alliance, c/o Karen Johnson, 5969 Sorrel Avenue, San Jose, CA 95123.

- b. The report, based on our experience, may indicate that the findings on which proposed legislation is based are misleading and present an inaccurate picture. They may include all animals - injured, sick, dead, vicious, unweaned animals, euthanasia requests at surrender, untamable feral cats, etc. - in their goals to eliminate euthanasia. Your objective is to determine how many **HEALTHY, ADOPTABLE ANIMALS ARE BEING EUTHANIZED.**
- c. Separate the figures for healthy adoptable animals from the feral cats (genetically domestic cats reverted to a wild state). These two categories require different solutions: the first may be affected by adoption outreach, increased advertising, use of special assistance grants, the shelter policies on screening, hours open, foster home and other programs as well as numerous factors which could be modified. The second could only be affected by feral cat trap/alter/release programs in areas which are secure for the cats (parks, campuses, etc.), foster care to tediously tame some of these cats and cooperation with the Farm Bureau.

Coercive - Governing by force.

4. Does your shelter have low cost spay/neuter facilities. It is estimated to cost \$30+ for a shelter to handle each animal. All shelters would benefit by assuring that animals placed at the very least are not capable of reproduction. According to one study, 16% of unspayed cats and a comparable number of dogs in the population reproduced. (3)
If there is a low cost altering clinic, is it available to the general public?
5. Has the community considered a certificate program in which all pet owners can get low cost spay/neuter services from a veterinarian of their choice. (4)
6. Although cats euthanized are the primary problem, pedigreed cats represent only an estimated 3% to 8% of the total cat population. Find out, with the help of the CFA central office, how many breeders, ongoing and active in registering litters, are within your area. Most likely the number will be extremely low. It will help illustrate that targeting pedigreed cat breeders is no solution and that this will not bring anticipated revenue.

Coercive legislation should be the last resort. Bureaucracy is expensive and infringes on our rights. Voluntary methods with incentives should be tried first. Educational efforts have not been fully exhausted. Eliminating deterrents to adoption, such as licensing of dogs without addressing zoning and limit laws, have not been tried. Identification of cats to facilitate reclaim has not been fully explored.

The push for breeder directed legislation seems to be part of an Animal Rights Activist agenda to eliminate pedigreed cats and dogs and eventually ALL companion animals. Control through laws, licenses, permits, etc. could make perpetuating the breeds of cats economically and practically impossible. The most dangerous tactic, used to obtain backing from the general public and media, is to mask this ultimate Animal Rights Activist goal in proposals which have easy public acceptance, i.e. "pet overpopulation."

The facts and findings of pet overpopulation are not related to pedigreed cat and dog breeding. All data indicates that the problem is mainly related to free-roaming and feral cat multiplication. Increase in human population density and the increased desire for cats as pets is a factor. Pet store and "backyard breeder" indiscriminate selling of animals without altering contracts and follow through is a factor. To focus on regulations attacking responsible breeders is not the solution.

Pedigreed cat breeders provide education, funds and help raise the status of all cats. They can continue to contribute to solutions if they are not alienated by humane organizations which are insensitive to their interests.

Pedigreed cat and dog breeders are not comfortable with legislators determining cattery or kennel management, proper environment for breeding animals and especially reproductive decisions concerning numbers or spacing of litters. A national certification program (perhaps with CFA/AKC/AVMA/HSUS cooperation) may be a better alternative for problems concerning these issues. Assuring the **WELFARE** of breeding animals is not directly related to **pet overpopulation**. It is a separate matter.

Cost of compliance with legislative solutions is high. The suggestion that offenders will be discovered by community reporting and by license checking, thereby saving expense, is offensive in a free society. A "spy system" of neighbors, veterinary clinic workers and surveys of newspaper ads, etc. sets up an atmosphere of distrust in the community.

Legislative proposals can be a means to avoid scrutiny of poor Humane Shelter management. Existing policies leading to the choice of euthanasia over outreach or because of lack of cage space, poor hours, refusal to solicit grant support, explore new programs, eliminate deterrents to adoption, etc. should be changed prior to consideration of new laws.

New animal shelter policies must be considered, and given a trial period, prior to coercive legislation: some ideas which might be workable in your area:

1. Altering all adult animals before adoption and early altering of kittens and puppies.
2. Cooperation with feral cat altering/release groups.
3. Voluntary cat identification should be implemented using the new low cost microchip implants (can be scanned at a distance of 8" and do not require anesthesia to insert; may be inserted by veterinarians at the time of vaccination). Safety collars could be another option offered. Identification allows cats to be reunited with their owners. (Microchips may also be useful to the cat fancy for parentage verification in the future.)
4. Discount certificates for spay/neuter allowing owners a choice of low cost clinics or participating veterinarians who are reimbursed from a special fund may increase voluntary altering.
5. A higher cost for dog license and cat registration for unaltered animals would provide money for a spay/neuter program and further encourage altering.
6. Free roaming animals, causing nuisance and reproducing are a major source of community animal problems. When a dog is impounded 2 or 3 times the requirement to alter is not unreasonable; when a cat is impounded once fees and altering requirements might be considered. An appeals board would handle unusual circumstances for properly licensed/identified animals.
7. Critical to any licensing of dogs/identification of cats is to eliminate or modify the existing community "limit laws" so that people will not fear compliance. If numbers of animals need to be stipulated, dogs and cats should be separately considered and the limits should be based on conditions related to potential nuisance or public danger, not arbitrary figures. Whether the animals are totally indoors, housing is well spaced from neighbors, etc. are factors for determination.
8. Propose a spay/neuter "amnesty" program with free or very low cost altering offered to city/county residents for a specific length of time. Require proof of license/identification or certification at surgery time to help defray costs.

All of these suggestions are alternatives to the pressure to pass laws. Education of irresponsible people must continue as part of any effort to reduce pet overpopulation. Feral cats don't buy licenses nor do they have owners to alter them. The community which states a goal of "zero population growth" must face this big obstacle. Although feral cat trap/release programs have been successful, there are circumstances in which the cats may be subjected to conditions which are more inhumane than euthanasia. (5)

Many people have supported the passage of radical legislation believing that it is at least something, a start. A real start would be implementation of the alternatives suggested above and utilizing the ability of national organizations, such as CFA, combined with local efforts. It is time to appreciate the part that cat fanciers play in improving fundamental attitudes regarding the value and status of all cats. Passage of coercive legislation will sidetrack and thwart this important objective.

References:

1. R.H. Winn Foundation Report and Grant Award Announcement, Developmental and Behavioral Effects of Prepubertal Gonadectomy in the Domestic Cat; CFA Almanac, April 1991, pg. 99.
2. HSUS Guidelines for Responsible Pet Adoptions, January 1990.
3. R. Nassar et al, Study of the feline and canine populations in the Greater Las Vegas Area, AmJ Vet Res. Vol 45, No 2, Feb 1984, pg 282-287.
4. S. Easterly, The Humane State; Cat Fancy, November 1990, pg. 38-39.
5. P. Wright, Feral Cats Revisited, Cat Fancy, November 1990, pg 2. ❀❀❀

Animal Rights: The Politically Correct Movement of the 90's?

BY PATTI STRAND

Mrs. Strand, Merry Go Round Dalmatians has been breeding and exhibiting for over 20 years and has provided over 100 champions.

In 22 years of breeding dogs I've periodically had pangs of guilt for all the time and money we've poured into our dogs. This amount of effort and passion might have cured world hunger. My husband likewise goes through periods of concern that we don't live like most folks and that we haven't accumulated the kind of wealth we expected when we were both in college 25 years and 50 champions ago. And what effect has our unending breeding program with summer vacations at the National Specialty rather than trips to Yellowstone Park had on our teenage son? I feel an apology welling up in my throat each time the thought of one of my in-laws crosses my mind and I recall the last family gathering we missed due to a dog show, a whelping or a dog seminar. A friend from college came by to visit recently (after a 25-year separation) and I again felt like apologizing for having been on another planet for over two decades.

Our successes in dogs have served to explain our hobby to family and some close friends. But those unfamiliar with the fancy simply can't understand our ongoing attraction to the sport. Ours is a difficult hobby to explain!

Throughout all my apologies and explanations though, for dog hair and unattended parties, it never occurred to me that the art and sport of breeding, raising and showing purebred dogs itself would come under serious attack and be asked to apologize, cease and desist.

That time is now at hand! They say that a frog tossed into boiling water will leap out unharmed, while another placed in a pot of cool water which is warmed gradually as it is brought to a boil will be lulled to sleep before its execution. So it has been with the purebred dog community and the growth of the animal rights extremist's agenda. Twenty years ago the biomedical community was targeted, then trappers and furbearers, hunters and today, the sport of purebred

dogs has been added to the agenda. Coast to coast, the heat has been increasing for years. The point of the frog illustration is that by the time the heat is detectable, it's too late. To save our sport and our right to breed dogs, it is critical that we all learn what we are up against, recognize the seriousness of the threat and immediately become involved.

To put this in perspective, the last decade has seen unprecedented growth in the ranks and sophistication of animal rights activist groups. In days gone by, terrorist or militant acts carried out by such groups as the ALF (the Animal Liberation Front, a domestic terrorist group listed by the FBI) and PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) were seen by the public as radical and bizarre, courts found their acts to be criminal. Legislators avoided their extreme positions and neither arson nor spray-painting fur coats won the public's heart or its pocketbook.

But the leopard has changed his spots! Enter the new and improved, evangelical and totally trendy, animal rights movement of the 90's. Doctrinaire and plugged into every topic of the day, from environmentalism to new age, one world government and personal responsibility issues, they've got it all. PAWS (the Progressive Animal Welfare Society) and similar modern groups who align themselves with extremists in the new animal rights movement have become masters of propaganda and experts second to none in using the media. Deceptively framed issues make effective emotional appeals to humane and unsuspecting audiences, well-dressed, perfectly trained spokespeople dish up servings of guilt, opportunities to scapegoat others and enlightenment, en route to fundraising, swaying public opinion and rearranging society through legislation which redistributes human rights (it's impossible to give an animal a right without first taking one away from a human).

The issue of puppy mills is a prime example. Who after all, among the purebred dog community or the public at large is in favor of puppy mills? Consensus issues like these are used at first to fan the flames of emotional outrage. The second step comes when the uproar is used as a springboard to introduce ordinances which are so broadly drawn that they not only ban exploitive acts such as the so-called puppy mills, but also effectively restrict the breeding practices of the most scrupulous breeders. This process pleases a number of political interests, while public funds for human services are diminishing (which includes enforcement for animal control legislation already on the books); politicians can appear in the media to be animal lovers, while turning up the heat on animal possession and ownership rights.

The difference between "animal welfare" and "animal rights" is enormous! This difference is blurred in the media to the extent that many "humane" people (including our own dog people) are genuinely confused. This confusion has led to the development of what we now call "the humane industry", an industry which exploits compassion, and sets one segment of the community against another under the pretense of animal welfare, generating an enormous amount of capital in the process.

Because of media exposes and direct attacks, animal user groups become defensive, apologetic and often fall prey to the tendency to point fingers at others who "are the real problem." This moral one-upmanship game gets breeders to point the finger at pet shops and pet shops at breeders, trainers at veterinarians and most of the above at the AKC. Predictably this reaction makes the activists' favorite "divide and conquer" techniques extremely effective. Further, the use of scapegoating as a fundraising technique has been "wildly" successful for the "animal rights movement."

ANIMAL RIGHTS BY STRAND

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 66

The combined animal rights network has an annual budget estimated at between \$50,000,000 and \$200,000,000!

Scapegoating has no historic role in honorable political movements. Rather, it has existed throughout time as the handmaiden of hidden agendas and mean-spirited goals. The hidden agenda in the animal rights movement is the total abolition - not the reformation - of animal use in society. The glue that holds this cultic-metaphysical system together is not pro-animal but rather anti-human.

Throughout time man has debated the proper role to adopt concerning personal responsibility for animals in his environment. Major world religions have dealt with this question. At one end of the spectrum are people who believe that man has full and total right to do whatever he desires in the area of so-called lower animals: participation in blood sports such as bullfighting, pit contests and other forms of animal sacrifice fall into this category, which can be termed "animal exploitationist." Literally, this classification regards man's entertainment as more important than the life of an animal.

At the other end of this spectrum are people who represent the belief that the only ethical behavior man can adopt in relation to an animal is one of "animal protection." (This position dovetails to some degree with environmental causes and their spokespeople - i.e. Endangered Species Act supporter John Hoyt, who is also President of the Humane Society of the United States.) For people at this end of the spectrum, even sports such as dog shows, service work performed by guide dogs, 4-H programs and obedience work all represent forms of unacceptable "slavery." They believe that domestication itself represents a form of unethical manipulation by man and they do not believe that the deliberate breeding of animals by humans is ever justified. Kim Sturia, a major spokesperson for animal rights, says that someday dog breeding should become an unacceptable practice like smoking and drunk driving! Some at this end of the spectrum claim that the decision as to whom to save from a burning house, choosing between a pet and the life of a child, would depend on which was closest. They literally believe in equal rights for animals!

These radical beliefs are held so intensely that bizarre public relations and news coverage events have been staged to jolt (and emotionalize) public attention. PAWS, which is a major player in the animal rights movement of the Northwest, puts dogs and

cats to sleep on television to make a public point about pet overpopulation and to garner support for legislation which would restrict or ban dog breeding. The Animal Liberation Front, which has claimed responsibility for two cases of arson in the Northwest this spring, believes that crimes committed on behalf of freeing animals are ethically justifiable. A questionnaire published by PETA recently asks respondents whether illegal activities are ever justified when the intent is to rescue suffering animals.

The environmental wing of this movement is as likely to quote religious figures as scientists when discussing issues such as animal protectionism. The religion it most closely resembles is Hindu, but in fairness to that religion it should be added that they've borrowed only those trendy doctrines which fit their larger goals. Animal rights is not a religion in the strictest sense. It is a cult with an "ends justifies the means" mentality. If this were not the case they'd use education rather than emotional manipulation to win converts and they'd oppose terrorism as a political enforcement tactic.

As a political movement they resemble the fascist model. Their intellectual elite have determined that they have the answer, the only answer, for the rest of mankind. Further, they've decided that mankind, through self interest, greed and stupidity is not capable of grasping the importance and truth of their beliefs, hence, the majority of the population must be propagandized and regulated into compliance. For those who continue to oppose them, the ALF serves as a terrorist enforcer, their military police.

We dog breeders oppose both the exploitationists and the animal rights extremists and have an orientation which places the vast majority of us squarely in the middle of the spectrum. Specifically, we believe in the concept, termed "animal welfare," which is based on the Judeo-Christian premise that man has dominion over the animals to the extent that he serves as a responsible, non-exploitive "steward." Clearly, in this metaphysical system, man and animal do not have equal rights. We would choose the life of a child over that of our most beloved pet. In our "Golden Rule" the term "others" is not exclusive, but it does mean humans first!

Our sport is vulnerable. To do a "reality check" on this premise, ask ten friends casually what they think about "biomedical research." Based on what we've seen and heard during the last several months, we'd guess that the majority won't even answer the question but instead will talk about how much they disapprove of "cosmetic testing." As with the pet overpopulation issue, you'll find that animal rights propaganda has already distorted the subject so greatly

that facts may never gain access to the discussion. Did you know, for instance that all over the United States there has been a tremendous decline in the number of dogs entering the shelters over the past two decades and a parallel decline in the number of animals euthanized? We have a long way to go and much more work to do, but the truth is that public education, spay-neuter clinics and breeder contracts that require spaying and neutering are having an enormous, though incremental effect. In fact, many animal control workers don't use the term pet overpopulation feeling instead that what we currently have is an unwanted pet problem. A major study introduced by the AVMA suggests that most dogs who enter shelters today may be healthy but have behavior problems due to improper purchaser/owner expectations and improper or non-existent puppyhood training.

Notwithstanding these facts and trends, the animal interest landscape is continually being colored by groups who would prefer a specific appearance for a very specific political advantage. The strength of the movement is gained by tactics which range from outright manipulation to opportunistic association, having visibly cozied up to the environmental groups, animal rights activists strike an even more "politically correct" and recognizable posture and continue to gain credibility from an urban public whose knowledge of animal issues comes primarily from Walt Disney.

As the animal rights movement gains momentum in the 90's, it is critical that we dog breeders who love our sport and work with our animals constantly as a labor of love... rather than a doctrinaire methodology to gain access to the "new age," get our positive message out to the public. I, for one, am proud to be part of a sport which provides competition that gives everyone - from whatever background - the opportunity to develop; that is a participation sport rather than a spectator sport and thereby provides the potential for physical fitness for all its entrants, that allows families to participate together and children to grow through such programs as 4-H and Junior Showmanship, a sport which has as a judging criterion an assessment of a person's ability to nurture an animal into a mentally and physically healthy being, that supports the use of dogs for physically limited people, and which, throughout the recent violent decades, has remained virtually drug-free and positive. Our sport is not without problems. There is no endeavor in which man has ever participated that is problem free. Our test lies in whether we love our sport enough to work toward its improvement without falling victim to tactics designed to cause us to scapegoat its participants and institutions into oblivion. □

THE WRONGS OF ANIMAL RIGHTS ACTIVISM AND HOW THEY AFFECT YOU

by LEE WALLOT, Sharlindemar Collies

Until just a few months ago I, like most of you, considered the possibility that animal right activists could actually stop the breeding of purebred dogs and cats extremely remote. I was so engrossed in raising my puppies and showing my adults that I didn't notice the growing influence of their cause. San Mateo passed a non-breeding ordinance but I blithely thought: "It will never happen here." Furthermore, I was convinced the public would see through their lies and distortions. That was an extremely naive and ultimately dangerous perception.

In our willingness to be flexible and make compromises, we have already allowed the politicians to be manipulated by the animal rights activists into introducing extremely restrictive legislation. We did not know, as we do now, that to compromise with them is to sign our own death warrants as animal owners. We blindly did not see what was happening and then we recoiled in shock when they actually got the legislation they wanted.

The issue is ANIMAL RIGHTS which is fundamentally different from animal welfare, an observation most of us have overlooked. Animal rights groups call for the TOTAL ELIMINATION OF OWNERSHIP AND USE by humans of ANY ANIMAL (dog, cat, horse, cow, chicken, etc.). We dog owners are only a part of the total agenda.

Although the humane and animal welfare societies started out many years ago with animal welfare as their concern, the leadership of many has been increasingly subverted by the animal rights activists taking over the governing boards. One such take-over is graphically detailed in an excerpt from "Who Will Live, Who Will Die" by Katie McCabe, THE WASHINGTONIAN, August 1986. It says:

"Along with his lobbying efforts on national issues, McArde (of the Humane Society of the United States...HSUS) coordinates and guides local humane societies into taking a more aggressive animal-rights stance. On his desk during an interview is a letter from the Peninsula Humane Society in San Mateo, CA, one of the country's wealthiest organizations.

According to the December 18, 1985 SAN MATEO TIMES, a 'surprise coup' at the Society by local activists forced the resignation of the board's conservative members, one of whom said, 'I am resigning because I do not agree with the philosophy of the extreme activists.'

The radicalization of local humane societies is a nation-wide phenomenon. Says PETA's Ingrid Newkirk "Humane societies all over the country are adopting the animals rights philosophy (and are) becoming vegetarian."

Increasingly, we see attempts by the activist humane societies to lead the public into believing that they are not a part of the total animal rights movement. Don't you believe it! Look below the surface. Read beyond their deception of denial and you will find they subscribe to the same ideals and goals. They may want you to think of them as "apples and oranges" but in reality they are all fruits. I prefer to think of them as a piece of cloth with one end kept shining and clean by carefully working within the legal and political system and the other end being dirty, tattered and frayed as they go about their work using terrorism, hate campaigns and smear tactics. The two ends may not look the

same but the same thread runs through the entire length of that cloth.

There is no such thing as separate philosophies and goals among the literally hundreds of different animal rights groups. They are ALL working on their piece of the action toward the same goal - the goal that 90% of their followers and workers don't even know about or at least refuse to admit - the goal that is the eventual ELIMINATION of the use and ownership of ALL ANIMALS by human beings.

Can't happen, you say? Too far out, you say? Let me tell you, it IS happening. Now. And has been happening, little by little, for years. If you don't believe so, ask the biomedical researchers who have been hit with so many new restrictive laws (pushed by the activists) and so much terrorism (by the activists) that continuing their research will cost billions more than it should. Or ask the McDonalds restaurant owners that were the object of terrorists threats and harassment because they dared sell hamburgers and chicken. (You have to kill cows and chickens to get such food, you know.) Or ask the outdoorsmen who have been fighting for years to keep their right to hunt and fish from being taken away from them. And now it is happening to the breeders of dogs and cats.

Read the agenda printed below. It was written by an animal rights activist and published in an animal rights activist magazine. It is the world they are in the process of LEGISLATING into existence. They have been telling us for years exactly what their goals are but we weren't listening. (Remember Hitler's "Mein Kampf"?)

1. Abolish by law all animal research.
2. Outlaw the use of animals for cosmetic and product testing, classroom demonstration and in weapons development.
3. Vegetarian meals should be made available at all public institutions, including schools.
4. Eliminate all animal agriculture.
5. No herbicides, pesticides or other agricultural chemicals should be used. Outlaw predator control.
6. Transfer enforcement of animal welfare legislation away from the Department of Agriculture.
7. Eliminate fur ranching and end the use of furs.
8. Prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing.
9. End the international trade in wildlife goods.
10. Stop any further breeding of companion animals, including purebred dogs and cats. Spaying and neutering should be subsidized by state and municipal governments. Abolish commerce in animals for the pet trade.
11. End the use of animals in entertainment and sports.
12. Prohibit the genetic manipulation of species.

(From: "Politics of Animal Liberation" by Kim Bartlett, ANIMAL AGENDA, November, 1987)

They are not my words. They are the words of the animal rights activists themselves. THIS IS THE AGENDA the activists are seeking to legislate into our lives and yet, because they are so skillful in separating (in people's minds) the various parts of the agenda, most of the people never even see the total picture.

The hunters think they are the target. The researchers think they are the target. The fur people think they are the target. The dog and cat people are new to all this and they are dismayed to find that they are the target. What is important to understand here is that **WE ALL ARE THE TARGETS**. This new religion - or cult - or philosophy - or movement or whatever you want to call it - has only one goal: To change our lives forever by **FORCING** us to adopt their beliefs. They are doing this by making their beliefs into **LAW**. Little by little the legislation they are responsible for having introduced is being put into law. Little by little those seemingly "good for the animals" laws are eating away at the right of human beings. Little by little those laws are bringing us closer and closer to the legal status that Ingrid Newkirk of PETA declared as her personal moral philosophy. To emphasize how she feels about the equality of man and animals, she said: "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy." The animal rights activists subscribe to this theory, that all animals are equal to humans and, therefore, deserve the same right as humans.

Which includes our dogs. Which means they feel no dog should be "enslaved" by being owned by a human being. Which brings us to the **REAL** goal behind the breeding bans that are sweeping across the country. Which brings us to the truth of what those breeding bans are really meant to accomplish. Which is to eliminate the ownership of dogs by human beings.

Ingrid Newkirk (PETA) herself has told us this is their goal. In her own words she has said: pet ownership is an "absolutely abysmal situation brought about by human manipulation." She further defines the steps that she feels should be taken to achieve this "liberation" of the pets in our animal kingdom. Read these words and remember them. They were said by the co-founder of PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals), the same PETA that hundreds of us have so willingly supported all these years in the mistaken belief that we were supporting a group that cared about animal welfare.

Newkirk says: "I don't use the word 'pet'. I think it's speciest language. I prefer 'companion animals'. For one thing, **WE WOULD NO LONGER ALLOW BREEDING**. People could not create different breeds. There would be no pet shops. If people had companion animals in their homes, those animals would have to be refugees from the animal shelters and the streets. You would have a protective relationship with them just as you would an orphaned child. But as the surplus of dogs and cats (artificially engineered by centuries of forced breeding) declined, eventually **COMPANION ANIMALS WOULD BE PHASED OUT** and we would return to a more symbiotic relationship...enjoyment from a distance." **HARPERS MAGAZINE**, August, 1988. Think about those words. "We would no longer allow breeding." The breeding bans impose this restriction.

"...those animals would have to be refugees from the animal shelters..." The breeding bans, if carried across the country the way the activists are trying to do, would eliminate the purebred breeders. Therefore, the only dogs available to the public would have to be from the shelters.

There is one part of these breeding bans that she does not directly call out but it is a very real part of the agenda. The San Mateo ban and others like it call for the mandatory spaying and neutering of dogs and cats. The only exceptions allowed would carry a price tag so outrageous that it would be financially impossible to comply.

Where does this lead us? 1) Purebred dogs are eliminated by the breeding bans; 2) Mixed breeds are eliminated by the

mandatory spay and neuter laws; 3) What is left to reproduce after this is all over, folks?

"Not so!" the activists protest. "We love animals. Look at the millions we have adopted out over the years. We don't want to eliminate dogs. We just want to stop the killing," they cry.

Look again at Newkirk's quote. We humans would be the "caretakers", the "guardians" of those shelter animals but only until such time as **THERE ARE NO MORE**. "Eventually companion animals would be phased out..." Do those words sound like their goal is to allow you to have animals in your home?

Are you upset? You should be. Are you scared? You should be. Are you going to do something about it? You'd better or else the animal rights activists are going to do it for you...**THEIR WAY**.

As in all of their campaigns against all of the users of animals in any way, they have found the emotional key that enables them to sway people blindly to their side and enables them to get the multi-million dollar operating budget they have achieved through donations from the uninformed. Emotionalism and guilt are triggered by the grotesque campaign methods they use. In the case of biomedical research they used the (staged) posters with Domitia, the now-famed Silver Spring monkey, and they sought to halt an entire research industry by hammering away at a few very real instances of misuse. In the case of the fur industry, they use the photos of animals...dead and caught in traps... as well as posters of a woman dragging a fur coat, trailing a pool of blood. In the meat industry they get 20/20 to cover the very real mistreatment of downed animals at slaughter yards while ignoring the 98% of the meat industry that is responsible and concerned for the humane treatment of their animals, even in the slaughterhouse. In the dog and cat world, they show barrels of dead dogs and cats and execute them publicly on T.V. and in the newspapers while ignoring the literally billions of dogs and cats that are well cared for and loved by most of the human race.

They are smart. They are media-wise. They know how to work the political system to get the legislation they want. **THEY ARE DANGEROUS!**

In the issues of our dogs and cats, they have jumped on the very real problem we have to contend with: overpopulation. That problem needs to be addressed. By you. By me. By all of us. But we must address the problem with solutions that will work for us. The solution is not the elimination of dogs and cats from our households.

Or is it? Is this what you think the solution should be?

Decide for yourself and the **DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT**. If you feel the activists' solution is not the right one, **GET INVOLVED**. Join and support with your money, your time and your commitment, one of the many groups forming to fight the activists. If you are not a registered voter, **GET REGISTERED**. If you are not politically inclined, **GET POLITICALLY INVOLVED ANYWAY**. You will learn, just as we are learning.

We cannot ignore the threat in the hope it will go away. We cannot compromise with their demands because each compromise is a victory for them, another step toward their ultimate goal. We cannot sit back and "let somebody else do it" because nobody else is doing it. You are the somebody else who has to. We cannot wait because in the last ten years, the animal rights activists movement has done nothing except get stronger and bigger and better financed all the time.

NOW is the time to stop them. Not tomorrow. Not next month. Not next year. By then it may be too late.

Issues and Concerns in Unwanted Pet Control

By Margaret A. Cleek, PhD, Beverly Cain & Sherry Guldager, MD

Let me ask a couple of questions to assess your views on conflict.

- If someone burst into your home with a shot gun, and swore to kill you, would you consider it a really good day if you talked them into shooting your right leg off instead?
- If someone has vowed to eliminate you, would you agree to pay a fee to obtain a permit, so they can more easily identify you?
- When two dynamite trucks meet on a road wide enough for one, who should back up?
- If someone was trying to take away the greatest pleasure of your life, would you just ignore the situation, waiting to see if it could really happen?
- Do you have the esteem to face conflict as a challenge and work to achieve solutions which are in your best interest and the best interest of others?

Get the picture?

Is the random breeding of surplus animals an issue?

Yes, we believe the killing of our surplus pets is a tragic waste of life, a needless drain on our civic resources, and a demoralizing and dehumanizing task for the individuals who must perform this activity.

Can we decrease the problem of unwanted pets?

Yes, after examining the research available, it can be concluded that pet overpopulation is not an unsolvable problem. It is possible to reduce the surplus pet population and reduce the killing of animals at shelters and animal control. Certain facts must be understood however. First, all mortal creatures must die, so we can never have a zero death rate. This is an obvious fact overlooked by some people who push for unrealistic goals. Many animals are euthanized because of aggression, other behavioral problems, injury, age, and illness. Thus, to address the population surplus issue, we must have accurate shelter statistics indicating the proportion of animals killed for population control (i.e., animals considered healthy and adoptable) relative to the total population handled by the shelter or control facility. Most shelters and control facilities have not kept the needed statistics. Rowan (1991) in a paper on pet overpopulation published in the *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, states, "Those representing local programs couldn't provide empirical data on the animal demographics of their own community...no one provided reliable baseline data to serve as a model to evaluate a new program. Considering the amount of time, effort and money spent to control pet populations, it was, to say the least, surprising that so little evaluation had been done."

Why are these statistics so important?

Rowan (1991) states, "Without such data there is no reliable way of estimating the total number of dogs and cats that are handled and euthanized in the shelters. Also, without accurate estimates on animal euthanasia rates, it is not possible to assess the effectiveness of various measures aimed at controlling animal populations." If we are going to solve the problem, we have to know what proportion of animals disposed of at shelters and control facilities are surplus population kills and what proportion are euthanized for reasons other than surplus. Plumb (1992, Promotion of Animal Welfare Society, California, Inc.) in an excellent position paper on pet overpopulation, uses population models to demonstrate how the surplus can be eliminated. Once the surplus population is ascertained, the breeding cycle and fecundity statistics can be used to determine the number of additional animals who would not ordinarily be spayed, that must be spayed to reduce the population by the number required. Surprisingly, Plumb's paradigms indicate that an amazingly small number of additional spays must be done to reduce the surplus. Plumb's population statistics indicate that less than 2% of the dog-owning public are responsible for the surplus population.

So all we have to do is assess the surplus, zap it with some math model, do a spay or three and solve our problem?

It is more complex than that of course. Once you have ascertained the amount of the surplus, you must account for the sources of the surplus so you know it will work and where to direct your resources.

• BACKGROUND •

In the summer of 1992 I (Margaret Cleek) was dragged off to a task force meeting on "pet overpopulation" by a friend. I planned on keeping silent. Even though I am a fancier, I really didn't have the time to get involved in any activities at that time.

I was appalled to discover that the issue of animal welfare and overpopulation was not being addressed, and the real agenda for the folks who had laid the groundwork for the task force was a mandatory spay/neuter ordinance and breeding ban. Not one to keep my mouth shut, I addressed the task force, criticizing its ineffective group process, and noting the lack of goal definition and problem solving activity. I accused them of spending an inordinate amount of time on unimportant issues and trying to railroad through the breeding ban.

The next day a Humane Officer visited my home on an animal neglect complaint. Although I was assured that it was just a coincidence and the officer confirmed that the complaint was unfounded, it shook me up. I later learned that others who had spoken out had similar events occur.

There was a good grapevine; within hours I was contacted by Bev Cain, a cat breeder, who had been involved for several months. She arrived with, literally, a box of articles and materials for me to read that had been collected by herself, Sherry Guldager, (a dog breeder) and Nancy Deering (a cat breeder and task force member).

I am an organizational psychologist and a university professor so I have an understanding of organizational dynamics and I am used to reading and assimilating information. Bev and Sherry brought me up to speed in no time. I got a crash course in the politics of the animal rights agenda.

I was at this point advocating a more conciliatory position, but Bev, and Sherry in particular, a researcher and a veteran of the ARA research wars at her University, convinced me, with all the literature they provided, that a "no compromise" position was appropriate.

Breeders were not making much progress. We were disappointed in the position taken by the representative from the fancy and we were making little head way against the ARA's emotional appeal. The "breeders are scum" mentality was firmly entrenched amongst the ARAs and they were quick to wave the petitions for a breeding ban signed by "thousands." I will never forget the hate evident as a task force member snarled at me through clenched teeth, "You're a breeder aren't you?" in an attempt to undermine any credibility I, or my proposals, might have. As if they had only pure motives and I had special interests!

At this point I began to read, assimilate and write up information. I was amazed to find out that there was information available from reliable sources which strongly argued that punitive "pay or spay" fees were not in the best interests of animals or the public health. Informed

For example, let's say surplus dogs come from the following sources in the proposed percents indicated in columns A, B, and C.

TABLE 1

	A	B	C
Pet shops	50%	05%	05%
Irresponsible owners	10%	10%	15%
Shelter returns/offspring	25%	00%	00%
Small scale breeders	05%	60%	10%
Large scale breeders	05%	20%	65%
Poor who can't afford spay	05%	05%	05%
Responsible dog owners	00%	00%	00%
	100%	100%	100%

Represented above are hypothetical distributions of dog population for purposes of illustration.

The source (percentages) of the animals tells us where to address our efforts to solve the problem. If situation A were the case, then the way to solve the problem would be to require that all dogs sold in pet shops or adopted from shelters be spayed or neutered since this is where the bulk of the animals come from. If situation B were the case, a ban on breeding would be justified. If C were the case, the large commercial breeders should be targeted. The principles of statistical quality control in industry apply—you can't fix a problem unless you know what is causing the problem. The sources of variance have to be identified and the appropriate solution applied. If situation A were the case, and you banned breeding, there could be little impact in terms of reducing the numbers killed because the breeders are not the source for the surplus animals in this situation. In all the hypothetical cases, responsible owners are not contributing to the problem, so punitive license fees would not be justified.

Do we have any data to show where our problems lie?

In Sacramento, not yet, but it is in process. Plumb has collected data for sev-

eral years which indicate where the problem lies. He has data for Butte County and limited data for Sacramento.

Plumb's data indicate that the percent distribution of dog population from the various sources are as follows:

Irresponsible (i.e., those who don't care)	17%
Small Scale Breeders	10%
Commercial Breeders	20%
Poverty level pet owners	53%

He concludes:

There are sufficient number of dog owners with incomes so low as to preclude their altering their pets even though they would gladly do so if they had the means, to completely account for surplus. We need to provide low-cost spay programs, and remove obstacles such as fear (many associate humane groups with animal control and are afraid of being ticketed), transportation needs...and on and on. (Plumb 1992).

So, if we combine irresponsible pet owners and the poverty level pet owner, we see that 70% of our pet dogs and undoubtedly more than 70% of our surplus dog problem comes from these sources.

But how come low cost spay/neuter programs haven't solved the problem?

Because low cost spay/neuter programs are not reaching the target population. It would appear that the people who are using these services are people who would have, and can afford to spay their animals at their own expense, but opted to save a few bucks. Those truly needing the service are, for whatever reasons, disenfranchised from the service. What is needed is a plan to reach these pet owners and empower and enable them to spay and neuter their animals. Putting a "Spay your Pet" sticker on your BMW and driving it down Gold River Road is not going to do the trick!

We would suggest that most veterinarians have been reluctant to offer lower-cost

spay/neuter because they recognize that the people taking advantage of these services would have and could have paid fair price for these services. If we could assure the veterinary community that the low-cost spays they provide would not otherwise be performed we would predict a greater willingness to participate.

So you are saying that low income pet owners may be largely responsible for the problem and we need to help these people get spay services?

Yes! Ask Animal Control if they perceive this as an issue—see where the bulk of their calls and litter pickups come from and you will get initial confirmation. In the near future reliable statistics will be available.

Spaying the family pet, of necessity, cannot be a high priority budget item for low income families; many times the pets are strays who are fed, but remain marginal "members" of the family; we need to reach these owners and let them know that help is available.

So if these animals are not intentionally bred, breeding bans and punitive license fees will not solve the problem.

Right! Plumb's work as well as common sense dictate that only increased spays in the target population will solve the problem.

But if we stop intentional breeding of purebreds won't more of the unintentional randomly bred dogs be adopted from shelters?

The "trickle down" theory works no better for dogs than it did for Reaganomics. People choose to own purebred dogs for different reasons than mixed breeds. We do not believe that the birth of a wanted, healthy, planned, purebred puppy displaces a shelter animal.

You don't think intentional breeding of purebreds contributes to the numbers of shelter animals?

Reputable purebred fanciers, have

and humane individuals suggested that such programs penalize kindness and would lead to great suffering for animals. Public Health focused individuals pointed out that punitive license structures would undermine the main purpose of animal agencies—rabies control. Epidemiologic data indicated breeding bans would have little impact on euthanasia numbers.

Most importantly, I found that most shelters did not have the base rate data to indicate the sources and status of animals. Those that did, showed that unowned feral cats were the bulk of the problem, many of the animals were not healthy or adoptable and the public was turning in aged or infirm pets for voluntary euthanasia. A distinction between "surplus" and "unfit" was in order.

In short, it became obvious that the position of the Animal Rights groups, that breeding bans were called for, could not stand up to the light of day. The information that they were providing was not accurate, yet we were assuming that it was. We believed that "the number of shelter deaths was escalating out of control." Available data did not confirm this. Even if numbers were increasing, such figures would need to be corrected for human population growth in the area and the animals had to be categorized. We needed to do our homework.

I compiled the information and proposed a study on shelter demographics, since our area did not have the information needed to assess the problem or evaluate any intervention. Later, I decided we needed a

position paper to educate the Board of Supervisors and the staff involved in making recommendations. I did a rough draft and Bev and Sherry and I got together to refine and structure the document. The result was the following position paper—and that Sherry caught my terrible cold.

Each County Supervisor, City Council Member and involved Staff Member received the position paper and a "bullet format" cover page with major points highlighted. We also had follow-up meetings with everyone to assure the paper was reviewed and points understood. We feel that the work we did had a strong impact on the outcome. We heard staff and the officials use our words and concepts in their comments. The county established a database on animal demographics as per our comments and recognized action without baseline data was ill-advised.

As per the task force recommendations, the County agreed that animals adopted from the shelter be altered prior to adoption at the expense of the adopter. We consider this a good thing. The minority task force recommended a punitive license structure and breeder permits, and euthanasia reduction goals. The scariest point for me was that they wanted euthanasia reduction goals. It was hard to convince the officials, who had the mind set that goals are good, that goals were inappropriate. We convinced them that goals could not be set without the base rate data to identify the source of the problem.

quality breeding stock which is tested clear for genetic disease and of sound temperament. They sell pets on spay and neuter contracts so that buyers do not have breeding rights to the animals. For reputable breeders, the commitment to the buyer extends past the sale. All reputable breeders take back animals that cannot be kept by their owners and re-place them in suitable homes. These animals are not "surplus."

There are people who own registered purebred dogs, usually of inferior stock, and sell them as "AKC registered." The commitment to the buyer ends at the point of sale and owners are not required to spay/neuter animals purchased. These "Backyard Breeders" are not generally willing or able to take back animals which can no longer be kept by the buyer.

There are large-scale out-of-state commercial breeders and/or puppy mill operations that supply pet stores. They do not require spay/neuter nor do they take back dogs which are subsequently unwanted by the buyer.

"Backyard Breeders" and puppy mills do contribute to pet surplus because national figures indicate about 2% of the shelter population is purebred. Educational efforts aimed at making the purebred buyer aware of how to identify a reputable breeder, and that AKC registration does not mean quality per se, will help to reduce the market for backyard and commercial stock.

Why are reputable breeders so opposed to breeder permits?

Because we know that it would not work and we know the agenda of the Animal Rights Activists. Animal Rights Activists are well aware that current zoning and use laws could be used to make it impossible to obtain permits, and they are then one step closer to the goal of eliminating the breeding of dogs and cats. The reason reputable breeders are so opposed to punitive license fees, and spay neuter ordi-

nances is that they realize that the commercial breeders would be exempt, and the irresponsible breeders wouldn't care. The true targets of these laws are the reputable breeders who do not contribute to shelter kills.

You feel that reputable breeders are not responsible for the suffering of surplus animals?

That is correct. Let me put it to you this way, you give birth to and raise two happy healthy children who are much loved and well cared for. Does the fact that you gave birth to these children result in a battered child and the child in India who labors in a textile factory? The logic is the same.

However, while we do not accept blame for the pet overpopulation problem, we would like to accept responsibility for the solution. We are not prepared to stand by and let the Animal Rights Activists impose their minority opinion on the majority. Nor will we tolerate the "breeder bashing" which takes place. Animal Rights activists hurl epithets such as "murderer" and "pimp" at reputable breeders; often in settings where ostensibly overpopulation issues are supposed to be addressed. We find this every bit as offensive as racial and ethnic slurs. We feel that they are entitled to hold their beliefs, but not to impose them on others with the enactment of sometimes unconstitutional laws nor to insult and berate people who do not espouse their beliefs. The last time we checked, the constitution was still in effect!

If only a very small percentage are responsible for the surplus, how come the problem is getting worse and worse?

Whoa, let's get something straight; the problem is not getting worse and worse. The *Animal Rights Agenda*, July 1992, reports a drop from 20 million to less than 6 million shelter kills in the last ten years. The American Humane Association presents similar statistics confirming this

position.

Some people are not aware of these facts; others are aware of them but choose to present the picture that there is a crisis situation and pet breeding is out of control. The fact is that we have made significant progress in surplus population control.

Since things have improved so much, why are we being told there is a crisis, and coercive legislation and breeding bans are the only way to go?

To understand this requires about six hours of background reading!

In a nutshell, in the last 20 years or so, many humane organizations have shifted focus from concern for animal welfare to concern for animal rights. Animal Rights proponents are anti-pet ownership. They believe that all animals have rights as do humans, and therefore they view animal ownership as immoral as slavery. One of the stated goals of the Animal Rights Movement is to eliminate the breeding of all "companion animals" (they consider the word "pet" insulting) and to eliminate all ownership of animals (we could serve as "guardians" for existing strays until the populations were eliminated). Presenting a sense of a crisis out of control enables the Animal Rights groups to enact restrictive legislation—the real goal of which is not understood by the general public or even the "worker bees" of the movement.

It must be further understood, that success in soliciting donations is directly proportional to the perceived magnitude of the problem—no problem, no donation. Fueling the fires of "pet population hysteria" serves the need of some organizations to garner donations to combat a problem presented as intractable. This also serves the political agenda of the Radical Animal Rights Activist who wishes to enact coercive legislation to restrict and tax pet ownership out of existence.

Are you saying that the killing of surplus animals is not the main focus

Goals are the most critical of concerns. Given the demographics of the surplus problem, goals are impossible to meet. Goals are a tremendous threat, as the ARAs couple them with "if, then" proposals which leave the door open for bans and moratoriums. Remember that even a 3 to 5 year moratorium on breeding would wipe out the breeding programs of most fanciers, seven years could wipe out some breeds, and in as few as 12 years purebred dogs would be eliminated. Goals, which appear to be the most innocuous of their proposals are the "foot in the door" to enact the most destructive of proposals. Don't think they haven't figured this out.

Even to the bitter end, the ARA letter campaign was in full swing to support a Breeding Ban. I was told that 1,300 letters were sent to the Supervisors in the week prior to the vote and ads were placed in the paper urging the public to write or call to "stop the killing." They also targeted the financially motivated, stating that it was costing the public "millions." But there was no breeding ban or spay or pay provision adopted and no goal setting. Most importantly, I think we have educated our officials, which should help us in the future, and the database may help to affect positive outcomes for animals.

Our position and actions were not popular with all members of the fancy, especially those who think we should show our concern by "compromising," or accept permit fees and punitive license structures. Some have labeled us the "Radical Right," and consider us a threat to the

fancy because we urge no compromise or accommodation. Actually, the position is very much left, and I am convinced and can demonstrate with available social science research that a non-accommodation strategy is in order.

Those who propose compromise or accommodation are either uninformed or driven by guilt. If you believe you are responsible for the deaths of shelter animals, then the only ethical response is to stop breeding. If you believe that what you do is of value and good, then stand firm and do not yield to their guilt-inducing tactics.

All are welcome to use the information compiled if you cite it properly. I hope it helps.

March 2, 1993 (position paper)

When all was said and done, Sacramento County did not adopt the breeding ban or "spay or pay" ordinance that the Animal Activist groups wanted so badly.

But the so-called Animal Rights Activists (ARA's) barely missed a beat. Within days of the Sacramento vote, a news report on Channel 10 (KXTV) News was discussing pet overpopulation in Stanislaus County, suggesting that a mandatory spay/neuter ordinance "like the one recently adopted in Sacramento County" was necessary. Next victim chosen!

of Animal Rights Activists?

Bingo! We call this a "mongoose tactic." The mongoose distracts its victim by waving its tail. While its victim is busy attacking the tail, the business end of the mongoose is accomplishing the kill. While we think that Animal Rights Activists are concerned with the welfare of animals, their real purpose is to force us all by law to conform to their belief system. While we think we are addressing the needs of our pets, they are laying the groundwork to enact their agenda to tax and ban pet ownership out of existence.

They are well-funded, and well-organized, and are more than eager to let others pay the price for the laws they enact. Please read the information provided in the attachments; see what they have cost us in the areas of animal research, fur, hunting, etc. They wish to ultimately eliminate the use of all animals for any purpose including meat, dairy and egg production. They wish to ban by law all commerce in animals and all animal agriculture. They are affecting these changes through legislation. In recent years they have met with limited success at the Federal and State level, so are currently targeting various municipalities. What is happening in our community is part of a nationally organized movement and people from outside our community have spearheaded it. Their tactic is to whittle away, wearing at our officials inch by inch, all the time using emotional appeal and fabricated statistics, until finally they yield. Animal Rights Activists are noted for their slick media releases and "chain" phone and letter campaigns which are designed to give the impression of a mass movement and a broad base of support.

So the "spay or pay" plans of the Animal Rights groups are part of a hidden agenda?

Yes. One that is not aimed at surplus population control. In fact Plumb predicted, and the facts now available support

that "these plans penalize kindness (feeding and caring for strays) and puts pet ownership out of reach financially for those in most need of the benefits of pet ownership—companionship for the poor, including children and the elderly." Such legislation targets the "98% of dog owners who do not breed...(and) is the height of irresponsibility in crafting legislation." (Plumb, 1992)

Fund for Animals provides literature titled "How to Initiate a Breeding Ban in your Community." Note that the title is not "How to solve pet overpopulation." Animal Rights Activists have chosen to ignore demonstrably effective programs in lieu of their solutions which have proven expensive and ineffective in terms of reducing overpopulation, but effective in terms of their mission to make it more expensive for people to own pets. The evidence indicates that their agenda costs municipalities large sums of money and is ineffective in reducing surplus population.

But hasn't the San Mateo Ordinance been successful?

Ha! The statistics now available from San Mateo indicate the following:

Number of Breeding Permits sold 18 at 25.	=	450
Enforcement costs	=	33,920
Revenue lost because of drop in dog licensing plus other minor income and losses	< or =	18,000
When all was said and done the result: Net loss		46,970

BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, EUTHANASIA RATES HAVE INCREASED!!!! THIS IS WHAT PLUMB PREDICTED AND WHAT AVANZINO (SFSPCA) WARNED ABOUT.

Even with aggressive canvassing license compliance has been low. Fewer people licensed dogs and only 600 cat licenses (574 were for cats adopted from PHS.) were purchased. The cat population is estimated to be over 13,000!

THE SAN MATEO ORDINANCE HAS PROVEN EXPENSIVE AND INEFFECTIVE.

And what about King County?

Check the sources reporting success and you will see that this is nothing more than Animal Rights propaganda. These "solutions" were not even implemented when the Animal Rights groups were touting their success. Legislation such as San Mateo and King County is planned to fail. Then the Animal Rights activists can get back in our faces to argue for even stronger laws because existing ones have not solved the problem!

We find it interesting that San Mateo was touted as the "model program"—until the hard facts confirming its failure and outrageous costs were published. Since then we hear nothing of San Mateo, but the King County ordinance is lauded. In a year, when it too has been exposed as a failure, will they move on to boast of another county with a "model program" just waiting to drain the county's funds and drain energy from more vital civic concerns—let us hope that county is not Sacramento!

How come we have not been able to solve this problem before?

Because the Humane groups and the Animal Rights Activists have been running the show. The rest of us blindly trusted that they knew what they were doing. We never adequately researched the literature and therefore bought into the propaganda. It turns out that a few individuals have actually been researching the problem and have proposed solutions using methods and data from the physical and social sciences, such as Epidemiology and Population Modeling. Animal Rights Activists choose to ignore these demonstrable solutions, because they are more interested in furthering their goals than in solving the problem. Some Humane groups have a vested interest in maintaining the perception of the problem as being out of

Thus, the ARAs moved on from one targeted county to another, as is typical of their tactics. A King County, Washington ordinance was predicated on the "success" of a San Mateo ordinance, Sacramento was urged to adopt an ordinance similar to the "model" King County Ordinance, and now Stanislaus County is urged to adopt a spay/neuter ordinance as per Sacramento County. In fact, the San Mateo ordinance is a failure both in terms of fiscal and humane impact (San Mateo Report Card, Hand et al., Nov. 1992), and the King County Ordinance was not even enacted when its success was being cited. As for Sacramento, mandatory sterilization applies only to animals adopted from shelters.

"Pet Population Control Task Force," or Breeding Control Ordinances are part of a national movement spearheaded by a minority special interest group. Slick media releases which incite the public, and "chain" phone and petition campaigns give the impression of a broad base of support at the community level.

Many in support of such ordinances are not aware of the stated goals of ARA groups. The espoused issue for these organizers, is the killing of animals at control facilities and shelters. The real issue, is the ARA's stated goal to eliminate the breeding and ownership of dogs and cats.

I call this a "mongoose tactic." The mongoose distracts its victim by waving its tail. While the victim is attacking the tail, the business end of the mongoose is accomplishing the kill. While we think we are

attacking pet overpopulation, they are laying the groundwork to eliminate the breeding, sale and ownership of cats and dogs.

The killing of animals is the emotional version used to get breeding restricted—just as leg-hold traps was the vehicle used to affect our attitudes toward wearing fur. Fund for Animals provides literature titled "How to Enact a Breeding Ban in Your Community." Note that the title is not "How to Solve Pet Overpopulation."

A Fund for Animals organizer has been quoted as saying that she wishes to make the breeding of animals as reprehensible in the eyes of the public as the wearing of fur.

The bread and butter of Animal Activism is the promotion of crisis to attract attention. The activists claim the pet population is exploding, and the death toll is out of control. In fact it was reported in the Animal's Agenda July 1992 that there was a drop from 20 million to less than 6 million shelter kills in the last ten years. It reports that many activists feel this dramatic reduction should not be made known to the public.

With any cause, sooner or later the mission shifts, and altruism is replaced with money, power, and politics. The Animal Rights movement is no longer addressing animal welfare. It is a special-interest lobby, focused on its own agenda, the goals of which are not known to the average person.

Radical ARAs are anti-pet ownership. Stated goals of the movement are to eliminate the breeding of dogs and cats, to outlaw the

control!

So research has actually been done?

Yes, there is research available and several researchers are currently gearing up to conduct further studies. A research resource is available right down the road at UC Davis in the School of Veterinary Medicine, Epidemiology Department. This research needs to be applied to solve the problem. Hysteria, blame, and expensive and ill-conceived coercive legislation does not contribute to a solution.

Researchers have applied scientific analysis of the data using mathematical models to predict pet population growth and distribution. Anyone interested in solutions should read these studies (references are provided in attachments). But solutions are not the objective of the Animal Rights groups, they have different goals.

The bread and butter of Animal Activism is the promotion of a perception of crisis to attract attention. Plumb refers to this as "Commotion, Emotion and Donation." While money is poured into solicitation of donations and efforts to enact legislation, the people who really need spay services are not reached. In short, the rich get gala events, T-shirts and bumper stickers, and the poor get puppies and kittens.

So what do you recommend?

Get the data needed to assess the problem and then direct existing resources to where they will do the most good.

Competent researchers in the community have offered to develop the software

necessary to establish the data bases needed to determine the source of the problem at no cost to the city/county. When the problem is identified, an action plan can be initiated that will solve the problem. With limited ammunition a shotgun approach is ill-advised; with the proper data and models, a targeted solution is possible. We need the following course of action:

RESEARCH PROBLEM DIAGNOSIS - PRESCRIPTION - ACTION PLAN

Rather than draining existing resources or drawing resources from other critical issues, let's obtain the information we need to approach the problem effectively.

Again to quote Rowan in the *Journal of the American Veterinary Association*, 1991:

Shelter programs need to recognize that without such data and subsequently evaluation of the effectiveness of their programs they are destined to continue to struggle with an endless flow of unwanted animals. The money spent on an annual survey may mean that, initially, less time is devoted to education or that fewer stray animals are handled. In the long run, however, the survey is likely to be a more efficient use of resources and may also strengthen the support for municipal animal control programs.

To enact any type of ordinance or coercive legislation which is costly to the municipality in this economic environment, without the information needed to assess its impact, would be the height of legislative irresponsibility.

REFERENCES

Avanzino, Richard., President. San Francisco SPCA, Letter dated February 6, 1991 to W. Kennedy, S.F. Board of Supervisors, argues against an ordinance similar to San Mateo.

Bartlett, Kim, Editor, "A measure of success." *Animals' Agenda*, pg. 2, July/August, 1992.

Cleveland, Patrick, H., "Animal Rights and public perceptions: a dangerous combination." (*Research Daily*, 1982-1983. Copies available).

Johnson, Karen, *W/NPA*
"San Mateo Report Card." Available:

PO BOX 53383, San Jose CA 95153

Nassar, R., et al., "Study of the feline and canine populations in the greater Las Vegas area." *American Journal of Veterinary Research*. Vol. 45, No. 2, Feb 1991.

Plumb, Lewis, R., "20 Questions and Answers: Solving the Pet Overpopulation Problem." A Position Paper, PAWS Inc. CA., Available from PAWS Inc. (\$6) 486 Pearson Road, Paradise, CA 95969. (916) USA-PAWS.

Rowan, Andrew N., "What we need to learn from epidemiologic surveys pertaining to pet overpopulation." *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*. Vol. 198, No. 7, April 1991.

Wastlhuber, Joan, and Johnson, Karen, "Why not Coercive Legislation." Tri-fold Brochure, Cat Fanciers' Association, 1992.

Wallot, Lee., "Lessons learned in King County." *Canine Chronicle*, October 28, 1992. (Reprinted from the *Collie Club of America Bulletin*.)

genetic manipulation of species (i.e., selective breeding of purebreds), and outlaw all commerce in animals (from "Politics of Animal Liberation," Kim Bartlett, *Animal's Agenda*, November, 1987).

Amid the Animal Activist's hidden agendas and demagoguery, problem focus and solutions are lost. Hysteria, blaming hidden agendas, and ill-conceived and costly coercive legislation will not solve the problem of surplus animals. Determined application of available knowledge will.

Research in the fields of Epidemiology and Population Modeling indicate it is possible to reduce the surplus pet population and the killing.

Certain facts must be understood, however. Many animals are euthanized because of aggression, other behavioral problems, injury, age, and illness. Any species has individuals who are unfit to survive in the wild; the unfit are eaten or starve. In the pet population, the unfit are humanely destroyed. Thus we can never have a zero death rate.

We need to know what proportion are surplus kills and what proportion are euthanized because they are unfit. We also need to know the source of the surplus kills, so that resources can be targeted. Rowan (1991) in a paper published in the *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, notes that most shelters have not kept this information.

What data is available, indicates that random-bred, stray and feral animals are the source of the surplus. Mandatory spay/neuter legisla-

tion could not replace the surplus killing—unless we could get the animals unowned, or owned by irresponsible people to turn themselves in for sterilization.

The conceptual links and causal relationships that the Animal Rights folks make are generally faulty. Given that random breeding and feral animals are the source of the problem, proposing legislation which affects the visible breeder of purposely bred animals has as much logic as proposing we solve our teen pregnancy problem by locking up all the seniors attending exclusive private girls' schools.

In Sacramento, ARAs used emotional appeal and letter and phone campaigns as usual, but the staff at Animal Control and the County Supervisors considered the facts and information available and acted in line with logic and reason, rather than emotion and hyperbole.

Constructive action to address the problem was taken. The County will not adopt out unaltered animals. Nassar and Fluke (1991) in the *Journal of the American Veterinary Association* predict a 25% drop in a community's cat population in five years and a 50% drop in fifteen years with this policy. Animal Control immediately established a pet demographics data base to determine the source and scope of our problem. Their action was informed, responsible, and in the best interest of the community.

But the ARAs are still out there, with arguments long on emotion but short on logic. Let us not go for the mongoose's tail, and instead use the knowledge available to really solve pet overpopulation.

Spay-or-pay juggernaut rolls on to next county

Margaret Anne Cleek is an associate professor in the School of Business Administration at California State University, Sacramento, and a member of the Alaska Malamute Club of America.

By Margaret Anne Cleek

WHEN ALL was said and done, Sacramento County did not adopt the breeding ban or "spay or pay" ordinance that the animal rights activists wanted. But that hasn't stopped the animal rights activists from claiming that the county did.

Within days of the vote, a news report on Channel 10 (KXTV) was discussing pet overpopulation in Stanislaus County, suggesting that a mandatory spay/neuter ordinance "like the one recently adopted in Sacramento County" was necessary.

That kind of misinformation has become all too common as the activists move from one targeted county to the next. An ordinance in King County, Wash., for example, was predicated on the alleged "success" of a San Mateo ordinance. Sacramento, in turn, was urged to adopt an ordinance similar to the "model" King County ordinance. Now Stanislaus County is being lobbied to adopt a spay/neuter ordinance that's supposed to be like Sacramento's.

In fact, the San Mateo ordinance is a failure both in terms of fiscal and humane impact. After nine months in operation, members of the county task force there reported that only 18 breeding permits had been sold, enforcement costs totaled \$33,920, and revenues from dog licenses had fallen \$18,000. The King County ordinance hadn't even been enacted when activists were touting its success here. And as for Sacramento County, mandatory sterilization under the new ordinance applies only to animals adopted from shelters.

THE BREAD and butter of animal activism is fomenting a perception of crisis. To promote their current interest in breeding-control ordinances, activists seek to create an impression that the pet population is exploding, and the death toll in shelters is escalating out of control.

But in July 1992, the Animal Agenda, published by the Animal Rights Network, reported that there had been a drop from 20 million to less than 6 million shelter kills in the last 10 years. The American Humane Association presents similar statistics confirming this report. The Animal Agenda notes that many activists feel it is better not to mention this dramatic reduction to the public.

Pet population control and the killing of animals at shelters isn't even the primary interest of the more radical elements of the animal rights movement. It's just an emotional vehicle for advancing a broader agenda of anti-pet ownership.

The stated goals of this movement seek to curtail the breeding of dogs and cats for both pets and purebreds and to put an end to all commerce in animals. That's from the "Politics of Animal Liberation" by Kim Bartlett in the Animal Agenda, November 1987. Ingrid Newkirk, leader of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, equates pet ownership with the enslavement of Africans and demands that we serve only as "guardians" until the "companion animal" population has been eliminated.

Amid this kind of demagoguery, problem focus and solutions are lost. Encouraging hysteria and costly coercive legislation will not solve the problem of surplus animals. But the determined application of knowledge can.

Many animals are euthanized because of aggression or other behavioral problems involving injury, age and illness. Every species has individuals that are unfit to survive; in the wild population they are eaten or driven off to starve. In the pet population they are humanely destroyed. Thus, we can never have a zero death rate.

WE HAVE to know what proportion of the animals disposed of at shelters are surplus population kills and what proportion are euthanized because they are old, sick or anti-social. We also need to know where the surplus animals are coming from. Unfortunately, most shelters have not recorded this information.

Once the source and size of the surplus population is ascertained, we can begin to apply the results of research in the fields of epidemiology and population modeling to reduce the killing. Fertility rates, for example, can be used to determine the number of additional animals in the target population that must be spayed.

What data there is on these questions indicates that random-bred, stray and feral animals are responsible for most of the surplus population problem. Mandatory spay/neuter legislation consequently would not do much to reduce the surplus killing unless we could get all of the animals that are unowned or owned by irresponsible people to turn themselves in for sterilization. On the other hand, legislation that affects the breeder of purebred animals, which is what the animal rights activists proposed, makes no sense.

In Sacramento, activists resorted to emotional appeals and letter and phone campaigns. But the staff at Animal Control and the county supervisors considered the facts and applied logic and reason, rather than emotion and hyperbole. As a result, the county will no longer adopt out unaltered animals.

Recent studies in the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association predict this approach will produce a 25 percent drop in a community's cat population in five years, and a 50 percent drop in 15 years. Meanwhile, Animal Control is setting up a pet demographics data base to determine the true source and scope of our problem.

Rather than draining existing resources or drawing funds away from other critical needs, the county opted to obtain the information we need to approach the surplus pet population problem effectively. That action isn't what the activists wanted, but it was informed, responsible and in the best interest of the community.

Special to The Bee