

Dear Steve

I am sure you will be interested in this reply to my letter. You may keep this copy, you may find it useful. His arguments are dangerous in that they are *prima facie* plausible. However, I find his reply most superficial as he has reduced the issue to shows or pit fighting, which is not the question under discussion. If we consider breed character important, then what steps should be taken to preserve it. And more generally, does the philosophy of Edmund Burke, of responsibility to past, present, and future apply here? It does not justify past, present, or future evils. But was not breed character developed at too high a price to be considered secondary to dog shows.

A 5 page reply deserves consideration. I have considered this reply carefully and if you care to read it, this is my analysis.

- ① Then why cannot this be as explicitly stated in our standard as it is in that of the Rottweiler Standard, as I suggested.
- ② Selection of facts. All this is irrelevant without proper character, as Mr. Gordon makes clear.
- ③ The "Certificate of Courage" I advocate is intended to help preserve character. Trials involving no cruelty can't prove gameness. It is a non sequitur to thus assume they would have no value.
- ④ This comment shows a lack of concern for man's cruelty to other animals.
- ⑤ An implied threat (which reoccurs) to refuse to register dogs of people not on the "approved list."
- ⑥ It is clear enough that there are certain situations where a SBT must not be shy.
- ⑦ Foolish statement.
- ⑧ Is this a good situation? Does the bitch deserve to win a prize? I suspect not.
- ⑨ Has effort been made to do so? Who are the "experts" and what tests did they propose? What problems did they find with each specific test? Why was no analysis given of one of the tests (involving no cruelty as I proposed) which must have occurred to them - in short, why was it decided there was no value in observing if a Stafford dog or bitch was impassive, terrified, or aggressive in the mere presence of a badger or other dangerous animal. Does the fact that one country does not have certain tests for a particular breed mean that it is impossible for workable and humane tests to be devised. Does the U.S. have Sch trials? Does Germany?

- ⑩ My proposal is skipped, which was for the club to make it clear "that no shy dog, regardless of looks, should ever be bred". In short, I proposed a strong ^{official} emphasis should always be placed on the importance of character, not "barring breeding for any fault" or of ejecting club members.
- ⑪ My dear Mr. Rant, "breeding still remains an art rather than a science."
- ⑫ Not proper policy for a dog club as it leaves out many people. Indeed Mr. Rant, I am surprised you replied to my letter at all if this is your policy as you must certainly do not know me very well.
- ⑬ Dedication to an ideal produces results. What practical steps have been taken to help maintain breed character. Please publish those steps.
- ⑭ Appeal to Authority Fallacy
- ⑮ Deeds count louder than words. A necessary platitude here I'm afraid.
- ⑯ Spirited? Game? The idea such words express is clear enough. An error is being made in believing spirit or gameness to occur in direct proportion to size and weight. Does an APB have to be capable of defeating a Mastiff to be game? does a SBT have to defeat an APB to be game?
- ⑰ Our breed was not?
- ⑱ Mr. Rant seems to feel anyone interested in preserving game temperament can't wait till his dog is in the pit. I specifically forbid pit fighting as a test.
- ⑲ I did not suggest this should be the case
- ⑳ I said nothing against shows except that they would not ensure, of themselves, survival of breed character. Does Mr. Rant propose they will?
- ㉑ Why is anyone interested in game character automatically a pit fighting man? The implication's constant occurrence is revealing. Game character is the breed's heritage.
- ㉒ Show dog, pet, Courage, all put in separate headings. Very interesting.
- ㉓ Does this mean the majority of club members do not care about temperament. Regardless of that, this is the Fallacy Argumentum ad Populum.

- (24) Rhetoric completely unrelated to my letter. Who has advised Mr. Rant to do this?
- (25) Expediency rather than genuine concern is indicated.
- (26) What specific steps have been tried? Why have my proposals not been dealt with?
- (27) There is no intellectual basis for showing a laissez faire economy to work in this way. How ~~are~~ advertising, social position, personal charm, etc., fitted into this neat scheme?
 Ex. Lancia made fabulously well engineered cars. The company went bankrupt and was acquired by Fiat, whose cars are not nearly so well put together.
 Ex. Kittinger furniture is superb. Interior makes have a much larger sales volume.
- (28) Begging the Question
- (29) Appeal to Pity

Steve, I apologize for the length of my analysis. I strove for all possible brevity. But as you can see, Mr. Rant's reply was shoddy thinking and to avoid appearing a fool ^{poor} lightly convinced by ~~book~~ writers I had to show a few of the faults of his reasoning. Hopefully, I have been entirely objective.

With most sincere hope I never again have to sit up till 4 a.m. writing this sort of thing,

Reid