

Banning a breed

Bonnie Larkin

August 23, 2006

Plainfield -- I was very happy to read of the recovery of Nick Foley ("The enduring agony of a pit bull rampage," Page 1, Aug. 13). His strength, as well as that of his family, is truly admirable. Let us celebrate the mending of this brave young man's body and soul by not feeding the need for vengeance. A knee-jerk reaction like banning an entire breed of animal based on the actions of those the media deem "newsworthy" is not the answer!

I urge everyone to keep in mind that it wasn't long ago when Doberman pinschers were the most feared dogs on the block. Later the spotlight turned to the Rotweiler, the Chow, the Akita, even the famed police dog--the German shepherd. If we institute bans based on breeds that are the "menace du jour," where will it lead? The problem of animal aggression and human injury is not solved by a ban on a breed any more than human aggression and injury would be solved by a ban on a race. Are we willing to allow legislation that would be the equivalent of genocide? Absolutely not, for we realize that every one of us has the potential to do great harm or good. The same logic applies here.

True solutions require effort. Owners of animals, all animals, need to be accountable for the actions of those in their keep. We cannot say an owner of one type or breed of animal should be more responsible than another. An owner's love for his or her pet cannot be deemed less real or important based on its ancestry. Let us not celebrate a life saved by legislating the taking of other lives.

Copyright © 2006, Chicago Tribune