What about plants? Don’t plants have feelings too?

It is possible that plants have sensitivities that we do not yet understand. Because plants do not have nervous systems and therefore cannot run simple programs, it has generally been assumed that they do not experience pain and suffering.

Recent scientific evidence suggests that the life of plants is more complex than we once thought. However, we do know that birds, mammals and fish have well-developed nervous systems. They feel pain, are afraid of the thought of pain, and respond to pain and suffering and present comparable evidence of fear and well-being. Animals cry out in pain, they nurse wounded body parts, and they seek to avoid those who have hurt them in the past.

In order to live, one has to eat. However, when we eat animal products, we consume many more plants indirectly than if we ate those plants directly, because the animals we eat are animal products, we consume many more plants indirectly than if we ate those plants directly. As a vegan (one who eats no animal products), we are responsible for their predicament. We have an obligation to find ways to ease the transitional period for these animals.

They may be suffering. The population will fade as people stop eating animal products. In fact, the wild is a human projection onto their predators in the form of parasites and other disease organisms.

Many producers will be overproduced. They are going to die anyway, aren't they? If they are going to die anyway, won't they die of starvation and failure to survive on their own, can they? If they are going to die anyway, don't we have a moral obligation towards those at our mercy.

The fact that giving farmed animals a decent life before killing them can be interpreted as an important reason to stop raising them for food. It is not that they are going to die anyway that seems to justify our mistreatment of them when they are alive—we are going to die too—but we do not generalize the argument—but that we are demonstrating a principle that is an inconsistency in valuing a creature so little and yet insisting that he or she granted a semblance of tolerable existence prior to execution. So wanton can our disrespect for our victims become that any cruelish sentiment or behavior seems fit to exercise. It is contemptible to assert that humans have no responsibility, or that it makes no sense, to enrich the life of a being brought into the world merely to suffer and die for us. The situation confers greater, rather than lesser, or no, obligations on us towards those at our mercy.
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Arguments about the true and ancient diet of humanity are largely speculative. Opposition to flesh-eating goes back to 1883. Records show a traditional association between certain human cultures throughout the world and a diet comprising, though not necessarily based on, meat. A vigorous humanity can sustain some intake of the flesh of vigorous animals— they’re going to die anyway, aren’t they?

The Biblical image of the Garden of Eden is paralleled by the classical image of the Golden Age and by ancient Indian depictions of a peaceful kingdom on earth.

Aren’t humans natural meat-eaters? Aren’t we omnivores, designed to eat plants and animals?
considers this the same as, or a justification for, slaughterhouses.

There is clear evidence that an animal-based diet causes degenerative diseases—actual cases can be cited and actual clogged arteries and staved internal organs can be viewed every day in the hospital or morgue. Where is the comparable evidence showing that people living on a varied plant-based diet suffer, as a result, from calcium, protein, and iron deficiencies, heart attacks and strokes? Recent studies by Dr. Dean Ornish and Dr. T. Colin Campbell in the U.S. and Turkey, Russia, South America and elsewhere: they were amazed that people living on such “impoverished fare” as rice, beans, millet and potatoes could be so hardy and long-lived. While there is no evidence that the human body needs animal products, there is abundant evidence that the human body thrives on a nutritious plant-based diet.

There is no such thing as cruelty-free food! To raise vegetables, you have to kill animals—“pests” who would otherwise eat your crops, like rodents and insects. What’s the difference between directly killing animals for food and killing them to protect crops and grains?

Assuming that all known methods of harmless self-protection have been exhausted, there is still a definite difference between defending oneself from predators (including people) and grains? Assuming that all known methods of harmless self-protection have been exhausted, there is still a definite difference between defending oneself from predators (including people) and grains?
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Assuming that all known methods of harmless self-protection have been exhausted, there is still a definite difference between defending oneself from predators (including people) and grains? What's wrong with eggs and milk? Eating dairy products and eggs is not the same as eating animals, is it? What about human problems? Why concentrate on animals when so many suffering people need help?

Are Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD) badgered with why they are not working instead for battered women or abused children or some other cause? Were Americans who fought against slavery attacked for ignoring the plight of white people? Choosing a particular issue does not mean that one is indifferent to other concerns. Animal abuse, like child abuse and spousal abuse, is a human problem. The world we have made for farmed animals to live in hurts people as well as the animals and offers good evidence that hardening of the arteries is an even worse disease than hardening of the arteries. As human beings, we have a responsibility to the victims of our society and our species, whoever and wherever those victims may be. Every social justice movement in history has been scorned by the mainstream, which is made up ironically of people whose own freedoms and rights were won by revolutionaries at an earlier time.

Forget about ethics. You’ll make a better case for vegetarianism if you stick to health and environmental issues. Do you honestly think most people are ever going to care about farm animals?

Some people argue that we should emphasize health, food-safety, and environmental issues rather than the animals and their plight, because humans are basically selfish. While it is important to combine these issues whenever possible, it is a mistake to assume that people cannot or will not care about their fellow creatures. Just as we owe it to our animal victims to rescue them from cruel and degrading circumstances, so we owe it to them to be their voice. To insist that most people will never care about farmed animals is to create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Two centuries ago, most people “didn’t want to hear about” human slaves, either. Many more people will openly care and move toward change when they feel it is socially safe. Millions of people have impulses of compassion that have been stifled by self-doubt and fear of ridicule. Eventually, some of the health and environmental problems caused by an animal-based diet may be solved or reduced by technology, at least in appearance. Only the ethics of diet, the pain and suffering, the shared mortality and claims of our fellow creatures upon us are lasting.
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