

MARS AND THE INDUSTRIAL PET FOOD EXPERIMENT | PAPER 8

Pet Owners of the Future

PIAS, PetNet, childhood conditioning and the missing public record

Publication date: 5 September 2026 | Status: Evidence-led investigation paper

The charge: For roughly half a century, a Mars-funded information service presented itself as autonomous, non-commercial and devoted to responsible pet ownership while its own charter included encouraging pet ownership. It commissioned research, supplied journalists, engaged governments and councils, supported school education and helped normalise pet acquisition as a social good. The graver allegation is that this machinery did not merely create consumers: it channelled dependent animals into a feeding-and-treatment system whose participants had long been warned about preventable oral disease, pain and wider harm. The company was then wound up and its website became a parked advertising domain without an accessible public archive or scientific handover. The campaign ended. The record should not have.

Executive assessment

The public record supports a serious inquiry into market creation disguised, or at least softened, by the language of education and community service. PIAS's own materials said Mars Petcare provided its funding. They described PIAS as autonomous and non-commercial, but also gave it a charter that included encouraging pet ownership, undertaking original research, ensuring accurate information and promoting correct pet care. [2-4]

The distinction between product advertising and market formation is central. PIAS did not need to tell a child to buy a particular can of food. If it helped make pet ownership expected, desirable and institutionally endorsed, the resulting household necessarily entered a recurring market for food, veterinary services and other pet-care expenditure. That is a behavioural pathway, not proof of a particular unlawful purpose. But it is a pathway that Mars and the institutions involved should be required to document.

Current AVA PetPEP material makes the child-to-household pathway unusually visible. It calls responsible owners the cornerstone of local veterinary practices and describes PetPEP as an investment in future pet owners. It reports that, after the program, 58% of children in non-pet families asked to become owners and 20% of families became pet owners. It also recommends practice logos on take-

home activity sheets, sample bags and promotional material for schoolchildren, and publicises extensive local media activity. [12-13]

Those statements do not by themselves prove Mars directed the current program, that any child or family was deceived, or that responsible-ownership education lacks social value. They do establish that pet acquisition and practice promotion are not merely speculative side effects. They are recorded and promoted benefits of the program itself. Any historical Mars role, funding conditions, brand exposure and governance arrangements therefore deserve disclosure.

The endpoint cannot be treated as morally neutral consumption. The project-wide allegation is that Mars and organised veterinary interests promoted a processed-feeding system despite accumulating notice that common oral disease was painful, destructive and potentially systemic, and despite specific warnings that diet and the absence of effective chewing and oral hygiene were material factors. The AVA's own guidance now acknowledges the pain and systemic implications of untreated oral disease; a Waltham review describes periodontal disease as frequent and diet as one of the likely contributors. [26-29] Those materials establish seriousness and notice issues, not the proposition that every Mars product caused disease or that every institutional participant shared criminal intent.

1. The question this paper asks

Was PIAS principally a disinterested public service that happened to benefit its funder, or was it a sophisticated form of category development: a long-duration system for creating pet-owning households, favourable public policy and trusted narratives around pet keeping? And if the architects or later defenders knew, or were recklessly indifferent to evidence that the normalised feeding system exposed animals to preventable suffering, did market creation become participation in a harmful and potentially unlawful scheme? The available evidence cannot finally determine motive or criminal liability. It can identify the architecture, show the declared behavioural objective, expose the notice and archive questions, and state what evidence would answer them.

Method: Each important proposition is classified as (a) documented fact or self-description; (b) allegation or historical criticism attributed to its source; or (c) inference requiring further evidence. 'Propaganda' is used, where used at all, as an analytical conclusion about organised interest-backed persuasion - never as a substitute for proof.

2. The institution and the autonomy paradox

Legacy PetNet material described PIAS as established in 1966, autonomous, non-commercial and committed to socially responsible pet ownership. The same material said its funding was provided by Mars Petcare as a community service. The charter included five linked functions: educating owners; undertaking original human-animal research; ensuring accurate and reliable pet information; encouraging pet ownership in balance with society's needs; and encouraging correct pet care. [2-4]

The phrase 'autonomous' is therefore a claim requiring a governance answer, not a conclusion. Autonomy can mean editorial independence, separate incorporation, operational discretion or simply a distinct public identity. Public sources located to date do not establish who appointed directors, approved budgets, selected research priorities, reviewed messages, owned the intellectual property or authorised closure.

The Australian Business Register records a separate PIAS company, ABN 85 085 490 857, later cancelled. The historical ABR record for Mars Australia Pty Ltd also lists multiple variants of the PIAS name among historical business or trading names in the 2000s. Those records strengthen the case for obtaining corporate files, but they do not on their own prove every period of ownership or control. [14,16]

The autonomy test: Who could hire and dismiss PIAS staff, approve research grants, veto publications, determine annual objectives, control databases and decide the fate of the archive? The answers matter more than the label.

3. The architecture of reach

PIAS described a system that reached beyond ordinary advertising. Its legacy website was organised for journalists, veterinarians, governments, pet owners, schools and welfare organisations. It offered publications, research, guidelines, media releases, breed and location resources and direct consultant assistance. [4-6]

A legacy PIAS profile stated that four Pet Hints a month went to more than 600 Australian newspapers, that PIAS acted as a resource for print and electronic media, and that PetNet received more than three million hits per month. These are PIAS's self-reported figures; no circulation audit, publication log or web analytics has yet been located. Even so, the claimed scale is itself evidence of intended reach. [4-5]

Search-indexed releases show a deliberate mix of emotional, health and lifestyle hooks - including 'Purrfect pets for little people', 'Dog ownership = active mums', 'Travels with your best friend' and

'Oodles of schnoodles'. The question is not whether every item was false. The question is whether a sustained stream of apparently newsworthy material converted a funder's commercial interest in more pet-owning households into third-party editorial coverage. [7-8]

Channel	Declared or observed function	Commercial relevance
Research	Commission and fund human-animal and urban-management work	Creates claims, experts and policy material
News media	Pet Hints, releases and consultant assistance	Earned-media repetition with editorial credibility
Schools	PetPEP visits, activities and take-home material	Shapes norms and household requests early
Veterinary practices	Presenters, logos, samples and promotion	Links education to trusted local businesses
Government and councils	Guidelines and urban-animal management	Normalises pet-friendly infrastructure and policy
Website	PetNet information hub and Selectapet tools	Turns interest into acquisition and continuing advice

Table note: 'Commercial relevance' is analysis of the pathway, not proof that each activity was undertaken for an improper commercial purpose.

4. From publicity to public authority

Dr Jonica Newby's 2025 Murdoch University profile provides an unusually useful first-person bridge. She says that at PIAS she commissioned research on the health benefits of pets, worked on urban animal management and planning, helped rewrite PetPEP, and learned research, communication and collaboration. She also says that while working in pet care she wrote and recorded roughly 10 or 12 pieces for ABC Radio National's Science Show. [9]

A campaigner-hosted transcript of ABC Media Watch's 3 March 1997 broadcast records sharp criticism that the Science Show series initially identified Newby as a veterinarian without clearly explaining PIAS's Mars/Uncle Ben's funding. The transcript records the program's view that encouraging pet ownership could indirectly benefit the food manufacturer. [10]

A contemporaneous Media Australia Update account, republished by Whistleblowers Australia, also records the ABC Science Show's response. The Science Show said it knew of Newby's PIAS association; described PIAS as autonomous and non-commercial; said the series was fully paid for by Radio Science; denied that it arose from the consultancy; and maintained that its assertions were supported by credible scientific research. Lonsdale disputed that account and alleged institutional overlap and incomplete disclosure. [11]

Why both sides matter: The 1997 episode is not presented as a judicial finding. It is documented evidence that the disclosure and independence problem was identified contemporaneously, publicly disputed and

never resolved by the production of a complete funding, commissioning and editorial record.

5. Childhood conditioning: the child-to-household demand pathway

In this paper, 'childhood conditioning' is not a psychiatric diagnosis and does not allege hypnosis, compulsion or a uniform effect. It means repeated norm-setting in an educational environment that seeks durable attitudes and behaviour: pets are natural members of the household; responsible people should own and care for them; professional advice is the proper route to care; and acquiring a pet is an expected or beneficial family decision.

The word 'conditioning' is justified as an investigative lens when four elements coincide: a young audience, repeated or institutionally trusted messaging, an intended behavioural outcome, and enduring commercial consequences. PetPEP's present materials openly document all but the historical Mars control question. [12-13]

The conversion route is straightforward:

- A school admits a program under the authority of education and animal welfare.
- A veterinary presenter teaches safety and responsible ownership and may use branded take-home material.
- A child without a pet asks the household to acquire one.
- The household assumes a long-term moral obligation to feed, house and obtain care for the animal.
- Recurring expenditure follows, while trusted veterinary and information systems influence product and treatment choices.

This is more consequential than an impulse purchase. The acquired animal becomes a dependent family member. A child's request can therefore initiate years of expenditure and emotional lock-in. That does not make the pet or the family relationship illegitimate. It makes undisclosed commercial participation in acquisition-oriented school programming unusually sensitive.

The decisive evidence: The current AVA page does not treat acquisition as an accidental by-product: it publicises the 58% request rate and 20% household acquisition rate under 'Benefits of getting involved'. It then promotes practice logos, sample bags, promotional material and media coverage. [13]

6. Research as evidence - and as campaign infrastructure

PIAS's charter joined original research to public information and encouragement of pet ownership. That combination is not inherently improper. Industry can fund valuable science. But when the same system funds research, translates it into media, supplies experts, shapes school material and benefits commercially from the behaviour encouraged, independence, methods, negative findings and conflicts must be unusually transparent.

Publicly indexed academic records show PIAS funding or industry-partner roles in work on dog walking, physical activity and social capital. An MJA search record also displays an author's declaration of paid PIAS consultancy. Those disclosures are welcome, but a complete research register has not been located. [18]

The scientific premise that acquiring a pet improves human health should not be treated as universally settled. A 2026 Australian quasi-experimental study using longitudinal HILDA data found no discernible average effect of acquiring a pet on life satisfaction, loneliness, mental health or general health under plausible assumptions. The authors expressly allow that some people benefit and acknowledge limitations; their result challenges universal causal claims, not the reality of individual bonds. [19]

The public-interest question is therefore not 'Are pets good or bad?' It is whether selectively positive, funder-compatible findings were turned into acquisition messages without an accessible accounting of methods, null results, limitations, conflicts and later corrections.

7. The endpoint was not neutral consumption

A campaign that creates pet-owning households also creates dependent animals whose food and care are selected by humans. If the promoted system foreseeably produces preventable pain or disease, the wrong is not confined to covert marketing. The endpoint becomes part of the case.

The AVA's dental guidance says untreated oral disease is painful, may contribute to local or systemic disease and can involve irreversible destruction of tooth-supporting structures. A 2020 review from Mars's Waltham Petcare Science Institute found periodontal disease to be frequent, with much higher prevalence detected under anaesthesia than in routine primary-care records; it identified poor oral care as a significant risk factor and diet as one likely contributor. Earlier veterinary literature reported reasonable evidence associating soft diets with increased frequency and severity of periodontal disease. [26-28]

The notice question is historical as well as scientific. In August 1992, Lonsdale addressed an AVA metropolitan practitioners' branch on what he described as a pandemic of periodontal disease and

urged dietary prevention. That document proves that the warning reached a professional AVA audience; it does not prove what every national officeholder or Mars executive knew. The necessary next step is a dated notice matrix: warning, recipient, response, product or policy decision, and consequence. [29]

If internal records show that Mars, PIAS or AVA decision-makers understood the risk yet continued to use schools, journalism, professional authority and public policy to expand the market while suppressing or marginalising corrective information, knowingly promoting that foreseeable suffering would be cruel and unconscionable in the ordinary moral sense. The conduct would warrant investigation far beyond advertising ethics. It could raise questions of misleading or legally unconscionable conduct, breach of professional or welfare duties, fraud, complicity or conspiracy. Those are legal characterisations requiring proof of specific elements, not adjectives that the public record can presently substitute for evidence. [30-31]

The stronger allegation: The alleged wrong was not merely disguising market expansion as education. It was constructing and protecting a market that may have exposed animals to preventable suffering, while trusted institutions normalised the products, advice and professional responses from which the system profited.

8. The disappearance

ASIC published notice records PIAS as in liquidation, with an appointment date of 11 January 2017 and a final general meeting of members on 10 July 2017. The ABR records cancellation of the company's ABN from 6 November 2017. Those facts establish winding up; they do not establish insolvency, motive or who decided the future of the records. [14-15]

The PetNet domain now presents advertising links from a different operator. Legacy URLs no longer deliver PIAS publications, despite search indexes retaining fragments of titles and text. No public closure statement, successor archive, research catalogue, correction register or custody notice has been located in this investigation.

It would be unsafe to state as fact that Mars cynically terminated PIAS because the campaign had completed its market-building work. Internal records are needed for that conclusion. It is fair to ask whether the vehicle was retired after its messages, relationships and institutions had become self-sustaining - and why a claimed public service was not preserved for the public.

The archival asymmetry: The public was asked to trust and act on the material while the campaign operated. When the sponsoring structure ended, the public was left without the full corpus needed to

audit what it had been told.

9. The truth trilemma

Mars and the former PIAS leadership face a simple trilemma:

1. If the research and advice remain true and useful, publish the complete archive and underlying evidence.
2. If the material has been superseded, publish it with dated corrections, methodological notes and replacement guidance.
3. If material was wrong, misleading or compromised, disclose what was withdrawn, why, when and by whom.

There is no defensible scientific fourth position in which decades of advice can influence public behaviour and policy, then become inaccessible without explanation. Silence and disappearance are not peer review, correction or accountability.

10. What the Meta comparison illuminates

In 2023, a coalition of United States attorneys general alleged that Meta built an engagement-maximising business model around young users, deployed psychologically manipulative features, misrepresented safety and concealed internal knowledge. These were allegations. In August 2026, Meta agreed to extensive youth restrictions and payments of up to US\$18 billion across state settlements, commonly reported in Australia as about A\$23.6 billion or A\$24 billion. Meta denied wrongdoing, and the federal consent judgment expressly says it is not an admission, final adjudication or precedent outside participating states. [21-25]

The comparison is powerful at the level of mechanism: a company benefits when young people adopt a durable behaviour; the activity is presented as beneficial or safe; the company and its partners possess superior research and behavioural information; and families or public systems may carry downstream costs. It also demonstrates why 'parents chose' is not a complete answer when the issue is how the choice environment was designed and what material information was withheld.

The differences are equally important. Meta's platforms were used directly and recurrently by minors, and the complaint alleged engineered compulsive engagement and direct mental-health harm. PIAS/PetPEP concerns a multi-stage pathway from education to household acquisition to long-term consumption and care. The present record does not establish physiological addiction to pet food, Meta-

style digital compulsion, unlawful collection of children's data or a legally identical cause of action. The Meta case supplies questions and a model of scrutiny - not proof against Mars.

Dimension	Meta proceedings	PIAS / PetPEP inquiry
Business pathway	Monetise youth attention and data	Create pet-owning households and recurring demand
Youth mechanism	Alleged engagement design and repeated prompts	School authority, emotional norms and take-home influence
Knowledge	Complaint alleged internal research and concealment	Commissioned research is public; full internal record is missing
Intermediaries	Platform, creators and advertisers	Schools, vets, media, councils, welfare and researchers
Harm theory	Direct compulsive use and mental/physical harm alleged	Animal exposure to an allegedly harmful feeding system; causation and knowledge require proof
Legal status	Consent judgment, denial, no admission	No equivalent finding identified; investigation proposed

11. Findings that can responsibly be stated

- PIAS publicly identified Mars Petcare as its funder and simultaneously described itself as autonomous and non-commercial. [2-4]
- Encouraging pet ownership was part of the published charter, alongside research, accurate information and correct care. [3]
- PIAS claimed a national media and web distribution system of substantial scale. The figures remain self-reported pending production of records. [4-6]
- A former PIAS employee says she commissioned research, worked on urban planning, helped rewrite PetPEP and produced ABC Science Show pieces while working in pet care. [9]
- The conflict and disclosure issue was raised publicly in 1997, and the ABC's defence was also recorded. [10-11]
- Current AVA PetPEP material expressly celebrates child-to-household pet acquisition and practice promotion. [12-13]
- The AVA acknowledges that untreated oral disease is painful and may contribute to local or systemic disease; Waltham research describes canine periodontal disease as frequent and recognises oral care and diet among relevant factors. [26-28]
- Dietary-periodontal warnings were presented to an AVA professional audience by 1992. The present public record does not establish which Mars or national AVA decision-makers received, accepted or acted on them. [29]
- PIAS was wound up in 2017; PetNet's legacy public corpus is no longer available from the live domain. [14-15]
- The reason for closure, the archival decision and the custody of research and communication records remain unanswered.

12. Inferences - clearly labelled

- PIAS appears to have functioned as long-term category development: promoting pet keeping itself, not merely particular branded products.
- The language of community service and autonomy likely increased access to trusted institutions and reduced ordinary advertising resistance.
- School programming created a measurable child-to-household acquisition pathway with unusually durable economic consequences.
- Research, media supply and institutional relationships may have made industry-compatible claims appear independent through repetition by third parties.
- The disappearance of the public corpus materially frustrates evaluation of accuracy, correction, conflicts and longitudinal message change.
- If decision-makers were on notice of preventable diet-associated suffering, continued acquisition promotion without candid risk disclosure may amount to callous or reckless institutional conduct rather than merely aggressive marketing.
- Journalists, individual veterinarians, regulators and officials should not all be labelled conspirators. The evidence must distinguish architects and beneficiaries, knowing enablers, captured or misled intermediaries, and institutions that continued to defend the system after receiving notice.
- A possible explanation is that the stand-alone vehicle became unnecessary once pet ownership and its supporting institutions were culturally entrenched. That proposition is plausible but unproven.

13. Questions requiring answers

Governance, funding and control

1. Who owned PIAS shares at each stage, who appointed its directors and who approved its annual budget?
2. What did 'autonomous' mean in legal, editorial and operational terms?
3. Which Mars, Uncle Ben's, Masterfoods or related personnel held PIAS roles or reviewed its work?
4. Were PIAS performance measures tied to pet acquisition, category growth, favourable policy, earned media or brand outcomes?

Research

5. Provide a complete project register: title, investigators, institutions, funding, agreements, protocols, datasets, reports and publications.
6. Identify null, negative, abandoned or unpublished studies and explain publication decisions.

7. Identify every claim concerning human health, community benefit, child development, urban planning, pet nutrition and dental health distributed to the public.
8. State what conflict disclosures were required in academic, media, school and government settings.
9. For every warning concerning diet, oral disease, animal suffering or systemic consequences, identify the recipient, date, assessment, response and resulting product, policy or communication decision.

Media and public policy

10. Produce the full Pet Hints and media-release corpus, distribution lists, placement logs, clipping services, briefing notes and audience metrics.
11. Identify all radio and television contributions by PIAS personnel and the funding or employment disclosure made in each.
12. Produce submissions, contracts, grants and correspondence with governments, councils, planning bodies, welfare organisations and professional associations.

Schools and children

13. Describe Mars and PIAS funding, authorship, approval and branding in PetPEP by year.
14. Produce the University of Queensland evaluation behind the 58% and 20% figures, including methods, sample, questionnaires, analysis and funding.
15. Identify all branded materials, samples, coupons or commercial messages supplied to children or families.
16. State whether child-to-household acquisition was an intended outcome, a measured side effect or a later promotional interpretation.
17. Identify any collection, transfer or use of children's or families' personal data.

Closure and archives

18. Who proposed winding up PIAS, what reasons were recorded and who approved the decision?
19. Who acquired the trademarks, domain, research files, datasets, copyright, mailing lists and digital assets?
20. Was an archive, records schedule, legal hold or public handover created? If not, why not?
21. Which records were destroyed, when, under whose authority and pursuant to what policy?
22. Who decided that PetNet's advice should no longer remain publicly accessible?

14. Preservation and production request

Mars, former PIAS officeholders, the AVA, participating universities, the ABC and relevant public bodies should preserve and, subject to lawful privacy protections, produce:

- board minutes, shareholder records, budgets, organisational charts and role descriptions;

- emails, memoranda, calendars, briefing notes and correspondence concerning PIAS strategy and closure;
- research agreements, ethics approvals, protocols, datasets, analyses, peer review, adverse or null findings and publication decisions;
- every version of PetNet, Selectapet, Pet Hints, releases, newsletters, educational kits, images, audio and video;
- media lists, placement and clipping records, audience analytics and communications with editors or producers;
- PetPEP curricula, governance, funding, sponsor benefits, branding guidance, evaluation instruments and raw or de-identified data;
- government, council, veterinary, welfare, school and university partnership records;
- domain, hosting, backup, content-management and decommissioning records; and
- document-retention, destruction, transfer and legal-hold instructions relating to PIAS and PetNet.

The National Library of Australia's Australian Web Archive should be searched by URL and keyword, and surviving captures should be catalogued before search indexes and third-party caches decay further. [17]

Conclusion

The strongest public evidence does not come from an opponent's adjective. It comes from the campaign's own language: funded by Mars; autonomous and non-commercial; chartered to encourage pet ownership; serving media, schools, government and professionals; and, in the present PetPEP record, investing in future owners and celebrating household acquisition after school visits.

That record justifies the childhood-conditioning inquiry, but the case no longer stops at the mechanics of persuasion. It also concerns the animals placed at the end of the demand pathway. The public record supports a serious allegation that a Mars-funded system helped create and protect a market despite longstanding warnings about preventable oral disease and suffering. Whether that system crossed the line into fraud, complicity or criminal conspiracy depends on proof of knowledge, agreement, an identified offence and overt acts. It must be investigated, not prematurely pronounced. [26-31]

If the advice was true, preserve it. If it changed, correct it. If it concealed material harm, disclose who knew, who enabled, who was misled and who continued to defend the system after notice. The campaign may have ended, but the duty to account for the animals, the teaching and the vanished record did not.

Corrections, documents and right of reply

This paper is a public-interest investigation based on sources available as at the publication date. It is not a judicial or regulatory finding. Mars, PIAS's former officers and staff, the Australian Veterinary Association, the ABC and any other named person or institution are invited to identify factual errors, supply missing records and provide a response for publication. Material corrections should be dated and preserved rather than silently substituted.

References and public sources

- [1] **The Pet Food Con.** [Mars and the Industrial Pet Food Experiment](#). Existing investigation landing page and scope statement.
- [2] **PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL).** [About PIAS](#). Legacy PIAS self-description. The live URL now resolves to a parked advertising page; quoted wording remains visible in public search indexing and should be verified against an archived capture before publication.
- [3] **PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL).** [Pet information and research for socially responsible pet ownership](#). Legacy PIAS charter wording, including original research, accurate information, encouraging pet ownership and correct pet care; now a parked-domain URL.
- [4] **PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL).** [International Association of Human-Animal Interaction Organisations: Who is PIAS?](#). Legacy self-report of four monthly Pet Hints to more than 600 newspapers, PetPEP involvement and more than three million website hits per month; figures are not independently audited in the public material located.
- [5] **PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL).** [For Journalists](#). Legacy offer of media releases, Pet Hints and consultant assistance to journalists; now a parked-domain URL.
- [6] **PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL).** [Pet Hints](#). Search-indexed trace of a recurring editorial calendar covering acquisition, health and pet-lifestyle themes.
- [7] **PetNet / PIAS media release (legacy PDF URL).** [Purrfect pets for little people](#). Example of an emotionally framed media release; the underlying file is no longer served by the live domain.
- [8] **PetNet / PIAS media release (legacy PDF URL).** [Dog ownership = active mums](#). Example of a health-and-lifestyle media release; the underlying file is no longer served by the live domain.
- [9] **Murdoch University.** [A vet who found her voice](#). Dr Jonica Newby describes working at PIAS, commissioning research into health benefits and urban animal management, helping rewrite PetPEP and producing roughly 10-12 ABC Science Show radio pieces while working in pet care.
- [10] **Raw Meaty Bones (reproduction of broadcast transcript).** [Media Watch Transcript, 3 March 1997](#). Campaigner-hosted transcript of ABC Media Watch criticism concerning disclosure of PIAS and Uncle Ben's funding. It is not the ABC's current official transcript archive and should be cited with that provenance.
- [11] **Media Australia Update extract republished in The Whistle, March 1997.** [ABC faces new conflict of interest scandal](#). Contemporaneous account setting out Lonsdale's allegations and the Science Show's response that PIAS was autonomous and non-commercial and that the series was independently commissioned and scientifically supportable.
- [12] **Australian Veterinary Association.** [PetPEP Coordinator Training](#). Current AVA description of PetPEP as responsible-ownership education and an 'investment in the pet owners of the future'.
- [13] **Australian Veterinary Association / Vet Voice.** [Benefits of getting involved](#). Current AVA page reporting school-program acquisition outcomes and encouraging veterinary logos, sample bags, promotional material and local media releases.
- [14] **Australian Business Register.** [Current details for ABN 85 085 490 857](#). PIAS Australia Pty Ltd is recorded as an Australian private company whose ABN was cancelled from 6 November 2017.
- [15] **ASIC Published Notices.** [Notice of general meeting of members](#). Records PIAS as in liquidation, liquidator appointed 11 January 2017, with final meeting listed for 10 July 2017. This does not itself establish insolvency or the reason for winding up.

- [16] **Australian Business Register.** [Historical details for ABN 48 008 454 313](#). Mars Australia Pty Ltd history includes variants of the PIAS name among historical business names/trading names in the 2000s. Corporate ownership, governance and transfer questions still require underlying ASIC records.
- [17] **National Library of Australia.** [Archived websites](#). Explains that the Australian Web Archive preserves snapshots of Australian sites, including sites that disappear, and can be searched by URL or keyword.
- [18] **Medical Journal of Australia.** [Pet ownership: good for health?](#). Article search record contains the author's declaration that he acted as a paid consultant to PIAS, then funded by Uncle Ben's. The complete article and disclosure should be obtained for the evidentiary bundle.
- [19] **Applied Research in Quality of Life.** [The causal effect of pet ownership on health and well-being](#). 2026 open-access Australian quasi-experimental study reporting no discernible average effect on life satisfaction, loneliness, mental health or general health under plausible assumptions; the authors stress limitations and possible heterogeneous benefits.
- [20] **Animal Medicines Australia.** [Pets in Australia: A national survey of pets and people 2025](#). Industry survey estimates 73% of Australian households own a pet and food represents 46% of an estimated A\$21.3 billion annual pet-care spend.
- [21] **United States District Court, N.D. California.** [Multistate Complaint for Injunctive and Other Relief](#). Filed 24 October 2023 in State of Arizona et al. v Meta Platforms, Inc. et al., No. 4:23-cv-05448. Contains allegations, not findings, concerning youth targeting, engagement-maximising design, internal knowledge, concealment and COPPA.
- [22] **United States District Court, N.D. California / New York Attorney General.** [Meta and State Attorneys General Consent Judgment and Settlement Agreement](#). Filed 26 August 2026. Records the states' allegations, Meta's denial, extensive youth protections and payments; expressly states no admission, no final adjudication and no precedent outside participating states.
- [23] **Office of the New York Attorney General.** [Attorney General James secures up to \\$17.1 billion and reforms from Meta](#). Official summary of the multistate payments and platform restrictions.
- [24] **Reuters.** [Meta agrees to pay \\$18 billion to settle US lawsuits](#). Contemporary report of up to US\$18 billion including a separate Texas agreement; reports Meta's denial of wrongdoing and continuing private litigation.
- [25] **ABC News Australia.** [Meta to pay \\$23 billion and update Facebook and Instagram](#). Australian report converting the maximum US\$18 billion figure to approximately A\$23.6 billion, explaining the '\$24 billion' Australian headline.
- [26] **Australian Veterinary Association.** [Guidelines for dental treatment in dogs and cats](#). AVA guidance, ratified in 2010, states that untreated oral disease is painful and may contribute to local or systemic disease; it describes periodontitis as an irreversible destructive process and requires prevention and homecare.
- [27] **Journal of Small Animal Practice / PubMed.** [A review of the frequency and impact of periodontal disease in dogs](#). 2020 Waltham Petcare Science Institute review reports 9.3-18.2% prevalence in primary-care records and 44-100% in detailed anaesthetised examinations; it identifies poor oral care as a significant risk factor and says diet, behaviour, environment and genetics may contribute.
- [28] **Australian Veterinary Journal / PubMed.** [Diet and periodontal disease in dogs and cats](#). 1994 review concludes that there was reasonable evidence associating soft diets with increased frequency and severity of periodontal disease, while also noting that dental-health effects vary by product and feeding practice.
- [29] **T. Lonsdale - address to the AVA Metropolitan Practitioners Branch.** [Pandemic of Periodontal Disease: A malodorous condition](#). Dated 20 August 1992. Primary evidence that diet, periodontal disease and prevention concerns were put before an AVA professional audience; it does not by itself prove receipt or acceptance by every AVA officeholder or by Mars.
- [30] **Federal Register of Legislation.** [Criminal Code Act 1995 - section 11.5 Conspiracy](#). A federal conspiracy charge requires an agreement, intention that an identified offence be committed pursuant to it, and an overt act. The precise applicable offence and jurisdiction must also be established.
- [31] **Australian Competition and Consumer Commission.** [Unfair business practices](#). ACCC guidance says unconscionable conduct requires more than unfairness; relevant matters can include youth vulnerability, unfair tactics, failure to disclose risks and good faith. Only a court can determine liability.