

OK, PETA, Let's Dance

Taking on archaic ideas



PETA's staff writer Lindsay Pillard-Post's misguided opposition to the No Kill movement in the letter "No-Kill No Way To Go" May 10 recited the same old lines that all the backward-thinking, entrenched killers of adoptable animals use to defend themselves. It's always warehousing animals and horror stories. Sometimes they use "There are not enough homes," and "Death is not always the worst option." True, but death sure is the most final. Ask the otherwise healthy, happy black Labrador retriever with kennel cough that was killed yesterday.

Let me say first that for the last 20 years I have been a staunch PETA supporter and animal rights activist. But I don't support their ideas about killing adoptable animals for space and convenience. Almost everything I know about activism comes from PETA, and I intend to use that knowledge to fight their archaic ideas about killing adoptable animals.

PETA says it is a waste of money to build a no-kill shelter. We, the No-Kill Community, don't want to build anything, just change the practices in our existing animal control. We aren't asking for more money. Many of the programs we are suggesting only need dedicated volunteers to implement.

PETA says no-kill shelters close their doors when they are full. We don't envision a shelter that closes its doors or gets full. When the shelter implements our suggested programs, the animals go through the system, quickly leaving room for the next animal.

PETA says no-kill shelters warehouse animals, and that they go crazy from being locked up. Our shelter will move animals through the system to the other end: off-site adoption centers, foster homes, rescue groups and permanent homes. The community will be involved and will make the difference. And if needed, many animals do fine *short term* in a confined situation if they get enough exercise and attention; otherwise boarding kennels would all be closed down.

PETA says you can't really have a no-kill shelter; some animals will be killed. That's true; we have always said so. No-kill means no killing of adoptable animals. Animals that are deemed unadoptable (the ones with a poor or grave prognosis regarding health and mental stability that can't be cured or rehabilitated), sadly, will have to be killed mercifully. But so many have died because of something as simple as kennel cough or a bad tooth or being terrified. How cruel and inhumane is it to kill someone who is scared because you are too busy or too unconcerned to help?

PETA says the *only* answer is spay and neuter. We say there are many answers including spay and neuter, foster homes, rescue groups, marketing, education, media involvement, community involvement and most importantly a shelter staff and management that goes beyond the call of duty, never gives up on an animal and uses every possible tool and creative idea within their grasp to help save animal's lives.

PETA, it's time to stop chanting the "There aren't enough homes for all of them" mantra. There *are* enough homes or people wouldn't be making a living selling dogs and cats. We can find those homes.

As PETA founder Ingrid Newkirk has said, "When it comes to pain, love, joy, loneliness, and fear, a rat is a pig is a dog is a boy. Each one values his or her life and fights the knife." Yes, Ingrid, each *does* value his or her life and has the right to live it as much as a rescued cow or chicken. How can you have different standards for different animals? We don't kill children because they are homeless. I doubt Peter Singer, author of *Animal Liberation*, would agree with you that killing adoptable animals is any different than slaughtering a pig for dinner.

PETA, you could be doing so much good on the right side of this issue instead of spending precious dollars and time fighting a paradigm change that is going to be the future whether you like it or not. Join us and monitor the new no-kill shelters like ours will be, making sure we are doing what we promised.

And for pete's sake, go to www.nokillsolutions.com and read what Nathan Winograd, the nationally recognized no-kill expert, has accomplished in the last 10 years, like save rates of 92 to 99 percent without closing the doors on the public. It's not the no-kill of the past, it's the future, and it's coming at you like a freight train. It's time to get on board!

Molly Sargent owns Embarkadero Compassionate Grooming in Pleasant Hill. She is a member of the No Kill Community Coalition and an appointee to the Lane County Commissioner's Save Adoptable Animals Task Force. She has been an animal rights activist since 1985. She has worked as a veterinary assistant, managed an emergency veterinary hospital, fostered, rescued and has worked and volunteered to help animals for the past 42 years.

Ms. Huntley's are far from vulgar as they show a heightened level of sophistication when it comes to expressing themselves.

*Jonathan Seraphim
Eugene*

BRING IN DA FUNK

Dear Michael Franti and Crew: We love the message, love the show. Got your back here in Eugene. As fans from way back we feel a duty to inform you of the current musical vacuum. This "oh so diverse" community is awash in a sea of bluegrass, newgrass, punkgrass, folk music (thankfully the folk festival is over) and a spattering of metal/edgy avant garde. All very Anglo, as is the predominate culture in our valley.

As if this weren't enough, we have a plethora of radio DJs working through mid-life crises, playing an unending maudlin medley of melancholy sounds rife with Caucasian existential angst. What we lack, and are in dire need of, is the deep dark funk and soul. You know, the shit that comes from the dirt, crawls up your legs and sets up house in your loins, leaving us no choice ... but to dance!

On behalf of the Michael (ain't afraid of the funk) Franti fanclub, we beseech you, give up the funk and bring us what we need to satisfy our souls. Thanks for the inspiration.

*Joe Wattles
Eugene*

ANOTHER CONSPIRACY

Chicken Little says, "The sky is falling!" Christine Gherardi (5/17) says, "I have seen the sun with rainbow circles around it" and interprets this as one of the signs of the impact of something called "chemical trails."

Before we rational Oregonians get drawn into this "conspiracy theory," let's look at the facts. Ms Gherardi's "rainbow circles," those that she implies are the effect of some nefarious governmental activity, are in fact a natural phenomena of the atmosphere. Circles around the sun, sundogs and pillars of light are all caused by the refraction and reflection of sunlight as it passes through tiny ice crystals high in the atmosphere. Check out the following website: www.atoptics.co.uk

Ms. Gherardi also referred to the chemical trails high in the sky. These "trails" are called contrails, which form when the hot humid air from jet exhaust mixes with low pressure, water-saturated air that has a low temperature. It is essentially the same thing as exhaling and seeing your breath on a cold day. A contrail can spread horizontally into a layer thin cirrus clouds. It has been estimated that in heavy air-traffic corridors, cloud cover could increase as much as 20 percent with two opposing effects: solar energy reaching the earth is reduced, causing surface cooling; and reduction of heat loss from the planet resulting in warming. I refer the reader to the following website: comss.ssec.wisc.edu/wx-wise/class/contrail.html

I believe that it is very important for the concerned citizen today to look into the real science behind a potentially controversial subject such as this before jumping onto any grand conspiracy bandwagon. No, Chicken Little, the sky is not falling.

*Maggie Pugsley
Eugene*

KISSIN' COUSINS

Democracy will never work in Iraq because half of all Iraqi marriages are between first or second cousins.

Loyalty between red blood related tribes will always be stronger than ballot box purple finger stained loyalty to a central government. This "kin and strangers" divide is thousands of years old and is not easily crossed. The bloody Hatfields and McCoys feud was driven by just a few generations of cousin clans.

The Bush administration is ignorant and naïve to think it can deal with a problem it doesn't recognize, let alone understand.

*Michael T. Hinojosa
Drain*

POWER OVER CONGRESS

I have been worried since early 2005 that President Bush will not want to leave office in 2008. I know this sounds absurd, but I believe it to be true.

A piece of evidence recently came to my attention to support my concern. It is called the National Security Presidential Directive/NSPD 51 and Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-20. These two directives give the president the power over congress and the judicial branches in the event of a national emergency. Think, for instance, a war with Iran, another attack by terrorists on U.S. soil or interests abroad, a national calamity such as a hurricane such as Katrina. He could declare martial law and suspend elections in 2008, for example.

The two directives were put in place without the knowledge of Congress on May 9. I feel that there needs to be more reporting on these directives. No president should have this power.

I hope I have misread the directives.

*W. Joe Lyon
Eugene*

GIVE ME PASTIES

I just wanted to write and tell you how thoroughly disappointed I am in John Henry's burlesque show. The next time I want to see titties, I will go to a strip club. I walked into John Henry's and expected to see a real burlesque show, pasties and all. But that isn't what I got. I saw strippers, baring their breasts for all to see. True burlesque performers are stripteasers. Where is the tease in what they do? I moved here from New York and have seen many a burly-Q — never have I seen true burlesque performers without pasties. And honestly, I don't want to. Don't get me wrong, I enjoy going to the clubs; I am a stripper loving female; hell, I used to be one.

Basically, I just wanted to say that I am unhappy there is no real burlesque show in Eugene. Guess I will have to move back to N.Y.?

*Heather Atnsley
Eugene*

NO NEW STORY

Immigration is one of the hot button issues in Congress and in the media and seems to produce more heat than light in these discussions. To me, all of this sounds similar to the discussions that took place in the U.S. in 1847, except the "Mexicans" were the Irish who were the first large wave of immigration.

In 1847, Ireland was still under English control and, similar to today's Mexico, a small number of people owned most of the land and used their land to grow wheat for export while their serfs were given an acre of land upon which to grow the food they needed. One of the most common uses of the land was to grow potatoes. When this crop suddenly failed, Ireland's eight million were