

Veganism, animal rights and animal welfare

I don't believe that people believe animal cruelty is ok. I do not understand the nature of life and death enough to impose myself personally, but I do worry that I don't do enough.

I think a lot of people probably think that because it is nature, and within the bounds of reality, that it must be ok, and they work their logic back from there. If there is a way that this is true, I don't think it is simply because of the idea that, if you think you are better than something, then you can do what you want with it. This is a toxic mentality and needs to be addressed, especially because you really don't want that as your argument when “whomever” wants to start a hierarchical system.

I imagine the argument is more akin to an argument about form and function, and live and let live. In order to live we must all make allowances for something else's shared desire to live.

I don't know what it's like to be a different creature, perhaps somewhere a deal is being struck, but wouldn't you want to know what it is? I don't think accountability is avoidable, so it is something to be aware of.

Some of the horror of death is in our human entanglements, which may not apply the same to animals, but I don't think killing is that normal either. This is to say the least.

It isn't reality to me to look at an animal and liken it to a plant. I hope that if something was suffering, there is a limit to that suffering, that nature represents itself in some kind of way that allows for form and function, so that something could communicate or run away or protect itself. Animals blur this line in some people's minds.

Hope like hell it's ok, at risk of being wrong? For some this may be a leap of faith. What really carries the burden of our actions beyond our capacity for personal responsibility?

Perhaps you really are what you eat, just like when we take on new information, we grow with it. It is also interesting to me that lean animals are carnivores, yet people try to eat protein to gain muscle.

If I were to chop down a 100 year old tree, it might make me nervous, not because I think it's wrong, or that anyone should think that way, but because it's not nothing. Moderation is a strange concept, I prefer to be carefree and believe in abundance of what's good and right.

It's either right or wrong, and with clarity I can rest somewhat assured in the sense of freedom in that, I'm not as blind. To me there is a clear line I do not think I should cross of my own accord unless I find out any different.

When it comes to animal cruelty and animal testing, I truly believe that the more you compromise on this the worse your outcomes. That in a functioning society there are better solutions to be found when psychopaths and pharmaceutical companies don't "progress" your healthcare system. This is my opinion.

I understand no one wants their loved one to die without a cure, but these people have done enough harm that to save a child would seem to come at the expense of poisoning another with toxic chemicals, dysfunctional systems and avoidance of real solutions.

I have no policy for this except to offer my opinion, and promote ethical alternatives generally and take a strong stance on removing cruelty.

When it comes to farming, I genuinely believe farmers are decent and good people. I think that compromising on animal welfare standards actually sabotages farmers and forces good people to compete with bad ethical practices, pushing good people out of profitability.

We must recognise this, why do we need ever increasing profits just to make a living? Why would a farmer need to keep scaling to remain viable? What is actually going on? When a restaurant expands it doesn't out scale the towns population, it recognises how it can scale effectively and what the limitations of that are. Environmental concerns around our waterways also must have acceptable solutions.

Animals have a right to exist, nature has a right to flourish. Humans will not circumvent the will to live. I understand that native birds suit the objectives of maintaining the ecosystem, but it does bother me, the attitude of wanting to distinguish between types of animals with bias, as if it is a valid argument for throwing one type "under the bus" and treating it poorly.

Labelling and catagorising something as "food" does not change anything, unless it has subsequently grown accustomed, or adapted itself, and hopefully not forcibly for the worst.

Just because it makes you more comfortable, and is convenient, does not make it an honest example of "form and function".

It's more like turning on a dime whenever it suits. That is a "predatory class" belief system. "Because I said so, because I can, because I want to" logic.

And we should be careful of how pervasive this type of attitude can be, because people who treat animals this way may also think to treat fellow humans this way.