

<http://www.bloggernews.net/18763>

Are animal owners becoming too complacent to fight for their property rights ?

This post was written by REXANO on 19 July, 2007 (21:44) | [All News](#)

Editorial By Zuzana Kukol, www.REXANO.org

Las Vegas, NV, July 20, 2007—I have been a private animal owner most of my life. My involvement with animals got more serious about 20 years ago with Doberman dogs and captive reptiles, and over 10 years ago with captive big cats.

Our enemies, extreme animal rights (AR) activists groups, are getting stronger and more successful at passing bans regarding how many and what species or breeds of animals we can keep, and often mandating forced sterilization of domestic pets. With Internet becoming more popular, the number of all kinds of animal organizations is increasing and our enemies are becoming stronger and more efficient.

It doesn't matter if you only own one hamster, horse, domestic dog, or cat, these unfair bans will eventually affect us all, since we all have a common enemy: extreme AR groups whose final agenda is no animals in captivity, no meat on our plates and no leather good in our houses. They want to remove all animal and human contact.

I was full of hope that maybe this AR threat will be a wake up call for all animal owners affected by these unfair bans to **unite and fight together**:

<http://www.bloggernews.net/18102>

Even though just like with AR groups, the number of pro animal ownership groups is increasing, they are not being efficient enough to stand up to the AR threat.

What I am unfortunately seeing is elists full of catty cat fights, mostly unproductive and concerned more about groups' elections and personal egos, preoccupied about who will be on the BOD and who is whose friend and who is sleeping with whom, instead fighting for our cause: protecting our right to keep any animal of our choice.

What I am witnessing is very few people working hard, while the rest/majority are just apathetic to what is going on, thinking the 'others' will do the work and fight for their rights. Too many that used to fight also give up when they themselves get grandfathered or exempted, not seeing AR will eventually come for them too.

Animal rights groups are mostly well paid “professional AR”. Not any different than paid lobbyists, this is their paid job and they have free time after they leave the office, plus, they do not have animals to take care of like many of us do.

Yes, we are outnumbered when it comes to the millions of dollars and time AR have, but instead of looking at excuses why not do something, it is time to look for reasons and ways how to fight effectively, for free or almost no cost, put your passion for your animals into hard work.

Redirect the cat fight energy and time into being constructive rather than destructive within a group by infighting, which wastes time and weaken us all by attacking our own. Stop concentrating on personal dislikes and concentrate on the common cause, to **win the war against AR and uninformed legislators**.

The problem I see nowadays is there are too many animal groups, too many BODs, too many presidents, but not enough great leaders and soldiers to get the work done.

Animal welfare and owners' rights groups needs to get the name recognition like PETA or HSUS have .

For free or almost nothing you can write your own news, with your own quotes on many Internet forums and blogging news sites such as Blogger News <http://www.bloggernews.net/>.

Articles on these services register as current news on Google search engines within hours or even minutes, for free or very little, all it takes is some time and little effort to write.

There are also many press release outlets with different price ranges to reach the media editors.

To save money posting ads, we need write articles for magazines, from AFG (Animal Finders Guide) all the way to Cat or Dog Fancy. This way you get few pages of free advertising that would otherwise cost few hundred to thousands.

This approach works very well for REXANO (www.REXANO.org, Responsible Exotic Animal Ownership) I recently co-founded with Scott Shoemaker. It is a free web resource designed to give facts-based research material to private owners of exotic animals to fight unfair legislation.

Also, get to know your local politicians, from commissioners thru state representatives to the federal level, and if possible try to meet with them in person to educate them about what is really going on (<http://www.rexano.org/HSUSAustFrame.htm>) and why all these AR

ordinances and bills are wrong, unfair and often unconstitutional.

Too many groups I have seen are becoming a big ineffective bureaucratic behemoth, like a government, too many BOD members, too many committees, too much administration and no effective or organized legislative action going on.

Year 2007 brought too many mandatory spay/neuter and anti exotic animal bills and bans to many states, localities and even federal level. In too many cases AR have been winning and responsible animal owners losing their rights to keep the animal of their choice.

It also takes too long for many groups to write and approve press release, it should take no more than 1 or 2 days, after that it is no longer news, (especially when commenting on hot events, like tiger attacks) , in order to minimize the damage most of the media is doing with their sensationalized stories.

It is time for pro animal owners' groups to write a position and mission statement and get them BOD approved. In addition, write a cookie cutter press releases relating to different events like AR do, and if unfortunate animal attack or injury or new bill happen, just insert name/location/date, and press release can go out the same day the event occurs, since the text as well as few BOD members quotes have been pre-approved by group's BOD.

If we continue the trend of doing nothing noteworthy in legislative area and having mostly complacent BODs who are happy with their titles but refuse to earn it, we, animal owners, are going to be extinct soon and we have only ourselves to blame.

Let Others Know About This Post These icons link to social bookmarking sites where readers can share and discover new web pages.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

« [Don't report suspicious behavior in airports. You may be sued](#)

[Faking war stories: Um, fellahs, 115 decibles would scare my dog Puti](#) »

Commenters are asked to refrain from personal attacks, insults, or profane language. Spam comments and/or trackbacks will not be published to the site.

Comments

Comment from **Steve**

Date: July 20, 2007, 6:48 am

I'm a pet owner and I have to say that your logic is way off. I'm not an AR person nor vegetarian but I do know that AR people do more and care more for our pets than you seem to (AND they have pets of their own). It's obvious that your intentions are to keep wild, exotic animals in captivity which doesn't show sincere concern for their welfare. I hope everyone sees your true intentions and misleading rhetoric. I think I trust more a person who works to save others than someone who spends so much time trying to protect their own interests. Not once did you mention welfare of animals. You speak only of your own property rights. It just goes to show that anyone can form an "organization". The fact that PETA and HSUS etc. raise so much money speaks to people's perception of what good work they do for our pets.

Comment from **DA**

Date: July 20, 2007, 11:44 am

Steve– While your are heaping praises onto H\$US, can you ask them where the \$34 million donated for Katrina pets went? They were there for a month then left with the \$\$\$\$\$CASH\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ The Louisiana Attorney General is investigating, maybe he will soon let us know! And where did the pets go? The many pet owners that are still looking for their pets would like to know! And why does PeTA fund the legal defense of domestic terrorists? The FBI has issued a \$250,000 reward for one of these animal rights or "protection" activists. TRUST? HSUS and PeTA are othing more than media whores that take advantage of others tragedies to ask for donations. They are a far cry from saviors of animals. Check out www.petakillsanimals.com so you can see they are killers of animals rather than saviors.

Comment from [Gloria Johnson](#)

Date: July 20, 2007, 11:46 am

I can't even begin to comment on what "Steve" wrote. It is so ignorant! It's just wasting time dealing with his type so I won't.

I'm so glad you said it Z the way it really is. This way it doesn't sound so much like I'm whining about myself. But the fact is two years ago, I accepted the appointment to the Captive Wildlife Technical Advisory Group. Since we met approximtely every 5 weeks for 3

days, I could not get a job. Who is going to hire you if you say "oh, by the way I need 3 days off every month". Then when the Python Bill came out, I spent 100% of my lobbying time dog trailing it so no other species would be added. I had no time for other clients and therefore made zero salary. I tried that summer to get ANY kind of job, and maybe its where I live but nothing came through, absolutely nothing. I did the same again this year, with zero salary, and now I ask you to look at what has happened. I was right, I was not wasting my time, that bill did get totally screwed up and I fought till I bled (with no help). I did everything I could to fight that addition of Class I Mammals, on a Reptile bill then when it passed anyway I worked 2 more months trying to get the Governor to veto it. Only about 5 people also wrote veto letters to the Governor and some just used my form letter. Now I'm doing everything I can to "guilt" the Commissioners into grandfathering us in.

Where has this got me? No income for 2 years. I just had a house fire. Computer crash Sometimes stay up 24 hours cleaning and trying to repair my house and still find a job. My personal business account is almost empty, and so is the Cougar Ridge Account.

Ironically, I probably will be the first to lose my animals because my house will be foreclosed on. Like a big dummy I thought if I did the "right thing" something would happen to get me through. Instead a \$5000 cougar surgery, \$2000 well pump, no job luck, house fire, and yesterday the plumbing broke. I can only send emails with no attachments and certainly can't afford repair or a new one.

Two wonderful couples each sent me \$200 during session actually apologizing it wasn't more but wanted to help. No one else lent a dime and now I face ruin. Even cooperation was awful. THEY told ME what to do and they know nothing about lobbying (you know I've done it for 25 years). Sometimes against my advice they would do things or make calls that only worsened the situation.

Now I'm scared. If I manage to pull through It will be with a full time job and I want be able to lobby for free. I won't be able to go to the capitol at all! So... who is going to step in? Who even knows how? To speak selfishly, I will have already lost everything for my stupidity in giving too much, so it won't matter to me.

It's time people woke up. Writing to each other doesn't get anything done. It just makes YOU feel better. Start raising funds and hire a lobbyist. It is the only way this will really work. I cannot beat this into everyone's head's enough. They all think its because I want the job. Hey!!! I can't take it now! I have to get a "real" every day job. I've never been so disgusted and depressed. I keep getting emails about Carol and this and that and that I MUST write a response. Dammit!!!! I'm trying to survive I don't have time to do that kind of stuff. Thank god I saw this because it is worth responding to. Everyone else can do the other

work they have so much free time for. I'm going back to repairing my kitchen, cleaning soot off of everything, wall, furniture, carpet in every room; and find a job and some food for the cats.

Good Luck,

Glo

Comment from Rob

Date: July 22, 2007, 6:35 am

Organizations of animal exploiters, like Rexano, are trying to rile up average people by deceiving them about what animal advocacy groups are up to. I wouldn't say that PETA or the Humane Society are above criticism, but that doesn't mean it's okay to misrepresent them.

The big lie, repeated on lots of pro-exploitation sites, is that animal advocates want to deprive people of their pets. No reference or proof is given for this, and none could be, because it is a complete fabrication. Ingrid Newkirk, head of PETA, has cats. My wife and I have dogs. In my experience, animal advocates are actually more likely to have pets.

What we do object to is the idea that having a pet is just having a piece of property that one is free to abuse and mistreat. When animal exploiters say that animal advocates are against owning pets, that's what they mean: They want to be left alone to irresponsibly exploit animals, rather than responsibly share their lives and homes with other living, feeling beings.

Comment from Amy

Date: July 22, 2007, 6:47 am

The lies and deceptions come from many of the big name/dollar organizations. I see nothing about REXANO that supports abuse, cruelty or neglect- simply the right to responsibly keep the animal of choice. A little more background research into HSUS, PETA, API, and like organizations would prove to very enlightening to a lot of the general public. Read some of the quotes from Wayne Pacelle, Ingrid Newkirk. Check out where the dollars go, the euthanasia rate. Read the small print. Check out the legislation they propose and support then use common sense and logic to reason where it all ends.

Comment from [Carole Baskin Founder of Big Cat Rescue](#)

Date: July 22, 2007, 9:07 am

Animal Lovers Near Critical Mass

According to the Internet dictionary, the definition of Critical Mass is: 1. The minimum quantity of fissile material required for a nuclear chain reaction. 2. The minimum amount of people with shared understanding to tip the balance and instigate change.

When a proportionately small fraction of electrons line up in an atom it creates an invisible force that causes all of the other electrons to snap into the same line. When enough people begin to think in certain ways, and reach a critical mass, then all of a sudden all of society begins to align that way. Changes that happen in one place begin to happen all over the world at the same time. Slavery began to be stopped in England in 1807 and around the middle of the 19th century, not only here, but in Asia, Africa and Indonesia because the belief emerged that this was no longer something we could tolerate. It started because one man, William Wilberforce, began to change the way the English viewed slavery and the rest of the world snapped into alignment.

Quantum Physics is not only stranger than you think it is, but it is stranger than you can think. It shatters the illusion of our separateness. If enough of us believe that something is intolerable we all begin to act that way.

The state of your life is nothing more than a reflection of your state of mind. The state of the world is nothing more than a collective state of mind.

The mass of changes that have taken place over just the past few years illustrate this, such as the falling of dictatorships in the Philippines, Nicaragua, Romania and Bulgaria, and the falling of the Berlin wall. These crises were all resolved with hardly a bullet being shed. It wasn't as if the people in power all got together and said we shouldn't be treating people this way. The new consciousness came about because enough of us began to align ourselves and out of that alignment came new leaders.

If you saw the recent movie called *Amazing Grace*, you may remember that in 1824 William Wilberforce started the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It was the beginning of a change in consciousness toward animals. Up until 1920 women weren't allowed to vote because they were thought to be irrational creatures and not as intelligent as men. The movement for female equality began in the 1500's, but it wasn't until 400 years later that it became law. We are seeing the same changes in attitudes toward the animals.

Big Cats have had big wins in the past couple of years. It began in 2003 with a law to ban the sale of big cats across state lines as pets. Since then eight states, including AR, IA, IN, KY, LA, MD, NY and WA have banned the keeping of big cats as pets. Three countries including Africa, Australia and Ireland and 12 communities in Canada have banned the keeping of big cats as pets. Five countries, including Brazil, Croatia, India, Scotland, the UK and 20 communities in Canada have banned circuses that use big cats in their performances.

Six states, including AL, IN, MT, NY, OR and WA have banned killing exotic animals in canned hunts and 27 states, including AL, CA, IA, IL, KY, LA, MD, MS, NH, NJ, NM, OR, RI, SC, TX, WI & WY have banned killing animals over the Internet. Scores of cities and counties have also enacted similar protective measures for the cats and many more have bills that are currently pending.

Please visit www.CatLaws.com today and support Haley's Act, which is a bill that would end the use of baby big cats in photo booths and petting sessions. These cubs can only be used for a couple of months and then are discarded. You can help save them from lives of suffering with just a few mouse clicks at www.CatLaws.com

The reason bans are being enacted is because the public knows that legislation cannot change the heart, but it can restrain the heartless.

Comment from **DA**

Date: July 22, 2007, 9:48 am

Forgot to mention animal rights organizations are making BIG \$\$\$\$ showing pics of poor puppies and kittens, falsifying pics with events, and spendin every waking minute of the day, asking for YOUR donations. They are a far cry from anything CHARITABLE. CAROL of BIG CATS, guess what, the ability to make laws to remove the rights of citizens to have animals is due to corruption of lobbyin, special interests which always are about \$\$\$\$PROFITS\$\$\$\$.... ECONOMICS of the animal rights INDUSTRY, not quantum BS physics...I bet you live high and mighty on your "charitable donations" , CHA CHING, Carol, CHA CHING. We are not fooled by your high & mighty fascade and AR speech. Slavery??? What a load of BS -

Comment from [Scott Shoemaker](#)

Date: July 22, 2007, 10:01 am

The truth of the matter is that the legislative bans are being enacted by legislators that are ill informed or mis-informed by Animal Rights (AR) groups and the lobbying of hypocrites like Ms. Baskin, see above post (who started as an exotic pet owner, then breeder, and now a sanctuary). The AR lobbyists are putting forth a propaganda campaign based on fear and half truths.

They never want to admit that there is such a thing as responsible exotic owners that care for and love their animals. They want to paint all exotic animal owners as exploiters and animal abusers. The AR groups and lobbyist want people and legislatures to ignore facts, to solely act on emotion and a false sense of fear.

It is an extremist attitude that wants everyone to think the way they do, to try and force their will on others by laws or force. Hence they are dictating what they believe is right, and taking away the freedom of choice.

Comment from **timbalioguy**

Date: July 22, 2007, 11:15 pm

I will first address Rob's comments. From his choice of words, it is clear he has bought the animal rights agenda hook, line and sinker. The meaning of the word 'exploit' has been twisted around by the animal rights groups to mean 'any use of animals at all'. Thus, I am exploiting my pet cats by simply having them. I am exploiting cows, by eating their flesh, something our body is designed to do. Thus, the original meaning of 'exploit', i.e. to 'abuse animals for profit' (and there are a few that actually do this. Stopping this heinous abuse is what animal cruelty laws are for, not stopping the responsible, legitimate and humane use of animals.) And yes, the animal rights people want to deprive people of their pets. The 'animal guardian' laws they are pushing for, for example, are designed to strip pet owners of their property rights so that the AR's can move in and seize their pets for any reason at all. Breed-specific laws, anti-tethering laws, and mandatory spay/neuter laws are all designed to harass responsible pet owners, and/or kill off pets by attrition. Last, but not least: stereotypes get nowhere with any thinking person. Trying to paint all pet owners as irresponsible abusers is like saying all drivers of cars always drive drunk. Certainly isn't the case!

Now, on Crol Baskin's comments. First of all, leave quantum physics to the physicists! What you view as victories for the cats is actually a step closer to the realization of your '20 year plan'. This plan calls for the total eradication of captive big cats. Since the wild populations of these animals is disappearing about as fast as you are reading this, this is nothing but **MANAGED EXTINCTION**. Make no doubt about it, we need captive populations of big cats in order for these species to survive. We need more than the handful kept by large, well financed zoos. Many more.

I do not see why you are equating social causes with big cat ownership. Most thinking people would have a huge problem with slavery to begin with. It divided our country from day one. Women's rights was something that came about to correct heinous abuses of women that dated from an earlier age. We are talking about **ENSLAVING OR BEATING OTHER HUMAN BEINGS BECAUSE WE CAN** here. This is human rights, and few would agree that these old practices should come back. But with animals, it is different. Powerful lobbyists are trying to take away our right to responsibly own and use animals. For me, this means lions. I am not practicing lion-beating. I am not torturing lions. I am not depriving them of any important

thing. These animals adapt quite well to captivity, and can be very happy when around those they love. (The animal rights people constantly forget about the ability of animals, especially higher animals, to adapt to new conditions and thrive in those conditions.) The ownership of animals goes back to the dawn of human civilization. Slavery and wife-beating do too, but those practices were barbaric to many even in those days. Owning animals, even exotics (BTW, 'exotic' is an artificial term made up by man that has no reality in the animal world. An animal is an animal. Animals know nothing about man-given labels.) is a FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT as discussed in the Declaration of Independence.

You call the banning of the responsible ownership of big cats a 'win'. Why is it a win? IS a win when people cannot cherish the powerful relationships you can build with these animals? (Which, BTW is as good for the animal as it is for the keeper.) Is it a win when all the cats have died off, and enough are not left to sustain the species? Is it a win when children can only look at pictures of big cats in books or on the internet? Is it a win when all the 'real' cats that are left are pelts and mounts in museums?

The time is going to come when many of these places that have banned keeping big cats are going to wake up and realize they have been duped. Then, you will see these laws dropping off the books. It has already happened in Missouri. The ban passed in Arkansas has unfixable loopholes to the point they can hardly enforce it.

Extremist positions are never around for very long. Such will be the case with these exotic animal bans. There is another kind of critical mass already at work. This is animal owners of all stripe. More and more, dog owners are working to protect the rights of a lion owner to own their lions. The lion owner is working to protect the dog owners rights. The ban-backers might have lots of money, and know how to lie to legislators. The animal owners have the TRUTH about these matters, and they vastly outnumber those who back these extremist bans. Now, THATS CRITICAL MASS!

Comment from **Steve**

Date: July 23, 2007, 8:31 am

Seriously, "petakillsanimals.com" which is run by The Center for Consumer Freedom which is funded by big tobacco, restaurants and the meat industry is not a reputable source to make your argument. This group and their funders have special interests to make money. Just look at the salaries of AR people and compare them to the CEO's etc of these industries. AR people aren't in it to make money so you have to ask, "why are they doing this?" The difference between fundraising for AR groups and industry groups is that the more money industry groups make, the more cars they get to buy. The more money AR groups make the more money they get to use to help more animals. I applaud those who sacrifice to save

animals because they care about them, not because they care about what the animal does for them. After reading people's post to this I'm leaning even more towards those who help animals. If you care about big cats and exotics you should have every right to "SAVE" them not buy and breed them. These animals are wild and don't deserve to be treated like domestic animals. I'm suggesting that people really practice some introspection and figure out why they are fighting to be able to "own" exotics and see if it truly is a noble reason or a selfish one.

Comment from [HM](#)

Date: July 23, 2007, 10:27 am

I hope they were only being sarcastic, but get a load of the comments after this article in the Casper Tribune.

<http://www.casperstartribune.net/articles/2007/07/19/news/regional/5c5f8ca0aa1611cd8725731c006eacb9.txt>

Comment from **timbalioguy**

Date: July 23, 2007, 11:50 am

Steve,

First of all, The Center for Consumer Freedom's research on animal rights is right-on and verifiable. Can you say this about much of what comes out of PETA, HSUS, etc? PETA has even had the audacity to deliberately and flagrantly misquote the Bible. That alone should say something about their integrity.

Once again, this post is loaded with stereotypes. Your statements imply, if you are a businessman, you are automatically an animal exploiter simply because the CEOs are in it for the money. Are you aware for instance, of the growing environmental interests among big business? Try subscribing to something called 'the PERC report'.

But why do the AR groups raise so much money? Because they lie, or misrepresent the truth to the general public. They will take an ordinary circumstance, and bend it around into something grotesque. This can be done by manipulating images, use of unusual camera angles, misquoting a text that everyone accepts without question, like the Bible mentioned above. They tell stories using loaded words to evoke powerful emotions. They will take one legitimate abuse situation (I am not implying for a minute they don't exist!) and twist it around to make it look like most or all people who have X animal abuse it in that manner. (Read Rob's post. It is an excellent example of what I am saying here.)

You will have to explain to me how you can save big cats by not breeding them. That statement has about the same common sense as 'You can make Ipods common by not manufacturing them'.

As far as being wild, and needing better treatment, try visiting a small facility that has big cats. I bet you will find their animals are well-adjusted and happy. They have no idea what 'wild' is. If you give some thought, 'wild' is a man-made idea. And another term whose meaning has been twisted around by the AR folks (they use a lot of their money to try and mis-educate people. That is how they hope to build their 'critical mass!'). A well cared-for lion has as little interest in living on the African savannah as you probably do. Their world is the people and animals they live with and around. It can be an excellent world for them because believe it or not, animals, especially big cats, can adapt to their environment. In fact the fossil record shows the big cats are among the most highly adaptable animals there are.

Have you ever owned a pet animal of any kind? Then you know, there is little 'selfish' in relating to that animal. Works with big cats, too, maybe even better than with small pets (it does for me!). There is nothing at all wrong with an animal as a companion, be it a chihuahua (sic) or a lion. This kind of ability to bond is hardwired into both humans and animals. In that sense, it is selfish, bonds like that could be said to be selfish in the sense that they only exist between two creatures. Many studies show the physical and mental benefits (both to the human and the animal) of having a pet. This is one of the reasons why I believe that animal ownership, especially pets, is a fundamental right. It is 'the pursuit of happiness' at it's highest.

Lastly, nothing states anywhere that private owners of exotic animals cannot contribute to conservation. Just by having these animals in a loose infrastructure, they are guaranteeing the future supply of them. Did you know that the well-intentioned breeding programs in the large zoos have failed because of their stubborn refusal to work with the private sector? Their genetic base is too small. Their solution? Capture more from the wild, thus affecting the often seriously endangered wild population. Private owners have also made significant contributions to husbandry practices. It is private owners who figured out how to captive-breed ocelots (and were rewarded by having their right to move them around taken away). Many enrichment and care techniques have been worked out in the informal environment of the responsible private owner. In the meantime, one time I saw a presentation on just how much paperwork was involved at a big zoo just to give a toy to an animal.

It's time for Americans to throw off the obfuscation of the animal rights people and take back what has been stolen from them!

Comment from **Steve**

Date: July 23, 2007, 2:04 pm

timbalionguy,

you are stating things as facts but aren't backing them up. using consumer freedom as a resource does not give your argument merit. my argument is people's intentions. not all businessmen are animal abusers, obviously, but when your business is to make a profit, then anything that does not lead to making money (such as animal welfare) can and many times take a back seat. otherwise, the businessman would be out of a job. anyone with a basic understanding of capitalism or share-holding understands that. your arguments are showing me your intentions are simply for your own benefit. you save an animal by rescuing it from an abusive situation. you don't save an animal by keeping it captive and breeding more of them. that is NOT saving an animal. that's creating more to be kept captive. if by some rare chance you're reintroducing them to their safe natural habitat, then that's one thing. otherwise it's not to their own benefit but yours.

Comment from TomK

Date: July 23, 2007, 3:44 pm

I don't know which is worse, Steve saying that animals are not saved by breeding in captivity, or people falling for such a statement.

Let me tell the audience something: Being a pet is a great deal for the animal. Very nearly every one of them loves human company. Humans do a lot of good for the animals, like curing diseases. helping them develop more genetic variety, and supporting a lot more of them in comfort than can be supported by nature unaided. Humans are able to be the best that nature has produced, and the animal rights people have constantly downgraded humanity's contributions.

Steve is wrong, the Centers for Consumer Freedom have done a lot of work to document crimes committed by animal rights, including felony arson and terrorism. It has also documented comments that contradict Rob's statement. It sounds like Rob either lies for the animal rights activists or doesn't know what they are about. Both Ingrid Newkirk and Wayne Pacelle have stated that they want an end to all ownership of animals. Anyone who says that they just want better treatment for animals is either lying or ignorant.

Carole Baskin is so ashamed of her extinction plan that she had it taken down from her website after word of it got around. It is something to be ashamed of. There are still many endangered and threatened animals living in captivity in the U.S., in greater numbers than the zoos can support when they spend hundreds of thousands of dollars per animal just making fancy enclosures. Carole Baskin is horribly negative against pet owners and apparently to her every pet owner who doesn't suck up to her or give her money is scum. The consequences of laws that she wants passed include the death of a lot of perfectly

healthy animals that could be used as breeding stock to restore the numbers of several threatened species, and to preserve their genome.

But really, people who own animals have a lot to be proud of. Taking good care of an animal is something to be proud of. The good that animal owners do is enough to justify the attitude that humans should be allowed to own any animal that they can keep alive and healthy. This is pretty much any animal and it definitely includes tigers.

There's not a lot of pride in letting animal rights activists make us feel guilty over issues that they knowingly and deliberately use to harm good people. The unwarranted negativity of the animal rights activists proves that they are not qualified to make such judgments. Carole Baskin certainly isn't. Also, the big cats lose when private owners are forced to destroy their animals. To follow a negative and delusional ideology, Carole Baskin and other people who work with her have forced the destruction of a lot of animals, intend to force the destruction of a lot more animals, and they intend to monopolize what is left of the trade and own the Species Survival Plans. In a few years people will be on a new environmental kick and the "great Restoration" will be the big thing for government to pour billions of dollars into. Seriously, once there is a president of the U.S. who vouches for people like Baskin and says that this is our highest priority, there will be so much money poured into AZA accredited programs to restore species that the unscrupulous will be able to steal billions, and it won't be accounted for any better than the money that was thrown at AIDS. In order to get at this money, various people (you know who you are) have done what it takes to trample the civil rights of owners, lied and lied and lied, had people's stuff set on fire, and God knows what else in order to set it up so that a very few owners of sanctuaries are allowed to have fertile animals. Every law that Baskin asks for has unconstitutional exemptions for AZA certified businesses.

Comment from **timbalionguy**

Date: July 23, 2007, 8:11 pm

Steve, I understand perfectly what the business world is like. Just like you, I work in it. And yes, when you are trying to make a profit, you have to set priorities. But setting priorities when it comes to animals does not have to be an excuse for abuse. Most good businessmen know you would get nowhere fast by hiding stuff like this 'in the back room'. (I'll admit it does sometimes happen. But busissmen like that usually belong behind bars for many reasons other than animal abuse.)

As far as your reasoning on 'saving animals', it makes no logical sense at all. Maybe you are confusing this with 'saving a species' which is what I mean. If you remember your grade school biology, an animal must reproduce to survive. because all animals eventually die, you

must reproduce more or less continuously. So, you might 'rescue' an animal from an abusive situation, and there is a legitimate need for facilities that do this, for virtually all species of animals. But, there are an awful lot of animals out there that don't need rescuing. And these are the ones that are reproducing, thus saving the species.

As far as 'benefit' goes, is it not a benefit to exist? If an animal is born in captivity and lives in captivity, what is wrong with that? Most animals are perfectly happy in captivity as long as they receive proper care. So yes, it benefits us. It also benefits the animal in preserving it, both as an individual and as a species. Most animals also love the attention they get in captivity. That attention, too is a benefit. Reintroduction to the wild is something we all dream about, but the 'wild' is rapidly disappearing. What do you do then? I say, let's try and save what's left of the wild AND work on raising the same animals in captivity. That is the only way to save a species, especially the big cats.

Comment from [Gabrielle Collins](#)

Date: July 23, 2007, 9:13 pm

The bottom line is that most AR groups are so preoccupied with proving to everyone that they are right, that their way is the only way, that they forget what they (maybe) originally started out for - helping animals. If they would invest their time, energy and money into ACTUALLY helping animals, they could do a lot of good. Places like PETA and HSUS give very little money toward the care of animals. This is a documented fact - just look at their public tax records. I guarantee, PETA and the HSUS make far more money than any circus or animal trainer. As for us pet owners, we don't make money at all - we LOSE money by pouring it into the care of our pets.

I do not own big cats, but I do own fennec foxes. I know that in the wild they only live an average of 3-4 years. In captivity they can live up to 14. In captivity they do not need to worry about disease, poachers, hunters, traps, starvation, shelter, injury, infection, etc. My fennec fox loves people, loves his nice, comfy pillow and his sunny windowsill. He loves his treats and toys. I am quite sure he is much more happy than he would be in the wild, where he would just be trying to survive. I doubt cats - big or small - feel any different. I am generally against removing an animal from the wild to make it a pet, but I am also highly against taking away a pet and trying to force it into wild behaviors. Let wild animals remain wild as much as possible, and let captive animals remain in the care of their owners.

Responsible pet owners love and care for their pets, and take care of them accordingly. Irresponsible ones do not, and these are the ones that make the news and add fuel to the AR propaganda. Think of it this way: if there really are 20,000+ tigers in the USA (as AR groups are so very fond of saying, despite the fact that there is no basis at all for this

number) and only 1 person is killed by a tiger every year or two, and you only hear about “abused” or “neglected” tigers once or twice a year, then it is actually a fairly safe situation - both for the tigers and for the owners.

Comment from **TomK**

Date: July 23, 2007, 10:00 pm

Gabrielle, humans can improve tremendously on the wild and usually do. We’re the best resource that the animals have. That’s what a brain and hands are for.