

A deadly breed

Daniel Messick

August 26, 2006

Forest Park -- I count myself among the vast majority of the population that does not currently own a pet. In my childhood I raised numerous parakeets, a lizard, a turtle for a time, hamsters and fish too numerous to mention, although for a number of years we had two "deadly" piranhas. I admit that I have never owned a dog.

That said, I'm having a hard time understanding those pet owners who are writing into this newspaper in defense of any type of legislation against the pit bull breed. The cry from pit bull defenders seems to be along the lines of instituting harsher penalties toward the pit bull owners.

Yet what of the attacks against people from rogue pit bulls? Who, then, should be punished for pit bulls that run wild, attacking people viciously, while there is no indication of who the owners might be?

Just another unpreventable tragedy? I think not.

I love animals, as stated earlier. I have owned a menagerie of pets in my time. But I just fail to see any redeeming qualities in pit bulls. Through no fault of their own, their gene pool has been subjected to Frankenstein-like manipulation to attain the toughest, most aggressive lines possible. Unfortunately this has led to a proliferation of overtly aggressive dogs, as well as stealthlike aggressive breeds that outwardly possess no indication of the often murderous rage that boils within.

I don't hold the dogs themselves responsible. Yet what purpose is served in maintaining the illusion that pit bulls are simply a misunderstood breed?

While holding owners more responsible might be an overdue step in the right direction, serious consideration must be given to phasing out the deadly pit bull breed. The consideration, care and love for our fellow human beings, our neighbors, our friends, and victims of pit bull attacks should outweigh the consideration that is afforded this deadly breed of dog.

Copyright © 2006, Chicago Tribune