



RESULTS OF SCJA 1997 AUGUST QUESTIONNAIRE

Final results on all items have not been tabulated as of now since we are still receiving input. However, the response so far more than confirms what we had been hearing from a limited number of our members that had previously called. Dennis Sprung was incorrect when he told us AKC Reps do not question a judge's placements. Comments on the questionnaire are enclosed. Do peruse them. They could very well affect you at some future date.

QUES. #3. 100% of our members who were turned down for any breeds applied for were **NOT** told why.

Comments: What a disgrace for management and the Board of Directors to allow this positively outrageous procedure to continue. Every person who has any influence whatsoever should see that we have Board members who will insist this blatant and willful mismanagement by the AKC of our judges approval process be changed. Every present AKC Board member, and especially the new individuals running for AKC Board positions in March, should be queried on this point. We have received numerous letters on this subject from our members written to the AKC which are well written, well organized and dead on point. Without exception, they all fell on deaf ears. What a disgraceful way to treat our judges.

QUES. #4. 100% of those judges turned down for additional breeds responded in the affirmative to the question of whether or not they believed they were treated fairly. (Some that received breeds also answered yes.)

Comments: The sad part about these statistics is that the responsible people at AKC for judges just don't seem to care about what our judges think about them. When they are told over 90% of judges don't think the AKC is approving breeds in a fair and equitable manner, they show little concern. Some AKC Board members sure sing a different tune when they are running for reelection. Once in, they act like the typical politician and forget their concerns and promises.

QUES. #5. We had 39% of our members respond "yes" to the question, "Have you ever had your placements questioned by an AKC Rep after your judging of a breed at a regular AKC show?"

Comments: Obviously, Dennis Sprung, when he was in charge of all AKC Reps, did not have it right. (We don't want to think he would intentionally mistake the facts known to him when he told us, "At no time however does a Field Representative 'challenge' the judges decision.")

When we informed the AKC Chairman of the Board, AKC's President and Vice-President, Dennis Sprung, that AKC Reps were questioning judges placements at shows, they could have at least contacted the Reps subsequent to being notified and inform the Reps that they should not challenge a judge's decision. Obviously, they did not contact the Reps, and our members signed answers testifying that headquarters either hands out misinformation or has no idea what is going on in the field.

Each of you should also inquire of the AKC Board members to ascertain their respective views on our First Amendment and due process rights. We should all know who on the AKC Board of Directors supports Chairman Merriam's views that dog show judges and others associated with the Dog World are disenfranchised from these rights afforded every other citizen in the country. Every AKC Board member knows full well even if the law indicated they did not have to abide by the due process and First Amendment (and we don't think it does), it most certainly does not compel the AKC Board to deny them these rights! What a reprehensible way to run the ship.