

**From:** cyberdobes-bounces@... [mailto:cyberdobes-bounces@...] **On Behalf Of** ZUMADOBIES@...

**Sent:** Friday, September 01, 2006 12:55 AM **To:** cyberdobes@...

**Subject:** [Cyberdobes] what would you do?

Hi: I was reading the results from last weeks shows from at the Santa Barbara Kennel club shows, and I noticed that at one of the shows, the dog who went winners dog was sired by a dog that the judge bred and currently owns?

---

**9**HOLDER PARK'S-RED HOT CAYENNE , **WS12792911** 4/24/2005. Breeder: Donald K. Holder. By CH Phillmar X-Static --  
CH Holder Park's Elsa. **Judith K. Walter** . Dog. Jorge Olivera, Agent.

How do you folks feel about that? and if you are a judge how would you have handled this situation? I was under the impression, that a judge could or should not judge a puppy that was sired by a dog that was owned by them or members of their immediate family, am I wrong?

for the full show results from that weekend go to [jbradshaw.com](http://jbradshaw.com) and go to the dates of the shows.

**For the Love of Dobes! Gwen Lucoff, Zuma Dobermans, Malibu, Ca**

65744	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] what would you do?</a></p> <p>I have spoken with some folks that were present ring side. All agreed the judge knew. I cannot elaborate as I wasn't there. This is just what I was told, more than once. Donna -Original Message- From: NRenejade@... Date: 09/01/06 05:05:00 To: cyberdobes ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Donna</a> <a href="#">dobes@...</a> <a href="#">shilohdobes</a></p>	<p>Sep 1, 2006 12:26 pm</p>
-------	---	--	---------------------------------

I have spoken with some folks that were present ring side. All agreed the judge knew.  
I cannot elaborate as I wasn't there.  
This is just what I was told, more than once.  
Donna

65749	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] what would you do? / Santa Barbara results</a></p> <p>It was a three day show including the Simi Valley KC and these are the results and only a week later &lt;grin&gt;: Friday  Judge: Ms. Annella Cooper BOB: CH Finika's Z-Man V. Del Mar  BOW: Kaandas Dragon BO: Kendras Cardinal Sin  Reserve Dog: Marienburg's Magic ...</p>	Thea Charrette Cyberdobes@...	Sep 1, 2006 12:27 pm
-------	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------

It was a three day show including the Simi Valley KC and these are the results and only a week later <grin>:

Friday

Judge: Ms. Annella Cooper  
BOB: CH Finika's Z-Man V. Del Mar  
BOW: Kaandas Dragon  
BO: Kendras Cardinal Sin  
Reserve Dog: Marienburg's Magic Man  
Bitch: Winmar's Divine Intervention

Sat

Judge: Mr. Philip Martin  
BOB: CH Finika's Z-Man V. Del Mar  
BOW: Holder Park's Red Hot Cayenne  
BO: CH Ameridobes Precious Pearl  
Reserve Dog: Renaissance Gettin' on Board  
Bitch: Winmar's Midnight Rhapsody

Sun

Judge: Dr. Peter Emily  
BOB: CH Synergy Chariots of Fire Winmar  
BOW: Kendras Cardinal Sin  
BO: CH Ameridobes Precious Pearl  
Reserve Dog: Toledobes Phenomenal V. Quinn  
Bitch: Winmar's Midnight Rhapsody

Thea

65751	<p>RE: <a href="#">[Cyberdobes] what would you do?</a></p> <p>Ethics: Honesty Plus Common Sense You must both possess and project an unwavering air of integrity and ethical behavior that protects the reputation of AKC dog shows as fair and well-judged. With common sense, judges can easily avoid situations which ...</p>	<p>Susan Claggett <a href="mailto:claggett@...">claggett@...</a> <a href="mailto:susanclaggett">susanclaggett</a></p>	<p>Sep 1, 2006 12:27 pm</p>
-------	--	---	---------------------------------

**Ethics: Honesty Plus Common Sense**

You must both possess and project an unwavering air of **integrity** and **ethical behavior** that protects the reputation of AKC dog shows as fair and well- judged. With common sense, judges can easily avoid situations which might raise ethical questions.

Judges are presumed to be honest, competent and dedicated. Nevertheless, it is all too easy to find yourself in uncomfortable or even inappropriate situations. **No guidelines can cover every situation.** But they can help you avoid improprieties or perceived improprieties.

Obviously, some ethical rules are clear. For example:

- Never solicit or promote assignments.
- Never accept any payments or presents for past or future placements.
- Advise potential exhibitors not to enter under you when their presence or the presence of their dogs might give the impression of unfair advantage.

For example, if the exhibitor is:

- ...your employer or an employee.
- ...a relative.
- ...a person with whom you co-own dogs
- ...a person with whom you travel to dog shows.

These are only examples. The key is to avoid situations that are likely to give the *impression* of impropriety, and you must do everything possible to keep your reputation above reproach

65755	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] what would you do?</b> Speaking for myself only, it would depend totally on if I was aware of the facts. I think it would be entirely possible for a breeder-judge to have something shown to them, be it sired by a dog they own (or co-own) or with their breeding behind it, or ...	NRenejade@... renejade	Sep 1, 2006 12:28 pm
-------	---	---------------------------	-------------------------

Speaking for myself only, it would depend totally on if I was aware of the facts.

I think it would be entirely possible for a breeder-judge to have something shown to them, be it sired by a dog they own (or co-own) or with their breeding behind it, or sired by a dog they have bred to, etc; without being aware of that fact while in the ring judging.

You don't get to see the catalog until you are done:) Unless you know the handler and have seen the dog recently or know the dog will be shown, it is hard to "identify" a dog in the ring. If it is sired by something you bred or own, then (hopefully anyway) it should look like what you like. Beyond that, I would want to know if the judge was aware that this dog being shown was sired by her dog.

That said, I would hope that owners and handlers would have more respect than to put a judge in this position.

Nancy E Christensen/Renejade

65761	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] what would you do?</a></p> <p>I doubt that was the case in this instance....LOL</p> <p><b>NRenejade@...</b> wrote: Speaking for myself only, it would depend totally on if I was aware of the facts. I think it would be entirely possible for a breeder-judge to have something shown to them, be it sired ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Cheri McNealy</a> <a href="#">ccandid@...</a> <a href="#">cheri_mcnealy</a></p>	<p>Sep 1, 2006 12:30 pm</p>
-------	---	--	---------------------------------

I doubt that was the case in this instance....LOL

**NRenejade@...** wrote:

Speaking for myself only, it would depend totally on if I was aware of the facts.

I think it would be entirely possible for a breeder-judge to have something shown to them, be it sired by a dog they own (or co-own) or with their breeding behind it, or sired by a dog they have bred to, etc; without being aware of that fact while in the ring judging.

You don't get to see the catalog until you are done:) Unless you know the handler and have seen the dog recently or know the dog will be shown, it is hard to "identify" a dog in the ring. If it is sired by something you bred or own, then (hopefully anyway) it should look like what you like. Beyond that, I would want to know if the judge was aware that this dog being shown was sired by her dog.

That said, I would hope that owners and handlers would have more respect than to put a judge in this position.

Nancy E Christensen/Renejade

65764	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] what would you do?</b> Nancy C of NRenejade@... says: That said, I would hope that owners and handlers would have more respect than to put a judge in this position. - I agree with this. I am thinking that the owners, handler and or breeders of the said dog was not fair to the ...	Marj Brooks Cyberdobes@...	Sep 1, 2006 12:34 pm
-------	---	-------------------------------	-------------------------

Nancy C of NRenejade@... says:

That said, I would hope that owners and handlers would have more respect than to put a judge in this position.

-----  
I agree with this.

I am thinking that the owners, handler and or breeders of the said dog was not fair to the judge and put him on the line with a damned if you do, damned if you don't sort of thing, but I willing to bet that the judge had no idea, until after the fact.

In looking at the names I would think the owners didn't know any better (possibly unaware of putting the judge on the spot) and probably not the breeder either, but I would think that the handler did know and if it were me I would have advised them of the situation and recommended that they skip this show and give them my reasons. If they wanted to do it anyway, I would have declined handling the dog at this show. I would have done it in respect of the judge and not put him that "hard rock" position and actually for myself too.

That is how that I would handled the situation.

Often times, I do not always know when showing other breeds, such as GW Pointers or a Giant Schnauzer or something other than a Doberman. I most always know who is going to judge the Dobermans though.

At least the dog won both days.

This dog has won before and I think that he even has at least one major too.

In his campaign this dog has been advertised though in our breed magazine plenty for most all Doberman people to see him and his team.

Bare in mind, that all of this could have been an innocent thing. There are no rules, per say about this, just guidelines. There is a rule about doing business with the owner, handler and ect and a time line which I think is 4 months. maybe someone with a little time can look that up and share this AKC rule with the list. I have to leave this morning for shows.

I hope that I haven't shared too much here. I tried to do it respectfully and with fairness.

Marj

66192	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes]</a> <b>Congrats/New Champion</b> Congratulations to Judie Walter on finishing CH. Holder Parks Red Hot Cayenne (CH PhillmarX-Static X Ch. Holder Parks Elsa). Cayenne finished at 16 months with a BOB/Grp 2 and a BOB/Grp 4 from the classes. What a way to finish!!! _ Cyberdobes mailing list ...</p>	<p><a href="#">ron&amp;rebecca</a> <a href="#">rrlbbe@...</a> <a href="#">rrlbbe</a></p>	<p>Sep 12, 2006 5:53 pm</p>
-------	--	--	---------------------------------

Congratulations to Judie Walter on finishing CH. Holder Parks Red Hot Cayenne (CH PhillmarX-Static X Ch. Holder Parks Elsa).

Cayenne finished at 16 months with a BOB/Grp 2 and a BOB/Grp 4 from the classes. What a way to finish!!!

66199	<p><b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Congrats/New Champion</b></p> <p>Oh come on, Larry. If your bitch/dog had been competing in Santa Barbara and was aced out of the points by a judge who's dog sired the winner - would you think it was okay? Apparently, there was no need for "that" kind of win to begin with - in point of ...</p>	<p>Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006 12:05 am</p>
-------	---	--	----------------------------------

Oh come on, Larry.

If your bitch/dog had been competing in Santa Barbara and was aced out of the points by a judge who's dog sired the winner - would you think it was okay?

Apparently, there was no need for "that" kind of win to begin with - in point of fact, I've seen that dog and he's quite nice. There's another X-Static son handled by Don Holder (black) that is just as nice and would probably be finished if Don gave him to a handler.

Phillip wasn't vindicated because the dog finished - the dog finished in spite of him and as much as I like Phillip personally (and I do) - for him to have put up that puppy while he owns Stat - well, it does nothing for him long term as a judge. He should be thinking "long term" because after the day is over, that's what we have here "in dogs".

People bitched about the win because they had every right to bitch. It was a conflict of interest for Phillip to judge the dog - for the handler to show the dog and for the owner to enter the dog - SOMEBODY knew that early on and decided to Hell with it and everyone else.

I don't care how good the dog was or is - winning under the owner of the sire isn't exactly something I'd brag about - and the one who will be hurt the most by it, "long term" is Phillip.

Cheri

**LBates2001@...** wrote:

**Great Finish!**

**Wasn't this the same dog that Philip Martin put up in Santa Barbara that some got so upset about?  
Sweet vindication for Philip, don't you think?**

**Larry**

Congratulations to Judie Walter on finishing CH. Holder Parks Red Hot Cayenne (CH PhillmarX-Static X Ch. Holder Parks Elsa).

Cayenne finished at 16 months with a BOB/Grp 2 and a BOB/Grp 4 from the classes. What a way to finish!!!

66202	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Congrats/New Champion</b> Great Finish! Wasn't this the same dog that Philip Martin put up in Santa Barbara that some got so upset about? Sweet vindication for Philip, don't you think? Larry Congratulations to Judie Walter on finishing CH. Holder Parks Red Hot Cayenne (CH ...	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 13, 2006 12:06 am
-------	--	----------------	--------------------------

Great Finish!

Wasn't this the same dog that Philip Martin put up in Santa Barbara that some got so upset about?  
Sweet vindication for Philip, don't you think?

Larry

Congratulations to Judie Walter on finishing CH. Holder Parks Red Hot Cayenne (CH PhillmarX-Static X Ch. Holder Parks Elsa).  
Cayenne finished at 16 months with a BOB/Grp 2 and a BOB/Grp 4 from the classes. What a way to finish!!!

66214	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Congrats/New Champion</b> Cheri, I understand where you are coming from, and in many ways I do not disagree with you. I will have to say though, that in my opinion it took more courage to give the dog the points than not to. How can a judge control who enters under them? If they ...	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 13, 2006 1:34 am
-------	--	----------------	-------------------------

Cheri,

I understand where you are coming from, and in many ways I do not disagree with you. I will have to say though, that in my opinion it took more courage to give the dog the points than not to. How can a judge control who enters under them? If they do enter under them, what do they do then? Ask them to pull the dog? If the DON'T pull the dog isn't the judge obligated to give the points to the BEST dog on THAT DAY? I think I would have been tempted to point to a different dog simply because my stud had sired the dog and I wouldn't want it to look like there was anything fishy going on. Although I do not know Phillip well, he does seem to do things his way. I actually respect that in a person, and it is refreshing to see that a judge made a decision based on something OTHER than what may enhance his future career in the judges circle. IF the Stat son WAS the best in the ring that day, and if Phillip had nothing to do with the dog being there, then I would hope everyone would think he made the right decision. It takes more courage to do the right thing, than do what is politically correct. The question really in this case is WHAT WAS THE RIGHT THING?

In a message dated 9/12/2006 10:04:23 P.M. Central Daylight Time, ccandid@... writes:

Oh come on, Larry. If your bitch/dog had been competing in Santa Barbara and was aced out of the points by a judge who's dog sired the winner - would you think it was okay? Apparently, there was no need for "that" kind of win to begin with - in point of fact, I've seen that dog and he's quite nice. There's another X-Static son handled by Don Holder (black) that is just as nice and would probably be finished if Don gave him to a handler. Phillip wasn't vindicated because the dog finished - the dog finished in spite of him and as much as I like Phillip personally (and I do) - for him to have put up that puppy while he owns Stat - well, it does nothing for him long term as a judge. He should be thinking "long term" because after the day is over, that's what we have here "in dogs". People bitched about the win because they had every right to bitch. It was a conflict of interest for Phillip to judge the dog - for the handler to show the dog and for the owner to enter the dog - SOMEBODY knew that early on and decided to Hell with it and everyone else. I don't care how good the dog was or is - winning under the owner of the sire isn't exactly something I'd brag about - and the one who will be hurt the most by it, "long term" is Phillip.

Cheri

66215	<p><b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Congrats/New Champion</b></p> <p>NO, it wasn't!!!! One of the things we have drilled in our heads from the first day we arrive on scene at the dog show - is that you don't do anything that could be PERCEIVED as a conflict of interest and from the other exhibitors point of view, that win ...</p>	<p>Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006 1:36 am</p>
-------	--	--	---------------------------------

**NO, it wasn't!!!! One of the things we have drilled in our heads from the first day we arrive on scene at the dog show - is that you don't do anything that could be PERCEIVED as a conflict of interest and from the other exhibitors point of view, that win, under that judge, with that dog can never be assessed as if it were on a level playing field - just as, if the shoe were on your foot and one of your dogs lost to him - you'd be frustrated and pissed. It never had to happen - it should have been stopped somewhere along the line BEFORE the dog ever walked in that ring....because no matter what justification is offered by any of the players, the win will always be tainted.**

**FOR THE SPORT - nobody did the right thing.**

**Cheri**

**LBates2001@...** wrote:

Cheri, I understand where you are coming from, and in many ways I do not disagree with you. I will have to say though, that in my opinion it took more courage to give the dog the points than not to. How can a judge control who enters under them? If they do enter under them, what do they do then? Ask them to pull the dog? If the DON'T pull the dog isn't the judge obligated to give the points to the BEST dog on THAT DAY? I think I would have been tempted to point to a different dog simply because my stud had sired the dog and I wouldn't want it to look like there was anything fishy going on. Although I do not know Philip well, he does seem to do things his way. I actually respect that in a person, and it is refreshing to see that a judge made a decision based on something OTHER than what may enhance his future career in the judges circle. IF the Stat son WAS the best in the ring that day, and if Philip had nothing to do with the dog being there, then I would hope everyone would think he made the right decision. It takes more courage to do the right thing, than do what is politically correct. The question really in this case is WHAT WAS THE RIGHT THING?

In a message dated 9/12/2006 10:04:23 P.M. Central Daylight Time, ccandid@... writes:

Oh come on, Larry.If your bitch/dog had been competing in Santa Barbara and was aced out of the points by a judge who's dog sired the winner - would you think it was okay? Apparently, there was no need for "that" kind of win to begin with - in point of fact, I've seen that dog and he's quite nice. There's another X-Static son handled by Don Holder (black) that is just as nice and would probably be finished if Don gave him to a handler. Phillip wasn't vindicated because the dog finished - the dog finished in spite of him and as much as I like Phillip personally (and I do) - for him to have put up that puppy while he owns Stat - well, it does nothing for him long term as a judge. He should be thinking "long term" because after the day is over, that's what we have here "in dogs". People bitched about the win because they had every right to bitch. It was a conflict of interest for Phillip to judge the dog - for the handler to show the dog and for the owner to enter the dog - SOMEBODY knew that early on and decided to Hell with it and everyone else. I don't care how good the dog was or is - winning under the owner of the sire isn't exactly something I'd brag about - and the one who will be hurt the most by it, "long term" is Phillip. Cheri

66225	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</b> Isn't there a manual or handbook that gives guidance to judges and handlers about these specific guidelines? For instance A handler shouldn't show to a judge if they handled one of their dogs in last 6 months? Isn't it addressed somewhere? if you know the ...	Dohse Eileen <a href="mailto:eileend1@...">eileend1@...</a> <a href="#">divinedob</a>	Sep 13, 2006 12:20 pm
-------	--	--	--------------------------

Isn't there a manual or handbook that gives guidance to judges and handlers about these specific guidelines? For instance A handler shouldn't show to a judge if they handled one of their dogs in last 6 months? Isn't it addressed somewhere? if you know the judge knows that his dog sired that dog he should not enter under him? I have not seen any of these in writing. Are they just dog show ediquite or are they actual rules? Mine were just picked up through experinence who I don't enter under because of.....It just seems like common sense to me that I would not enter or show a dog to that judge for that reason. And if my dog was mistakenly entered while putting in entries for a group of shows then I would not show it that day for this reason. I wouldn't want to be the subject of discussion on the internet.  
Eileen

66227	<p>[Cyberdobes] Re: Cyberdobes Digest, Vol 16, Issue 4 - Discussion of "Conflict of Interest"</p> <p>... JUDGES" published by the <b>American</b> Kennel Club <b>and available</b> to every Provisional <b>and AKC Approved</b> Judge</p> <p>Sincerely, <b>Grace A. Black AKC</b> Judge #4312 _</p> <p>Cyberdobes mailing list</p> <p><a href="http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes">http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes</a></p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 13, 2006 12:22 pm
-------	---	----------------	--------------------------

RE: Philip Martin - Judging at Santa Barbara -

I know I am somewhat late in replying to the discussion concerning Philip putting up a dog sired by his own dog; but I had to find my "Guidelines for Conformation Dog Show Judges" (our bible). I will quote from the "Guidelines., Page 2 - Under Heading 'ETHICS: HONESTY PLUS COMMON SENSE"

"Advise potential exhibitors not to enter under you when their presence or the presence of their dogs might give the impression of unfair advantage." The Guidelines state further "The key is to avoid situations that are likely to give the IMPRESSION of impropriety, and you must do everything possible to keep your reputation above reproach".

Under Section CONFLICT OF INTEREST - Page 2 - I quote - "AKC recognizes you cannot control who enters under you. Consequently, situations may arise that require you to excuse an exhibitor due to a conflict of interest known to you. Some examples of exhibits or exhibitors that meet the criteria are: - a dog which you or a member of your immediate family has owned, co-owned, sold, boarded, etc. within one year prior to the show date".

Hope the above quotes clarify the situation. All above quotations were taken directly from "GUIDELINES FOR CONFORMATION DOG SHOW JUDGES" published by the American Kennel Club and available to every Provisional and AKC Approved Judge

Sincerely,

Grace A. Black

AKC Judge #4312

66228	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</a> Cheri, I don't think any judge should be thinking "long term when they're in the ring." I think that's the problem with judging a lot of the times -- when we have bad judging. Judges should judge what's in front of them on that day, based on how that dog ...	<a href="mailto:eastwkdobe@...">eastwkdobe@...</a> <a href="#">dobecropper</a>	Sep 13, 2006 12:23 pm
-------	--	---	--------------------------

Cheri,

I don't think any judge should be thinking "long term when they're in the ring." I think that's the problem with judging a lot of the times -- when we have bad judging. Judges should judge what's in front of them on that day, based on how that dog performs and how it conforms to the standard. I was at a show once and a special (that had won a Group under a certain judge) came back to free bait and refused to stand -- the dog sat and scratched -- the judge told the handler to just take the dog around and awarded that dog the breed. There was something seriously wrong with that picture -- maybe the judge was thinking "long term." I think if a conflict of interest is in the "gray zone" -- then once a judge decides in his or her mind that they are comfortable judging the dog, and can "just pick the best dog" -- then that's what they need to do. The last thing we need at dog shows are more judges thinking "long term."

Sophia Koster, DVM

EASTWICK

66233	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</a>  Then we have to agree to disagree. My point regarding "thinking long term" was meant to be weighed in on the plus side of the dog show game - something in my opinion, sadly lacking today. A judge who walks into the ring and doesn't consider everything ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Cheri McNealy</a>  <a href="#">ccandid@...</a>  <a href="#">cheri_mcnealy</a></p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006  1:53 pm</p>
-------	--	--	----------------------------------

Then we have to agree to disagree. My point regarding "thinking long term" was meant to be weighed in on the plus side of the dog show game - something in my opinion, sadly lacking today. A judge who walks into the ring and doesn't consider everything that should be considered, is a judge who will soon be in serious trouble. Philip Martin's foray into the judging ring is a classic case in point. He could have - and should have recused himself from judging the dog sired by his male - regardless of whether or not he was the best animal in the ring that day simply because to do anything else, puts his ethics and the credibility of THE SPORT in serious jeopardy. If he didn't care about how he'd come out of it, he should have been thinking "long term" about "the sport" and the ramifications his decision would have on what we're all trying to do here: fairly and objectively evaluate breeding stock. Fairly and objectively evaluating breeding stock is another of those things you have to look at "long term". If we judge the animal against the only acceptable Standard of Excellence we have - then the dog of the day and the "fad" of the hour should be put aside by both breeders and judges, regardless of how much they like a certain not-so-standard look. If that happened more often, there'd be a helluva lot less bitching about the "non-Standard" dogs who are winning (a cry we've heard from generation to generation because there's always something new and exciting to deal with from the "dog of the day") - and each new generation of fanciers wouldn't be faced with trying to find a way to correct the extremes accepted by the previous keepers of the breed. Where judging is concerned, I think any of them worth their salt who can assess reality and have the courage and tenacity to be honest - they'll tell you that there is a lot going on in their heads as they evaluate those dogs and the ones who do it right, waste no time cutting to the chase - EVERY chase happening in their ring - the ones we can see and those just under the surface. It goes with the territory. Like the most beautiful rose in the garden, it's excellence isn't without some thorns. The AKC continually stresses that our behavior at dog shows should reflect well on the sport. This includes judges. If John Q. Public attends a dog show, AKC wants us - ALL OF US - judges included, to show them the side of the sport that would make them want to run out and buy a purebred dog from a reputable breeder and then start showing it in some AKC events. That's how AKC pays its bills - so it behooves them to pound that into our heads non-stop. The very first thing the public has to think in order for that to happen - is that it's a level playing field - FAIR. Unbiased. Everyone has an equal chance and the deck isn't stacked. That means each and every judge who walks into a ring is not only charged with finding the best exhibit of the day, s/he needs to think ahead about what his or her actions as the authority figure of the moment - will convey to the rest of the world about "the sport". That is long term thinking in its purest form in this discussion... and it's an absolute necessity if the sport is to continue. If a conflict of interests exists and the judge is aware of it - THE BUCK STOPS THERE. If the owner and handler of a dog decide to slide into home base while nobody is looking - it's up to the judge to make the call. You don't get the rose without the thorns. The only time "long term" thinking shouldn't be a consideration in the ring is if that thinking benefits an individual over the whole of the sport. "I need to put up that dog so I can judge his show next year". Enough said - I think we all understand that type of long term thinking.

I remember a show some years back where a judge had a serious problem with an unhappy handler who behaved very badly when he did not win. So bad in fact, that the judge told him: "Never enter my ring again". The handler was, at that moment, prevented by the judge from ever showing to him again. I asked the judge if he were allowed to do that and follow through - and he said "Yes". I would think then, that the AKC also provides guidelines for judges when there is an obvious moment in their careers that could affect them and "the sport" for the long term. I am almost positive that while it may be a non-punishable offense to judge a dog sired by your stud (as long as you don't own it) - that there is something in all those AKC guidelines and rulebooks that would address such a scenario as a HUGE conflict of interest that the AKC would highly frown upon even if the dog was the only entry of the day. The AKC writes those rules and guidelines not only for the moment - but to protect itself and the sport, "long term". Yes, judge what's in front of you on that day - but to do so without regard for other, just as important considerations, is a dereliction of the duty and responsibility bestowed upon the individual who helps shape the future of the breed and the sport they preside over. Cheri

**EastWkDobe@...** wrote:

Cheri, I don't think any judge should be thinking "long term when they're in the ring." I think that's the problem with judging a lot of the times -- when we have bad judging. Judges should judge what's in front of them on that day, based on how that dog performs and how it conforms to the standard. I was at a show once and a special (that had won a Group under a certain judge) came back to free bait and refused to stand -- the dog sat and scratched -- the judge told the handler to just take the dog around and awarded that dog the breed. There was something seriously wrong with that picture -- maybe the judge was thinking "long term." I think if a conflict of interest is in the "gray zone" -- then once a judge decides in his or her mind that they are comfortable judging the dog, and can "just pick the best dog" -- then that's what they need to do. The last thing we need at dog shows are more judges thinking "long term." Sophia Koster, DVM EASTWICK

66234	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</b> Yes, and as a corollary the judging might not appear so consistent for "type" of dog. I find it strange that people so often applaud a judge for consistency in choosing his winning type. Dogs of somewhat different type may be closer to the standard than ...	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 13, 2006 1:57 pm
-------	--	----------------	-------------------------

Yes, and as a corollary the judging might not appear so consistent for "type" of dog. I find it strange that people so often applaud a judge for consistency in choosing his winning type. Dogs of somewhat different type may be closer to the standard than dogs of similar breeding and type on a given day. JudyS

On Wed, 13 Sep 2006 10:30:51 -0700 (PDT)

Cheri McNealy <[ccandid@...](mailto:ccandid@...)> wrote: If we judge the animal against the only acceptable Standard of Excellence we have - then the dog of the day and the "fad" of the hour should be put aside by both breeders and judges, regardless of how much they like a certain not-so-standard look. If that happened more often, there'd be a helluva lot less bitching about the "non-Standard" dogs who are winning (a cry we've heard from generation to generation because there's always something new and exciting to deal with from the "dog of the day") - and each new generation of fanciers wouldn't be faced with trying to find a way to correct the extremes accepted by the previous keepers of the breed.

66235	<a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</a> Then we have to agree to disagree. Cheri I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were even related to the dog I have from him) I respected him for making the request ...	Katherine Kew <a href="#">doberman@...</a> <a href="#">sharinway</a>	Sep 13, 2006 1:58 pm
-------	---	---	-------------------------

Then we have to agree to disagree.

>

> Cheri

I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were even related to the dog I have from him) I respected him for making the request and did not enter one of my dogs.....

Katherine Kew

66237	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</a></p> <p>So he was thinking "long term".... Cheri Katherine Kew &lt;doberman@...&gt; wrote: Then we have to agree to disagree. Cheri I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Cheri McNealy</a> <a href="#">ccandid@...</a> <a href="#">cheri_mcnealy</a></p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006 2:21 pm</p>
-------	---	--	---------------------------------

So he was thinking "long term"....

Cheri

**Katherine Kew** <doberman@...> wrote:

Then we have to agree to disagree.

>

> Cheri

I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were even related to the dog I have from him) I respected him for making the request and did not enter one of my dogs.....

Katherine Kew

66238	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] Re:Judges thinking long term...</a>  <a href="#">goats@...</a> wrote: Yes, and as a corollary the judging might not appear so consistent for "type" of dog. I find it strange that people so often applaud a judge for consistency in choosing his winning type. Dogs of somewhat different type may be closer to ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Cheri McNealy</a>  <a href="#">ccandid@...</a>  <a href="#">cheri_mcnealy</a></p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006  2:27 pm</p>
-------	---	--	----------------------------------

**goats@...** wrote:

Yes, and as a corollary the judging might not appear so consistent for "type" of dog. I find it strange that people so often applaud a judge for consistency in choosing his winning type. Dogs of somewhat different type may be closer to the standard than dogs of similar breeding and type on a given day. JudyS

=====

You have to have consistent "type" entered before you can consistently put it up.

Entries everywhere are WAY down from years gone by - even recent years. And of what is out there (even at previously huge specialty shows) - the quality, in my opinion, just isn't there the way it used to be. It used to be that a judge could find fairly equal dogs of similar type to point at - but now, if you get an open black dog class of 6 animals, they're all over the map. Straight rears, overangulated rears, flat backs, soft backs, long backs, short backs, good heads, down faces, light eyes, dark eyes, full muzzles, no muzzle. How can we blame the judge then for not putting up dogs who are consistent with a certain type? The type isn't there to begin with - and often, neither is the quality!

Sometimes I think judges have no choice except to put up the best of a lesser group - and hope like hell by the time its over, at least one animal will stroll into his ring that he won't be embarrassed to have his photo taken with - and advertised! LOL

Does it seem to you all like with the decrease in numbers - there's also a decrease in overall quality? What would be responsible for that?

I think the National is probably one of the only shows today where you will see a large number of dogs - many of them "consistent" in type and quality....oh for the days when the specialties boasted entries of 100+....it was such a wonderful education and such a glorious time in the breed - watching those up and comers fulfill their potential and the promise of "the best is yet to come".

Cheri

66243	<p>[Cyberdobes] Fwd: Cyberdobes Digest, Vol 16, Issue 4 - Discussion of "Conflict of Interest"</p> <p>... JUDGES" published by the <b>American</b> Kennel Club <b>and available</b> to every Provisional <b>and AKC Approved</b> Judge</p> <p>Sincerely, <b>Grace A. Black AKC</b> Judge #4312 _</p> <p>Cyberdobes mailing list</p> <p><a href="http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes">http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes</a></p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 13, 2006 3:53 pm
-------	--	----------------	-------------------------

RE: Philip Martin - Judging at Santa Barbara -

I know I am somewhat late in replying to the discussion concerning Philip putting up a dog sired by his own dog; but I had to find my "Guidelines for Conformation Dog Show Judges" (our bible). I will quote from the "Guidelines., Page 2 - Under Heading 'ETHICS: HONESTY PLUS COMMON SENSE' "Advise potential exhibitors not to enter under you when their presence or the presence of their dogs might give the impression of unfair advantage." The Guidelines state further "The key is to avoid situations that are likely to give the IMPRESSION of impropriety, and you must do everything possible to keep your reputation above reproach".

Under Section CONFLICT OF INTEREST - Page 2 - I quote - "AKC recognizes you cannot control who enters under you. Consequently, situations may arise that require you to excuse an exhibitor due to a conflict of interest known to you. Some examples of exhibits or exhibitors that meet the criteria are: - a dog which you or a member of your immediate family has owned, co-owned, sold, boarded, etc. within one year prior to the show date".

Hope the above quotes clarify the situation. All above quotations were taken directly from "GUIDELINES FOR CONFORMATION DOG SHOW JUDGES" published by the American Kennel Club and available to every Provisional and AKC Approved Judge

Sincerely,

Grace A. Black

AKC Judge #4312

66251	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re: Cyberdobes Digest, Vol 16, Issue 58 ... JUDGES"</a> published by the <b>American</b> Kennel Club <b>and available</b> to every Provisional <b>and AKC Approved</b> Judge Sincerely, <b>Grace A. Black AKC</b> Judge #4312 _ Cyberdobes mailing list <a href="http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes">http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes</a>	Mary Jo Ansel <a href="mailto:mjansel@velmadobe">mjansel@... velmadobe</a>	Sep 13, 2006 4:15 pm
-------	---	---	-------------------------

Thank you Grace for the information. The wording still leaves a lot of room for individual interpretation. Unfortunately, there are a lot of people in this world who are lacking common sense. I personally would tend to lean towards making sure that there was no room for anyone to think "favoritism". For example: one of my personal mentors is Mims Datskow, and I also own a bitch sired by a dog of hers. I would NEVER consider entering a dog of mine under her .....she'd kick me out if I even tried :-).

Mary Jo Ansel in SE PA  
Dillon's Barclay Amy CD WAC CGC TDInc  
Cha-Rish A Moment Like This

66254	<p><b>[Cyberdobes] judges thinking long term</b></p> <p>In a message dated 9/13/2006 10:52:19 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, cyberdobes-request@... writes: I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were even related to the dog ...</p>	<p>ZUMADOBIES@... zumadobies</p>	<p>Sep 13, 2006 5:22 pm</p>
-------	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

In a message dated 9/13/2006 10:52:19 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, cyberdobes-request@... writes:

I have to disagree also....when Luiz judged in my area, he called me and asked me not to show my dogs under him (and none of them were even related to the dog I have from him) I respected him for making the request and did not enter one of my dogs.....

Katherine:

I think that Luiz is a first class judge for doing this. See, it can and was done, end of story.

Kudos to Luiz, and I look forward to showing him my dogs if the opportunity presented it's self.

**For the Love of Dobes!**

**Gwen Lucoff, Zuma Dobermans, Malibu, Ca**

66258	<b>[Cyberdobes] Judges thinking long term</b> In a message dated 9/13/2006 10:52:19 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, cyberdobes-request@... writes: Yes, judge what's in front of you on that day - but to do so without regard for other, just as important considerations, is a derelection of the duty and ...	ZUMADOBIES@... zumadobies	Sep 13, 2006 5:24 pm
-------	---	------------------------------	-------------------------

In a message dated 9/13/2006 10:52:19 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, cyberdobes-request@... writes:

Yes, judge what's in front of you on that day - but to do so without regard for other, just as important considerations, is a derelection of the duty and responsibility bestowed upon the individual who helps shape the future of the breed and the sport they preside over

Cheri:

I think that you hit the nail on the head. Santa Barbara KC show should and could have been avoided. And it will be interesting to see what becomes of the situation. probably nothing, because from the private emails I received about the show, again, "no body wanted to say anything", or they knew the owners of the puppy, and they didn't want to upset their friends. That's bullsh\*t folks, if you aren't part of the solution, you are part of the problem. How can things get better, if everybody is afraid to say anything from fear of what might happen to them. Winning is everything to me too, but not if it involves cheating, and that's what not playing by the rules is. Cheating. Silence is acceptance.....

**For the Love of Dobes!**

**Gwen Lucoff, Zuma Dobermans, Malibu, Ca**

66269	<p>[Cyberdobes] Re: CD Vol 16 Issue 4 "Discussion of Conflict of Interest" Grace Black's post that was scrubbed</p> <p>Looks like <b>Grace Black</b> must have picked up a computer virus so I'm posting this for <b>all</b> to read. Philip ... <b>available</b> to every Provisional <b>and AKC Approved</b> Judge Sincerely, <b>Grace A. Black AKC Judge #4312_</b> Cyberdobes mailing list <a href="http://mailman.listserve ...">http://mailman.listserve ...</a></p>	<p>Sandy Teague  <a href="mailto:sandy@pettemp.com">sandy@pettemp.com</a>  pettemp</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006  1:08 am</p>
-------	--	--	----------------------------------

Looks like Grace Black must have picked up a computer virus so I'm posting this for all to read.

Philip Martin Judging at Santa Barbara

I know I am somewhat late in replying to the discussion concerning Philip putting up a dog sired by his own dog but I had to find my Guidelines for Conformation Dog Show Judges (our bible) I will quote from the Guide lines. Page 2 - Under Heading ETHICS: HONESTY PLUS COMMON SENSE Advise potential exhibitors not to enter under you when their presence or the presence of their dogs might give the impression of unfair advantage. The Guidelines state further; The key is to avoid situations that are likely to give the IMPRESSION of impropriety, and you must do everything possible to keep your reputation above reproach Under Section CONFLICT OF INTEREST Page 2 I quote AKC recognizes you cannot control who enters under you. Consequently, situations may arise that require you to excuse an exhibitor due to a conflict of interest known to you. Some examples of exhibits or exhibitors that meet the criteria are a dog which you or a member of your immediate family has owned, co-owned, sold, boarded, etc. within one year prior to the show date

Hope the above quotes clarify the situation All above quotations were taken directly from GUIDELINES FOR CONFORMATION DOG SHOW JUDGES published by the American Kennel Club and available to every Provisional and AKC Approved Judge

Sincerely,

Grace A. Black

AKC Judge #4312

66280	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re: Judges thinking long term</a> <<Gwen Lucoff wrote: <<Winning is everything to me too, but not if it involves cheating, and that's <<what not playing by the rules is. Cheating. <<Silence is acceptance..... I think we need to be cautious of going a little overboard here. As far as I ...	<a href="#">ron&amp;rebecca</a> <a href="#">rribbe@...</a> <a href="#">rribbe</a>	Sep 14, 2006 2:31 am
-------	---	---	-------------------------

<<Gwen Lucoff wrote:

<<Winning is everything to me too, but not if it involves cheating, and that's what not playing by the rules is. Cheating.

Silence is acceptance.....

I think we need to be cautious of going a little overboard here. As far as I can tell what was done in Santa Barbara was not illegal according to AKC's rules. I understand argument for the appearance of favoritism but to call it outright cheating is stretching it. I believe Grace Black posted the judge's guidelines and as anyone can see there is a lot of gray area there.

The Doberman community is a rather small group so anytime you have a breeder judge chances are there is going to be some type of connection with one or more of the exhibitors. Whether they have bred together in the past, one handled for the other, one used the others stud dog, co-owned dogs together, serve on the board together, are friendly on an internet list or whatever...there is normally some type of connection that could be questioned. If we truly want to erase every possible perception of favoritism, it would probably be hard for most breeder judges to draw much of any entry. I think the quality of the dog that wins has to be given some type of consideration when you are throwing around accusations. Was the dog deserving of the win or was it a pet that needed a special favor to finish?

It is one thing to say a judge is incompetent, but you should have pretty good backup when you accuse a judge of outright cheating,

Ron Babics

66284	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Santa Barbara Show</a> ... placed second out of two, Pete Emily told the handlers at the winners table that the red puppy in the 9-12 class had <b>three missing teeth</b> . The handlers of Winners and Reserve Winners dog both said in unison, "That dog won the point yesterday." Dr. Emily ...	<a href="#">Kathy Bishop</a> <a href="#">kbishop1@...</a> <a href="#">kaanda7</a>	Sep 14, 2006 12:13 pm
-------	---	---	--------------------------

Hi Cheri,

I was there and my dog was the one aced out of the point because of the way Philip judged the classes. Not only did he give the point to a puppy of his breeding but he gave the Am. Bred class to the breeder of that puppy. The AM. Bred dog had NEVER beaten my dog in AM Bred until that day. Never. To top it off, the next day, when my dog did win the point and the puppy that had won the day before was placed second out of two, Pete Emily told the handlers at the winners table that the red puppy in the 9-12 class had three missing teeth. The handlers of Winners and Reserve Winners dog both said in unison, "That dog won the point yesterday." Dr. Emily could only say, "Over these two dogs?" And yes, that one point would have finished my boy.

Kathy Bishop

66286	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Mr. Martin</b> In a message dated 9/14/2006 10:23:55 A.M. Central Daylight Time, arthurgreenwood@... writes: Thanks Elaine! I was shocked to read that too... I mean couldn't that be said about any of us? With all the mean comments made on this and other doberman lists I ...	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 14, 2006 12:15 pm
-------	---	----------------	--------------------------

In a message dated 9/14/2006 10:23:55 A.M. Central Daylight Time, arthurgreenwood@... writes:

Thanks Elaine! I was shocked to read that too... I mean couldn't that be said about any of us? With all the mean comments made on this and other doberman lists I think there may be MANY people on the "Not well liked" list. LOL

Besides, that had nothing to do with the discussion anyway.

The other day on this list someone made a comment to the effect that Mr. Martin was not well liked in Dobermans. Arthur and I cringed when we read it. We had to ask ourselves, "Why would anyone make such a petty unkind comment in public?"

66288	[Cyberdobes] <b>Mr. Martin</b> _ Cyberdobes mailing list <a href="http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes">http://mailman.listserve.com/listmanager/listinfo/cyberdobes</a>	Arthur Greenwood <a href="mailto:arthurgreenwood@...">arthurgreenwood@...</a> <a href="mailto:greenwoodarthur">greenwoodarthur</a>	Sep 14, 2006 12:18 pm
-------	--	--	--------------------------

The other day on this list someone made a comment to the effect that Mr. Martin was not well liked in Dobermans. Arthur and I cringed when we read it. We had to ask ourselves, "Why would anyone make such a petty unkind comment in public?"

Unfortunately the answer is obvious... from just one glance at Mr. Martin's website...

<http://www.phillmardobermans.com/champions.htm> Mr. Martin has been very very successful in a rather short period of time... and success seems to bring out the worst in competitors.

One thing that impressed Arthur and I about Mr. Martin (aside from the many Champions, Best In Show Winners and Top 20 Dobes) is his personal commitment to the health and well-being of his dogs. Phil clearly loves them and they in turn are perfect reflections of his commitment to them. One has only to look at this photo of Stat jumping in to the pool to note the bond of love between Stat and Phil. [http://www.phillmardobermans.com/stud\\_dogs.htm](http://www.phillmardobermans.com/stud_dogs.htm)

I think this photo of the the litter of puppies by BIS BISS Ch. Eastwick's Meadow Monster out of BIS BISS Ch. Phillmar Thunderella CD says a great deal about Phil. [http://www.phillmardobermans.com/upcoming\\_stars.htm](http://www.phillmardobermans.com/upcoming_stars.htm) The ad could rightly be focused on this extraordinary breeding of two BIS BISS Dobermans ... but instead, it is aimed at the very heart of the message Dobe breeders should be sending, "Our Dobes are loved family companions."

This is a man who is "not liked by Doberman people." Really? Who took that poll? We like him, we like him very very much, and we respect him... as a friend, as a competitor, as a breeder, and as a huge asset for our breed.

-Elaine

66309	<b>Re: [Cyberdobes] Mr. Martin</b> Arthur Greenwood <arthurgreenwood@...> wrote: The other day on this list someone made a comment to the effect that Mr. Martin was not well liked in Dobermans. Arthur and I cringed when we read it. We had to ask ourselves, "Why would anyone make such a ...	Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy	Sep 14, 2006 12:59 pm
-------	---	--	--------------------------

**Arthur Greenwood** <arthurgreenwood@...> wrote:

The other day on this list someone made a comment to the effect that Mr. Martin was not well liked in Dobermans. Arthur and I cringed when we read it. We had to ask ourselves, "Why would anyone make such a petty unkind comment in public?"

-----

I think those kinds of comments deserve to be sorted and placed where they belong....LOL - and we all know where they belong.

Cheri

66310	<p>Re: [Cyberdobes] Public criticism of a judge</p> <p>... dark shadow over everything we're supposed to be doing here - then I don't know what could! <b>As</b> for the information <b>Grace Black</b> (a judge) sent the list - it came right out of books published <b>and</b> distributed by <b>AKC</b> to <b>ALL</b> judges. If someone wants ...</p>	<p>Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006 1:00 pm</p>
-------	--	--	---------------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] Public criticism of a judge

**Arthur Greenwood** <arthurgreenwood@...> wrote:

What Mr. Martin did is not REMOTELY wrong, nor does it rise to the level of creating the impression of impropriety. The criticism of him is a best, unseemly.

**WRONG, Elaine.**

Public criticism of a judge is very often inappropriate and it is - to a marked degree - proscribed by the AKC Rules and Regulations for several very good reasons... one of which is that it degrades the public's confidence in the sport. Experienced dog people understand that most criticism should be kept private. I think some of the posters here are walking a fine line. I can see the AKC turning on some who post here, especially judges - who publicly criticize other judges.

-Elaine <http://logresfarm.com/>

---

I respectfully disagree. It's not the criticism of a judge that degrades the sport, it's what the judge did in plain view of the world, leading to justified criticism that degrades the sport. If the bottom line here is to insure the "public's confidence in the sport" then JUDGES CANNOT BE GIVEN ANY EXTRA LEEWAY WHERE ETHICAL ISSUES ARE CONCERNED and in fact, \*must be held to a higher standard as representative of the AKC and ultimate authority figures of the "sport". If we cannot openly discuss judging - both good and bad, fair and crooked, competent and incompetent then we are PART OF THE PROBLEM and if you ask me, THE WORST PART. Because, as I've said a million times before - to the extent that I'm sure someone will carve it on my headstone: SILENCE IS PERMISSION.

The "sport" is in trouble. And anyone out there who believes or tries to lead others to believe its all about the price of gas - is either living in a cave (by choice) or just wants to go along and get along, wrapped happily in a cloak of security that provides anything BUT....

Philip knew that puppy was sired by his dog and if that isn't a classic definition of "conflict of interest" that would make anyone else who knew rightfully suspicious of his motives for awarding the dog and casting a dark shadow over everything we're supposed to be doing here - then I don't know what could!

As for the information Grace Black (a judge) sent the list - it came right out of books published and distributed by AKC to ALL judges. If someone wants to yell "Foul" in this discussion - don't scream in Grace's direction because she didn't criticize - she informed. There are many instances where criticism of a judge is nothing but sour grapes or poor sportsmanship and all of us know it. We can smell it from a mile away. This particular situation, in my opinion, SHOULD be examined and discussed and if I had to categorize it, I guarantee it wouldn't fit into my idea of "sour grapes"...it would instead, be defined as a classic case of a conflict of interest. We can't undo that which has been done. Can't unring the bell. But we CAN all learn from it and that's not a half bad thing. Cheri

66316	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] On Kathy Bishop's Post</a> ... try to be anonymous. I don't appreciate anyone making false accusations against any dog, not just mine. ( My dog does not have 3 <b>missing teeth</b> .) If Judge Emily said such a thing, against my dog, then I would say, we have an issue with a judge..... I'm awfully sorry that ...	Judith Walter <a href="#">Cyberdobes@...</a>	Sep 14, 2006 1:12 pm
-------	---	---	-------------------------

Kathy, if you post something on this website, you should have the guts to stand up to it and not try to be anonymous. I don't appreciate anyone making false accusations against any dog, not just mine. ( My dog does not have 3 missing teeth.) If Judge Emily said such a thing, against my dog, then I would say, we have an issue with a judge.....

I'm awfully sorry that you blame Judge Martin, for your dog not winning on that particular day. I don't think that this had been her only opportunity to accomplish this....After all, she is almost 3 years old....

I'm sure your dog has Faults, as they all do.....But posting untrue ones, puts this all into a new level.....

Judie Walter

66318	<p>Re: [Cyberdobes] <b>Mr. Martin/NOT</b></p> <p>LBates2001@... wrote: In a message dated 9/14/2006 10:23:55 A.M. Central Daylight Time, arthurgreenwood@... writes: Thanks Elaine! I was shocked to read that too... I mean couldn't that be said about any of us? With all the mean comments made on this and ...</p>	<p>Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006 1:16 pm</p>
-------	---	--	---------------------------------

**LBates2001@...** wrote:

In a message dated 9/14/2006 10:23:55 A.M. Central Daylight Time, arthurgreenwood@... writes:

Thanks Elaine! I was shocked to read that too... I mean couldn't that be said about any of us? With all the mean comments made on this and other doberman lists I think there may be MANY people on the "Not well liked" list. LOL

Besides, that had nothing to do with the discussion anyway.

=====

And we all knew it and continue to know it.

That counts for something, Larry....

And a "list" is not an entity unto itself. ALL lists are made up of people - each of them individuals who have a right to think and feel the way they do. You can blame an individual for being "mean" but leave the rest of us out of it. Membership on any list does not mean you are responsible for the thoughts and beliefs of others - not every person on this list is a "cyberdope" just because they subscribe to CD!

This isn't FANTASYLAND - its a community of individuals who ALL suffer from the human condition - which includes days when you're feeling bitchy and mean and other days when you'd give the shirt off your back to someone less fortunate. Add that little ditty known as "competition" to the mix and what do you have?

Human Beans ain't perfect!

"Mean" can and does have a different definition - depending on who you're talking to! How often, really, is something said just for meanness?

If having a "for real" conversation about the problems we have to deal with as members of the fancy constitutes "mean" - then bring it on because I'm not gonna sit here devoting my spare time to a bunch of "hey, way to go" kinds of meaningLESS posts and discussions.

You just don't get the rose without the thorns. Who wants to live without the roses?

Cheri

66320	<p>Re: [Cyberdobes] Santa Barbara judging</p> <p>... stated yesterday, which was confirmed by the information <b>Grace Black</b> sent us from the <b>AKC</b> Guidelines for Judges - Philip could have recused himself ... that the puppy is the same "type" <b>as</b> his stud dog, <b>a</b> dog who duplicates the manner of standard that Martin ...</p>	<p>Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006 1:40 pm</p>
-------	---	--	---------------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] Santa Barbara judging

Elaine and Debi, It'd be a little difficult to actually claim total innocence where that dog is concerned since he is featured on Philip's website and if I remember correctly, was used in an advertisement for Philmar in a recent issue of DD. [http://www.phillmardobermans.com/stud\\_dogs\\_offspring.htm](http://www.phillmardobermans.com/stud_dogs_offspring.htm) Additionally - as I stated yesterday, which was confirmed by the information Grace Black sent us from the AKC Guidelines for Judges - Philip could have recused himself from judging the dog but didn't....so regardless of who entered him or who handled him - in the final analysis, the buck should have stopped with the judge. If we make excuses for the judges we "know" and "like" - then how can we ever expect the playing field to be level? Isn't a bland acceptance or excusal of behaviors we wouldn't tolerate from people we don't know - its own kind of favoritism? If we can't be above that, then let's don't get all whacked out about judges (any judge) who plays exactly the same kind of game in the ring....because there is NO difference!

Cheri I love the roses - so bring on the thorns!

*StarlaineK9@...* wrote: I don't personally know ANY of the folks involved in this, but have been reading the discussion with great interest. I'm wondering...isn't it possible that the judge, in this case Philip Martin, did not know that the puppy was sired by his dog? The stud dog provides semen. Now a days, that can be across continents. Some of the larger concerns utilize "kennel managers" to make the transactions, so the owner may not have any idea who all gets the semen. So someone contracts with him (or whomever) to buy semen from his stud dog. When the puppies arrive that person places their kennel name on the litter and sells the puppies. One of those puppies is shown in Santa Barbara. Does Martin know all the puppy buyers of all the litters his dog has sired? Does he know the handlers of all those puppies? Does he even know the kennel names that have been attached to those puppies? My understanding is that the judges cannot look over the names of those who are entered under them. If that's the case, they wouldn't know the kennel name, the sire, the dam, or even the owner, unless that person is handling the dog. Isn't it possible that the puppy is the same "type" as his stud dog, a dog who duplicates the manner of standard that Martin feels is correct? Isn't it possible, that he wouldn't have had any idea that that particular pup had his stud dog at the top of its pedigree? I understand that the guy isn't the most loved in the Doberman community, and that status may or may not be well-deserved. However, even if it is, does that automatically mean that he knew the pedigree of the puppy he gave the points to and that was the reason he awarded those points? Debi Sternberg

**Hi all** Good points, Debi. I for one, as someone who considers Philip Martin a good friend would certainly like to give him the benefit of the doubt. In such a case, just what is the judge supposed to do? Let's say a judge knows which dog is sired by their dog....are they to stand at the ring entrance and refuse them entry?? Bar the door?? What if the competitor was told not to enter and did anyway? If the competitor insists on showing, is the judge to let down on that dog just to please the ringside observers?? I would like to know exactly how a judge is supposed to handle this and make everyone happy...ON THE DAY of judging....it goes without saying that one should tell those with whom you have business dealings not to enter under you. Are you all so sure Philip did not do that?? Once the person is in the ring should he show reverse favoritism?? Is that the right thing to do?? Philip had the most to lose here and would be

damned either way. It seems to me that the person who should be receiving all this attention is the person who entered/owns the dog. THAT is the person behaving unethically, for they KNEW the connection and did it any way and are ultimately responsible for putting Philip in that position in the first place. How about we banter about that persons name and lay the onus on them? JMO Elaine Hopper

66324	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] On Kathy Bishop's Post</a></p> <p>... a public website is <b>MEAN!</b> (claiming that a dog has 3 <b>missing teeth</b> when it doesn't). And what about this judge that allegedly ... against any dog, not just mine. ( My dog does not have 3 <b>missing teeth</b>.) If Judge Emily said such a thing, against my dog ...</p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 14, 2006 2:38 pm
-------	--	----------------	-------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] On Kathy Bishop's Post

In a message dated 9/14/2006 12:02:49 P.M. Central Daylight Time, walterjk1@... writes:

See Cheri,

Posting this kind of stuff on a public website is **MEAN!** (claiming that a dog has 3 missing teeth when it doesn't).

And what about this judge that allegedly made this comment (missing teeth) to other exhibitors. Could anyone out there possibly think that is the professional thing to do? Why isn't this judge being talked about? Believe me, THAT is the judge I wouldn't want to evaluate my dog... if she cannot even count teeth, and then spreads the misinformation to the other exhibitors there.

So now this incident has been elevated from Mr. Martin putting up a dog that his dog sired... to him doing that for a dog with 3 missing teeth. The first part of the previous sentence is true, but the last part of the sentence is a downright LIE. **THAT IS MEAN, and completely uncalled for.**

Larry Bates

*Kathy, if you post something on this website, you should have the guts to stand up to it and not try to be anonymous. I don't appreciate anyone making false accusations against any dog, not just mine. ( My dog does not have 3 missing teeth.) If Judge Emily said such a thing, against my dog, then I would say, we have an issue with a judge.....*

*I'm awfully sorry that you blame Judge Martin, for your dog not winning on that particular day. I don't think that this had been her only opportunity to accomplish this....After all, she is almost 3 years old.....*

*I'm sure your dog has Faults, as they all do.....But posting untrue ones, puts this all into a new level.....*

*Judie Walter*

66330	<p>Re: [Cyberdobes] Mr. Martin/NOT</p> <p>Yeah Cheri, I agree with you here for sure. That is precisely why most of us at one time or another are part of the "not well liked" list. My point was it had nothing to do with the discussion. n a message dated 9/14/2006 12:07:13 P.M. Central Daylight ...</p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 14, 2006 2:42 pm
-------	--	----------------	-------------------------

Yeah Cheri, I agree with you here for sure. That is precisely why most of us at one time or another are part of the "not well liked" list.

My point was it had nothing to do with the discussion.

n a message dated 9/14/2006 12:07:13 P.M. Central Daylight Time, ccandid@... writes:

Thanks Elaine! I was shocked to read that too... I mean couldn't that be said about any of us? With all the mean comments made on this and other doberman lists I think there may be MANY people on the "Not well liked" list. LOL

Besides, that had nothing to do with the discussion anyway.

=====

And we all knew it and continue to know it.

That counts for something, Larry....

And a "list" is not an entity unto itself. ALL lists are made up of people - each of them individuals who have a right to think and feel the way they do. You can blame an individual for being "mean" but leave the rest of us out of it. Membership on any list does not mean you are responsible for the thoughts and beliefs of others - not every person on this list is a "cyberdope" just because they subscribe to CD!

This isn't FANTASYLAND - its a community of individuals who ALL suffer from the human condition - which includes days when you're feeling bitchy and mean and other days when you'd give the shirt off your back to someone less fortunate. Add that little ditty known as "competition" to the mix and what do you have?

Human Beans ain't perfect!

"Mean" can and does have a different definition - depending on who you're talking to! How often, really, is something said just for meanness?

If having a "for real" conversation about the problems we have to deal with as members of the fancy constitutes "mean" - then bring it on because I'm not gonna sit here devoting my spare time to a bunch of "hey, way to go" kinds of meaningLESS posts and discussions.

You just don't get the rose without the thorns. Who wants to live without the roses?

Cheri

66332	<p>Re: [Cyberdobes] two words I hate most, "WRONG Elaine"  ... dark shadow over everything we're supposed to be doing here - then I don't know what could! <b>As</b> for the information <b>Grace Black (a judge)</b> sent the list - it came right out of books published <b>and</b> distributed by <b>AKC</b> to <b>ALL</b> judges. If someone wants ...</p>	<p>Cheri  McNealy  ccandid@...  cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006  2:44 pm</p>
-------	--	---	----------------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] two words I hate most, "WRONG Elaine"

The "wrong" I referred to Elaine, was in reference to the moral and ethical aspects of Philip's decision to point at one of his own.

"WRONG, Elaine" refers to MY take on what he did - which was in response to your feeling it was okay...there's no rule and all that. Hell, even when there are rules, they're often ignored or dismissed as not important - so who cares anyways? I DO like Philip. I met him a few years ago when he came out here to breed to Thunder. He's smart, entertaining, handsome as hell, has a great sense of humor, knows everyone, knows everyone "connected", is a fierce competitor who's enjoyed a lot of successes - NONE OF WHICH I'm jealous of....I LIKE HIM and I'd like him even in a non-Doberman context. I don't like what he did as a judge in one of his first forays into the ring. If my best friend in the world had done something similar, I STILL WOULDN'T LIKE IT, nor would I be terribly silent about my feelings. Ask anyone who KNOWS me - that's the way it is and it ain't gonna change anytime soon. I tried. I can't. Oh well - so what??? Philip did HIMSELF a big disservice by awarding that particular dog the point in Santa Barbara for all the reasons I've listed and re-listed ad nauseam. It ain't gonna hurt me - but it WILL follow him. Maybe it won't matter because he IS well liked by many....so he's easily forgiven. What has been discussed here is something he could have USED to help himself as he begins what I'm sure will be a long and hopefully distinguished judging career. He's not the only person who's ever made a mistake adjudicating - its what you do with the knowledge that separates the wheat from the chaff. And those of you who think its wise to continue "warning" me about what I write here - just give it up....I'm not "mean" - I'm honest. If that bothers you - tough noogies. Live with it - or not. Your choice. Cheri

**Arthur Greenwood <arthurgreenwood@...>** wrote:

Cheri, I started to go down the slippery slope of responding in detail to your post (copied below), but then I stopped and did the obvious thing... **I picked up the phone and called Jim Crawley at AKC 212-696-8200. "There is no Rule or Regulation of the American Kennel Club that prohibits Mr. Martin or any judge from judging an exhibit sired by his stud dog."**

Some people may not like Mr. Martin and may not like what he did... but it was not unethical or wrong in the context of the AKC Rules and Regulations. Cheri, I respect you and do not want to get into an ongoing exchange about which of us is more "right" than the other. If you don't like the man, don't show to him, but I think that singling him out as an example of what is wrong with the sport is extremely misguided. Moreover, I think we would all benefit from a more solid familiarity with the AKC Rules and Regulations. In private we can all go on forever about our opinions of what goes on (and please call 910-949-2632, I'd love to hear them), but they do not always belong in public, most especially not if we are casting aspersions on the reputation of a judge who has NOT violated any Rule or Regulation of the AKC. -Elaine

From: *Cheri McNealy <ccandid@...>*Reply-To: *"a discussion list for the Doberman Pinscher Fancy."<cyberdobes@...>*

To: *"a discussion list for the Doberman Pinscher Fancy."<cyberdobes@...>*Subject: *Re: [Cyberdobes] Public criticism of a judge*Date: *Thu, 14 Sep 2006 09:43:16 -0700 (PDT)*

**Arthur Greenwood <arthurgreenwood@...>** wrote:

What Mr. Martin did is not REMOTELY wrong, nor does it rise to the level of creating the impression of impropriety. The criticism of him is a best, unseemly.

**WRONG, Elaine.**

Public criticism of a judge is very often inappropriate and it is - to a marked degree - proscribed by the AKC Rules and Regulations for several very good reasons... one of which is that it degrades the public's confidence in the sport. Experienced dog people understand that most criticism should be kept private. I think some of the posters here are walking a fine line. I can see the AKC turning on some who post here, especially judges - who publicly criticize other judges. -Elaine

---

I respectfully disagree. It's not the criticism of a judge that degrades the sport, it's what the judge did in plain view of the world, leading to justified criticism that degrades the sport. If the bottom line here is to insure the "public's confidence in the sport" then JUDGES CANNOT BE GIVEN ANY EXTRA LEEWAY WHERE ETHICAL ISSUES ARE CONCERNED and in fact, \*must be held to a higher standard as representative of the AKC and ultimate authority figures of the "sport"\*. If we cannot openly discuss judging - both good and bad, fair and crooked, competent and incompetent then we are PART OF THE PROBLEM and if you ask me, THE WORST PART. Because, as I've said a million times before - to the extent that I'm sure someone will carve it on my headstone: SILENCE IS PERMISSION. The "sport" is in trouble. And anyone out there who believes or tries to lead others to believe its all about the price of gas - is either living in a cave (by choice) or just wants to go along and get along, wrapped happily in a cloak of security that provides anything BUT....Philip knew that puppy was sired by his dog and if that isn't a classic definition of "conflict of interest" that would make anyone else who knew rightfully suspicious of his motives for awarding the dog and casting a dark shadow over everything we're supposed to be doing here - then I don't know what could! As for the information Grace Black (a judge) sent the list - it came right out of books published and distributed by AKC to ALL judges. If someone wants to yell "Foul" in this discussion - don't scream in Grace's direction because she didn't criticize - she informed. There are many instances where criticism of a judge is nothing but sour grapes or poor sportsmanship and all of us know it. We can smell it from a mile away. This particular situation, in my opinion, SHOULD be examined and discussed and if I had to categorize it, I guarantee it wouldn't fit into my idea of "sour grapes"....it would instead, be defined as a classic case of a conflict of interest. We can't undo that which has been done. Can't unring the bell. But we CAN all learn from it and that's not a half bad thing. Cheri

66335	<p>[Cyberdobes] Larry ....I GIVE!  ... walterjk1@... writes: See Cheri, Posting this kind of stuff on a public website is MEAN! (claiming that a dog has 3 <b>missing teeth</b> when it doesn't). And what about this judge that allegedly made this comment (<b>missing teeth</b>) to other exhibitors. Could ...</p>	<p>Cheri  McNealy  ccandid@...  cheri_mcnealy</p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006  2:46 pm</p>
-------	--	---	----------------------------------

[Cyberdobes] Larry ....I GIVE!

You know what, Larry?

I give up. UNCLE! I quit! I'm done! Forgetaboutit!!!

A number of ya'll have managed to take what should have been an important discussion and turn it into a bunch of garbage and finger pointing revolving around whether or not you know/like Philip (so then its okay) to focusing on an accidental post from Kathy Bishop that outlined what she saw and heard behind the scenes - and then defining it as "mean".

I guess "mean" is in the eye of the beholder and different levels of "mean" are subject to intrepretation, depending on who you stab in the heart or better yet, "why".

There has got to be something REALLY, REALLY, REALLY \*\*\*\*\*wrong\*\*\*\*\* with me - that I continue to bang my head on the fence, attempting to get to the other side - where I know the grass is greener and sweeter - yeah, like the dumb ass donkey in the corral - intent on beating himself to a pulp if necessary just so he can experience something better. Try for it. Decide for himself....

This list shit is really getting me down - and I've just about come to the conclusion that there is no way to ever have it be what I wanted for it in the beginning (and still do, even now) -or what it COULD be if everyone just got their heads out of their rear ends and TRIED to get past the BS and pointless arguing and FOCUS ON THE THINGS THAT MATTER.

Before this list - (and even after) - there was NO place where we could REALLY talk about the sport and the fancy - except behind closed doors or quietly at the dinner gatherings we shared with the most trusted friends once a year at the National or after the larger shows.

I've tried to change that and give us an avenue where we could talk turkey about what matters most to us - and at every corner, my efforts are foiled; disregarded; minimized; or used as a weapon to slam me and the list - up the side of the head.

I do have another life....other interests - and lots of things I could be doing that would make me happy and be a helluva lot less frustrating....but then, how would I be making a difference?

Man, it's a double edged sword...and I can't seem to get out of the way no matter what I do - say - think...how I adjust, back off, go forward....

So have at it. I'm out of this conversation. I know when I'm beat - so me thinks I'll leave the arena while I can still get up and walk out and before I turn on myself and chew off my fastest typing fingers!!!!

So there!!!

Cheri

66339	<p>[Cyberdobes] <b>Judges thinking long term?</b> Santa Barbara-I was there.</p> <p>After reading your post Gwen, I have to agree. Silence=Acceptance. I've had few weeks to mull this over in my very busy and overworked brain. I was there in Santa Barbara. Can I know what Mr. Martin had in his head and in his heart that day? NO. I feel it ...</p>	Thea Charrette Cyberdobes@...	Sep 14, 2006 3:51 pm
-------	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------

After reading your post Gwen, I have to agree. Silence=Acceptance. I've had few weeks to mull this over in my very busy and overworked brain. I was there in Santa Barbara. Can I know what Mr. Martin had in his head and in his heart that day? NO. I feel it is the responsibility of a professional handler to inform their clients of a conflict of interest. Can I know if this took place? Again, NO. Is there an appearance of impropriety? One can look at the results from the day before at the Simi Valley Kennel Club and the day after at the Santa Barbara Kennel Club and make their own conclusions, while taking into consideration that only Mr. Martin knows what happened that day. We should see this as a learning experience for all exhibitors and handlers. It's a lot like pushing the send button prematurely after we write an email. Before we push send, we should ask ourselves: What does this say about me? Does this action I am taking show that I have integrity? Will this make the recipient feel uncomfortable? What will be the consequences of what I have created? We need to ask the same questions before we make an entry to a dog show. Even now, I am asking myself: What will be the consequences of this email? It seems that in the dog show world, so many people are afraid to say what's on their mind. In my personal and professional life, I'm like a bull in a china shop when advocating for myself, loved ones or clients. Finding a perfect balance has been the most difficult aspect of participating in conformation. I for one don't want to alienate the breeder or owner of the dog Mr. Martin put up. I know these folks and I LIKE THEM. Should I, as a friend, have advised them to do differently that day-especially since there was so much talk the day before and that morning among handlers and exhibitors? YES. Quite honestly, I didn't because I was afraid to do so. My inner voice said "They'll think I'm being a poor sport or ..." I will never know what the result would have been had I said something and now I am ready to move on to our next dog show---because I still trust the process. In the future, I intend to be part of the solution. Look out fellow Doberfolk-here I come! Thea

----- Original Message ----- **From:** ZUMADOBIES@... **To:** cyberdobes@... **Sent:** Wednesday, September 13, 2006 1:29 PM **Subject:** [Cyberdobes] Judges thinking long term

**In a message dated 9/13/2006 10:52:19 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, cyberdobes-request@... writes:**

Yes, judge what's in front of you on that day - but to do so without regard for other, just as important considerations, is a dereliction of the duty and responsibility bestowed upon the individual who helps shape the future of the breed and the sport they preside over

**Cheri:** I think that you hit the nail on the head. Santa Barbara KC show should and could have been avoided. And it will be interesting to see what becomes of the situation. probably nothing, because from the private emails I received about the show, again, "no body wanted to say anything", or they knew the owners of the puppy, and they didn't want to upset their friends. That's bullsh\*t folks, if you aren't part of the solution, you are part of the problem. How can things get better, if everybody is afraid to say anything from fear of what might happen to

**them. Winning is everything to me too, but not if it involves cheating, and that's what not playing by the rules is. Cheating. Silence is acceptance..... For the Love of Dobes!Gwen Lucoff**

66345	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re: Santa Barbara/Martin</a> Elaine - you write we need to work within to change the rules if we don't like them. But also we need to let other exhibitors know what is going on and then they can make the informed decisions on whether or not to show to certain judges. Years ago, I ...	<a href="#">cathy spears</a> <a href="#">cathyspears@...</a> <a href="#">pentastardobes</a>	Sep 14, 2006 5:21 pm
-------	--	---	-------------------------

Elaine -

you write we need to work within to change the rules if we don't like them.

But also we need to let other exhibitors know what is going on and then they can make the informed decisions on whether or not to show to certain judges.

Years ago, I showed to a breeder judge that had bred several of her bitches to a top and widely campaigned stud dog. She had this dog as an entry under her, according to AKC rules there was a matter of conflict of interest. A lot of people witnessed that day the goings on. We filed complaints with the rep and also sent letters to AKC.

Recently in another breed, a judge put up the dog he had bred to in the last year for the dog's last major to finish. Again by the rules it was allowed.

My first boxer breeding was to a top dog on the East coast, his owner came out to the West coast to judge sweeps at a specialty. He approached me after the show and asked why I did not enter under him. I said although by AKC rules, I can - but I would not want to win that way and I had more respect to the owner and his dog to put him in that situation.

You then state that

It is not for us after the fact- to suggest that doing so was unethical, cheating or lacked integrity the judge was doing what the AKC's Rules and Regulations allow.

It may be what the "rule's allow". But most of us are intelligent enough to realize when we have been cheated out of an honest evaluation of the dogs shown to that judge on that day.

Cheri writes that it stops with the judge. I also add that it should have been stopped with the owner or handler that walked into the ring knowing of the conflict of interest.

Cathy R. Spears

66346	<p><a href="#">Re: [Cyberdobes] IF you don't like the rules work to change them</a></p> <p>... theme. But OTOH it does mention that it doesn't have the "<b>appearance</b>" of propriety or ethics, or whatever the wording was that <b>Grace Black</b> quoted. <b>And</b> in my opinion it does not look good. I "grew up" in Dobermans thinking it didn't look good. One of the earliest <b>articles</b> I read ...</p>	<p>Cosima Ross  <a href="#">cosima300@...</a>  <a href="#">cosima300</a></p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006  5:22 pm</p>
-------	---	--	----------------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] IF you don't like the rules work to change them

Of course it is for us - to have opinions, and to express them if we want to. Apparently the AKC does not expressly forbid a judge to judge a dog sired by his stud dog or several other variations on that theme.

But OTOH it does mention that it doesn't have the "appearance" of propriety or ethics, or whatever the wording was that Grace Black quoted.

And in my opinion it does not look good. I "grew up" in Dobermans thinking it didn't look good. One of the earliest articles I read in an old DQ was by Virginia Markley, of Hotai fame, and she mentioned that once when she judged two people entered under her with dogs closely descended from her. She simply ignored them, didn't even consider them for placement, and told the owners afterward never to do that to her again.

I guess I took her message to heart.

Jessica Ross

**Arthur Greenwood** <[arthurgreenwood@...](#)> wrote: The AKC says that a judge can judge (and use) an exhibit that is sired by the judge's stud dog. It is not for us –after the fact- to suggest that doing so was unethical, cheating or lacked integrity ... the judge was doing what the AKC's Rules and Regulations allow.

66349	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re: Mr Martin</a></p> <p>I personally don;t care who Philip put up in Santa Barbara. As someone said before it wouldn;t be a surprise that he put up the phenotype that he breeds and likes. If the small group of people tha are having an issue with it want to pursue it, then go for ...</p>	<p><a href="#">Alison McDonald</a> <a href="#">Cyberdobes@...</a></p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006 6:45 pm</p>
-------	--	---	---------------------------------

I personally don;t care who Philip put up in Santa Barbara. As someone said before it wouldn;t be a surprise that he put up the phenotype that he breeds and likes. If the small group of people tha are having an issue with it want to pursue it, then go for it. Maybe the RWD can get awarded the 1 point, and if your lucky I will finish your dog, congratulations, you wouldn't even have a "new champion" picture.

On the subject of Philip "not being liked in the doberman world" couldn't be further from the truth. Lets just say its lonely at the top. There might be a few handlers and their groupies that don;t like him, that would be because he's beating them in the ring. It starts to hurt when you get spanked weekend after weekend.

Alison McDonald

66355	<a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Re: Mr. Martin</a> Allison McDonald writes: On the subject of Philip "not being liked in the doberman world" couldn't be further from the truth. Lets just say its lonely at the top. There might be a few handlers and their groupies that don;t like him, that would be because ...	<a href="#">cathy spears</a> <a href="#">cathyspears@...</a> <a href="#">pentastardobes</a>	Sep 14, 2006 7:05 pm
-------	---	---	-------------------------

Allison McDonald writes:

On the subject of Philip "not being liked in the doberman world" couldn't be further from the truth. Lets just say its lonely at the top. There might be a few handlers and their groupies that don;t like him, that would be because he's beating them in the ring. It starts to hurt when you get spanked weekend after weekend.

I respond.....it is not about being like or not liked by a certain faction. It is ABOUT the perception of biased judging.

Nothing More - Nothing Less.

Cathy R. Spears

66356	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes]</a> Re: <b>Mr Martin</b></p> <p>PS....Last time I spoke to Philip he has 11 judging assignments and is not accepting any more. Not bad for not being liked. LOL Alison - All-new Yahoo! Mail - Fire up a more powerful email and get things done faster._ Cyberdobes mailing list <a href="#">http ...</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Alison McDonald</a> <a href="#">Cyberdobes@...</a></p>	<p>Sep 14, 2006 7:33 pm</p>
-------	--	---	---------------------------------

PS....Last time I spoke to Philip he has 11 judging assignments and is not accepting any more.  
Not bad for not being liked. LOL

Alison

66369	<p><b>Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing</b></p> <p>Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing, but now one resorts to degrading a dog that has won 4 BIS?... well more than that I guess ...</p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 15, 2006 12:35 am
-------	--	----------------	--------------------------

Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing, but now one resorts to degrading a dog that has won 4 BIS?... well more than that I guess if you want to include the record of "his big bitch" that is a multiple BIS winner. incredible

In a message dated 9/14/2006 7:36:37 P.M. Central Daylight Time, sandy@... writes:

Look, Philip is a very SMART man. Look at what he has done in less than three years.... He has smoozed his way to the TOP obtained a judging license without having ALL the requirements needed...

He made one really bad mistake by not informing any and all handlers and owners of puppies he bred or puppies sired by his dogs to stay out of his ring for at least the first year or two, to avoid this type of situation. And I'll bet money he knew who that dog was, you must blame his x-handler and him for what happened. He at the least has made himself look bad and I hope all these people that keep giving him assignments are paying attention....

But knowing Philip he'll recover from this just like the way he recovers from everything else he has gotten away with. The only mistake he made was not asking the handler to excuse himself from the ring, what he did was not breaking any rules but remember he's on some kind of mission to be able to brag that Stat is the Top CH. producer in the Top 20.....If I remember correctly didn't that finish the dog all this BS has been about????I'm not a fan of Philips and he knows that, I don't dislike him but I don't agree that as a breeder and now a judge he has chosen to take a non standard size dog to the top....as he tried to do with his big bitch. Both are lovely animals, but, just to large to fit into the category of medium size dogs which a Doberman is. He should have waited and bred them to get something more correct in size and then made his blast to the top. I will say I've know Philip for years and he has a good personality can be very funny at times, but he also has a mean streak and can be a sore loser/winner as I've personally witnessed several attacks by him to other breeders / pro handlers....Which I feel is wrong, pulling someone off to the side and saying something to them is one thing, but screaming across a room having a tantrum is another, not very professional in my opinion. And ALL judges should act professional when at a dog show.....Maybe anger management is what he needs or a good stiff drink before the shows when he's exhibiting....I know Philip knows the rules as I heard him tell a handler earlier this year a week before a show that he couldn't show to him as the handler had shown one of the Philmar dogs within a certain time frame. My guess with the ads, website knowing how involved he is with all the dogs he breeds and puppies out of Stat I would have to say he knew who the dog was. So even if it was the best dog at the show he shouldn't have judged the dog.....BIG MISTAKE....but this won't hurt him, he's like superman the bullets just bounce off...

Sandy Teague

66372	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Thank you, Larry</a></p> <p>Yeah, now go sit in the corner and listen to music you usually wouldn't. (Not Nancy). NRenejade@... wrote: In a message dated 9/14/2006 6:56:35 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, LBates2001@... writes: Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The ...</p>	<p>Meg Dollinger Cyberdobes@...</p>	<p>Sep 15, 2006 12:35 am</p>
-------	---	---	----------------------------------

Yeah, now go sit in the corner and listen to music you usually wouldn't.  
(Not Nancy).

**NRenejade@...** wrote:

In a message dated 9/14/2006 6:56:35 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, LBates2001@... writes:

Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing, but now one resorts to degrading a dog that has won 4 BIS?... well more than that I guess if you want to include the record of "his big bitch" that is a multiple BIS winner. incredible

=====

I am just astounded that people will write such ugly things on a public list about a fellow Doberman owner, lover, breeder and judge- who has given MUCH to the breed in many, many ways.

What is wrong with keeping your opinion to yourself when it is so hurtful? Did no one else's mother tell them the one about "if you can't say something nice, don't say anything at all"?

Geez. We are all entitled to dislike others, but stop for a moment and think how it would feel if you or one of your good friends were the recipient of some of this.

Meg Dollinger

66382	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing</a></p> <p>Look, Philip is a very SMART man. Look at what he has done in less than three years.... He has smoozed his way to the TOP obtained a judging license without having ALL the requirements needed... He made one really bad mistake by not informing any and all ...</p>	<p>Sandy Teague  <a href="mailto:sandy@pettemp.com">sandy@pettemp.com</a>  pettemp</p>	<p>Sep 15, 2006  12:36 am</p>
-------	--	--	-----------------------------------

Look, Philip is a very SMART man. Look at what he has done in less than three years.... He has smoozed his way to the TOP obtained a judging license without having ALL the requirements needed...

He made one really bad mistake by not informing any and all handlers and owners of puppies he bred or puppies sired by his dogs to stay out of his ring for at least the first year or two, to avoid this type of situation. And I'll bet money he knew who that dog was, you must blame his x-handler and him for what happened. He at the least has made himself look bad and I hope all these people that keep giving him assignments are paying attention....

But knowing Philip he'll recover from this just like the way he recovers from everything else he has gotten away with.

The only mistake he made was not asking the handler to excuse himself from the ring, what he did was not breaking any rules but remember he's on some kind of mission to be able to brag that Stat is the Top CH. producer in the Top 20.....If I remember correctly didn't that finish the dog all this BS has been about????

I'm not a fan of Philips and he knows that, I don't dislike him but I don't agree that as a breeder and now a judge he has chosen to take a non standard size dog to the top....as he tried to do with his big bitch.

Both are lovely animals, but, just to large to fit into the category of medium size dogs which a Doberman is.

He should have waited and bred them to get something more correct in size and then made his blast to the top.

I will say I've know Philip for years and he has a good personality can be very funny at times, but he also has a mean streak and can be a sore loser/winner as I've personally witnessed several attacks by him to other breeders / pro handlers....

Which I feel is wrong, pulling someone off to the side and saying something to them is one thing, but screaming across a room having a tantrum is another, not very professional in my opinion. And ALL judges should act professional when at a dog show.....

Maybe anger management is what he needs or a good stiff drink before the shows when he's exhibiting....

I know Philip knows the rules as I heard him tell a handler earlier this year a week before a show that he couldn't show to him as the handler had shown one of the Philmar dogs within a certain time frame.

My guess with the ads, website knowing how involved he is with all the dogs he breeds and puppies out of Stat I would have to say he knew who the dog was. So even if it was the best dog at the show he

shouldn't have judged the dog.....BIG MISTAKE....but this won't hurt him, he's like superman the bullets just bounce off...

Sandy Teague

66387	<p>[Cyberdobes] <b>Judging/Conflicts of Interest</b></p> <p>I think the Philip Martin thing has been beaten to death by now. Most Hollywood agents could only dream of getting their clients that much free publicity. I think it has been established that what happened was totally legal in the eyes of the AKC. The ...</p>	<p>ron&amp;rebecca rribbe@... rribbe</p>	<p>Sep 15, 2006 12:36 am</p>
-------	---	--	----------------------------------

I think the Philip Martin thing has been beaten to death by now. Most Hollywood agents could only dream of getting their clients that much free publicity.

I think it has been established that what happened was totally legal in the eyes of the AKC.

The only disagreement was the "perception" of what happened.

Anyway...I thought the basic issue of perception was interesting since the AKC guidelines leave a lot of room for interpretation. I was at a show recently where the Dobe judge was a high ranking DPCA official. Not a big entry, maybe 25 Dobes. The handler of the breed winner was a DPCA board member and the BOW was handled by a former high ranking officer that recently served with the judge. Conflict of interest? Both of the dogs were quality dogs that have won in the past so it was a not a surprise that they would win. With the way Philip was vilified I wonder if this type of thing holds the same perception or not?

Another recent example is of high profile breeder judge that put up a special for a big win (and has awarded this dog several times in the past). Just so happens this judge has a litter due sired by that dog. Conflict of interest?

Again, the dog has won a lot so it wasn't some out of the blue favor.

I just wanted to get some opinions on this because it is totally legal according to AKC.

Ron

66391	<p><a href="#">[Cyberdobes] Thank you, Larry</a></p> <p>In a message dated 9/14/2006 6:56:35 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, LBates2001@... writes: Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing ...</p>	<p><a href="#">NRenejade@...</a> <a href="#">renejade</a></p>	<p>Sep 15, 2006 12:37 am</p>
-------	---	---	----------------------------------

In a message dated 9/14/2006 6:56:35 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, LBates2001@... writes:

Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing, but now one resorts to degrading a dog that has won 4 BIS?... well more than that I guess if you want to include the record of "his big bitch" that is a multiple BIS winner. incredible

=====

I am just astounded that people will write such ugly things on a public list about a fellow Doberman owner, lover, breeder and judge- who has given MUCH to the breed in many, many ways.

What is wrong with keeping your opinion to yourself when it is so hurtful? Did no one else's mother tell them the one about "if you can't say something nice, don't say anything at all"?

Geez. We are all entitled to dislike others, but stop for a moment and think how it would feel if you or one of your good friends were the recipient of some of this.

Nancy E Christensen/Renejade

66394	<p><b>Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing</b>  OMG if this is an example of the way Sandy talks about people (and their dogs) she's not a fan of and claims not to dislike (contradiction in terms:not a fan--don't dislike) then heaven help the people she does like! Perhaps she needs a nap? Or maybe ...</p>	<p>Lynn Ely  ilynnely@...  ilynnely</p>	<p>Sep 15, 2006  12:38 am</p>
-------	---	---	-----------------------------------

OMG if this is an example of the way Sandy talks about people (and their dogs) she's not a fan of and claims not to dislike (contradiction in terms:not a fan--don't dislike) then heaven help the people she does like! Perhaps she needs a nap? Or maybe strolling the edge has taking its toll. They say writing is cathartic. I do hope Sandy feels better after expressing so much OBVIOUS anger.

----- Original Message ----- **From:** Sandy Teague **To:** Cyber Dobes Post **Sent:** Thursday, September 14, 2006 8:36 PM **Subject:** [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing

Look, Philip is a very SMART man. Look at what he has done in less than three years.... He has smoozed his way to the TOP obtained a judging license without having ALL the requirements needed...

He made one really bad mistake by not informing any and all handlers and owners of puppies he bred or puppies sired by his dogs to stay out of his ring for at least the first year or two, to avoid this type of situation. And I'll bet money he knew who that dog was, you must blame his x-handler and him for what happened. He at the least has made himself look bad and I hope all these people that keep giving him assignments are paying attention....But knowing Philip he'll recover from this just like the way he recovers from everything else he has gotten away with. The only mistake he made was not asking the handler to excuse himself from the ring, what he did was not breaking any rules but remember he's on some kind of mission to be able to brag that Stat is the Top CH. producer in the Top 20.....If I remember correctly didn't that finish the dog all this BS has been about????I'm not a fan of Philips and he knows that, I don't dislike him but I don't agree that as a breeder and now a judge he has chosen to take a non standard size dog to the top....as he tried to do with his big bitch.Both are lovely animals, but, just to large to fit into the category of medium size dogs which a Doberman is.He should have waited and bred them to get something more correct in size and then made his blast to the top.I will say I've know Philip for years and he has a good personality can be very funny at times, but he also has a mean streak and can be a sore loser/winner as I've personally witnessed several attacks by him to other breeders / pro handlers....

Which I feel is wrong, pulling someone off to the side and saying something to them is one thing, but screaming across a room having a tantrum is another, not very professional in my opinion. And ALL judges should act professional when at a dog show.....

Maybe anger management is what he needs or a good stiff drink before the shows when he's exhibiting....

I know Philip knows the rules as I heard him tell a handler earlier this year a week before a show that he couldn't show to him as the handler had shown one of the Philmar dogs within a certain time frame.

My guess with the ads, website knowing how involved he is with all the dogs he breeds and puppies out of Stat I would have to say he knew who the dog was. So even if it was the best dog at the show he shouldn't have judged the dog.....BIG MISTAKE....but this won't hurt him, he's like superman the bullets just bounce off...

Sandy Teague

66395	<p><b>Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing</b></p> <p>Sandy: I have never posted before, but there is a first time for everything. I am a very good friend of (and legal counsel to) Philip Martin and, as such, think that it is important to clear up a few things. First, no the dog that "all of this BS is about ...</p>	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 15, 2006 12:39 am
-------	--	----------------	--------------------------

Sandy:I have never posted before, but there is a first time for everything. I am a very good friend of (and legal counsel to) Philip Martin and, as such, think that it is important to clear up a few things. First, no the dog that "all of this BS is about" did not finish that day in Santa Barbara. Rather, it finished last weekend with a Group 2 and a Group 4 (at 16 months) - clearly not a deserving dog! (By the way, that was sarcasm in case you didn't pick up on it). Second, I find it curious that you claim to know Philip so well. I just spoke to Philip on the phone, and when I mentioned your post he said that he has never spoken with you. How is it possible for a person to "know" somebody when they have never had a conversation with them? Quite frankly, I think that your vicious post says far more about you than it does about Philip Martin. That being said, Philip was appreciative of your top notch advice not to show two top twenty dogs because they were not the ideal size. (Again, more sarcasm). Keep up the good work, and we'll see you at the Top Twenty!

----- Original Message ----- **From:** LBates2001@... **To:** cyberdobes@... **Sent:** Thursday, September 14, 2006 8:55 PM **Subject:** Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing

Let's just all have a cocktail and let this one go. The jealousy, insecurity, and personal attacks are getting old. The personal attacks on Mr. Martin are one thing, but now one resorts to degrading a dog that has won 4 BIS?... well more than that I guess if you want to include the record of "his big bitch" that is a multiple BIS winner. incredible

In a message dated 9/14/2006 7:36:37 P.M. Central Daylight Time, sandy@... writes:  
 Look, Philip is a very SMART man. Look at what he has done in less than three years.... He has smoozed his way to the TOP obtained a judging license without having ALL the requirements needed...He made one really bad mistake by not informing any and all handlers and owners of puppies he bred or puppies sired by his dogs to stay out of his ring for at least the first year or two, to avoid this type of situation. And I'll bet money he knew who that dog was, you must blame his x-handler and him for what happened. He at the least has made himself look bad and I hope all these people that keep giving him assignments are paying attention....But knowing Philip he'll recover from this just like the way he recovers from everything else he has gotten away with. The only mistake he made was not asking the handler to excuse himself from the ring, what he did was not breaking any rules but remember he's on some kind of mission to be able to brag that Stat is the Top CH. producer in the Top 20.....If I remember correctly didn't that finish the dog all this BS has been about???? I'm not a fan of Philips and he knows that, I don't dislike him but I don't agree that as a breeder and now a judge he has chosen to take a non standard size dog to the top....as he tried to do with his big bitch. Both are lovely animals, but, just to large to fit into the category of medium size dogs which a Doberman is. He should have waited and bred them to get something more correct in

size and then made his blast to the top. I will say I've know Philip for years and he has a good personality can be very funny at times, but he also has a mean streak and can be a sore loser/winner as I've personally witnessed several attacks by him to other breeders / pro handlers....Which I feel is wrong, pulling someone off to the side and saying something to them is one thing, but screaming across a room having a tantrum is another, not very professional in my opinion. And ALL judges should act professional when at a dog show.....Maybe anger management is what he needs or a good stiff drink before the shows when he's exhibiting....

I know Philip knows the rules as I heard him tell a handler earlier this year a week before a show that he couldn't show to him as the handler had shown one of the Philmar dogs within a certain time frame.

My guess with the ads, website knowing how involved he is with all the dogs he breeds and puppies out of Stat I would have to say he knew who the dog was. So even if it was the best dog at the show he shouldn't have judged the dog.....BIG MISTAKE....but this won't hurt him, he's like superman the bullets just bounce off...

Sandy Teague

66395	Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing <b>Sandy: I have never posted before</b> , but there is a first ... somebody when they <b>have never</b> had a conversation ... them? Quite frankly, I think that your vicious ... thing Let's just all <b>have</b> a cocktail and let ... Central Daylight Time, <b>sandy@...</b> writes: Look ...	Cyberdobes@...	Sep 15, 2006 12:39 am
-------	--	----------------	--------------------------

Re: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing

Sandy:

I have never posted before, but there is a first time for everything. I am a very good friend of (and legal counsel to) Philip Martin and, as such, think that it is important to clear up a few things. First, no the dog that "all of this BS is about" did not finish that day in Santa Barbara. Rather, it finished last weekend with a Group 2 and a Group 4 (at 16 months) - clearly not a deserving dog! (By the way, that was sarcasm in case you didn't pick up on it). Second, I find it curious that you claim to know Philip so well. I just spoke to Philip on the phone, and when I mentioned your post he said that he has never spoken with you. How is it possible for a person to "know" somebody when they have never had a conversation with them? Quite frankly, I think that your vicious post says far more about you than it does about Philip Martin. That being said, Philip was appreciative of your top notch advice not to show two top twenty dogs because they were not the ideal size. (Again, more sarcasm). Keep up the good work, and we'll see you at the Top Twenty!

---

**The above was posted by cyberdobes on the behalf of Mr. McCormick he did not sign his post.**

---



66406	<b>RE: [Cyberdobes] My thoughts on this Phillip Martin thing</b> Don <Doberman@... wrote: \:* {behavior:url(#default#VML);} o\:* {behavior:url(#default#VML);} w\:* {behavior:url(#default#VML);} .shape {behavior:url(#default#VML);} st1\:*{behavior:url(#default#ieooui) } Hello, This is my first and last post to ...	Cheri McNealy ccandid@... cheri_mcnealy	Sep 15, 2006 1:34 pm
-------	---	--	-------------------------

**Don <Doberman@...>** wrote:

Hello,

This is my first and last post to Cyberdobes. Can't resist one post, I've been a member for all of two days now! Next keystroke after I hit send is, cancel subscription, delete files.

Yes, I'm the Breeder of CHAMPION Holder Park's Red Hot Cayenne, and very proud of the little chili pepper! Yes, I met Philip Martin once, let's see, about a gestation period before Cay was born. That would be about 18 months before I showed under Philip Martin in Santa Barbara as a breeder/owner/handler of Holder Park's Runaway American Dream (RD), who, to correct an earlier post is not out of X-Static, but from Marienburg's Born to Run. Not that it matters much to anyone except maybe me and Mary. Apparently it was a mistake for me to show under Philip Martin because of the "appearance of evil", or favoritism or something). The conclusion that I draw from 2 days of this thread is that AKC Judges must be known for their general lack of integrity. If they were respected, truly, this would not be an issue. So, I'm just going in to present my dog, the best I can. Like the song goes,,, about mistakes, I've made a few. I've been showing RD myself for a few months (yes I'm still re-learning how to tie a tie) and have enjoyed most of it, except the tie part. Yes, apparently I'm ignorant of what goes on at AKC shows, and at this point, trying to be. Which, is the reason I'm canceling Cyberdobes. Never before, except in chat rooms and Church, have I ever seen more kisses with knives attached. Wow. Want my opinion?? LOL ☺

Yes, Respectfully, Don Holder Holder Park Dobermans

=====

Don,

We are sorry to see you go. It was my post that referred to RD as an XStatic son - my mistake, for which I humbly apologize. Yes, he's a Born To Run son and he's very nice. I'm sure you will have a lot of fun learning the ropes with him - but I believe he could be finished quickly with a good handler. He's been beaten by lesser dogs a number of times and to me, that is sad. I think I've told you as much in person. And you obviously already knew it - but you want to do it yourself. Good on ya. Sometimes the list gets passionate. It was unfortunate for you that the passion regarding the events at Santa Barbara - had to do with a dog you bred. If you re-read what I said about him early on, it was good. He is a nice dog from what I saw of him in Sacramento back in April. However, having Jorge show the dog to the owner of the sire, who has advertised the dog as part of his campaign for XStatic - regardless of his quality - was asking for trouble. As has been pointed out to us a number of times now - its not against AKC rules....except that one that talks about the "appearance of impropriety" which in my opinion, trumps all others. The dog finished in style and did not need the point from Philip. If the shoe had been on your foot and you did your thing getting to a show where Judge Jimmy Joe awarded WD to a puppy sired by his male, you would feel exactly the same way. The rest of this is all banter - but THAT is the bottom line. If we all went to the National and Irene Bivin were the judge and she gave BOB to

Teresa Nail, the tongues would RIGHTFULLY be wagging. If she gave BOB to a dog sired by Thomas Jefferson, the tongues would be RIGHTFULLY wagging. It's supposed to be a level playing field - and although we understand it isn't - we sure don't need to have it rubbed in our faces in some instances and this was one of them. The dog who won that day can NEVER ascend above what people perceived and that is a shame.

Judges aren't always so great - you must know that as an owner handler when you are beat by dogs who don't measure up to the quality of RD. Why is it then surprising that the people who feel they didn't get a fair shake under Philip - would so state?

I hate to see you leave - there is much to be gained from this list. You can go elsewhere and have sunshine and flowers at all times (well, except when they're after someone! LOL) - but what does that give you besides sunshine and flowers and how bad do you need that to understand and be successful as an owner handler or just "in dogs" generally?

I hope you reconsider and - really - think about how you would have felt if the shoe had been on your foot. Maybe you wouldn't have said anything on a list - but what thoughts would have been uppermost in your mind and what subject would you have been discussing with your dog friends at lunch?

Take care.

Cheri