

A Critique of Anti-Breeding Propaganda

By Marcy Covault © January 2006

There has been a furor recently over an aviary in Oregon, targeted by local animal rights fanatics (ARFs) and an anti-breeding reporter as substandard in the care of its birds. The article paints a horrid picture (as such sensationalist articles ALWAYS do), but the local animal control did NOT recommend seizing the birds, even though “rescues” were competing for the right to take them. Whether the accusations are somewhat, very, or not true is for those involved to determine. Those who don’t live in that area don’t have firsthand knowledge or the ability to affect the situation. Those who do will hopefully do what is appropriate.

- Ø Link to original article published in the NewsTribune, Tacoma, WA:
<http://www.thenewstribune.com/news/local/story/5407680p-4885764c.htm> [DEAD LINK]
- Ø FOLLOW-UP: See responses at <http://www.parrot-depot.com/q&a.htm>. [LINK GONE] Seems the two principal attackers of the aviary were not being quite truthful. Not surprising with the ARA league—where the end justifies the means, including deceiving, distorting, or exaggerating.

What bothered me most about the whole scenario was that, once again, an animal breeder was vilified, this time in an article by a well-known anti-breeding reporter. In addition, there were many on avian-related internet lists who were willing to tar and feather this “bad” breeder on only the word of this anti-breeding reporter! Are we that gullible and easily led? Evidently many are... It’s that old lynch mob mentality that comes into play when the frenzy of the crowd / pack / flock instinct overrides reason.

What has happened to our society’s attitude toward animal breeding and husbandry? In my opinion, over the past few decades, there has been a slow “tainting” (or “poisoning”) of the stream of consciousness in the “civilized” societies, e.g, United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Italy, etc., by anti-animal-use groups. Virtually all breeding (and use) of animals has been propagandized as immoral and inhumane. Many of those who are involved in rescue organizations have also incorporated this philosophy into their jargon and slogans, e.g., “Don’t breed or buy, while shelter animals die.” If you consider what that’s saying and what the reality is of animals that are offered for adoption (usually mixed breeds), that is based on faulty logic—anti-breeding logic for which ARFs are noted. And well-meaning, animal-loving people, who mainly see the rescue / rehoming side of the equation, fall for that propaganda—hook, line, and sinker.

What is this faulty logic? It makes NO sense, based on the reality that people usually buy purebred animals (referring to dogs and cats), and those are a minority of animals offered for rehoming. But it does appeal to the emotions of people, especially when it is combined with a cadre of pictures showing pitiful animals and filthy facilities in order to garner support and donations—although those cases are a TINY percentage of the total animal ownership and breeding situations!

When referring to birds, the common ARF line is that there are thousands of unwanted birds; that most birds wind up neglected, abused, or abandoned; that birds are naturally wild and should not be kept as pets anyway; and that the greedy breeders are at fault for “forcing” the birds to breed until they are worn out and die, and not telling buyers how hard it is to get along with a bird long-term. Knowledgeable people know that “forcing” is not realistic when it comes to parrots; that responsible breeders do indeed present the negatives as well as the positives; and that the buyer is responsible for caring for the bird and not viewing it as a “disposable commodity” in today’s ultra-consumer world.

Are there bad breeders? Of course. Are there bad parents? Of course. *We’re humans, not robots!*

The anti-breeding propaganda is part of the incremental undermining of the use of animals, with the ultimate goal of ending animal ownership and use, whether that's a so-called "factory farm," a so-called "bird mill," or a so-called "backyard breeder." All of these derogatory terms have been absorbed into our societal vocabulary and, therefore, our consciousness. They are strongly affecting the legislative successes that we are seeing in controlling animal handling / ownership / companionship / breeding in the U.S. and in other countries. And our legislators are falling prey to the deceptive propaganda as well. An alarming number of our Congressional legislators have signed up to support the misguided federal PAWS amendment to the AWA, which is being pushed HARD by ARF groups, like HSUS. Talk about shooting home animal breeders in both feet and working to ensure companion animals are difficult for constituents to come by in the next generation!

In addition, there is this attitude of self-righteous and judgmental condemnation for the animal husbandry business, e.g., the quote that "breeders live off the backs of their animals." Since when was engaging in a respectable business considered BAD? The anti-breeding philosophy implies that making money from an animal enterprise is immoral and inhumane. Since when has a conscientiously operated animal enterprise been labeled an "undesirable" business? *Since the "Animal Rights Fanatics" SAID it was so!* And they are bombarding the general public with this concept, and they are enlisting naïve animal-loving people in doing the ARF dirty work.

When an agribusiness (small or large) is conducted in an ethical manner, humane animal husbandry methods are used, and there is follow-up, where applicable, with buyers (who also share responsibility for the animal they bought), what can be logical about anti-breeding rantings? **NOTHING!**

"One generation and out. We have no problems with the extinction of domestic animals. They are creations of human selective breeding."

— Wayne Pacelle, President of the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)

Since it is not logical, perhaps it has to do with the basic ARF premise, plainly stated in the PETA article, "No Birth Nation" [*NOW REMOVED FROM THEIR WEB SITE*]. Think about it!!! If there is no breeding, then in a generation, there will be no more companion animals. **No breeding = no pets = extinction. It is as SIMPLE AS THAT! And the ARFs KNOW it.**

Is this the future that the "general public" wants? I don't think the majority of people even think about it as a possibility. They think, *"Oh those radical animal rights kooks are at it again. It really doesn't affect me, but maybe they'll do some good against those BAD breeders. The good ones won't be hurt, because who would hurt GOOD breeders?"*

That is fallacious reasoning when the premise is to eliminate breeders altogether! Repeat that over and over—**the GOAL of hard-core ARFs is to eliminate animal breeding, and therefore eliminate animal use**—whether for companionship, food, or clothes!

Unrealistic? A "reasonable" person would think so, but don't assume we are dealing with reasonable people. We already know that for fanatical "true believers," there is no middle ground, only their way. We've certainly seen enough of that in our current world situation with terrorist threats by extremist sects. Please research anti-breeding movements if you doubt this! For further insights and arguments, check out the following (among dozens of sites).

- Ø Center for Consumer Freedom exposé of PETA: <http://www.petakillsanimals.com>
- Ø HSUS, an AR Organization: http://www.activistcash.com/organization_overview.cfm/oid/136
- Ø Animal Rights Quotes: <http://www.animalrights.net/quotes.html>
- Ø Thorough discussion of the animal rights movement: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal_rights
- Ø Interesting articles by Neil Schulman: <http://www.pulpless.com/jneil/aniright.html>
<http://www.pulpless.com/jneil/fifty.html>
- Ø Animal Rights is not Animal Welfare: http://www.animalscam.com/rights_vs_welfare.cfm
- Ø AR and Eco-Terrorism:
http://brianoconnor.typepad.com/animal_crackers/2005/11/as_luck_would_h.html