I suppose that many JAWS members do not have any theoretical understanding of the animal situation in Japan and are led to believe that little can be done except euthanizing dogs and cats; at the same time these people want to do something for animal welfare and participate more or less actively. On the other hand, I am under the impression that among the representatives of the organization there are more than a few people who for status reasons ("which charity do you belong to?") or because they want to improve their image while not doing anything much for this purpose, or because they are interested in upkeeping the present state of affairs, are participating in JAWS (such as veterinarians who want to keep costs high; politicians and administrators as well as amakudari-people of all sorts who could not care less for animals but are holding certain positions so that these positions could not be held by more concerned people). For the latter group, the main purpose seems to be to keep this organization existing as an entity so that the government/administration can always point out that such an organization exists in which such-and-such are members, so as to counter criticism concerning the animal situation, e.g. from abroad. The attitude of many of those holding office in JAWS (e.g. in Tokyo) seems to justify this supposition, and also the fact that JAWS, while headed by such people, could become a legal entity whereas well-known organizations such as Amnesty International could not leaves one to wonder why.
The statement of expenditure of 1990 also indicates that there is a tendency towards "more of the same" while offensives for more effective activities are not to be seen. In an overall budget of 53 million ¥ the expenses for spaying campaigns amounting to hardly 3 million ¥ are only as much as the expenses for "printing, stationary and office supplies"; on the other hand, "staff and caretakers" are spent 27 million ¥ on, with another 8 million ¥ spent on "personnel costs". There seems to be a bureaucratic waterhead which, however, does not achieve anything in particular, or at least nothing such can be found in the information material. Here one cannot help thinking that, instead of such an expensive self-administration, the 27 plus 8 million ¥ would be better used for spaying. Anyway it would be interesting to know just how many animals were actually spayed for the 3 million ¥, because only this information could clarify whether or not certain veterinarians involved made a rip-off instead of working for animal welfare. (By the way it is certainly not wrong to consider e.g. Nihon Dobutsu Hogo Kanri Kyokai as an amakudari organization run by the veterinarians' organization.)

If organizations which from their financial basis claim to be representative for animal welfare by and large do not carry out the kind of activity that fits this claim they should not be surprised if criticism arises. In regard of our common aim it is to be honed that JAWS is able to carry out inner reforms.

Last but not least it should be said that JAWS' ambiguous attitude regarding vivisection will certainly sooner or later be criticized, because fortunately also in Japan more and more people are against vivisection. When JAWS was founded, all the basic arguments against vivisection were already well known so that one must wonder why a society for the protection of animals could even overtly accept vivisection in its rules; for the present membership the question arises what their opinion in this respect really is. Let those who are truly against vivisection speak up and be counted so that we may know who you are.