may be used to present differing views on the same subject. If references are used in these articles, they will be the minimum necessary to locate the source and support the argument being developed.

Original and Review Articles are written by anyone with the necessary knowledge, data or expertise to prepare ‘hard’ scientific reviews or to present new data. These articles will be refereed, and we are following a policy of sending out papers for review without identifying the author. The referees will remain anonymous unless they agree to be named.

Legislation and Regulation items are written by members of the editorial staff or appropriate experts, and every effort is made to ensure their factual accuracy. Meeting Reports are written by persons who have attended the relevant meetings. Every effort is made to ensure factual accuracy. IJSAP Book News consists of a conglomeration of reviews and news about the printed and electronic media. The reviews reflect the opinions of the bylined author. Letters to the Editor is the department in which readers should point out errors and dispute opinions and statements made in earlier issues of the Journal. If a letter is very long and cannot be cut, we will place it in the Comment section.

As should be apparent from the above, the Journal may well contain articles which produce vehement disagreement from certain segments of our readers. In fact, if everyone agreed with everything printed in these pages, we would not be achieving our objective, namely, to act as a forum for constructive debate and dialogue. Perhaps it is unrealistic to expect the Letters page to be flooded with comments at this stage, but we hope that readers will not be hesitant about criticizing the Journal’s content or style. We may not agree with all of the criticisms, but we will not ignore them.

Finally, we would like to thank all of you who had sufficient faith in the Journal to subscribe, some even before we had produced a single issue. There have been a few problems with distribution and we apologize for the long delay in getting the first issue out. We hope that you feel the wait was worthwhile.
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agreement about the extent to which change should proceed and the methods which should be employed to achieve it. It must follow that this wish to change the ‘status quo,’ although fundamental to progress, can in itself create conflict. The more radical the desired change, the slower the progress. Slowness breeds impatience and in an organization as traditional as the RSPCA there will be a minority who will claim that progress can only be achieved if the organization itself is radically changed. Such an attitude is basically anarchical and nothing is more guaranteed to stimulate conservatism than for such an opinion to be expressed publicly and to be identified with a certain group of people.

These different approaches to animal welfare are always present to some extent, but a balance has been achieved, even though on occasion precariously. Compromise always has to be the basis of such a balance, and for various reasons the advocates of compromise have been missing in the recent troubles. It was inevitable that once the conflict became public it would spread. The moderating or temperate voices were not heard or if they were, not heeded. Those who became deeply involved in such a conflict became determined to win and anything less than victory was unacceptable.

This surge of feeling toward different attitudes to animals is inescapable and is occurring throughout the whole social structure of our so-called Western civilization. Some people, and this is the third important factor in the RSPCA’s present problem, harness themselves to this surge and manipulate it to their own ends, sometimes with no regard to the practical realities. Such people are found in all forms of revolution, and there is no doubt that the exaggerated promotion of extreme ideologies can actually damage progress. It is this small minority which beyond all others has aggravated the situation within the RSPCA. However, it does not follow that the arguments or people are political in any sense. Radicalism has always been associated with the socialist attitude, but to suggest that the arguments are of a political nature is to misunderstand the situation. It would also be wrong to imagine that animal welfare in general suffers by such a conflict. Certainly in the short term some aspects of animal welfare receive a setback because too much involvement with internal argument and controversy impairs an organization’s external functioning. However, the outcome of the present conflict might well be a reestablishment of values which in itself will lead to progress. During the course of this self-examination individuals might fail in their personal ambitions and some will be exposed to a charge of misconduct.

The whole point of democracy would be lost if expressions of opinion were suppressed. It could well be argued that the RSPCA has achieved its present stature and influence because its structure allows all shades of opinion to be aired and that occasional conflict is an indication of health rather than of sickness. To resolve internal conflict and to reach what is hoped will be the inevitable compromise should be an indication of strength and therefore should be to the benefit of animal welfare rather than to its detriment.