Crimes of Zealots and Terrorists

Seizure of Animals Incidences Increase

By Marcy Covault, © November 2006

Is this the America envisioned by our founding fathers? What happened to Constitutional due process and "innocent until proven guilty?" Situations similar to the one described in Pinellas County, FL, are happening with alarming regularity in areas where laws give unprecedented power to animal control organizations, under the premise that they need the legal ability to "rescue" animals in danger. Unfortunately, a problem in abuse of power has developed, and those with "animal rights" and/or anti-breeding agendas are taking full advantage! In addition, "opportunists," whose own personal issues and insecurities drive their greed or anger at others, crusade for a cause by which they can terrorize others (and maybe make a few dollars from others' misery).

Do you have a personal grudge against someone? Get involved with a powerful SPCA or similar cooperative "animal rescue" organization and accuse that person of animal abuse, neglect, or cruelty. Hopefully, all their animals will be seized, and they will be properly traumatized and ostracized. You might even "help" the "rescue" organization earn extra money from the sale of the confiscated animals. What a way to do your civic duty and "help animals," huh? Is this the American way? I don't think so!

There is a situation occurring right now in Pinellas County, FL, where a breeder of small parrots had her home raided while she was attending a bird show, and all her birds were seized by the local SPCA (local animal control had refused to do so, citing no evidence of animal cruelty or neglect). Other aviculturists who live in the area and know the woman, and who have the courage to speak out, say this is not a situation of animal cruelty, but rather the desire by an overzealous anti-breeding organization to set yet another precedent to seize an individual's animals.

At the THIRD hearing, according to a long-time, well-respected aviculturist who attended, here's what the SPCA's attorney had to say about the situation: "...we don't have to prove animal cruelty, the defendant has to prove to be fit to get her birds back."

So, if they can get possession of your animals, you have to PROVE you can take care of them in court? And they are dragging out hearings so that they can cost this woman thousands of dollars—and maybe she'll give up like so many people do. These groups don't pick on wealthy people—they victimize those who appear vulnerable and unlikely to be able to afford to ransom their animals or pay thousands of dollars in attorney fees to fight to get their animals back and to salvage their reputations.

This victimized breeder is being assessed hundreds of dollars a day in fees by the SPCA, and the hearings keep dragging on. Rather than turn belly-up and give up her animals, however, she has put her home on the line to pay for legal fees to fight. The Florida Federation of Aviculturists, Inc. (FFAI) and other prominent and well-respected aviculturists are assisting, but she needs more help.

I sent a check to the FFAI, P.O. Box 4763, Plant City, FL 33563-0031 (notation: AV). I certainly hope that if something like this happened to me or someone I personally knew, that other animal owners would rally and help fight against the anti-breeding zealots and opportunistic intimidators!

If you care about this abuse of legalized stealing, become educated. Read Florida's Animal Cruelty Statutes at: http://tinyurl.com/t7x3p. If you really care about your rights to own exotic animals in Florida, attend the ongoing hearings taking place in Pinellas County. Join the FL_C_C e-mail list for the latest hearing dates: http://pets.groups.yahoo.com/group/FL_C_C.

Aviculturists and other animal owners and breeders must work together to defeat the AR-zombie minority, which has been insidiously getting empowerment clauses in ordinances so that they have the authority to terrorize and steal from animal owners under guise of "rescue." Unconstitutional laws are often passed, but if a person doesn't have the financial means to challenge them through appeals, they will lose—regardless. This is not a case of "that's wrong, so the bad guys can't win." Rather, it's a case where those who have the money to finance extended hearings control the outcome!

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, U.S., U.K., Canada, Germany, 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." And well-meaning, animal-loving people, who mainly see

the rescue / rehoming side of the equation, fall for that propaganda—hook, line, and sinker—and become the AR-zombies that do the bidding of the fanatics.

When referring to birds, the common AR fanatics claims are 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; that unwanted animals are a tiny percentage of total birds; 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. And true animal lovers do NOT believe "better dead than bred."

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 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 signed up to support the misguided federal PAWS amendment to the AWA, which was pushed HARD by AR groups, like HSUS (which has now ingested DDAL and vows to redouble its efforts to go after animal interest groups legislatively in 2007). Misguided elected representatives who fall for the AR line are shooting home animal breeders in both feet and working to ensure companion animals are difficult for constituents to come by in the next generation!

"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 HSUS

In addition, there is an attitude of self-righteous and judgmental condemnation for the animal husbandry industry, e.g., the quote that "breeders live off the backs of their animals." 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! They are bombarding the general public with this concept, and they are enlisting naïve animal-loving people in doing the AR dirty work.

When agribusiness 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!* Since it is not logical, perhaps it has to do with the basic AR premise of no animal use. Think about it!!! If there is little breeding (because of persecution through onerous legislation), then in a generation, there will be few companion animals.

No breeding = extinction = no pets. It is as SIMPLE AS THAT! And the ARs 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?" Or they assume that an organization that SAYS it's for animal welfare would not terrorize innocent animal owners. Situations like the Pinellas County scenario are TERRORIST ACTIONS against animal owners and breeders!

Repeat over and over—the GOAL of hard-core AR fanatics 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 activities by extremist sects. We also know that there are "opportunists," whose own personal problems help them justify taking advantage of others.

Please research "animal rights" and anti-breeding movements if you doubt this. For further insights and arguments, check out the following (among dozens of sites).

- Ø National Animal Interest Alliance (NAIA): http://www.naiaonline.org/issues/index.htm
- Ø Animal Rights is not Animal Welfare: http://www.animalscam.com/rights_vs_welfare.cfm
- 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