

Emotional Support Livestock Pets Downsides

CPS2018-1121 Presented by Larry Heather jerusalem1@shaw.ca

fetishize in American, Collins English Dictionary.
('fetɪʃ, aɪz ; fet 'ishīz,)

verb transitive **Word forms:** 'fetish, ized or 'fetish, izing

1. to make a fetish of
2. to treat with unwarranted respect; overvalue
3. to be excessively or irrationally devoted to (an object, activity, etc)



When you make a fetish of an individual's rights, one will inevitably start to view individual responsibilities as an unfair burden, to be disposed of as quickly as possible. Negative consequences accompany individual rights pushed to the extreme, especially in big cities like Calgary where newly won individual rights are brazenly and defiantly exercised to the detriment of the public good.

A moral pluralism pushed to the extreme, yields no such thing as the public good – there are in this wasteland only private goods. Public Life in Calgary is suffering, as society fractionates into disparate and conflicting spheres. 'Being Good' in governance, degrading to the lower 'Feeling Good.' Motions which pass effortlessly meeting after meeting.

There is a whole hosts of diseases that accompany livestock and a citified pet owner is the least equipped to see the initial signs. And the learned by experience, regimented procedures, established on farms to avoid these diseases. Note the complete lack of what animals are prohibited in the bylaw, no doubt to accommodate some psychologist's future nutty allowance. Moreover, emotional attachment to livestock lacks the dispassionate discipline of the farmer who knows better, when the line is crossed from affection, to the endangerment of others. (i.e the prestige of owning a pit bull.)

As we see in the States, the custody of keeping livestock in homes, has morphed into the objectionable 'right' to take you animals with you to the shopping mall, foodstore, restaurants, transit, recreational facility and even airplanes. Wait for it, the first trio of approved LESA support Norway rats. One anticipates the day when the emotional support monkeys cross the bar into the Council horseshoe, although the quality change in decisions issuing from thereabouts, may not be discernible.

The sounds and smells of livestock inevitably become attractants for predators lured into the city, to lunch on the livestock, or rodents attracted to homes by spilled feed. People driven to distraction by the 24 hr sounds cacophony, and domesticated dogs, having their hunting instincts rekindled.

Wisdom dictates that it is not a good thing to have the type of livestock in your home, which the next door neighbor may be frying on the stove for tonight's dinner.

(Who can forget the memorable case of Foody Goody in Bonavista, whose ginger beef seemed to be a bit grisly. Then the inspector found the locked room full of refrigerated dead cats!) Imagine the first Emotional Support pig authorized in the community of Taradale, and the kind of social strife and even violence that it could cause. As I know from cleaning out the pig barn of my uncle in Bashaw, pig excrement is not the pickup friendly items we find around dogs and cats. Pig excrement is liquid, more like diarrhea than anything else. It takes specialized cleaning, drainage and disposal.

Freedom in the West was never defined as promiscuously as it is today. Beginning with the Greeks, to be free meant to be free from arbitrary and capricious rule. It did not mean freedom from social sanctions. It meant that individuals could freely pursue their own interests, consistent always with respect for the rights of others and in deference to the general interests of society.

The proposed bylaw on Livestock Emotional Support Animals (LESA) is poorly written and by its vagueness makes room for the latest fad livestock of the month. This new freedom of the select few, to keep livestock in the City of Calgary creates many problems because it cuts against the grain of society.

No society, free or unfree, can exist without a modicum of civility and community. As sociological analysis confirms, both of these properties are dependent upon the subordination of the individual to the social. It is worth noting that the initial allowance not only permitted a relaxation for a chicken, but for three chickens and thus a precedent already set for multiples.

But this new freedom is predicated on precisely the opposite principle: it elevates the individual above all other considerations. In short, the pursuit of an individual fixation on livestock animals, is on a collision course with the public good. This is evidence of the unprecedented multiplication of social pathologies, all with the respective psychologist recommending nouveau and often outlandish workarounds that do not deal with the foundational individual issues.

There is no third way of maximizing freedom while neglecting order. It is a sociological impossibility. From zoned land rights, to traffic planned congestion, to Livestock Emotional Support Animals, push one person's rights too far and it means the emasculation of someone else's rights. This breeds a disinterest in the rights of others and a lack of concern for the common good.

An individual liberty maximized? Beneath the veneer of tolerance lies exhaustion indifference, a total collapse of caring about what others will do to themselves. All of our hundreds of years of historical experience of livestock care and why it was separated from urban life, disregarded in two meetings because of a social feel good fad.

This is a situation proves to be a fascinating case study of how mass delusions can become acceptable — and how decent people can make decisions that are more selfish than they realize. It is one of the downsides of a modern culture that too often fetishizes individual preference and expression over communal well-being.

Extension 'Right' of Livestock to accompany designated to Public places and Transit.

A woman tried unsuccessfully in January 2018 to board a flight at Newark Liberty International Airport with a peacock that she described as her emotional support animal.
Credit: The Jet Set TV/via Reuters



This story begins with progress, in the form of [a 1986 law](#) forbidding discrimination against handicapped air travelers. The law made sure that physically disabled people could travel with service animals. It also rightly applied to nonphysical disabilities. Some autistic children, for example, function better with a trained dog.

It's true that some people honestly believe they have an emotional condition that an animal solves. But they are often confusing their preferences with actual medical needs. As a recent front-page story in The Washington Post [dryly put it](#), the effectiveness of emotional-support animals "is poorly substantiated through studies but widely embraced by the public."

A cottage industry sprung up in service of low-level fraud. For \$30 on Amazon, you can buy a bright-red dog vest that reads, EMOTIONAL SUPPORT. With a quick web search, you can find a therapist to diagnose you long-distance. Fill out a form, and suddenly you're certified as having an illness that requires animal attention.

All the while, people told themselves they weren't doing anything wrong. (How often have you heard a version of, "*My* pet is friendly and harmless"?) But people weren't thinking about the collective cost of their actions — about the many children afraid of sitting next to a dog, about travelers with serious allergies, about flight attendants charged with keeping cabins safe and, most of all, about truly disabled travelers.

The whole bizarre situation is a reminder of why trust matters so much to a well-functioning society. The best solution, of course, would be based not on some Transportation Department regulation but on simple trust. People who really needed service animals could then bring them on planes without having to carry documents.

Maybe a trust-based system will return at some point. But it won't return automatically. When trust breaks down and small bits of dishonesty become normal, people need to make a conscious effort to restore basic decency.

Certified Service Animals:

Service animals are trained to be calm and quiet. If you see a Yorkie barking it's fool head off and scurrying around it is not a service animal. If you hold treat in front of the animal and it grabs for it it is not a service animal.

The concept of "comfort animals" is symptomatic of a society that places the rights of individuals over everything to the point of insanity.

A well-functioning society will be able to draw the line between reasonable and silly on both sides of any issue.

Supposed Benefits of Emotional Support Livestock not supported by studies.

From Pigs to Peacocks, What's Up With Those 'Emotional-Support Animals'?



By Dennis Thompson

HealthDay Reporter

MONDAY, Aug. 13, 2018 (HealthDay News) -- It's easy to roll your eyes at the latest news nugget about someone trying to take an "emotional support animal" onto a plane, even though it's too big or out of control.

There's the large emotional support peacock that was denied a seat aboard a United Airlines flight in January, for example. Or the young girl who was bitten by an emotional support dog while boarding a Southwest Airlines flight in February.

But concern is mounting over people's asserted need for emotional support animals, as more seek accommodations for their pets and livestock in places not designed for bird or beast, said Phyllis Erdman, chair of the American Psychological Association's section on human-animal interaction.

There's scant scientific evidence that these animals provide legitimate benefit, said Erdman, associate dean for academic affairs at Washington State University's College of Education, in Pullman.

"There's very little research to suggest that the presence of this animal really helps this person," she said.

On the other hand, the animals could cause harm and discomfort to bystanders, through bites and scratches, allergic reactions, or public defecation and urination.

It's incredibly easy to have any critter classified as an emotional support animal, said Erdman, who led a symposium on the topic last week at the American Psychological Association's annual meeting, in San Francisco.

"The only thing they need is a letter from a health professional -- who could be a doctor, a counselor, a psychologist -- that says this person requires this animal" for a legitimate psychological condition, she explained.

Mood disorders like depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder are usually the reasons cited for assigning someone an emotional support animal, Erdman said.

The animals don't have to be certified or trained, and there are no federal restrictions on the species, size or weight of an animal in an emotional support role, she added.

"It can be anything from a snake to a very large animal," Erdman said. "A few years ago, we had a full-sized pig that was brought in as an emotional support animal into the second floor of a dorm. It caused damage to that dorm and, really, should a pig be left inside all day?"

I urge the committee to turn down this by-law, and restore a sense of proportion, to the common good of society over fetish fixations of individuals choosing inappropriate ways to meet their emotional needs.