

The Similarities Of Cancer In Canines And Humans Means Veterinary Research Could Benefit Both

16 Jul 2007 One of the major issues associated with longer life expectancy in man and his best friend is an increase in the incidence of cancer. Even though they cannot talk it seems dogs might be able to tell us why and how certain cancers develop. In turn that could lead to better treatments for both canine and human cancer patients.

An expert from the country's newest Vet School told a symposium in London that studying tumors in dogs and humans could give us a better understanding of their shared pathogenesis.

Dr Ali Mobasheri, an Associate Professor from the School of Veterinary Medicine and Science at The University of Nottingham, attended the one day symposium entitled "Curing Canine Cancer -- Human Cancer Benefit". The symposium was organized by the Colorado based Morris Animal Foundation and is the first event of its kind to be held in this country. As well as addressing the cause of canine cancer, it will explore areas of translational cancer treatment research as cancer cures for dogs are now being successfully applied to humans, in particular children.

Cancer is the single biggest cause of death in dogs over the age of 2. The incidence of bone cancers, skin cancers, and lymphomas is increasing in humans and dogs and there are significant similarities between certain types of human and canine cancer -- such as breast and prostate cancer. Dr Mobasheri says we are all mammals with similar genes and studying the bioenergetics of canine tumors will allow us to gain a comparative understanding of human tumour metabolism. He said: "We are using high throughput screening techniques to identify new biomarkers of prognostic significance in cancer. The approach involves using clinical samples from a tissue bank to carry out hypothesis driven immunohistochemical studies to look at tumour metabolism."

Certain breeds of dog are known to develop certain types of cancer. For instance Osteosarcoma (bone cancer) is common in the Greyhound and the Rottweiler. It is also the sixth most common cancer seen in children. Research into canine cancer is easier because of the dog's extensive pedigree information. Experts say this could be crucial in identifying the underlying genetic causes of cancer in dogs and humans and finding treatments that could be to the benefit of both.

Dr Mobasheri said: "The benefits of taking a comparative approach to cancer research will be of mutual benefit to humans and companion animals. That is because cancer is cancer. It is a similar disease in animals and humans."

Article adapted by Medical News Today from original press release.

Additional information can be found at <http://www.morrisanimalfoundation.org/>

Article URL: <http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/76781.php>

What Might Changed Behavior Mean?

When a cat is not doing well, for whatever reason, she depends upon her special person to take notice. Usually, some behavioral change will be observed. The behavioral change is the clinical sign that drives a person to consult with his veterinarian.

Veterinarians receive complaints ranging from the very specific "My cat is sneezing" to the very elusive "My cat is just not herself." These behavioral changes are the indicators that a cat needs attention.

Regardless of the nature of the reported clinical signs, a workup will be done so that a diagnosis can be established. Veterinarians require a diagnosis, or at least a therapeutic plan, in order to successfully treat their patients.

It is tempting to use the clinical sign itself as the diagnosis. But clinical signs and behavior changes are just signs. Consider the sneezing cat. Many conditions cause the behavioral sign of sneezing: allergies, foreign bodies in the nose and even tumors are only some of the underlying conditions that must be ruled out before the final diagnosis is determined. Each of these conditions would require a very different treatment strategy. A veterinarian must combine the history that you provide along with her own physical findings and laboratory test results to finalize a diagnosis and begin appropriate treatment.

What Behavioral Changes Mean

Many of the behavioral changes that bring cats to the veterinarian actually have an organic basis. That is to say, the veterinarian will be able to discover an underlying medical condition that caused the problem. We expect our veterinarian to tell us why our cat is limping, or not eating.

Yet sometimes, the diagnostic protocol is overlooked when it comes to the behavioral sign of urinating outside the litter box. The frustration of cleaning urine spots drives many people to simply label the cat as behaving badly. A workup is needed to be sure that the soiling cat is not suffering from an underlying medical condition. An uncomfortable infection or inflammation in the urinary tract may be responsible for this frustrating behavior change.

Once the physical examination and lab work reveal that the cat is indeed healthy, the workup must still continue. Remember, urination out of the box is a clinical sign, not a diagnosis. It is a behavior change that — no different from sneezing — can have many causes. Your veterinarian must determine the diagnosis so that the appropriate treatment strategy may be determined. A very careful and detailed behavioral history will be needed. Be prepared to answer a lot of questions, as there are many behavioral conditions to consider.

A very common reason for a cat to urinate outside her box is that the box is just not accessible to the cat. There may be physical impediments: perhaps the cat has arthritis and can no longer comfortably climb the steps to the box. There may be behavioral barriers as well. For example, not all cats are willing to pass through a noisy playroom to reach their boxes. Your veterinarian will need to know where the litter box is located. Photos are invaluable.

Sometimes, a cat can get to her box but is just not willing to use it. Perhaps the box is not clean enough for your meticulous cat — be frank with your veterinarian about the hygiene regimen you follow. Since all cats do not like all litter types, consider the type of litter you use as well as any recent changes in litter type. Even a change in brand may be enough to send a cat seeking a new toilet.

If your history offers support that a litter box has become unavailable or unacceptable, your veterinarian may diagnose inappropriate urination due to an aversion to a litter box, to a location or to a substrate. Other potential diagnoses include location preference and substrate preference. Once properly diagnosed, these conditions are usually very treatable.

An entirely different set of diagnoses will be considered if your behavioral history suggests that your cat has begun to urinate outside her box in an attempt to express anxiety or aggression. Urine marking serves an important communication function among cats. And surely our cats must assume that we humans are quite capable of reading these important messages.

Urine marking is also quite treatable. Social issues will be addressed so that anxiety and aggression can be reduced to a comfortable level. Behavior modification and, in some cases, anxiety-reducing medication may be prescribed to complete the treatment plan.

Working up a behavioral condition is no different from working up a medical problem. History-taking and behavioral testing can be time consuming. But this initial expense in time will assure that your cat is treated for the correct condition. <http://www.catwatchnewsletter.com/>

Myth Buster

Reading the usual diatribe on the numbers of offspring of unaltered animals on this page: (In just 6 generations one male and one female dog, which can reproduce two times a year, can be responsible for the birth of 67,000 puppies. One male and one female cat, which can reproduce three times each year, can in that same period be responsible for the birth of 420,000 kittens), I thought I would add a good resource disputing those figures from...where else...the Cat Fancier Association's website (bless their hearts). <http://www.cfa.org/articles/trap-alter-release.html>

After a six-year study and daily observation of a feral cat colony, it has been documented that stray female cats start cycling when they are 4 - 6.9 months old,(2) or as soon as the days are long enough. January and February are the start of the kitten season, with the litters born in March and April. These cats have an average of 2.1 litters per year of 4.25 kittens.(3) Forty-two percent of the kittens will die by the age of two months of natural causes.(4) Many more will end up at the shelter. Those who escape early death and the shelter go on to be prolific bearers of kittens over their short life span of approximately three years.(5)



Taking the mortality into account, along with birth and death rates, the average stray female will have 5.25 litters in her lifetime, encompassing 22.3 kittens. At age two months there should be 12.9 survivors, roughly six females and seven males (at maturity, roughly 2/3 of the stray cat population is male,(6) due to the high mortality of females during first pregnancy and birth), which will decrease to four females over time. These six females will go on to have their 22 surviving kittens each.

Realistically, over 12 years one unspayed female with all her unspayed female offspring can reasonably be expected to be responsible for over 3200 kittens if there is no human intervention.<snip>

A far cry from the 420,000 figure that is used as "fact" in pushing the mandatory spay/neuter ordinances.

1. Zaunbrecher, K., & R. Smith, "Neutering of Feral Cats as an Alternative to Eradication Programs," *Journal of American Veterinary Medical Association*, 203, No 3, 8/1/93, 449-452.
2. Jochle, W., & M. Jochle, "Reproduction in a feral cat population and its control with a prolactin inhibitor," 2nd International Symposium on Canine and Feline Reproduction, Belgium.
3. Pedersen, N., *Feline Husbandry* (American Veterinary Publications, 1991), pp. 3-12.
4. Berkeley E.P., *Maverick Cats* (New England Press, 1982).
5. Ibid.

Radical Flank Effect

by Lee Wallot, Past Collie Club of America Legislative Liaison
originally published in *Canine Chronicle*, May 1997

In case you have forgotten, let me remind you that we are in a war...a war in which each and every battle determines our future as owners of animals of every kind. You know the animal rights agenda as printed in the Twelve Steps of the Animal Rights Movements, *ANIMALS AGENDA*, Nov, 1987. The goals are not only to end the breeding and keeping of dogs and cats as pets, it is to also prohibit all use and ownership of all animals by human beings. You know this is true. They have told us so in their own words.

The animal rights activists do not intend to win this war in one battle; they are smart enough to know that is impossible. They are, however, also smart enough to know they might be able to win it in small, incremental steps... each small victory adding to the stranglehold of prior small victories until our relationship with animals as we know it today gradually, finally, ceases to exist.

Their arsenal is manipulation. Manipulate the facts; manipulate our emotions; manipulate our thinking; manipulate our laws to accomplish their incremental steps toward our destruction. To them, the end always justifies the means. They do this through campaigns designed to gradually change our laws in order to force us into accepting animal use on their terms. Two of their most effective weapons in this endeavor are task forces and advisory committees.

Ironically, by forming task forces and animal welfare advisory committees, when animal rights issues are involved, we hand the activists their first victory. By agreeing to serve on such committees, we have automatically allowed the animal rights activists to define a problem according to their agenda and we have accepted their definition of what is right and what is wrong.

TASK FORCES

Let's take one example – the anti-breeding laws we are all so familiar with. The progress of such legislation is usually as follows:

Animal rights groups go to a legislator and, with passion and their own “statistics” (substitute “propaganda” here), they define a problem. In this case, they say there is a growing crisis of dogs and cats being euthanized at shelters and they blame it on overpopulation caused by too much breeding. The legislator listens and, based on what the activists have told him, agrees there must be a problem indeed. After all, at this point, he has received no dissenting information from the other side. Then the animal rightists helpfully give him all the information he needs to write a new law (or sometimes even writes it for him).

Shortly thereafter the animal rights activists, through their very effective propaganda, speed up their campaign to convince the public and the media that the problem addressed by the ordinance is not only real but is a growing crisis.

If the subsequent uproar of protest from animal owners is loud enough, the legislator may decide the proposed legislation might need some modification after all, so the second step is taken – a task force is suggested to look at the proposed ordinance and to make changes that would make it “better.”

Can you see the victory this becomes for the animal rights activists? Through their propaganda they have succeeded in convincing others there must actually be a problem as defined by their proposed ordinance. Otherwise, why form a task force to fix it? Therein lies the manipulation.

The truth is the so-called problem of “overpopulation” is not really a problem at all because the euthanasia numbers at shelters all across the country have been plummeting for over fifteen years without legislation. Successful solutions were already in place and working long before the animal rights activists decided to use overpopulation as a cause to advance their personal agenda. Actually, the overpopulation issue is not really an issue at all; it is the vehicle used to pass a law that will further their agenda.

Mitchell Fox of PAWS (Progressive Animal Welfare Society) who pushed through the nation's second anti-breeding ordinance in 1992 in King County, Washington is quoted in ANIMAL'S AGENDA, May 1988: *“The animal rights movement will continue to lack credibility until it confronts pet overpopulation. Ironically, it may be the easiest of all forms of animal exploitation to eliminate. In (using this issue), the movement faces the fewest obstacles, no engrained societal traditions, no ‘experts’ challenging us and no high-powered lobbies to defeat us.”*

THE FEAR FACTOR

Unfortunately, when confronted with pending legislation, most people are intimidated and do not understand they have both a legal and ethical right to say NO. NO – we do not need this law. NO – we do not need a task force to make a bad law better. NO – this ordinance is wrong no matter what the animal rights people say.

Those who would be affected by the ordinance are frightened into believing either they accept the task force or else they will have a law without any input from their side. This simply IS NOT TRUE!

If we can stand up to our unfounded fears, we can defeat the proposed legislation by working closely with the other members of the council or government body. The sponsor of the proposed legislation is only one person. If we present sound reasons to the other legislators as to why the legislation is bad, and if they see there is heavy and legitimate opposition to the bill, THE LEGISLATION CAN BE DEFEATED.

We know this is true because we have been doing it for the past four years in our state at both the state and local level against some of the strongest and best funded animal rights organizations in the country.

HOW ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUPS MOVE PEOPLE TO THEIR SIDE

When anti-breeding legislation is first introduced, we (animal owners) start out at point (A) and the animal rights people start out at point (B). We do not agree with their goals and solutions nor do they agree with ours. (A)->(A-1)->(A-2)->(A-3)->((B-1)<-(B)

However, once a task force is formed, we have already been moved to point (A-1) in our thinking, closer to the position of the animal rights movement (B) because we have accepted their premise that a problem as they define it needs to be addressed.

The task force will appear to be fairly representative of many diverse groups, all involved in some way with the issue at hand, i.e., dog and cat breeders, a veterinarian, a representative of the pet store market, maybe even one or two “ordinary” citizens and, of course, members of one or more humane societies and/or animal rights groups. Appearances, however, can be deceiving. These days, the veterinarian could possibly be a member of AVAR (Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights). Surprised? Check it out. The ordinary citizens may or may not be a member of an animal rights group but will most certainly be sympathetic, compassionate and, therefore, easily influenced by animal rights propaganda. Finally, one or more of the humane societies we always thought of as moderate and mainstream may already have adopted much of the animal rights philosophy without our even knowing it.

Most important of all is the fact that all of the task force members, except the animal rights people, will be thinking about how necessary it is for them to come up with ideas that will be a compromise satisfactory to all. After all, isn't that the democratic way?

But look what happens. Nothing has changed with the thinking of the animal rights members of the task force: They are still at point (B). But the other committee members, because of their acceptance of the concept of compromise, have now been moved from point (A-1) to (A-2).

It is important to remember that the animal rights people will always open their campaign with horrific demands that they don't really expect to get in the real world, i.e., total breeding bans or long moratoriums; absurd license fee differentials; a big breeding license fee; regulations for kenneling, feeding, vet care; prohibitions on selling and certain types of advertising; the list is varied and endless. There may even be one or two points that we agree with the some way; these are carrots on a stick they hold out to us.

THE FINAL BILL

The concerns are addressed and some are modified by the task force but, always, what finally comes out as recommendations are some changes to the proposed ordinance but retention of its basic tenets of higher fees, prohibitions, and more regulations. The animal rights people may have moved to point (B-1) by modifying a few of their original demands but the resulting proposed legislation will most assuredly be closer to point (A-3). The animal activists have won.

At this point, it is almost impossible to defeat the proposed ordinance or even change it further in any meaningful way even in the forum of a public hearing. It can be done (we did it last year in our county) but it is extremely difficult. Within a few weeks the animal rights movement will be proudly advertising their latest victory all across the country and using it to influence other legislative bodies.

THE RADICAL FLANK EFFECT

Please take a moment and go back and reread the last two sections. You are reading about how the Radical Flank Effect works. It is a process that combines threat (severe restrictions) and persuasive manipulation (the carrots on a stick) to gradually move an opponent closer toward acceptance of your goals. It is a process that has been used since the beginning of time by social and ideological movements to advance their cause. It is the basis of how the entire animal rights movement works and the only way to avoid the trap at the end is to refuse to negotiate in the beginning.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Next we turn to the newest and most dangerous committee; the more permanent vehicle of the animal rights movement, the animal welfare advisory committee. This committee is set up to study animal-related issues and to formulate legislation on those issues. Its members will be of a similar makeup as the task force – once again, already a strike against anyone fighting the animal rights movement. What is even more dangerous, however, is that while the task force operated only briefly and under the bright light of publicity and scrutiny from interested parties, the advisory committee is designed for long term operation. An advisory committee works much more in the background and after a year or two, sometimes even gets forgotten by the general public.

As time passes, ordinary citizens on the committee get bored or decide they want to do other things with their life and they are gradually replaced with members who have been carefully chosen from within the animal rights community. Soon those few members opposing the animal rights philosophy are hopelessly outnumbered. Some may continue to fight for what they feel is right but eventually the relentlessness of the animal rights activists and the lack of support and understanding from their own people will force even the staunchest anti-animal rights people to resign. This leaves the advisory committee 100% in the hands of the animal rights groups and is exactly the way they have taken over hundreds of moderate humane societies all across the country in the last 15 years, turning them into the animal rights organizations they now are.

This now leaves the advisory committee free to expand its agenda, without opposition, wherever it wants to go, toward even more restrictive legislation for dog and cat owners but also restrictive legislation pertaining to ALL animal groups. What started out as an advisory group for dog and cat legislation, ends up as an advisory group for legislation that now includes horses, research animals, animals in circuses, zoos and aquariums, animals in farming... the list goes on... because they are after all, by definition, an ANIMAL welfare advisory committee.

Those of you shaking your heads and saying “No way. That’s just playing chicken little the sky is falling” had best open your eyes and look up. We are already on the road under that sky and such advisory committees are being proposed both at the state and local levels, usually as a hidden part of other animal legislation. **READ THE BILLS BEING PROPOSED THESE DAYS.** Don’t just accept the animal rights propaganda of what the bills will do. Determine the truth for yourself.

The Sky may not be falling quite yet but if you look carefully you just might finally see the mile-wide asteroid that is headed straight for you.



In Their Own Words: From leaders in the animal rights movement.

Do you know the difference between animal rights and animal welfare?

“I think activists ought to persist in what they already are doing—working on both the production and consumption end of the equation. One could bomb all the factory farms and slaughterhouses in the world without scratching the human demand for meat and dairy products. Vegan outreach and education is the most radical strategy, in the literal sense that it gets to the root (“radic”) of the problem, which is the uncompassionate and ignorant preference for a carnivorous rather than vegan diet and lifestyle.” **Stephen Best, Associate Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at the University of Texas El Paso, *Legally Blind: The Case For Granting Animals Rights***

“I think it’s always very important whatever we’re doing, if the strategy is to push it and push it through incremental steps, assuming that can be done, then I think we should keep two things in mind: one, have those incremental steps ban and prohibit rather than merely regulate atrocity; and two, have that ban coupled with the rhetoric of rights and with the rhetoric of the abolition of the property status of animals and the recognition of the moral status of animals.” **Professor Gary L. Francione, Rutgers School of Law. *The Legal Status of Nonhuman Animals, September 25, 1999***

“[In conclusion,] I think it is speciesist to think that the September 11 attack on the World Trade Center was a greater tragedy than what millions of chickens endured that day and what they endure every day because they cannot defend themselves against the concerted human appetites arrayed against them.” **Karen Davis, PhD, President United Poultry Concerns. *Open Letter to Vegan Voice, Dec 26, 2001***
http://www.upc-online.org/011226vegan_voice_singer.html

“Beginning in 1974, the ALF declared war against animal oppressors and the state that defends them, but the ALF did not start the conflict. It entered into a war that animal exploiters long ago began. If one party succumbs to a war initiated by another party, it employs violence in self-defense and so its actions are legitimate. Acting as proxy agents for animals who cannot defend themselves, ALF actions in principle are just.” **Stephen Best, Associate Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at the University of Texas El Paso, *Pluralistically Thinking: A Case for Direct Action. SATYA, April 2004***

[The political climate of our country] has a detrimental effect on the animal rights community because it’s hard to be heard. How do we awaken people to animal abuse when they are so concerned about human healthcare policies; whether their sons or daughters are going to go to Iraq and be shot at, maybe even killed; or how we are going to pay \$89 billion to fund the war? For animal rights advocates, these are challenging times. **Tom Regan, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, NCSU, *Giving Voice to Animal Rights, August 2004.***

I think that chimpanzees and bonobos are likely to win their legal rights ahead of other animals. For many reasons they are the best candidate species for breaking through the legal wall that recognizes only humans as worthy of legal rights, legal battering rams if you will. **Steven Wise, Harvard Law School, past president of Animal Legal Defense Fund. *Interview in Vegan***

“We’re pushing the envelope until we can press a case in which the animal is plaintiff.” **Joyce Tischler, Executive Director ~ Animal Legal Defense Fund.**

Wildlife Resources Commission Honors

SYLVA, N.C. (July 30, 2007) – Richard B. Hamilton, executive director of N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission, was recently honored for his efforts with the disabled community “in removing architectural, attitudinal, sensory and/or communications barriers and support in implementing the use of assistive technology and universal access.”

Hamilton received the Mountain Community Access Award, presented by Pathways for the Future, an independent living and advocacy group serving Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Haywood, Jackson, Macon, and Swain counties of western North Carolina, in conjunction with the Jackson County Department of Aging.

“Mr. Hamilton and the Wildlife Resources Commission are breaking down the physical barriers and the attitudes that stand in the way of the disabled enjoying the outdoors, whether it’s fishing, hunting or boating,” said Roy Burnette, community services coordinator for Pathways for the Future. “I hope other agencies follow his example and make their facilities more accessible, not just what’s required by law but what works for the disabled.”

Hamilton has been the Wildlife Resources Commission executive director since 2004. Since then, the agency has gained recognition for its Disabled Sportsman Program, described as one of the more progressive programs in the nation. Efforts are directed towards assisting access to favorable recreational areas, allowing the use of equipment designed to overcome specific disabilities and encouraging sportsmen to take advantage of hunting, fishing and boating opportunities.

Wayne E. Smith of Waynesville, a leading regional and state advocate for disabled sportsmen, presented the Mountain Community Access Award to Hamilton in ceremonies held July 26 in Sylva.

“When have you ever heard of another agency asking the disabled for input?” Smith asked rhetorically in his remarks. “This is where Dick Hamilton is making a difference.

“Before Dick Hamilton, if you were in a wheelchair – as I was starting in 1994 – you were barred from all our lakes and streams, and this was hard after spending a lifetime hunting and fishing. Dick Hamilton changed this by putting floating docks on our lakes in our far western counties. If you have a pontoon and you are in a wheelchair, thanks to Mr. Hamilton, you can access our lakes in this area.”

Wayne E. Smith and members of the Walkfar Coonhunters Club, based in Haywood County in Western North Carolina, worked with the WRC to establish a public shooting range in their area. The Cold Mountain Shooting Range became a reality January 1, 2007. The range has walkways and paths and five shooting benches to accommodate the handicapped, including those in wheel chairs. This range was engineered to accommodate the able and disabled and both left and right handed shooters. According to Wayne, “The Cold Mountain Shooting Range is one of a kind in the Western end of the State and could be a model for future shooting ranges.”

At the July WRC meeting, commissioners honored Wayne for his many tireless hours advocating on behalf of disabled sportsmen by passing a resolution to rename the Cold Mountain Range to the Wayne E Smith Shooting Range.

For more information on the [Disabled Access Program](#) and the [Disabled Sportsman Program](#), go online to www.ncwildlife.org or call (919) 707-0050.

CVM Leads Animal Shelter Study

The College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) at North Carolina State University is the lead institution in a collaborative project to track shelter animal populations, uncover demographic trends, and increase awareness of the plight of homeless, abandoned, and marginalized dogs and cats in the United States.

According to the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), the shelter problem is serious and growing. The ASPCA, one of the participants in the study, estimates that up to 12 million dogs and cats enter shelters annually. Of these, some nine million are euthanized.

“We need a better understanding of this national problem,” says Dr. Dianne Dunning, the director of the CVM Animal Welfare, Ethics and Public Policy Program and the study’s principal investigator. “This project seeks to develop consistent shelter reporting methods and to collect valuable information on how, why, and in what condition animals find their way to shelters and what happens to them when they arrive.”

The “Shelter Population Index in Companion Animals: A Multi-Institutional Feasibility Study,” as the project is called, is funded by a \$75,100 grant from the National Council on Pet Population Study and Policy and involves the colleges of veterinary medicine at Colorado State University and the University of Tennessee in addition to the ASPCA.

A dozen shelters from Colorado, Tennessee, New York, and North Carolina are participating in the study, which includes the monthly reporting of various statistics such as the number of stray animals, health of the animal, number and health of those animals who are euthanized. Confidential and voluntary information also will be collected from individuals who are adopting or giving up animals at their local shelters.

“We expect that this collected information will provide reliable data for making informed decisions at both the national and local level,” says Dunning. “Our goal is to strengthen shelter animal medicine, promote improvement of the animal shelter system, and ensure the most humane solutions to pet overpopulation.”

The results of the year-long study will be compiled and analyzed later this year.

<http://www.tiny.cc/YXupj>

Protecting your right to responsibly own and breed animals.

Join NCRAOA. See our home page for membership information and application

For more information on animal health, training, reports on pet issues, animal sheltering, or to learn the difference between animal welfare and animal rights – visit our website at www.ncraoa.com

North Carolina Responsible Animal Owners Alliance, Inc. (NCRAOA) is a statewide organization of animal owners and professionals dedicated to animal welfare, responsible animal ownership, and maintaining the rights of responsible citizens to breed and own animals. NCRAOA, a 501(c)3 organization, provides education and information to the public and supports reasonable and humane animal welfare laws.

Permission granted to copy and distribute NCRAOA News and Views in its entirety as is.