Info shared by Pitbull SA.

Manjaro APBT kennel.

South Africa.

My Website www.pitbullsa.co.za

My E mail "manjaro@pitbullsa.co.za"

My Facebook "Gawie Manjaro"

My Facebook page "Manjaro Kennel"

My mobile +27827838280.

Zello.com "VoIP" – ask for info

Generation -profiling - stereotyping the APBT.

Doing this is irresponsible – come on!

Derived from
http://www.gladwell.com/2006/2006_02_06_a_pitbull.html

It's all about the "pure bred real APBT game working dogs.
Either will you know this or you won't. ***Gawie MK***

Ruff stuff but the truth.
Guy Clairoux picked up his two-and-a half-year-old son, Jayden, from day care and walked him back to their house.
They were almost home.
Jayden was straggling behind, and, as his father's back was turned, a "Pit Bull" jumped over a back-yard fence along the way and lunged at Jayden.

"The dog had his head in its mouth and started to do this shake," Clairoux's wife, *JoAnn Hartley*, said later.
As she watched in horror, two more “Pit Bulls” (was found these were two Pit bullmastiff puppies, Agua and Akasha – mix breed) jumped over the fence, joining in the assault.
She and Clairoux came running, and he punched the first of the dogs in the head, until it dropped Jayden, and then he threw the boy toward his mother.
Hartley fell on her son, protecting him with her body. "JoAnn!" Clairoux cried out, as all three dogs descended on his wife.
"Cover your neck, cover your neck."
A neighbor, sitting by her window, screamed for help.
Her partner and a friend, *Mario Gauthier*, ran outside.
A neighborhood boy grabbed his hockey stick and threw it to Gauthier.
He began hitting one of the dogs over the head, until the stick broke.
"They wouldn't stop," Gauthier said. "As soon as you'd stop, they'd attack again. I've never seen a dog go so crazy.
They were like Tasmanian devils." The police came.
The dogs were pulled away, and the Clairouxes and one of the rescuers were taken to the hospital.
Five days later, the Ontario legislature banned the ownership of APBT’s.

"Just as we wouldn't let a great white shark in a swimming pool with bathers" the province's attorney general, Michael Bryant, had said, "Maybe we shouldn't have these animals on the civilized streets."
APBT’s, descendants of the “Old English Bulldogs” used in the nineteenth century for bull, bear and wild pig baiting and dog fighting, have been bred for high prey drive and "gameness," and thus a lowered inhibition to aggression.

Most dogs fight as a last resort, when staring and growling fail.
The APBT is willing to fight with little or no provocation.

APBT's seem to have a high tolerance for pain, making it possible for them to fight to the point of exhaustion.
Whereas taught guard dogs like German shepherds usually attempt to restrain those they perceive to be threats by biting and holding, APBT's do inflict the maximum amount of damage on an opponent. They bite, hold, shake, and tear.
Normally they don't growl or assume an aggressive facial expression as warning except lifting of their ears and tail.

Then they just engage in fighting.

One scientific review of the breed states;
"They are often insensitive to behaviours that usually stop aggression, for example, dogs not bred for fighting (non-game dogs) usually display defeat in combat by rolling over and exposing a light underside.

On several occasions, pit bulls have been reported to disembowel dogs offering this signal of submission."

In epidemiological studies of dog bites, the APBT is over represented among dogs known to have seriously injured or killed human beings, and, as a result, APBT's have been banned or restricted in several Western European countries, China, and numerous cities and municipalities across North America.

APBT's are now proclaimed to be dangerous.

Of course, not all APBT's are dangerous.
Most don't bite anyone. Good and responsible stewards of this breed, owners and breeders selectively breed socialize and keep well socialized dogs and these dogs <u>don't run in the streets</u>.

Likewise, Dobermans Great Danes, Boer Bulls, German shepherds, Rottweiler's and mixed breed dogs are frequent biters as well (especially loose running dogs or those that easily jump over a fence into the street), and the dog that recently mauled a Frenchwoman so badly that she was given the world's first face transplant was, of all things, a Labrador retriever.

When we say that APBT's are dangerous, we are making a generalization, just as insurance companies use generalizations when they charge young men more for car insurance than the rest of us (even though many young men are perfectly good drivers), and doctors use generalizations when they tell overweight middle-aged men to get their cholesterol checked (even though many overweight middle-aged men won't experience heart trouble).

Because we don't know which dog will bite someone or who will have a heart attack or which drivers will get in an accident, we can make predictions only by generalizing.

As the legal scholar "*Frederick Schauer*" has observed;
"painting with a broad brush" is "an often inevitable and frequently desirable dimension of our decision-making lives."

Another word for generalization, though, is "stereotype," and stereotypes are usually not considered desirable dimensions of our decision-making lives.

The process of moving from the specific to the general is both necessary and perilous.

A doctor could, with some statistical support, generalize about men of a certain age and weight.
But what if generalizing from other traits—such as high blood pressure,

family history, and smoking—saved more lives?
Behind each generalization is a choice of what factors to leave in and what factors to leave out, and those choices can prove surprisingly complicated.

After the attack on *Jayden Clairoux*, the Ontario government chose to make a generalization about APBT's.
But it could also have chosen to generalize about powerful dogs, or about the kinds of people who own powerful dogs, or about small children, or about low high back-yard fences—or, indeed, about any number of other things to do with dogs and people and places.
How do we know when we've made the right generalization?
Following the transit bombings in London, the New York City Police Department announced that it would send officers into the subways to conduct random searches of passengers' bags.
On the face of it, doing random searches in the hunt for terrorists—as opposed to being guided by generalizations—seems like a silly idea.
As a columnist in New York wrote at the time;
"Not just 'most' but nearly every jihadi who has attacked a Western European or American target is a young Arab or Pakistani man.
In other words, you can predict with a fair degree of certainty what an Al Qaeda terrorist looks like.
Just as we have always known what Mafiosi look like—even as we understand that only an infinitesimal fraction of Italian-Americans are members of the mob."
But wait: do we really know what Mafiosi look like?
In "The Godfather," where most of us get our knowledge of the Mafia, the male members of the Corleone family were played by Marlon Brando, who was of Irish and French ancestry, James Caan, who is Jewish, and two Italian-Americans, Al Pacino and John Cazale.
To go by "The Godfather," Mafiosi look like white men of European descent, which, as generalizations go, isn't terribly helpful.
Figuring out what an Islamic terrorist looks like isn't any easier.

Muslims are not like the Amish;they don't come dressed in identifiable costumes.
And they don't look like basketball players; they don't come in predictable shapes and sizes.
Islam is a religion that spans the globe.

Raymond Kelly, New York City's police commissioner states;
"We have a policy against racial profiling; I put it in here in March of the first year I was here.
It's the wrong thing to do, and it's also ineffective.
If you look at the London bombings, you have three British citizens of Pakistani descent.
You have Germaine Lindsay, who is Jamaican. You have the next crew, on July 21st, who is East African.
You have a Chechen woman in Moscow in early 2004 who blows herself up in the subway station. So whom do you profile?

Look at New York City. Forty per cent of New Yorkers are born outside the country.
Look at the diversity here. Who am I supposed to profile?"

Kelly was pointing out what might be called profiling "category problem."
Generalizations involve matching a category of people to a behaviour or trait—overweight middle-aged men to heart-attack risk, young men to bad driving.
But, for that process to work, you have to be able both to define and to identify the category you are generalizing about.

"You think that terrorists aren't aware of how easy it is to be characterized by ethnicity?
Look at the 9/11 hijackers. They came here. They shaved. They went to topless bars. They wanted to blend in.

They wanted to look like they were part of the American dream. These are not dumb people.
Could a terrorist dress up as a Hasidic Jew and walk into the subway, and not be profiled? Yes. I think profiling is just nuts."

APBT bans involve a category problem, too, because APBT's, as it happens, by the public they aren't just accepted a single breed.
The name refers to dogs belonging to a number of related breeds, such as the American Staffordshire terrier and the Staffordshire bull terrier, and many other breeds was created using the real APBT as baseline which share a square and muscular body, a short snout, and a sleek, short-haired coat.
Thus the Ontario ban prohibits not only these three breeds but any "dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar" to theirs; the term of art is "pit bull-type" dogs.
But what does that mean?
Is a cross between an American Pit Bull terrier and a golden retriever a Pit Bull-type dog or a golden retriever-type dog?
If thinking about muscular terriers as "Pit Bulls" is a generalization, then thinking about dangerous dogs as anything substantially similar to an APBTis a generalization about a generalization.
Lora Brashears, a kennel manager in Pennsylvania states;
"The way a lot of these laws are written, Pit Bulls are whatever they say they are and for most people it just means big, nasty, scary dog that bites."

The goal of "pit bull" bans, obviously, isn't to prohibit dogs that look like pit bulls.
The pit-bull appearance is a proxy for the pit-bull temperament—for some trait that these dogs share.
But "pit bullness" turns out to be elusive as well.
The supposedly troublesome characteristics of the APBT type—its gameness, its determination, its insensitivity to pain (argumentative …

supposed insensitivity) as some wrongfully believe—are chiefly directed toward other dogs or during a fight.
APBT's were not bred to fight humans never was.
On the contrary, a dog that went after spectators, or its handler, or the trainer, or any of the other people involved in making a dogfighting dog a good dogfighter was usually put down. (The rule in the APBT world was "Man-eaters die") and still do.

Know this about temperament tests concluded and the APBT.
A Georgia-based group called the American Temperament Test Society has put twenty-five thousand dogs through a ten-part standardized drill designed to assess a dog's stability, shyness, aggressiveness, and friendliness in the company of people.

A handler takes a dog on a six-foot lead and judges its reaction to stimuli such as gunshots, an umbrella opening, and a weirdly dressed stranger approaching in a threatening way.

Eighty-four per cent of the pit bulls that have been given the test have passed, which ranks pit bulls ahead of beagles, Airedales, bearded collies, and all but one variety of dachshund.

Carl Herkstroeter, the president of the A.T.T.S., says;
"We have tested somewhere around a thousand Pit-Bull-types and also real APBT game dogs, I've tested half of them.
And of the number I've tested I have disqualified only one Pit Bull because of aggressive tendencies.
They have done extremely well. They have a good temperament.
They are very good with children.
It can even be argued that the same traits that make the Pit Bull so aggressive toward other dogs are what make it so nice to humans."

The writer *"Vicki Hearne"* points out;

"*There are a lot of Pit Bulls these days who are licensed Therapy dogs. Their stability and resoluteness make them excellent for work with people who might not like a more bouncy, flibbertigibbet sort of dog. When Pit Bulls set out to provide comfort, they are as resolute as they are when they fight, but what they are resolute about is being gentle. And, because they are fearless, they can be gentle with anybody."*

Read this again;
"*Herkstroeter* says – *"Then which are the Pit Bulls that get into trouble? The ones that the legislation is geared toward have aggressive tendencies that are bred in by the breeder, trained in by the trainer, or purposely reinforced in by the owner.*

A mean Pit Bull is a dog that has been turned mean, not only by selective breeding, but being cross-bred with a bigger, human-aggressive breed like German shepherds or Rottweiler's, or by being conditioned in such a way that it begins to express hostility to human beings.

A specific trained behaviour.
A Pit Bull is dangerous to people, then, not to the extent that it expresses its essential Pit Bullness but to the extent that it deviates from it.

A Pit Bull ban is a generalization about a generalization about a trait that is not, in fact, general.
That's a category problem."

Does the notion of an APBT menace rest on a stable or an unstable generalization?
The best data we have on breed dangerousness are fatal dog bites, which serve as a useful indicator of just how much havoc certain kinds

of dogs are causing.

Between the late nineteen-seventies and the late nineteen-nineties, more than twenty-five breeds were involved in fatal attacks in the United States.

Pit-bull breeds led the pack, but the variability from year to year is considerable.
For instance, in the period from 1981 to 1982 fatalities were caused by five Pit Bulls, three mixed breeds, two St. Bernard's, two German-shepherd mixes, a pure-bred German shepherd, a husky type, a Doberman, a Chow Chow, a Great Dane, a wolf-dog hybrid, a husky mix, and a pit-bull mix—
but no Rottweiler's. In 1995 and 1996, the list included ten Rottweiler's, four Pit Bulls, two German shepherds, two huskies, two Chow Chows, two wolf-dog hybrids, two shepherd mixes, a Rottweiler mix, a mixed breed, a Chow Chow mix, and a Great Dane.

The kinds of dogs that kill people change over time, because the popularity of certain breeds changes over time.
The one thing that doesn't change is the total number of the people killed by dogs.
When we have more problems with pit bulls, it's not necessarily a sign that pit bulls are more dangerous than other dogs.
It could just be a sign that APBT's have become more numerous because they became more popular and sought after.

Randall Lockwood, a senior vice-president of the A.S.P.C.A. and one of the country's leading dog bite expert's states;
"I've seen virtually every breed involved in fatalities, including Pomeranians and everything else, except a beagle or a basset hound. And there are always one or two deaths attributable to malamutes or huskies, although you never hear people clamoring for a ban on those

breeds.
When I first started looking at fatal dog attacks, they largely involved dogs like German shepherds and shepherd mixes and St. Bernard's—which is probably why Stephen King chose to make Cujo a St. Bernard, not an American Pit Bull terrier.
I haven't seen a fatality involving a Doberman for decades, whereas in the nineteen-seventies they were quite common.
If you wanted a mean dog, back then, you got a Doberman.
I don't think I even saw my first APBT case until the middle to late nineteen-eighties,
and I didn't start seeing Rottweiler's until I'd already looked at a few hundred fatal dog attacks.
Now those dogs make up the preponderance of fatalities.
The point is that it changes over time. It's a reflection of what the dog of choice is among people who want to own an aggressive dog."

Then of course your specific training and more so your purpose of having such a dog in the first place.
There is no shortage of more stable generalizations about dangerous dogs, though.
A 1991 study in Denver, for example, compared a hundred and seventy-eight dogs with a history of biting people with a random sample of a hundred and seventy-eight dogs with no history of biting.
The breeds were scattered: German shepherds, Akitas, and Chow Chows were among those most heavily represented.
"(There were no APBT's among the biting dogs in the study, because Denver banned APBT's in 1989.)
But a number of other, more stable factors stand out.
The biters were 6.2 times as likely to be male as female, and 2.6 times as likely to be intact as neutered.
The Denver study also found that biters were 2.8 times as likely to be chained as unchained.
Randall Lockwood said;

"About twenty per cent of the dogs involved in fatalities were chained at the time, and had a history of long-term chaining, now, are they chained because they are aggressive or aggressive because they are chained? It's a bit of both.
These are animals that have not had an opportunity to become socialized to people.
They don't necessarily even know that children are small human beings. They tend to see them as prey."
In many cases, vicious dogs are hungry or in need of medical attention or just in need of attention.
Often, the dogs had a history of aggressive incidents, and, overwhelmingly, dog-bite victims were children (particularly small boys) who were physically vulnerable to attack and may also have unwittingly **done things to provoke the dog,**
like teasing it (this happens daily when children passes in the street), or **bothering it while it was eating.**

The strongest connection of all, though, is between the trait of dog viciousness and certain kinds of dog owners.

In about a quarter of fatal dog-bite cases, the dog owners were previously involved in illegal fighting and also aggressive in nature.
The dogs that bite people are, in many cases, socially isolated because their owners are socially isolated, and they are vicious because they have owners who want a vicious dog.
The junk-yard German shepherd—which looks as if it would rip your throat out—and the German-shepherd guide dog are the same breed. But they are not the same dog, because they have owners with different intentions.
Lockwood went *on;*
"A fatal dog attack is not just a dog bite by a big or aggressive dog, it is usually a perfect storm of bad human-canine interactions—
the wrong dog, the wrong background, the wrong history in the hands

of the wrong person in the wrong environmental situation.
I've been involved in many legal cases involving fatal dog attacks, and, certainly, it's my impression that these are generally cases where everyone is to blame – (not always the dog only).
You've got the unsupervised three-year-old child wandering in the neighborhood killed by a starved, abused dog owned by the dog fighting boyfriend of some woman who doesn't know where her child is. It's not old Sheppard sleeping by the fire that suddenly goes bonkers.
Usually there are all kinds of other warning signs" (and circumstances)
Jayden Clairoux was attacked by Jada, an APBT, and her two Pit bullmastiff puppies, Agua and Akasha – mix breed.

The dogs were owned by a twenty-one-year-old man named *Shridev Café*, who worked in construction and did odd jobs.
Five weeks before the Clairoux attack, Café's three dogs got loose and attacked a sixteen-year-old boy and his four-year-old half-brother while they were ice skating.

The boys beat back the animals with a snow shovel and escaped into a neighbor's house.

Café was fined, and he moved the dogs to his seventeen-year-old girlfriend's house.

This was not the first time that he ran into trouble that year; a few months later, he was charged with domestic assault, and, in another incident, involving a street brawl, with aggravated assault.
"Shridev has personal issues," *Cheryl Smith*, a canine-behaviour specialist who consulted on the case, says;
"He's certainly not a very mature person." The puppies Agua and Akasha were now about seven months old.
The court order in the wake of the first attack required that they be muzzled when they were outside the home and kept in an enclosed

yard.

But Café did not muzzle them, because, he said later, he couldn't afford muzzles, and apparently no one from the city ever came by to force him to comply.

A few times, he talked about taking his dogs to obedience classes, but never did.
The subject of neutering them also came up—particularly Agua, the male—but neutering cost a hundred dollars, which he evidently thought was too much money, and when the city temporarily confiscated his animals after the first attack they did not neuter them, either,
because Ottawa does not have a policy of preëmptively neutering dogs that bite people.
On the day of the second attack, according to some accounts, a visitor came by the house of Café's girlfriend, and the dogs got wound up. They were put outside, where the snow banks were high enough so that the back-yard fence could be readily jumped.
Jayden Clairoux stopped and stared at the dogs, saying;
"Puppies, puppies." His mother called out to his father. His father came running, which is the kind of thing that will rile up an aggressive dog. The dogs jumped the fence, and Agua took Jayden's head in his mouth and started to shake.
It was a textbook dog-biting case: unneutered, ill-trained, charged-up dogs, with a history of immediate aggression and an irresponsible owner, somehow get loose, and set upon a small child.
The dogs had already passed through the animal bureaucracy of Ottawa, and the city could easily have prevented the second attack with the right kind of generalization—a generalization based not on breed but on the known and meaningful connection between dangerous dogs and negligent owners.
But that would have required someone to track down Shridev Café, and

check to see whether he had bought muzzles, and someone to send the dogs to be neutered after the first attack, and an animal-control law that insured that those whose dogs attack small children forfeit their right to have a dog.
It would have required, that is, a more exacting set of generalizations to be more exactingly applied.

Then it is always easier just to ban the breed. **Is it not?**