I have been honored to serve the whales, dolphins, seals—and all the other creatures on this Earth. Their beauty, intelligence, strength, and spirit have inspired me. These beings have spoken to me, touched me, and I have been rewarded by friendship with many members of different species. If the whales survive and flourish, if the seals continue to live and give birth, and if I can contribute to ensuring their future prosperity, I will be forever happy.

Captain Paul Watson (1950- )
Canadian founder and president, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society
(CONTINUATION OF QUOTES FROM PAGE 1 AUTHOR)

<> The...whalers are stubborn and proudly ruthless.
The whale defenders are equally stubborn,
moving the whaler's cruelty
with determined compassionate activism.
This is a war, a war between conflicting values,
a battle to uphold the rule of international conservation law
and to protect endangered species
from arrogant greed and ecological ignorance.
A war between those who champion life
and those who profit from death.
("The Cold War at the Bottom of the Planet to Save the Whales"
January 17, 2008 seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<> If...whalers cannot be stopped from pirating the world's whales,
there is a real and present danger that the whales and humanity
may suffer the loss of these magnificent minds in the water
these largest of living Earthlings.
* * *
The slaughter of the great whales has no place in the 21st Century.
It must be ended.
("Saving Leviathan" June 15, 2006
seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<> The whale killers we...oppose...are ruthless mass murderers
of intelligent, emotional, self-aware, socially complex sentient beings.
The pain their thousand victims will experience
is something that we must have empathy for
and it is this empathy that guides my crew
into risking their lives to intervene against
what is an atrocity and a crime against nature and humanity.
The killing of a whale is an act of murder.
("Why Killing Whales is Murder" December 15, 2006
seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<> It is a bizarre world we live in
where people are sympathetic to killers
and condemn those trying to save lives.
It is a world where governments and corporations
can commit atrocious acts of ruthless violence,
yet both condemn as violent
any non-violent opposition to their activities.
* * *
The media tends to have more sympathy
for those who kill and plunder
than for those who strive to protect life
for reasons of compassion and ecological concern. The sympathy and the concern are one-sided. Anytime a whaler, a logger, or a polluter is inconvenienced, they scream "terrorism," yet, when violence is inflicted upon a defender of animals or the environment, it is reported as natural.

* * *

Violence in our culture is simply a matter of public relations spin. Something is violent if the media can be bought or manipulated to spin it as violent. Likewise non-violence can be spun to appear violent. Whoever has the best public relations firm wins. ("Dealing with the Hypocrisy of the Human Perceptions" February 10, 2007 seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<> I have always found it despicable for people to use their race, their sex, or their culture to cover up crimes. The slaughter of sharks is a crime against nature and a crime under international and national laws. * * *

What many people do not see is that our violent invasion of the oceans is a form of imperialism. It is hominid imperialism and the culture of the sharks is being torn apart as these incredible animals are massacred for vanity purposes. The shark is an essential species in maintaining the health of oceanic ecosystems, and especially, of ocean reef communities. Should we accept the diminishment of the health of the oceans for a bowl of soup and justify it because it is a "cultural" dish? I think not. ("Rejecting the Cultural Justification for Slaughter" June 21, 2005 seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<> [on serving shark fin soup at upscale Asian establishments] These beautiful and ecologically-beneficial creatures are being systematically destroyed and for what —so people can demonstrate that they have wealth, so they can impress their friends and family. This is not a cultural tradition; it is an exercise in environmental arrogance and a demonstration of ecological ignorance. ("Disney Cruelly Cuts the Fins Off Sharks for Money" May 28, 2005 seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<>
The fact is that sealers are barbarians engaged in an industry that belongs in the dark ages.

This kind of torturous trade in pain and carnage has no place in the modern world. It is archaic barbarism plain and simple. ("Saving Seals for the Money" March 24, 2006 seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)

<>

Trophy hunters argue that hunting is a natural instinct of man. We come from a hunter-gathering background, they say, yet I don't see any acorn or root gathering going on. In fact, I don't think there is a single gathering club in the country. So, if hunting is a natural part of our instincts, then how come gathering isn't? And there are few predators in nature that would target the biggest and the strongest animals. Humans do so, only because we have devastating weapons of mass wildlife destruction. Targeting the biggest and the strongest is not natural or ecologically sound.
Behind all the chit-chat of conservation and tradition
is the plain simple fact that trophy hunters like to kill living things.
Many...like their victims helpless,
therefore they patronize canned hunts and safaris parks
to snuff out defenseless captive animals.
("Loving Nature with a Gun" April 17, 2006
seashepherd.org/Captain's_Commentary)
<>[on observing a meeting of International Whaling Commission delegates]
These delegates cannot see, they cannot feel, nor can they
understand the enduring pain that we, who love the whales,
experience when we witness the deaths of these gentle giants,
these great armless Buddhas, these maritime musicians and poets.
Where we see intelligence, family bonds and beauty,	hose on the darker side of humanity merely see materialistic profit.
For us it's music and magic, grace and beauty,
and for those cold-blooded others
it is simply blubber and meat, money and power.
* * *
Those of us who care about the whales
find that we can communicate
more effectively with whales and dolphins
than with these alien suits
whose behavioral patterns are leading the world to collective suicide.
They don't understand that if we can't save the whales,
we will fail to save the oceans and if the oceans die, then we all die,
and all the great dreams of humanity
will be blown away as dust in the winds of time.
* * *
It is like there are two species of humanity on the planet
—the ruthless anthropocentric killing machines
who slaughter without mercy or remorse,
and those of us whose allegiance is to the biocentric view
that all Earthlings, regardless of species,
have the inalienable right to life and the pursuit of happiness.
* * *
In the end we will triumph, we must triumph,
or at least we will have done all that we could
with the resources available to us to defend and protect
a legacy that we can bequeath to the future.
* * *
After all is said and done, the fact remains
that the forces of light were represented this year in Madeira,
peering into the dungeon of darkness from the outside looking in,
a reminder that a light of compassion
still flickers within the heart of humanity,
waiting for the darkness of the human heart to be illuminated with a new understanding that we are not alone on this planet, and that somewhere out there on the vast shroud of the ocean, in her mysterious depths, there swim whales and dolphins, and in their evolved brains dwells a separate reality and perhaps therein lies forgiveness for the lethal and obscene sins we have collectively inflicted upon their gentle souls. For the ultimate truth is this: if we fail to save the great whales, we will fail to save ourselves, and thus we weep for the whales in fear that if they disappear then so shall we—forever! (“For the Whales We Weep Before Forever We Sleep" June 29, 2009 seashepherd.org/Captain’s_Commentary)

Captain Paul Watson (1950- )
Canadian founder and president,
Sea Shepherd Conservation Society
Captain of MV Steve Irwin,
featured in Animal Planet’s Whale Wars

Would it not be more harmonious if we did not associate religious celebrations directly with ham and other non-spiritual symbols? Do really so many animals have to die when we celebrate higher consciousness and try to develop spiritually? The answer is clear: of course not.

Dr. Janez Drnovšek (1950-2008)
President of Slovenia

Well-intentioned people argue that it is our humane responsibility to kill ferals kindly, rather than let them face the rigors and perils of an uncertain future. When I observe a recently caught feral cat, cringing in terror in the corner of its cage, I see a being not altogether unlike myself. If I were that feral facing immediate, albeit painless death, or a chance at life replete with all the perilous uncertainties it holds, I would choose life. And so for these ferals, I can choose no less.

Cole McFarland, Jr. (1950-2010)
American photographer, writer, shelter director
I am a vegetarian precisely because I am a believing Jew who strives to live in accordance with the ethical teachings of my heritage....
I believe that if you follow the most sublime and noble values in our tradition in this day and age, then there is an imperative to live a vegetarian lifestyle....
It is a halachic imperative.
Compassion for animals is a halachic imperative. And being responsible also for your environment and for your globe, which also have ramifications [for] the meat industry and meat consumption, are all fundamental Jewish questions.
So I, simply put, am a vegetarian because I am a religious Jew.

* * *

Being compassionate toward animal life is not just a matter of being responsible for animal life, which we have very clearly laid down in the Torah, expounded by our sages, but is a matter of imbuing ourselves with the right kind of values. If we are insensitive towards animal life, then we desensitize ourselves as human beings. And therefore a truly sensitive human being, compassionate towards other human beings, should be compassionate towards animals.

* * *

Perhaps the most powerful argument in favor of vegetarianism today more than ever before... is the prohibition against chillul HaShem, the desecration of God's name. Surely it is precisely such a desecration when observant Jews eat animals produced under conditions of cruelty that flagrantly violate Jewish teachings and prohibitions.

* * *

Much of the current treatment of animals in the livestock trade makes the consumption produced through such cruel conditions halachically unacceptable as the product of illegitimate means. 
(Rabbis and Vegetarianism: An Evolving Tradition © 1996) 
Rabbi David Rosen (1951- )
British Chief Rabbi of Ireland
President, International Jewish Committee for Inter-Religious Consultations

.................
There’s not a doubt in my mind that a lust for killing creatures is an illness.

* * *

It seems rather bizarre to me, and somewhat Jekyll and Hyde, to be sitting at your table devouring a creature while at the same time lovingly stroking another as your pet. But then again, when one’s raised that way, I guess the irony (some would say hypocrisy) isn’t so easily seen. ("Author's Pen" poetrywithamission.co.nz)

<> Those who love hunting, must love weapons, and thereby, effectively violence.

Where there's no need, it's plain desire, and such perverted desire is by its very nature less respecting of life. When it comes to creatures, man has gone from being their care-taker to being their life-taker.

* * *
I would rather stroke, cuddle, pamper and protect a creature, than slit, shoot, pluck, skin, gut, stuff, and eat one.
* * *
Show me a man who can slit a creature's throat as unemotionally as he would slice a tomato, and I'll show you a man whose savaged sensibilities are fertile ground for murderous intent to grow.
* * *
Creatures eating creatures, and humans doing likewise (they being creatures too), is a tragic practice in a tragic world.
* * *
A violent and bloody affair. Even within the animal kingdom there are animals that do not eat flesh-food; for example: elephants, deer, zebras, cows, sheep, etc. This would suggest that a flesh-food diet is not a natural one, but rather a distortion that has occurred at some point.
* * *
It also suggests that just as it is not normal (a self-inflicted distortion) for humans to eat flesh-food (given they're clearly herbivores by design) neither is it normal for any creature, and that originally all would have eaten a non-flesh diet. If humans and certain creatures (but a few mentioned) can survive on a plant based diet, I see no reason why all creatures couldn't have at sometime. In my mind, there is no doubt that they all did, and that something went amiss. Personally, I would rather not be amiss.
("Quotations Archive" all-creatures.org)
<>
The killing of animals for food just doesn't gel with a gospel of love and non-violence. In my eyes, the killing of animals is only one step away from the killing of humans. Animals have emotions, intelligence, and a face.
* * *
I also find it intriguing how Christians celebrate the birth of Jesus at Christmas via the death of the likes of a turkey or pig. Isn't there an irony in that?
("Why I'm A Vegetarian" poetrywithamission.co.nz)
Lance Landall (1951- )
New Zealand Christian poet and pacifist
************
The fused oppression of women and animals through the power of naming can be traced to the story of the Fall in Genesis in which women and an animal, the serpent, are blamed for the Fall.

** Manhood is constructed in our culture, in part, by access to meat eating and control of other bodies. **

People with power have always eaten meat. Dietary habits proclaim class distinctions, but they also proclaim patriarchal distinctions as well. Women, second class citizens, are more likely to eat what are considered to be second-class foods in a patriarchal culture —vegetables, fruits and grains rather than meat.

** The sexism in meat eating recapitulates the class distinctions with an added twist: a mythology permeates all classes that meat is a masculine food and meat eating a male activity. **

The more important meat is in their life, the greater relative dominance will the men command. On the other hand, plant-based economies are more likely to be egalitarian.

** We have no bodily agency for killing and dismembering the animals we eat; we require implements. **

By charging indigenous peoples with cannibalism (and thus demonstrating their utterly savage ways, for they supposedly did to humans what Europeans only did to animals) one justification for colonization was provided. (The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory © 1999)

<> Spiritual vegetarianism...arises from a desire for wholeness. Spiritual vegetarianism is animal-free. It makes the following promise to all animals, those who are eaten, those who are used to produce milk and eggs, and honeybees: I will not take from you to feed myself. Spiritual vegetarianism is a spiritual practice that links us to the rest of nature and the rest of our own nature. Spiritual vegetarianism acknowledges the interconnectedness of all beings and enacts compassion toward them. It acts on the understanding
that we express ourselves through relationships, and that these relationships include the other animals. Spiritual vegetarianism is a living ahimsa, the practice of nonviolence. *(The Inner Art of Vegetarianism: Spiritual Practices for Body and Soul © 2001)*

I believe that flesh eating is an unjust use of another for one's own profit or advantage. It is unjust because it is unnecessary (people do not need to eat animals to survive), cruel, and perpetuates inauthentic relationships among people and between people and the other animals. *(Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals © 1995)*

Until we recognize how people who have no power —whether it’s women or people of color or the working class—are positioned as being closer to animals, the human/animal barrier will retain its power and influence.

* * *

Generally, people are loving to specific animals with whom they have specific relationships. It's a very privatized notion of love, so we have to start by having them acknowledge that the relationship they cherish need not be limited just to the cat or dog they are fond of. We have to understand how it can be a model for other kinds of relationships, how love must work in partnership with justice.

* * *

We traffic in animals literally whenever we purchase products that derive from animals. (*"Do Feminists Need to Liberate Animals, Too?" interview with Merle Hoffman On The Issues Spring 1995)*

*[T]he fate of the dairy cow and the egg-laying hen is one of the most serious issues for us to address. If we eliminated forcing cows to get pregnant, you'd eliminate 50 percent of hamburgers, too.*

* * *

Meat-eaters argue, "Well, the animals come into life, into existence, because we want to eat them. The animals owe us their lives." No, the animals come into existence and owe their mothers their lives.
It's the mothers who are being the most oppressed because they're going through constant pregnancy.
("Carol J. Adams on Activism, Veganism and Models for Change" interview with Mark Hawthorne strikingattheroots.wordpress.com October 11, 2009)
<>
The most important thing for an ethical vegan to recognize is that simply by choosing to eat vegan foods, we make omnivores uncomfortable. We remind them that they are making choices. Once they are reminded that what they are doing is a choice, then they often feel distressed. It then becomes easy to blame us for those feelings.

In Living Among Meat Eaters I argue that vegans should look at omnivores as blocked vegetarians. Until we enter the room, they may have no notion that they are blocked. But, if they start acting defensively toward us, they are telling us exactly that. Meat eaters want to know if we are at peace with our diet. They won't ask us directly. They ask, "but don't you miss meat?" They mean, "Are you at peace with giving up meat?"
If you are at peace, maybe they too could be at peace with living without meat.

* * *
When I meet meat eaters, I think, "what are you hiding from yourself?"
If I decide it is only the facts about what animals are going through, well then, fine, let's help them learn that. But, which one of us hasn't heard, "don't tell me I don't want to know."
This means, actually, that they already know. If they didn't know they wouldn't have any need to stop us. No, they are keeping something from themselves: that they are unable to change.

What are they going through? They are going through the painful fact that they cannot bring awareness and action in line with each other.

* * *
The challenge for recognizing the oppression of farmed animals is that industrialized farming depends on domesticated female animals' reproductive labor. Consumption of domesticated animals cannot exist without the enslavement of female animals to reproductive labor. To control fertility one must have absolute access
to the female of the species. Cows, sows, chickens, and female sheep are exploited in ways that merge their reproductive and productive labor. Their bodies must be reproduced so that there will be "meat" for humans, so that there will be cow's milk for humans, so that there will be eggs for humans. Through the oppression, female animals become viewed as not worthy of respect. Their importance is what they do—reproduce—rather than who they are—individual animals. They become a what. There is no who. 

(interview with Animal Acres blogger Philip Steir vegansanctuary.blogspot.com November 2009) <>

If humans want to talk about human-nonhuman relationships, they must bring attention to the 95 percent of the nonhumans whose suffering is caused by humans—terminal animals, that is, the nonhumans used in the food industry to produce milk, eggs, and flesh. Every day good people participate in activities that cause the suffering of these terminal animals. Why do they seem to care so little about this suffering? [B]ecause of the cultivated disappearance of the subject. Not only does the subject of suffering disappear, especially when the issue is reframed as being about the "existence" rather than suffering, but also the subject who is suffering disappears,..... The suffering remains invisible.

* * *

Behind every meal of meat is an absence; the death of the nonhuman whose place the product takes. The absent referent is that which separates the consumer from the animal and the animal from the end product. If nonhumans are alive they cannot be meat. Thus a dead body replaces the live nonhuman and nonhumans are conceptually absent from the act of eating flesh because they have been transformed into food. The function of the absent referent is to keep our "meat" separated from any idea that she or he was once an animal, to keep the "moo" or "cluck" or "baa" away from the meat,
to keep something from being seen as having been someone. Cow becomes "beef," pig becomes "pork." In cases in which slaughtered nonhumans carry the same name before and after their deaths, e.g., "chicken," "duck," "turkey,"

the absent referent is still at work. Their body parts are labeled without any possessivenessss attributed to the nonhuman, that is, a lamb's leg becomes "leg of lamb," many chickens' wings become chicken wings.

Once the existence of flesh is disconnected from the existence of a nonhuman who was killed to become that product, "meat" becomes unanchored by its original referent (the animal), becoming instead a free-floating image, a metaphor, unbloodied by suffering.

* * *

In our culture, "meat" operates as a mass term...defining entire species of nonhumans. Mass terms refer to things like water...; no matter how much you have of it, or what type of container it is in, it is still water. You can add a bucket of water to a pool of water without changing it at all. Objects referred to by mass terms have no individuality, no uniqueness, no specificity, no particularity. When humans turn a nonhuman into "meat," someone who has a very particular, situated life, a unique being, our neighbor, is converted into something that has no distinctiveness, no uniqueness, no individuality. When one adds five pounds of hamburger to a plate of hamburger,
it is more of the same thing, nothing is changed. But to have a living cow,...and then kill that cow, and butcher that cow, and grind up her flesh, you have not added a mass term to a mass term and ended up with more of the same. You have destroyed an individual. You have injured a neighbor. What is on the table in front of us is not devoid of specificity. It is the dead flesh of what was once a living, feeling being. The crucial point here is that humans make someone who is a unique being and therefore not the appropriate referent of a mass term into something that is the appropriate referent of a mass term.

Disembodied suffering is easier to ignore than the direct experience of someone's suffering. The very size of the problem—9 billion terminal animals (excluding sea animals) in the U.S. alone—favors objectification of the suffering because the numbers involved are inconceivable. The implications of flesh-eating are simply too big to be comprehended.

[W]e hear about giving thanks to terminal animals for sacrificing themselves.

The only volition apparently granted nonhumans is the desire to die for humans.
* * * *
If one knows one is being inconsistent,
the response may be to defend oneself against this knowledge,
rather than to acknowledge that one is being inconsistent.
"What I am doing cannot survive close scrutiny,
it does not accord with my idea of my own
—and others—humanity.
It clashes with the values I believe I have.
So, I am going to distort this action, split it apart from everything else,
and do everything to defend myself against this realization."
The more people are uncomfortable with what they are doing,
the more they will have to defend it.
* * * *
Many people report that they could not eat a nonhuman
after looking into her or his eyes.
They realized there was a "who" there.
(’A very rare and difficult thing’: Ecofeminism, Attention
to Animal Suffering and the Disappearance of the Subject"
A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Ethics, and Science,
Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton (eds.) © 2006)
<>[on the dominant culture of meat eating]
We see meat as the ontological reason for animals' existence,
that they are there to be eaten.
The person with the least amount of information
sets the discourse: consequently the meateater,
who usually has less information about meat-eating
than the vegetarian, sets the level of the discourse.
We are brought down to that level to begin with.
The question is how one brings all that knowledge in,
because of the ignorance
that is determining our level of engagement.
* * * *
To raise vegetarianism as an ethical issue
says to our culture's self-defined principles:
"What we claim is not what we're doing."
("Living Among Meat Eaters" interview in Satya December 1995)
<>[When it comes to animals,
the level of engagement and thought is pretty undeveloped.
Why all these years is it only the nonhumans
who are to sacrifice themselves to the humans?
Maybe it's time for...humans to sacrifice ourselves
to the nonhumans by not eating them.
And...how do we know that those animals wanted to be sacrificed
—especially if that argument is coming
from someone who is not a hunter?
They use—in a sense they abuse—a native relationship with animals.
Out of all the native ways of relating to nonhumans, the only ones that are brought into the dominant culture are the ones that can be used to justify what we’re already doing. There are lots of native cultures that didn’t eat animals. (“A feminist-vegetarian ethic” interview with Marianne Arbogast, *Witness Magazine* September 2002)

<>

There are two things we need to respond to when meat eating is "naturalized."
One is that, supposedly, we humans get to eat animals because we’re different from animals—and then suddenly the justification for eating these non-humans is that other non-humans do it.
We become inconsistent.
Secondly—and I think this is part of patriarchal culture—we not only symbolically uphold carnivores in our culture, we uphold what are called the top carnivores, carnivores that actually eat other carnivores.
Most meat-eaters eat herbivores.
Humans are a good example—we eat cows, lambs, etc. Yet we uphold lions and eagles in a cultural mythology—carnivorous beings who are actually more carnivorous than we are. (The fact is, less than six percent of animals actually are carnivorous.)
I think what is actually going on with that argument is that people are building defenses around their meat eating because they are already uncomfortable with the fact that they are eating dead animals. They simply engage us with these arguments that aren’t really very logical to keep themselves from engaging with their own relationship to vegetarianism.

* * *

For me, doing the least harm possible is a very spiritual path and a path with integrity. People think they’re going to harm themselves by giving up meat—there’s some protective nature there that keeps them from connecting the dots about the environment and human well-being and health.
Vegetarianism arises from a desire for wholeness; it is a spiritual practice that links us to the rest of nature and the rest of our own nature; it acknowledges the interconnectedness of all beings and enacts compassion toward them; it is a living ahimsa, the absence of violence.
To be a vegetarian is to be a witness: I will do the least harm possible. To be a vegetarian is to celebrate good food from the earth.
To be a vegetarian is to experience grace, and on this grace I feed. A spiritual life is a life of abundance, but when it comes to meat-eating, people think they're going to experience scarcity. The most important thing vegans can do is simply live a life of abundance. (“Very Vegetarian” interview with Leah Bobal, *Nervy Girl* November/December 2002)
Carol J. Adams, M.Div. (1951- )
American eco-feminist author and theorist

Every day is a 9/11 for the animals.
<> How was I born into a family of savage barbarians? They seemed so nice. How were they coerced into the cult of the carnivore? (interview with *Vegetarians in Paradise* December 2001)
<> Violence is the main ingredient on our plate, if we are corpse eaters. We must remember that every meal that is fast food is slashed food.

It is insane that we would seek nourishment from mass murder, a bloody stabbing, dismemberment, decapitation.
I can claim food-source ignorance growing up. [It was in] very urban non-agricultural New York City, where, if you told me salami grew on a salami tree and peas grew in cans, I would have believed you. I was used to buying non-descript cellophane-wrapped "food cutlets"; but one night I saw "the body" and I realized that someone was killed to get to my plate, and that he or she probably suffered great pain getting there, presumably non-voluntarily. Propaganda would have us believe that animals recognize their reason for existence and voluntarily jump into frying pans. Propaganda ignores their feelings. They cry and they scream and they bleed. I look at the king of beasts, the king of the jungle in his tiny cage waiting to be summoned to perform. It is so sad. He is not treated as a king. He is lucky if the circus remembers to give him water in his steamy railroad car enclosure. "Welcome to the cruelest show on earth." Speciesism is pervasive in language and serves to reinforce the notion of nonhuman as subhuman, or even worse—as mere objects. Particularly bothersome to me are references to an animal as "it" as opposed to "he" or "she" or "him" or "her." An animal is not an object or a thing. It was such bizarre thinking by Descartes that an animal is a mindless machine that allowed vivisection to emerge as acceptable "science." Unfortunately, law often objectifies animals as property. The In Defense of Animals' campaign to change language from "owner" to "guardian" of companion animals is certainly admirable in reflecting more responsibility and stewardship in animal care. Okay, that's one word down and another 700,000 to go in the English language, replete with speciesist idiomatic expressions like "there's more than one way to skin a cat" or "kill two birds with one stone." * * *
We humans feel so superior when we call someone a pig, cow, monkey, chicken, dog, rat, weasel, or snake. Such "demonization" makes it easier to conduct warfare on such subhumans. The war against animals has itself been waged for a long, long time. Massive slaughters are not "killing," they are "culling." Mechanized systematic murder is not "killing," it is "harvesting," as if cows were corn and geese were grapes.

* * *

Often humans condemn others as "acting like animals," but it is not the animals who are conducting deadly war, engaging in serial killing, murdering for fun, abusing their young and their elderly, and destroying the earth. Maybe humans should act more like animals. Until they do, I'm sure that when animals get upset with each other they will ask themselves: "Why are you acting like such a human?"

* * *
It is great to be for peace, for nonviolence, for justice, for the environment. You can talk the talk all you want. But with the blood of a murder victim dripping off your sandwich down your chin, are you really walking the walk? The continued abnormal practice of meat eating is a horrible death sentence for children who will be doomed to a thirsty, hungry, infertile, toxic world. With meat squandering a third of all resources, using half of freshwater supplies, accounting for half of all water pollution, as well as deforestation, erosion, desertification, and global warming, any responsible individual must decide to "Go Vegan." Twenty-five gallons of water to produce a pound of wheat and 2,500 gallons to produce a pound of beef? Two hundred fifty pounds of beef per acre, 30,000 pounds of potatoes? If all humans worldwide adopt the dead-animal diet, oil reserves last less than 50 years. If all humans go vegan, oil supplies last longer than 250 years.

The death camps are on overtime all the time to satisfy a hunger for cadaver and a thirst for blood. Ten billion innocents in the U.S. annually, ten thousand million innocents devoured in the automated atrocity of mechanized mayhem and murder. Where there was once an Auschwitz, there is now a Cow-schwitz.

Meat is mass murder, the product of an endless war on animals, the weakest most oppressed beings on earth, who have no voice, except their screams, who have no vote, except their tears, who have no ally, except the vegan. In terms of a greater love, or connected spirituality, or affection, going vegan is all about love, even loving the meat-eater in spite of his or her actions, being sympathetic to how brainwashed he or she must be, what a hell it must be to crave flesh to this day and make one's stomach a graveyard, without being repulsed by what is being swallowed or how "it" was prepared, or who "it" was.

(interview with Claudette Vaughan abolitionist-online.com March 2006)

Bob Linden (1951- )
American host of GoVeganRadio.com

..................
What my eyes seek in these encounters is not just the beauty traditionally revered by wildlife photographers. The perfection I seek in my photographic composition is a means to show the strength and dignity of animals in nature.

* * * *

The way I feel about it is, if you're going to kill someone's child and eat it, you might as well kill your own child and eat it. I mean, I'm a mother. I know. I have a pretty good idea of the kind of emotions that it would put me through to have somebody take my baby away from me. Now why, as even a remotely sensitive creature, would I wish to inflict that kind of suffering on any other creature? * * * *

There's no way anyone who has humanity or any compassion can stand here and take a calf away from its mother and think that's all right.

( Interview with *Vegetarian Times*, September 1987)

* * * *

Chrissie Hynde (1951- )
American songwriter, lead singer with The Pretenders

[on what the author terms "theos-rights"]
Since an animal's natural life is a gift from God, it follows that God's right is violated when the life of his creatures is perverted.

* * * *

The de-beaked hen in a battery cage is more than a moral crime,

It is a living sign of our failure to recognize the blessing of God in creation.
The Christian argument for vegetarianism...is simple:
since animals belong to God, have value to God and live for God,
then their needless destruction is sinful.
(*Christianity and the Rights of Animals, Crossword Publishing Co. © 1987*)

Creation exists for its Creator.
Years of anthropocentrism have almost completely obscured
this simple but fundamental point.
What follows from this is that animals
should not be seen simply as means to human ends.
The key to grasping this theology is the abandoning
of the common but deeply erroneous view that animals exist
in a wholly instrumental relationship to human beings.
Even if humans are uniquely important in creation,
it does not follow that everything in creation
is made for us, to be pleasing for us,
or that our pleasure is God's chief concern.

* * *

[on the author's "Generosity Paradigm," in which "the weak
and the defenceless...should have moral priority"]

The Generosity View rejects the idea
that the rights and welfare of animals
must always be subordinate to human interests,
even when vital human interests are at stake.
We must be quite clear about this.
Acting out the Generosity Paradigm will cost human beings.
In the short run the dismantling of unjust institutions
such as animal experimentation, intensive farming,
and the end to recreational practices
such as hunting and shooting and angling for sport
will involve some diminution of human pleasure
or job prospects or even life chances (commonly understood).
The question is, however, not whether we gain from these present practices
but rather whether they are ill-gotten gains.
I state the issue plainly because there seems to be
a general misconception that behaving morally to animals
will not really involve humans in any fundamental change of life-style.
Too many individuals want to speak generally about generosity to animals
while still destroying their habitats,
hunting them for sport, or consuming their flesh.
To appreciate the moral gains to humanity
from desisting from exploitation,
we need to take the longer view.
If we ask whether humanity has lost out
because it no longer has access to the ill-gotten gains
achieved through widespread slavery, racism or sexism,
we can see immediately that though there were indeed gains—
— and still are for some—
without these sacrifices moral progress would have been impossible.
Whether we can now make moral progress in relation to animals
is the question before us.
* * *
To make animals suffer for human purposes is not just morally wrong,
it is an act of the gravest faithlessness.
* * *
The divine right of humans may be an idea whose time has gone.
That humans should use their power in defence of the weak,
especially the weak of other species,
and that humans should actively seek the liberation of all beings
capable of knowing their oppression and suffering
may be an idea whose time has come.
* * *

[I]f it was really true that predation is God’s will,
it would have to follow for Christians that the life of Jesus
— what after all is the self-disclosure of God—
manifested and vindicated this predator/prey relationship.
Such a gospel would be substantially different
from the one we currently have.
Jesus would not just be eating some fishes,
but feasting on calves and lambs.
Jesus, according to the Predator Gospel,
would be the butcher *par excellence*.
He would be the one who far from desisting from animal sacrifice
actually encouraged his disciples to excel in it.
Instead of driving out the sacrificial animals from the Temple,
the Jesus of the Predator Gospel would drive them in.
The line that most characterizes his ministry would not be
‘the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep’
but rather ‘the good shepherd slaughters
— with gratitude—as many sheep as he can.’
* * *
Since in Christ there is a new creation,
there can be no justification for humanity to increase,
exacerbate and intensify that predatory system itself.
The truth is that, whatever may have been the situation for our forbears,
we can live differently, and we should.
The Christian view has frequently been focussed
on the centrality of humanity in creation.
It may yet be possible, in ways we scarcely understand,
for creation to free itself from bondage
by humans releasing themselves from their own.
*(Animal Theology, SCM Press, Ltd. © 1994)*
The automated, institutionalized, routine destruction of billions of creatures every year, for food, for profit, for science and for sport, raises the question whether Christians have lost their grasp of the reality of evil. Animal rights constitute a spiritual struggle against the forces of cruelty and death.

* * *

It took Christians many years to realize that we cannot love God and also keep humans as slaves. It has taken even longer for Christians to realize that we cannot love God and also regard women as second-class humans. Now is the time for Christians to realize that we cannot love God and hate the Creator's nonhuman creatures. Christians are people who need to be liberated by the Gospel they preach. Christians cannot both love God and be free to hate.

* * *

In my view, what we owe animals is more than equal consideration, equal treatment, or equal concern. The weak, the powerless, the disadvantaged, the oppressed should not have equal moral priority but greater moral priority. When we minister to the least of all we minister to Christ himself. To follow Jesus is to accept axiomatically that the weak have moral priority. Our special value as a species consists of being of special value for others. The relevance of such theology to animal rights should be clear.

* * *

To attempt a theological understanding of animals requires a radical break with humanism, both religious and secular. Humans are not the measure of the worth of all other creatures. The utility and value of other creatures to us is a totally separate question from what their value is to almighty God. A truly theocentric understanding of animals does not begin by assuming that the value of animals can be determined by moral negotiation, however desirable that may generally be, or that the worth of other creatures is deducible from human wants and needs. As already noted, theories of animal rights are not without a theological basis: If God is the sovereign Creator,
all rights in an absolute sense are God's.  
Rights language helps focus our attention  
on the value of what is given by the Creator  
in the sentient lives of other creatures.  
If it comes to "contractualism," there is only one contract:  
the divine covenant made not just with human beings  
but with all living beings.  
* * *

We have come to accept as a matter of course  
the increasingly sophisticated and ruthless use of animals in our society.  
Hardly ever nowadays are serious Christian voices  
raised against our massive exploitation of animals.  
* * *

Our species more than ever suffers  
from an overdose of hubris, pride, the perpetual sin  
of thinking more highly of ourselves than we should,  
even that we are the only species that matters before God.  
Scientists are changing the doctrine of human sinfulness  
into the doctrine of human perfectibility.  
Who are we to make a world in which each and every species of life  
has no other reason for living except that of serving the advantage  
and comfort and convenience of the human species?  
* * *

I have yet to hear a Gospel sermon on the love of animals  
—a sermon, that is, which begins with a recognition  
of God's expansive and creative love  
and treats seriously how we can love animals, too,  
in a way that approximates God's love for them and for us.  
If the love and care of animals appears as an aberration  
or as an intrusion into normal Christian preaching,  
it is simply because we have failed to relate our faith  
to our full God-given potentialities for loving.  
If Christian clergy appear uncomfortable  
when members of their congregation  
speak of their love for other creatures,  
it is a sure sign that they themselves  
have a limited conception of the expansive love of God.  
I know that there are Christian leaders  
who can hardly speak of animals without smiling or raising a laugh,  
as though the whole notion that God loves other than human creatures  
is utterly foreign to the Christian Gospel.  
* * *

[on the basis for a contemporary Christian ministry to all creatures]  
[Far from treasuring God's work of reconciliation in Christ  
as a possession of the human species alone,  
we should understand that the purpose of this reconciling work]
is to set us free—free, that is, to show forth and manifest
that reconciling, healing ministry to other creatures.
What is truly oddball and perverse
is not ministry to all creatures but the reverse:
the idea that while Christ’s work is cosmic in scope, ours should be less so.

I believe...that the Church must wake up to a new kind of ministry,
not just to Christians or to human beings,
but to the whole world of suffering creatures.
It must be our human, Christian task to heal the suffering in the world.
We must take every opportunity,
even if things appear small or insignificant,
to lessen the burden of suffering on the animal world.

Preaching the Gospel has always a subversive aspect to it
no matter how establishment Christians
try to camouflage or submerge it.
It is subversive because it necessarily speaks of a different order
of justice and mercy than the one currently prevailing.
This is true as much—or rather more—of animal concerns
than it is of purely human ones.
The Gospel breaks through into our thinking
when we become convicted that our own judgments
about what is right or wrong are self-serving, egoistical, or unjust,
when we suddenly glimpse that from God’s own perspective
we stand condemned as mean and heartless.
Communities of faith committed to a notion of repentance
could help us feel sorrow for the cruelties we inflict on animals
—indeed, not only to feel that sorrow (important as that is),
but also to express it publicly, thereby helping us to change our lives.
But the Gospel hope has to be that the cries of the "dumb" are heard,
that no matter how deaf human subjects may be,
God hears the cries of the creatures.

(Animal Gospel, Westminster John Knox Press © 2000; originally published as

Once the biblical insight is grasped
that God really does care for all creatures,
we are forced to grapple with
an other-than-anthropocentric view of the world.
What value (or use) other creatures may have to us
is an entirely different issue from their value to Almighty God.
We cannot assume (as does so much historical and contemporary theology)
that what is of benefit to us is automatically God’s will.
Our own estimations of our own needs and welfare cannot
be the only basis for determining our relations with fellow creatures.
Christian theology in this regard seems to have baptized an essentially utilitarian view of other-than-human creatures.

There are few signs that the Church really sees, let alone understands, the cause of animals. Yes, the Church understands well the needs of farmers, and the problems that beset the farming community, but does the Church really see the suffering of farm animals? Does it have any appreciation of what they have to endure in intensive farming—debeaking, castration, tail docking without anesthetics, battery cages—to take only a few examples? The Church grasps with an easygoing certainty the utilitarian arguments of scientific researchers, but does it equally comprehend the suffering that animals have to undergo in laboratories throughout the world? Where, I wonder, are the Christian protests at the dramatic rise in genetic experiments on animals? The Church is fully appreciative of the needs of industry and commerce, but does it also know the cost that animals have to pay when they are treated as economic commodities—when they are genetically manipulated, patented, reared in miserable conditions, exported abroad or over long distances only to await grisly slaughter? Has it really grasped that now, as never before, we have turned God's creatures into meat machines?

The world looks in vain for Church leaders and theologians to speak God's truth—that human interests are not God's only interests in the world. The whole creation is not just made for human betterment. God, not human beings, is the measure of all things.

So often Christians speak as if we are the "chosen species." I, for once, believe that we are the chosen species—not the master species but the servant species. Our vocation is to use our power for the weak, the defenseless, the vulnerable, the unprotected, and the innocent—precisely those who cannot represent themselves. That, for me, is Christian ministry: Christ-like ministry to all suffering creatures.

( Creatures of the Same God: Explorations in Animal Theology, Lantern Books © 2009; originally published by The Winchester University Press © 2007)

The Reverend Professor Andrew Linzey, Ph.D., D.D. (1952- )
English theologian, Anglican priest, author
Honorary professor, University of Winchester
Founder and director, Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics

.................
[on primate experimentation]
It's not just the suffering they endure
in the laboratories and research establishments.
Just getting there can be torture.
Studies of primates show them
to have complex mental abilities
which may increase their capacity to suffer.
Supplying the laboratories in the UK
imposes huge suffering on the animals.

* * *
They're then contained in small, single cages,
and transported for very long distances
causing deaths, distress and suffering.
(quoted in Organ Farms, Jenny Bryan and John Clare © 2001)

<> It's not that they are so much like us
[that] they shouldn't be experimented on.
It comes down to pain and suffering.
Like humans, they know the pain is coming,
they remember pain
and are susceptible to non-physical pain,
suffering anxiety if they're isolated socially
from other monkeys.
[There is] "no halfway house."
We can argue about the science forever,
but what I've never heard is any clear
scientific explanation for moral discrimination.
(quoted in "Report Claims Experiments on Monkeys Are Vital"
Andy Coghlan, New Scientist, June 2, 2006)

Gillian Rose Langley, Ph.D. (1952- )
British scientist, author, editor, ex-*in vitro* researcher
Science director, Dr. Hadwen Trust for Humane Research

On one side, every human is a person with legal rights;
on the other, every nonhuman is a thing with no legal rights.
Every animal rights lawyer knows that this barrier must be breached.
(Animal Thing to Animal Person:
Thoughts on Time, Place, and Theories © 1999)

<> For four thousand years, a thick and impenetrable legal wall
has separated all human from all nonhuman animals.
On one side, even the most trivial interests of a single species
—ours—are jealously guarded.
We have assigned ourselves, alone among
the million animal species, the status of "legal persons."
On the other side of that wall
lies the legal refuse of an entire kingdom, not just chimpanzees and bonobos

but also gorillas, orangutans, and monkeys, dogs, elephants, and dolphins. They are "legal things."
Their most basic and fundamental interests—their pains, their lives, their freedoms—are intentionally ignored, often maliciously trampled, and routinely abused. Ancient philosophers claimed that all nonhuman animals had been designed and placed on this earth just for human beings. Ancient jurists declared that law had been created just for human beings. Although philosophy and science have long since recanted, the law has not.
* * *
This book demands legal personhood for chimpanzees and bonobos. Without legal personhood, one is invisible to civil law. One has no civil rights. One might as well be dead.
* * *
[W]hen we encounter this legal wall, it is so tall, its stones are so thick, and it has been standing for so long that we do not see it.
* * *
[I]t was built by the Babylonians four thousand years ago,
then strengthened by the Israelites, Greeks, and Romans, and buttressed again by early Christians and medieval Europeans. As one might expect, its mortar is now cracked and stones are missing. It may appear firm and sturdy, but its intellectual foundations are so unprincipled and arbitrary, so unfair and unjust, that it is crumbling. It has some years left, but it is so weak that one good book could topple it. This is meant to be that book.

* * *

I hope to convince you that equality and liberty, the two most powerful legal principles and values of which Western law can boast, demand the destruction of that wall. But there are about 1 million species of animals. Many of them, say, beetles and ants, should never have these rights. So the wall must be rebuilt. But how?

* * *

I will show you that the hallmark of the common law, which is the judge-made law of English-speaking peoples, is FLEXIBILITY. It abhors thick high legal walls, except when they bulwark such fundamental interests as bodily integrity and bodily liberty, and prefers sturdy dividers that can be dismantled and re-erected as new discoveries, morality, and public policy dictate.

* * *

Chimpanzees and bonobos ("pygmy chimpanzees") are kidnapped for use as biomedical research subjects or as pets or in entertainment. They are massacred for their meat..., [and for display] as trophies and for their babies.

* * *

You will get a close look at the kinds of creatures these apes are and how similar their genes and brain structures are to ours. You will learn about the scientific revolt that has broken out as an increasing number of scientists demand they be tucked into the genus *Homo* with us. We will peel back the layers of their minds and try to understand what is known about how they feel and what they think; why they are conscious and self-conscious; how they understand cause and effect, relationships among objects,
and even relationships among relationships;
how they use and make tools;
how they can live in societies so complex and fluid
that they have been dubbed "Machiavellian";
how they deceive and empathize,
count simple numbers and add fractions,
treat their illnesses with medicinal plants,
communicate with symbols,
understand English and use sign or lexigram languages,
and how they might know what others think.
We will compare what we think we know about their minds
with what we think we know about ours.
* * *
I hope you will conclude, as I do..., that justice entities

chimpanzees and bonobos to legal personhood
and to the fundamental legal rights
of bodily integrity and bodily liberty—NOW.
Kidnapping...selling...imprisoning...vivisecting them must stop—NOW.
Their abuse and their murder must be forbidden
for what they are: GENOCIDE.
* * *
Law—good, mediocre, and bad—tends to survive,
borrowed from one age by another.
* * *
Borrowing law is simpler than constantly beginning anew.
It provides continuity and stability.
But when we borrow past law, we borrow the past.
The law of a modern society
often springs from a different time and place,...
Legal rules that may have made good sense when fashioned may make little sense when transplated to a vastly different time, place, and culture. Raised by age to the status of self-evident truths, ancient legal rules mindlessly borrowed may perpetrate ancient injustices that may once have been less unjust because we knew no better. But they may no longer reflect shared values and often constitute little more than evidence for the extraordinary respect that lawmakers have for the past.

* * *

Few legal rules are as doddering, or as unjust, as the legal thinghood of every nonhuman animal.

* * *

Long ago we learned how to domesticate wild animals. We applied that learning to enslave each other. But as our domestication of wild animals served as an unprincipled model for our enslavement of human beings, so the destruction of human slavery and all its badges can model the principled destruction of chimpanzee and bonobo slavery. Determining the dignity-rights of chimpanzees and bonobos in accordance with fundamental principles of Western law—equality, liberty, and reasoned judicial decisionmaking—reemphasizes and reinvigorates these principles just as the abolition of slavery and its badges did.

* * *

While our animal mind-blindness may be a tendency, even a strong one, it is not irresistible. Certainly it has resisted change, but strongly held beliefs always do.

* * *

Neither the ancient Greeks nor Hebrews nor Christians had difficulty accepting that the end of everything in the universe was themselves. But no scientific evidence today exists that other animals, or anything, were made for us.

* * *

I...never meant to imply that chimpanzees and bonobos are the only nonhuman animals who might be entitled to the fundamental legal rights to bodily integrity and bodily liberty. Judges must determine the entitlement to dignity-rights of any nonhuman animal the same ways they determine the entitlements of chimpanzees, bonobos,
and human beings—according to autonomy. Autonomy, of course, arises from minds.

* * *

Because no one can ever know for certain that anyone, human or nonhuman, has a mind, all we can do is apply our reasoned judgment to the facts that science reveals. In order to keep our judgments about "who's in and who's out" both accurate and fair, we must keep [my] three rules in mind.

- We cannot trust ourselves to judge ourselves or place ourselves fairly in nature.
- We must be at our most skeptical when we evaluate arguments that confirm the very high opinion that we have of ourselves.
- We must play fair and ignore special pleading that different rules apply when we assess the mental abilities of human and nonhuman animals.

* * *

The ancient Great Wall that has for so long divided humans from every other animal is biased, irrational, unfair, and unjust. It is time to knock it down. The decision to extend common law personhood to chimpanzees and bonobos will arise from a great common law case. Great common law cases are produced when great common law judges radically restructure existing precedent in ways that reaffirm bedrock principles and policies. All the tools for deciding such a case exist. They await a great common law judge... to take them up and set to work. Until that day arrives, the legal thinghood of chimpanzees and bonobos will gnaw at the heart of what we believe, what we stand for, and who we are.

*(Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal Rights for Animals © 2000)*

<> The most abused beings in the United States are those whom we raise and kill for food. The numbers of dead are staggering. Most are victims of the severe and almost entirely unregulated practices that Americans permit on their factory farms. According to the United States Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Statistics Service, in 2007, a total of 10.4 billion land-based animals were killed by the American food industry. These included 9.4 billion broiler chickens, 450 million laying hens,
317 million turkeys, 121 million pigs, 39 million bovines, 28 million ducks, 10 million rabbits, and 4 million sheep and goats—fifty times the number killed in biomedical research, for sport, as pests, and for all other reasons combined, carrying a value of hundreds of billions of dollars a year. The degree to which animal enslavement is embedded in our society is difficult to calculate or fathom. In commenting on human slavery, slave historian David Brion Davis wrote in *The New York Times* that [a]fter decades of research, historians are only now beginning to grasp the complex interdependencies of a society enmeshed in slavery.

* * *

Brutalized as they were, at least human slaves in the United States were not eaten.

I. Legal Rights and Nonhuman Animals

Twenty-three years ago, as officers of the California-based Animal Legal Defense Fund, Michigan State University Law Professor David Favre and I commenced work in earnest on a long-term attempt to solve some of the most desperate problems posed by the legal thinghood of every nonhuman animal. As legal things, nonhuman animals lack all legal rights and remain entirely the object of the rights held by us legal persons—that is, the beings with rights. We understood that, with the exception of those few nonhuman animals protected by such statutes as the American Endangered Species Act, it is extremely difficult to protect and advance the interests of rightless beings in the courts. All legal history bears this out, whether those rightless things have been black slaves, women, children, the insane, or nonhuman animals. Most legal protections for nonhuman animals remain indirect (mostly anti-cruelty statutes), enforceable only by public prosecutors. Even the Endangered Species Act requires a human plaintiff to have standing sufficient under Article III of the U.S. Constitution. Our years of practicing animal law and our knowledge of legal history convinced Professor Favre and me that no meaningful percentage of nonhuman animals will ever be treated well or fairly until they attain some minimum degree of legal personhood—that is, until they achieve some minimum level of fundamental legal rights. All legal history bears that out, too.
Precisely because whether one is classified as a legal thing or a legal person determines who dies and who lives, who may be enslaved and who may not, who does not count and who does count within our legal system, legal personhood is the most important individual issue that can come before a court.
The arguments for the fundamental legal rights of any being, human or nonhuman animal, are strongest when they are most firmly grounded on accepted legal principles. Therefore, in arguing for the fundamental rights of a nonhuman animal, I rely upon bedrock principles of Western law: liberty and equality.
Liberty entitles one to be treated a certain way because of characteristics one may possess. Presently for humans, some irreducible degree of bodily liberty and bodily integrity are everywhere protected. If we trespass upon this deeply personal liberty, we commit the terrible wrong of treating a person as a thing. Equality means that likes should be treated alike and unalikes can be treated unalike.

II. Fundamental Liberties Apply Not Just to Humans

"In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free," said Abraham Lincoln in his 1862 message to...Congress. After centuries of struggle, it is clear that humans may not be legally enslaved and they may not be legally tortured, no matter how beneficial their enslavement or torture might be to others.

* * *
[on the theory that nonhumans, like humans, are persons]
Yet these most fundamental liberties are denied to every nonhuman animal. This not only inflicts grave injustice upon its victims, but underlines the arbitrariness of claiming fundamental liberties only for human beings. Dignity mandates fundamental liberties. Dignity is, significantly, a product of the capacity for autonomy and self-determination. Things are not autonomous. Persons are. Things do not self-determine. Persons do. This entitles them to fundamental liberties. Most moral and legal philosophers, and nearly every common law judge, recognize that a normal human possesses autonomy and self-determination if she has preferences and the ability to act to satisfy them,
can cope with changed circumstances, can make choices—even ones she cannot evaluate well—or has desires and beliefs and can make appropriate inferences from them. I call these basic autonomies "practical." Practical autonomy is not just what most humans have, but is what most judges think is sufficient for basic liberties. Any being possesses practical autonomy and is entitled to personhood and basic liberties if she can desire, can intentionally act to try to fulfill her desire, and can possess a sense of self-sufficiency to allow her to understand, even dimly, that it is she who wants something and is trying to get it. Consciousness, though not necessarily self-consciousness, and sentience are implicit. How do we know when nonhuman animals possess practical autonomy? The more their behavior resembles ours and the taxonomically closer we are, the more confident we can be that they do.

Chimpanzees, for example, are quite close to us taxonomically and genetically. Further, chimpanzee behavior resembles that of humans.
They are conscious, probably self-aware, possess some or all the elements of a theory of mind (i.e., they know what others see or know), understand symbols, use a sophisticated language or language-like communication system, deceive, pretend, imitate, and solve complex problems that require mental representation. We can therefore be highly confident they possess practical autonomy sufficient for basic liberty rights. The animals most commonly used for food (pigs, sheep, goats, cows, chickens, turkeys, and ducks) may have all the cognitive characteristics of chimpanzees. They may have none. Or they may have some; or perhaps they possess some simpler consciousness, are able mentally to represent and act insightfully, use symbols, think, use a simple communication system, and have a primitive, but sufficient, sense of self. The stronger and more complex these abilities are, the more confident we can be that a being possesses practical autonomy. We do not know much about the cognitive abilities of farmed animals, because those who make billions of dollars exploiting them have never bothered to conduct significant research into what sorts of beings they are.

* * *

Scattered academics have recently begun to investigate farm animals' cognitive abilities, but there remains little research on the subject. In light of what we know—and we do know some things—it may be appropriate to apply the precautionary principle that is often used in the field of environmental law. Depriving any being with practical autonomy of basic liberty rights—treating a being as a thing rather than as a person—is the most terrible injustice we can inflict. When there is doubt and serious damage is threatened, we should err on the cautious side where evidence of practical autonomy exists. More than a million animal species exist. Darwinian evolution postulates a natural continuum of mental abilities. In Drawing the Line, I demonstrate that we know that all four species of great apes and at least some cetaceans, for example, possess practical autonomy, and that African elephants and African Grey Parrots probably do, too—or at least come close. We could deal with this problem in another way. Personhood and basic liberty rights might be given in proportion to the degree a farmed animal possesses practical autonomy.
If you have it, you get full liberty rights. 
But if you don't, the degree to which you approach it 
might make you eligible to receive some proportional liberties. 
This idea of receiving proportional liberties 
accords with how judges often think. 
They may give fewer legal rights to humans who lack autonomy. 
But they do not make her a legal thing. 
* * * 
Elementary justice demands that research 
on what sorts of beings farmed animals are begin in earnest. 

III. Equality Rights and Nonhuman Rights 

Finally, recall that liberty is not the only ground 
for the allocation of basic legal rights 
and that equality demands that likes be treated alike. 
Equality rights depend upon how one rightless being 
compares to another being with rights. 
An animal might be entitled to basic equality rights, 
even if she is not entitled to liberties, 
because she is similar to another with basic liberty rights. 
Equality rights require a comparison. 
Since like beings should be treated alike, 
something can only be equal to something or someone else. 
The strongest argument for equality rights of a farmed animal 
is simple: even very young or severely cognitively-impaired humans 
possess the basic right to bodily integrity, though they lack autonomy. 
Presently, such nonhuman animals as chimpanzees 
possess very complex minds, yet lack all rights, as they are things. 
This offends equality. 
To the degree that the animals we raise and kill for food 
also possess complex minds, 
the refusal to recognize their basic rights 
also offends the principle of equality. 
Only careful scientific investigations will answer the questions 
of what kinds of minds the various farmed animals possess. 
There is only one reason not to determine 
what rights farmed animals are due and recognize them. 
That is the reason that once justified human slavery: 
powerful economic interests are arrayed against it. 
("An Argument for the Basic Legal Rights of Farmed Animals" 
Steven M. Wise (1952- ) 
American professor of animal rights law and author 
Founder, Center for the Expansion of Fundamental Rights 
.................
I wonder if God is pleased with our "thanks" for His many blessings when we don't allow His creatures to live the lives they were intended to live in their natural habitats?

And since the first "thanksgiving" with the Native Indians, I wonder if they approve of our treatment of animals?

* * *

When are we going to realize that "giving thanks" can be expressed by being kinder to people (perhaps the American Indian) and by being the good stewards of God's creatures that we were commissioned to be, rather than supporting animal abuse?
The turkey was considered to be our national bird (before the eagle).
If the turkey were our national bird, I wonder if we would treat turkeys the way they should be treated, with compassion as their Creator has compassion on them.
Wouldn't it be great if we changed our "traditions" from supporting animal abuse to "adopting" a turkey (or any other abused animal) living in a sanctuary...?
I believe God is waiting for us to live lives of peace and gratitude for the many blessings He gives us.
("Celebrating 'Thanksgiving' " Catholic Concern for Animals)<>
Our views and our treatment of animals reflect and affect our relationship with God.
<>
If we lived the Lord's Prayer, we would be bringing God's Kingdom—where animals and humans will live together forever—to earth.
<>
God gave us the commission to be good stewards of His animals, for which we will be held accountable some day.
<>
We should not boast of being "rational" above animals, especially when we rationalize our abusive treatment of them; it may lead to our deaths.

Janice Arlene Fredericks, L.P.C., M.A. (1952- )
American licensed counselor, Christian educator
Founder, God's Creatures Ministry
Chairman, Catholic Concern for Animals-USA

The absurd contention that concentration camps never actually existed was, as everybody knows, described as the "Auschwitz lie."
The assertion that concentration camps were closed down after the Second World War is the "second Auschwitz lie."
What many people don't know, or don't want to know, is that there are still concentration camps today: animal concentration camps.
If you don't believe [that the second Auschwitz lie] exists, then you should read reports of the experiments that Nazis carried out in their research labs on Jews, and then read reports on the experiments done today with animals.
<>
Everything the Nazis did to Jews we are today practicing on animals.
Our grandchildren will ask us one day:
Where were you during the Holocaust of the animals?
What did you do against these horrifying crimes?
We won't be able to offer the same excuse for the second time, that we didn't know.
(quoted in Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust, Charles Patterson (ed.) © 2002)
<>
Animal experiments are wrong, irrespective of whether they are medically beneficial.
The real or supposed benefit of animal experiments is not an ethical argument at all, because there are many things that could be beneficial but which are, however, immoral or forbidden, such as experiments on humans.

We do not need any new morals for animals. We must merely stop arbitrarily excluding animals from our present morals.

Helmut Friedrich Kaplan, Ph.D. (1952- )
Austrian professor, philosopher, author

………

[on food animals]
Converting living systems into machines for capital accumulation wouldn't be possible without the instrumentality of a reductionist science that achieves two things for you. On the one hand it kills your ethics of compassion because reductionism transforms a living system into inert parts that are put together from the outside—and that reductionism then creates the ethical anesthesia that basically says: "You don't have to worry about the ethics of your relationship, because this is just a bundle of matter which is in your hands to play around with."
It's as if you're playing with plasticine. And it also gives you the actual manipulative power to get more milk out of a cow, to produce more lean meat in the cows, to stock cows in smaller spaces, to slaughter them more quickly. These are the systems by which capital uses the reductionism of science for capital accumulation and appropriation of life from beings who have a right to their own life.

(A Cow on My Table documentary © 1998)

Vandana Shiva, Ph.D. (1952- )
Indian physicist, environmentalist, author

………

Without all of us the movement ceases to exist. Who will then care about the animals?
(quoted in Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust, Charles Patterson © 2002)

Barry Horne (1952-2001)
English activist

………
[on whether there should be rights for animals]
The core of what we're discussing is values.
That's what it's about: human values.
Martin Luther King talked about "power without compassion,
might without morality, and strength without sight."
They are the values that allow our society to abuse animals,
but they are the values that allow our society to abuse people
and to abuse the planet...in the name of economics.
You cannot divorce the values that abuse animals
and those that abuse people and abuse the planet,
for they are the same values.
Henry Salt said, "[Reformers of all classes must recognize that]
it is useless to preach peace by itself, or socialism by itself,
or anti-vivisection by itself, or vegetarianism by itself,
or kindness to animals by itself.
The cause of each and all of the evils that afflict the world
is the same—the general lack of humanity,
the lack of knowledge that all sentient life is akin
and that he who injures a fellow-being
is in fact doing injury to himself.
It is not this bloodshed or that bloodshed that must cease,
but all bloodshed—all wanton infliction of pain or death."
And if the people who run this country...do not see that,
then maybe they do need a bill of rights for animals
to constantly remind them.
For...if we have a society that treats animals
with respect, love and dignity,
we will have a society that treats people and the planet
with love, respect and dignity.
Gandhi said, "The greatness of a nation and its moral progress
can be judged by the way its animals are treated."
And on that basis, this country and many other countries
are not great. It's about time they were.
And if that takes a bill of rights, then so be it.
("Does the Animal Kingdom Need a Bill of Rights?"
debate held at The Royal Institute of Great Britain, 1989)
David Vaughan Icke (1952- )
English writer and public speaker
.................

Even when the Bible tells you "Thou shalt not kill,"
it never said "Thou shalt not kill man."
It said "Thou shalt not kill" and full stop.
So who's to say what it is talking about
when it says "Thou shalt not kill"?
If God wanted animals to be your food,
He wouldn’t make them with feet to run away, and with eyes. Food is not supposed to have eyes and mouth and nose. That is not food. Food cannot have eyes. That is crazy.

* * *

If a man says he doesn’t eat cow, but he wears leather shoes, that kind of thought is contradictory because it’s the same perpetuation of the killing of the animal to make clothes and to eat. Human beings are the only creatures on earth who kill to create clothes. (interview with blackvegetarians.org February 2004)

**Mutabaruka (1952- )**
Jamaican reggae poet


Choosing to be blind to what we are actually doing when we shop for, prepare, and eat food, we blind ourselves not only to the horror and suffering we are instigating and eating, but also to the beauty of the world around us. This acquired inability to actually see and appreciate the overwhelming loveliness of this earth allows us to ravage forests and oceans and systematically destroy the natural world.
Becoming insensitive to the pain we cause daily to defenseless animals, we also become insensitive to the beauty and luminosity of the creation that we oppress and from which we disconnect at every meal.

* * *

We are not predatory by nature, but we've been taught that we are, in the most potent way possible: we've been raised from birth to eat like predators. We've thus been initiated into a predatory culture and been forced to see ourselves at the deepest levels as predators. Farming animals is simply a refined and perverse form of predation in which the animals are confined before being attacked and killed.

* * *

Our meals require us to eat like predators and thus to see ourselves as such, cultivating and justifying predatory behaviors and institutions that are the antithesis of the inclusiveness and kindness.
that accompany spiritual growth.  
Because cruelty is inescapable  
in confining, mutilating, and slaughtering animals for food,  
we have been forced from childhood  
to be distracted and inattentive perpetrators of cruelty.  
None of us ever consciously and freely chose to eat animals.  
We have all inherited this from our culture and upbringing.  
* * *  
Because we are adept at disconnecting  
from the suffering we impose on animals,  
we naturally and inevitably become adept at disconnecting  
from the suffering we impose on hungry people, living biosystems,  
war-ravaged communities, and future generations.  
* * *  
Compassion is ethical intelligence:  
it is the capacity to make connections  
and the consequent urge to act to relieve the suffering of others.  
Like cognitive intelligence,  
it is suppressed by the practice of eating animals.  
The ability to disconnect, practiced at every mealtime,  
is seen in more chilling guise in the modern scientist  
slowly freezing dogs to death to learn about human physiology,  
in modern soldiers looking straight into the eyes  
of helpless civilians [and] killing them,  
in hunters deceiving and chasing defenseless animals  
and killing them for sport, and in countless other  
legal and approved cultural activities.  
As long as we remain, at core, a culture that sees animals  
merely as commodities and food, there is little hope for our survival.  
The systematic practice of ignoring, oppressing, and excluding  
that is fundamental to our daily meals  
disconnects us from our inner wisdom  
and from our sense of belonging  
to a benevolent and blessed universe.  
By actively ignoring the truth of our connectedness,  
we inescapably commit genocide and suicide,  
and forsake the innate intelligence and compassion  
that would guide us.  
* * *  
Our mistreatment of animals for food  
is far and away our greatest cultural shadow.  
Our collective guilt drives us not only to hide the violence we eat  
but also to act it out: In our aggressive lifestyle,  
in movies, books, games, and other media, and in the violence  
we inflict both directly and indirectly on each other.  
* * *
[W]e invent mental categories for the infinitely mysterious beings we encounter, such as "blacks," "slaves," and "pagans," or "food animals," "game," "pests," and "laboratory animals." These categories, and the violence with which we treat the magnificent beings thus categorized, do not fundamentally change or cheapen that sacred and enigmatic nature. They only cloud and enslave our minds with the distorted thinking born of our exclusionary and self-serving attitude. The light of the infinite spiritual source of all life shines in all creatures.

By seeing and recognizing this light in others, we free both them and ourselves. This is love. Failing to see it, often because we never experienced others seeing it in us, we imprison ourselves, mistaking the confines of the shallows for the deep and free.
By seeing other animals merely as objects to be exploited for food, we have torn the fabric of essential harmony so deeply that we have created a culture that enslaves itself, often without realizing it.
The domination of humans by humans is a necessary outgrowth of dominating other animals for food. As Jim Mason has demonstrated in *An Unnatural Order*, there is a strong historical link between the human enslavement of other humans and the human enslavement of animals for food. This enslaving mentality of domination and exclusion lies at the core of the spiritual malaise that allows us to wage war upon the earth and upon each other.

* * *

[T]he mentality of domination characterizing the culture into which we were born thrives on seeing and emphasizing differences and ignoring similarities, because this is what enslaving and killing animals requires us all to practice. As herders and dominators of animals, we must continually practice seeing ourselves as separate and different from them, as superior and special. Our natural human compassion can be repressed by learning to exclude others and to see them as essentially unlike us. This exclusivism is necessary to racism, elitism, and war, because in order to harm and dominate other people we must break the bonds that our hearts naturally feel with them. The mentality of domination is necessarily a mentality of exclusion.

* * *

The core values of the old herding culture still define our culture, as does its main ritual, eating commodified animals. Our deep urge to evolve to a more spiritually mature level of understanding and living, and to create a social order that promotes more justice, peace, freedom, health, sanity, prosperity, sustainability, and happiness, absolutely requires us to stop viewing animals as food objects to be consumed and to shift to a plant-based way of eating. This would bless us enormously, liberating us from routinely practicing, denying, and projecting violence, and would help us cultivate equality and loving-kindness in our relationships as well as develop our capacity for inner serenity. By sowing and nurturing seeds of inclusiveness and sensitivity, we can reap an understanding of our interconnectedness and an ability to live in peace.
* * *
Because of our own wounding, we cannot see the blindness and cruelty that always accompany our thinking that others exist for our purposes. Slave owners in the South couldn’t see it, either. And yet, if we humans were the ones born into miserable confinement and routinely castrated, branded, raped, shocked, mutilated, and driven insane because we were viewed merely as tasty meat by a stronger and more "intelligent" species, we would certainly hope that this "superior" species would recognize that we have a greater purpose than being mere commodities to be imprisoned, killed, wrapped, sold, and eaten.

We likewise must regain the intelligence we have lost through desensitizing ourselves to the undeniable truth that from the perspective of the millions of terrified animals whom we see only as food commodities, we are vicious terrorists. * * *
As we ignore animal suffering, we ignore each other's suffering. As we deny animals their dignity and privacy, we deny our own dignity and find our privacy being increasingly eroded. As we enforce powerlessness on them, we feel increasingly powerless. As we reduce them to mere commodities, we become commodities ourselves. As we destroy their ability to fulfill their purpose, we lose track of our purpose. As we deny them rights, we lose our own rights. As we enslave them, we become slaves ourselves. As we break their spirits, our own spirits are broken. As we sow, we reap.

* * *

If our only motivation for not eating animal foods is our own health, it's easy to "cheat" a little here and there and pretty soon go back to eating them again. When our motivation is based on compassion, it is deep and lasting, because we understand that our actions have direct consequences on others who are vulnerable. We never "cheat" because that means directly harming others, which we are unwilling to do. While there are thus many "former vegetarians," it's unlikely that "former vegans" were ever actually vegans; it seems doubtful that compassion authentically attained is ever lost.

* * *

When we are then drawn toward a plant-based way of eating, it is in no way a limitation on us; rather it is the harmonious fulfillment of our inner seeing. At first we think it's an option we can choose, but with time we realize that it's not a choice at all but the free expression of the truth that we are. It is not an ethic that we have to police from outside, but our own radiant love spontaneously expressing, both for ourselves and for our world.

* * *

Now knowing better, we can act better, and acting better, we can live better, and give the animals, our children, and ourselves a true reason for hope and celebration.

(The World Peace Diet © 2005 worldpeacediet.org)

Will Tuttle, Ph.D. (1953–)
American author and lecturer, composer and musician
Co-founder, Circle of Compassion Initiative

...............
[O]ther animals and devalued humans are increasingly becoming fodder for the capitalist system. The elites’ plundering of the previous centuries continues into the present moment, only perhaps accomplished with more finesse, when tyranny masquerades as democracy. Sociology examines social issues from a systemic or holistic vantage point, and application of this perspective to the treatment of other animals reveals that the awful treatment they receive in human society is driven by the system. Specifically, oppression of other animals is produced by three processes that thrive under capitalism.

- The first and primary factor is that their mistreatment is motivated by desire for economic or material gain.
- Second, potential oppressors must have the power to exploit, and in contemporary society this power is largely found in the authority of the state.
- Third, the oppressors, motivated by economic gain and given the legal power to exploit, work to foster an ideology—or set of beliefs—that explains and justifies their actions and the oppressive arrangements they create.

I call this model the Theory of Oppression, as it also largely explains racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, ageism and other… injustice.

* * *

[T]he oppression of other animals is not just similar to the oppression of devalued humans, but… these various forms of oppression are entangled and mutually enabling.

[P]rogress in the struggle against injustice for any group is only as solid and sustainable as the level of progress of justice achieved for every devalued group.

[A] socially constructed and generally accepted "hierarchy of worth" underlies the notion that certain groups of human and other animals are less important and valuable than others. This way of thinking is necessary for oppression to occur, and once it is accepted, economic forces play a profound role in determining what groups are less valued or expendable. History demonstrates that, while some devalued groups may obtain a certain higher status at any point in time, as long as the hierarchy exists, their descent is possible when circumstances
—especially economic circumstances—change.
In our work, we must foster the recognition
that all creatures are of worth
in order to effectively challenge systemic oppression.

* * *

[I]n most human societies,
where masses of humans are struggling for daily existence,
many have little awareness of or concern
about the gross injustices committed against other animals
—and how the fates of the devalued are intertwined.
Sadly, but not surprisingly,
the interests of other animals are rarely considered
when initial plans for a more equitable form of social organization
are promoted by those who exist in conditions of poverty.
In my book, I invoke Abraham Maslow's
concept of the hierarchy of needs to help explain this oversight.
In essence, Maslow suggested that most humans
need to have their basic needs met before they are able
to respond empathetically and altruistically.

* * *

Vastly increased numbers of cows [are] raised in captivity
and murdered for the economic value of their bodies,
and their resistance to this oppression is witnessed
by the widespread use of whips, electric prods
and other implements used to enact their compliance.
As a result of this plundering to keep flesh on the tables of the affluent,
countless other animals have been displaced or killed,
especially in the rainforest.
Millions of other animals in the tropics have been captured
and turned into commodities for the exotic pet trade.

* * *

Most of the animal rights literature treats speciesism
as prejudice or discrimination,
and some writers compare it to racism and other forms of injustice.
Sociologists, however, have long maintained
that racism, sexism, classism
and related injustices are actually ideologies.
Ideologies are belief systems that are created to legitimatise
oppressive social arrangements.

* * *

Prejudice and discrimination are the results
of oppressive ideologies, harmful ideas
and practices promoted by destructive belief systems.
This is an important distinction, because oppressive ideologies
like speciesism, sexism, racism and classism
are created and promulgated by the powerful
in order to justify arrangements that...are producing material benefit for some members of society.
What is more, these forms of oppression are intertwined economically, politically and ideologically—and sustainable progress requires the unraveling of each form of oppression.
As long as socially sanctioned permission to exploit any group exists, all devalued groups are in peril.
Unless all humans and other animals are respected and protected, the significant motivation to exploit will be rationalised by a belief system that is easily shifted to encompass other groups.
So, as the Theory of Oppression holds, the motivation or primary basis for the oppression must be neutralized, and societal practices altered, to reduce prejudice and discrimination and ameliorate oppression.
It is not enough only to change minds, but the struggle is also to change the structure of society.
Structural change is essential for a future with sustainable economic practices and reduced levels of oppression and violence.
This is why a clear understanding of speciesism is important.
*

[M]ultitudes of oppressed others resist their horrible captivity and treatment....
As the number experiencing this oppression grows, it is essential that activists in the United States increase efforts to educate the public about the horrors that are behind such "products" as meat, milk, eggs and leather.
It is so important that those with welfarist viewpoints begin to recognise that reformist campaigns only produce public perceptions of more "humane"—and thus, acceptable—oppression.
And, once modest reforms are agreed to, or enacted, there is no real interest, or funding, to enforce them.
And, worst of all, all the effort that has gone into sensitising the public to suffering and injustice largely evaporates as many happily make their way back to the establishments that peddle flesh.
Animal liberationists must continue to work to bring welfarists to a strategic campaign for the abolition of animal suffering.
Increased unity for abolition should be supplemented with increased unity among all groups working to end oppression.
(interview with Claudette Vaughan abolitionist-online.com November 2006)

David Alan Nibert, Ph.D. (1953- )
American author and professor of sociology
.................
For almost two years I went against everything I ever believed in
by selling out to the McDonald’s corporate juggernaut
by playing Ronald McDonald
to thousands of innocent, trusting children.
Prior to that, I am sorry to say, I also portrayed
The Marvellous Magical Burger King…doing a children’s magic show
promoting the glories of meat eating for the Burger King Corporation.
[I] now realize I have a debt to parents and children everywhere
to try and present the truth about the wonderful vegetarian lifestyle
to which I owe so much.
<>
Meat is murder!
Man can get along very happily on fruit, vegetables and whole grains.
I brainwashed youngsters into doing wrong—eating burgers.
I want to say sorry to children everywhere for selling out to concerns
who make millions by murdering innocent animals.

Geoffrey Guilianio (1953- )
American actor, writer, radio personality

We demand toppdown reform of all
government wildlife mismanagement agencies of the nation.

They’re all bureaucracies corrupted by powerful organized hunters
that brazenly exploit wildlife (“game”) and our natural environment
for the interests and benefits of the hunting establishment.
We want nothing less than an immediate ban of all hunting (and trapping, which is equally as unnecessary and evil) on all public lands—millions of acres of state and national parks, military lands, and especially our National Wildlife Refuge System, which has been systematically pried open, on over 300 of these supposedly inviolate sanctuaries, to sport and trophy hunters and trappers. Ours is an omnicidal and dystopic epoch, an era marked by gross human overpopulation, suffering, and starvation, environmental destruction, ecosystem collapse, mass extinction of species, escalations of violence and killing, sectarian and religious fanaticism, maniacal militarism, multiple wars, and predicaments ad infinitum.

* * *

Thoughtlessly condoning the abuse and killing of hundreds of millions of sentient wild animals every year, killing only for recreational kicks and male validation, well, I marvel at their sheer inhumanity.

("Riding Shotgun with a Bowhunter: An Anti-hunting Odyssey" opednews.com/Glenn_Kirk_Riding_Shotgun August 14, 2009)

<>

To be opposed to sport and trophy hunting is having to bear witness each year while a minority (5-7%) segment of American society takes control of our shared outdoor commonwealth and, without humility or apology, sets out to harass, maim, and kill hundreds of millions of innocent wild animals. Donning themselves in a variety of machismo fashions,... while carrying an amazing arsenal of weaponry, they blast into the forests and fields to conduct their primitive customs. No one truly knows with any degree of certainty what the actual body count of this legalized slaughter is each year. Not even their official "game" managers, the wildlife biologists, know how many are "harvested" (like corn?) or left to die nationwide. Estimates during the months-long killing season range in the hundreds of millions, but an actual tally of all the mortally wounded, poached, and shot as target practice non-human beings can never truly be known. This unspoken and unpublicized travesty of nature is apparently of little concern to the modern game establishment. Formerly seen as trustworthy stewards of our cherished wildlife heritage,
traditional game wardens have allowed
their professional conservation ethic
to become degraded by institutionalized hunter collusion
and political pressure.
The official new role of the wildlife manager
is to function like a bureaucratic pimp
for the organized hunting lobby,
their primary purpose being to assure perpetual numbers
of select target species to satisfy approximately 12 million hunters.
Like clockwork each autumn,
hunters and their pandering game biostitutes
begin pumping the mainstream media
and sport and outdoor magazines
with disinformation and self-aggrandizement
justifying their barbaric bloodsports.
They extol the mythical virtues of hunting,
while proclaiming their services as absolutely necessary
for controlling wildlife populations and preserving the environment.
Yet in this new 21st century,
the ecology of wildlife is far from healthy and secure.
In fact, the effect of mass public hunting
is a far different and gruesome reality.
With few exceptions, hunting has been a complete disaster
for wildlife and the biological diversity of the environment.
The evidence can be found through a cursory examination
of the Federal Endangered Species List
and an objective, common sense look
at the state of the natural world.
Regardless of this awful truth, hunters inform us
(with righteous indignation) that it is only they
who "pick up the tab for wildlife conservation"
and that wildlife is doing just fine, thank you, bullet holes and all.
Yet it is the hunters who invade our state,
national parklands, forests and most of our supposedly inviolate
National Wildlife Refuges to shoot up, shaft, and trap wildlife
to Kingdom Come and back for primarily recreational pursuits.
Somehow this unbelievable violation of nature and the public trust
continues to be cast as wildlife conservation.
Conservation means "the deliberate, planned
guarding and protecting of something precious."
But the deliberate mismanagement of wildlife
for hunter recreation and exploitation has nothing to do
with protecting...precious...wildlife and our environment.
In fact, hunters' license fees are used to manipulate
a comparatively few game species
into overpopulation (white-tail deer),
at the expense of a much larger number of non-game species, which includes the extermination of natural predators such as wolves and coyotes. This contributes to the loss of biological diversity, genetic integrity and ecological balance of wildlife. Hunters' licenses pay for environmental degradation and not conservation, as is claimed. Hasn't the time come for the non-hunting, environmentally enlightened and concerned public to question and openly challenge the acceptability, legitimacy, and humanity of killing animals for "sport"?

Our wonderful world and its amazing kingdom of marvelous creatures is in dire jeopardy of deteriorating irrevocably right before our eyes, its delicate ecosystems coming apart at the seams. Clearly, we can no longer afford to have it "managed" by a pre-Darwinian cabal of trigger-happy animal killers. We should abolish sport hunting and relegate it to the dustbin of history, along with burning witches at the stake, slavery, and more recently, dog fighting.

(“The War on Wildlife” opednews.com/Glenn_Kirk_War October 10, 2007)

Glenn A. Kirk (1954-)
American social and ecological justice advocate

.................
How can you say you're trying to spiritually evolve, without even a thought about what happens to the animals whose lives are sacrificed in the name of gluttony?

(Day #1 of a 21-day vegan diet oprah.com/blog May 2008)

Oprah Winfrey (1954- )
American television talk show host and media mogul

[R]ights theory has at its core the rejection of the property status of animals.

<>
Speciesism is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of morality.
(Animal Rights: The Abolitionist Approach)

<>
In order to understand the human/nonhuman relationship, we must distinguish between our use of animals and our treatment of animals.

* * *
Our use of animals is a separate matter from whether our treatment of them is "humane" or "cruel."
Animal welfare concerns the treatment of animals and has as its central focus the regulation of animal exploitation. Animal welfare maintains that it is acceptable to use nonhumans as long as we treat them "humanely."
Animal rights theory...concerns the use of animals and has as its central focus the abolition of animal use rather than its regulation.
We have no moral justification for using nonhumans for our purposes. Moreover, as long as animals are human property, animal welfare standards will never provide adequate protection to animal interests.

* * *
[A]ll sentient beings should have at least one right—the right not to be treated as property.
If we recognized this one right, we would be compelled to abolish institutionalized animal exploitation. We would stop bringing domesticated nonhumans into existence for human use.

* * *
[I]t is not necessary that nonhumans have humanlike rationality or other humanlike cognitive characteristics to be members of the moral community.

* * *
It is important to recognize that just as an abolitionist with respect to human slavery cannot continue to be a slaveowner, an abolitionist with respect to animal slavery cannot continue to consume or use animal flesh or animal products.

* * *

The animal rights position is the ultimate rejection of violence. It is the ultimate affirmation of peace. The animal rights movement is the logical progression of the peace movement, which seeks to end conflict between humans; the animal rights movement ideally seeks to take that a step further and to end conflict between humans and nonhumans. Violence treats others as means to ends rather than as ends in themselves. When we engage in violence against others—whether they are human or nonhuman—we ignore their inherent value. We treat them only as things that have no value except that which we decide to give them.

* * *

The farmer raises animals because the overwhelming number of humans demand[ing] to meat and animal products. The farmer raises those animals in intensive conditions because consumers want meat and animal products to be as inexpensive as possible. Violence against institutional providers of animal products makes no sense. If we want to end animal exploitation, we need to educate the public about why animal exploitation is immoral. We need to reduce demand for animal products and that can be done only through education—not violence. The abolitionist approach to animal rights maintains that those who reject the exploitation of nonhuman animals should be ethical vegans and should engage in creative, non-violent vegan education. *(Animal Rights: The Abolitionist Approach)*

<> I believe that animals have rights.

This is not to say that animals have the same rights we do, but the reasons that lead us to accord certain rights to human beings are equally applicable to animals. The problem is that our value system doesn't permit the breadth of vision necessary to understand that. We currently use the category of "species" as the relevant criterion for determining membership in our moral community,
just as we once used race and sex to determine that membership. If you had asked white men in 1810 whether Blacks had rights, most of them would have laughed at you. What was necessary then is necessary now. We must change the way we think: a paradigm shift in the way we think about animals. Rights for Blacks and women were the constitutional issues of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Animal rights, once more people understand the issue, will emerge as the civil rights movement of the twenty-first century. (“Just Like Us? Toward a Nation of Animal Rights” Harper’s, August 1988)
<>
We have two choices—and only two—when it comes to the moral status of animals.

We can continue to permit the infliction of suffering on animals for virtually any purpose that provides a benefit to us, including wholly unnecessary purposes. If we exercise this option then we should at least admit that our claim that animals have morally significant interests is a sham and that we in fact recognize only their value as things, as means to our ends.
Or we can maintain that animals have morally significant interests in not being subjected to unnecessary suffering. This option requires that we rethink the moral status of animals and provide some meaningful content to the humane treatment principle that we claim to accept. It is important to understand that this second option does not require that we treat animals in the same way that we treat humans, or that we regard animals and humans as the "same," or that we give up the idea that in situations of true emergency or conflict—where necessity requires—we may prefer human over animal interests. All that is required is that we accept that animals have a morally significant interest in not suffering and that we must justify the necessity of inflicting any suffering on animals.

* * *

If we are to take animal interests seriously, then we can do so in only one way: by applying the principle of equal consideration to animal interests in not suffering.

* * *

The principle of equal consideration reflects the view that sound moral judgments must be universal and cannot be based on self-interest or the interests of a "special" or elite group.

* * *

The humane treatment principle is a moral theory that requires us to balance the interests of animals and humans.

* * *

We are supposed to weigh human interests in using animals against animal interests in avoiding suffering.

* * *

We claim to require a balancing of animal interests and human interests, but in fact no true balancing occurs. No animal interest is ever considered as similar to, let alone as exceeding, any human interest in our balancing act. Even when animals have significant interests in not suffering and humans have only an interest in amusement,
animals lose because their status as property is always a good reason not to respect their interests in not suffering. The interests of property will almost never be judged as similar to the interests of property owners. The principle of equal consideration has then essentially no meaning in the context of any balance of human and animal interests required by the humane treatment principle.

* * *

The humane treatment principle was intended to overturn the view that animals are merely things and to recognize that animals have a morally significant interest in not suffering. The property status of animals, however, precludes the recognition of any animal interests beyond those required to ensure that humans benefit from the exploitation of animals. Animals are treated in precisely the same way that slaves were. We do not want property owners to "waste" animal property any more than we wanted slave owners to "waste" human property—to inflict suffering on animals or slaves for no purpose whatsoever. But as long as there is a purpose, however trivial it may be, the suffering of the animal is considered justified, just as it was in the case of the slave. Although there are laws that supposedly protect animals, just as there were laws that supposedly protected slaves, these laws require that we balance the interests of right holders, and, in particular, holders of property rights, against the interests of their property. This sort of "hybrid" system did not work for slaves and it does not work for animals. In the case of animals, the law has presumed that the owners of animals will act to protect their economic interest in the animal property, and that this self-interest will provide a sufficient level of protection for the animal. Such a presumption did not provide much protection for slaves, and...it does not provide much protection for animals. Although animal welfare laws were originally intended, at least in part, to recognize that humans had at least some obligations directly to animals, this purpose was quickly forgotten, with the result that the law now defines the primary object of anticruelty laws as "to prevent the outrage to the sensibilities of the community." The very same thing happened with laws that supposedly protected slaves: their primary object became the protection of community sensibilities.
If we extend the principle of equal consideration to animals, does that mean that they will become "persons"? Yes, it does.
But we should be careful about what we mean by that term. We tend to use "persons" and "humans" synonymously, but such usage is incorrect.

We should not think that our considering animals as persons means that animals are the same as humans or that they have all the same rights humans have. To say that a being is a person is merely to say that the being has morally significant interests, that the principle of equal consideration applies to that being, that the being is not a thing. In a sense, we already accept that animals are persons; the humane treatment principle represented a historical shift that established that we could have direct obligations to animals. Their status as property, however, prevented their personhood from being realized.

The moral universe is limited to only two kinds of beings: persons and things. "Quasi-persons" or "things plus" will necessarily risk being treated as things because the principle of equal consideration cannot apply to them. [As with human slaves], we cannot regard animals as "quasi-persons" or as "things plus." They are either persons, beings to whom the principle of equal consideration applies and to whom we have direct moral obligations, or things, beings to whom the principle of equal consideration does not apply and to whom we have no direct moral obligations.

Our considering animals as persons does not mean that we cannot prefer humans to animals in situations of true emergency or conflict; it means only that we must stop creating those conflicts by treating animals as our property.

If we are going to apply the principle of equal consideration to animals and treat animal interests in not suffering as morally significant, then we must extend to animals the basic right not to be treated as our resources.
This does not require that we treat animals in the same way that we treat humans. No one argues that we should extend to animals the right to vote or to drive a car or to own property or to attend a university, or many other rights that we reserve to competent human beings. Nor does this mean that animals have any sort of guarantee of never suffering or that we must protect animals from harm from other animals in the wild or that we can prevent animals from accidental injury by humans. But just as we believe that humans should not suffer from use as...slaves or property of other humans, animals should not be made to suffer from our use of them as resources. Yet the extension of this one right to animals will profoundly affect our use and treatment of animals. We will no longer be able to justify our institutional exploitation of animals for food, biomedical experiments, entertainment, or clothing. All of these uses assume that animals are resources and have no moral status. 

* * *

Our abolition of animal exploitation might be the most effective thing to do to save the planet from the unquestioned environmental devastation caused by animal agriculture, as well as to improve our own health. And even if we care nothing for animals and accord moral value only to humans, we should abolish animal agriculture because it condemns a good many of our fellow humans to starvation. We would surely pay a price for such a different world. We would have to forgo the unnecessary pleasure of eating animals, ...the fun of watching them being tormented in rodeos or circuses, the excitement of walking in the woods and blowing them apart or wounding them with arrows, and the very questionable science involved in making them addicted to drugs that they would never use except in laboratories. We would finally have to confront our moral schizophrenia about animals, which leads us to love some animals, treat them as members of our family, and never once doubt their sentience, emotional capacity, self-awareness, or personhood,
while at the same time we stick dinner forks into other animals who are indistinguishable in any relevant sense from our animal companions. In many ways, our prevailing ways of thinking about animals should make us skeptical of our claim that it is our rationality that distinguishes us from them. (Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog? © 2000)

<>

There is something bizarre about condemning Michael Vick for using dogs in a hideous form of entertainment when 99 percent of us also use animals that are every bit as sentient as dogs in another hideous form of entertainment that is no more justifiable than fighting dogs: eating animals and animal products. There is something bizarre about Reebok and Nike, which use leather in their shoes, suspending products endorsed by Vick. They're not going to allow a guy who allegedly tortures dogs to endorse products that contain tortured cows.

* * *

Michael Vick may enjoy watching dogs fight. Someone else may find that repulsive but see nothing wrong with eating an animal who has had a life as full of pain and suffering as the lives of the fighting dogs.

It's strange that we regard the latter as morally different from, and superior to, the former. How removed from the screaming crowd around the dog pit is the laughing group around the summer steak barbecue? ("We're all Michael Vick" philly.com August 14, 2009)

Gary L. Francione, J.D. (1954- )
American author, professor of law and philosophy

...............
I think if you want to eat more meat you should kill it yourself and eat it raw so that you are not blinded by the hypocrisy of having it processed for you.

**Margi Clarke (1954- )**
English actress

----------

That animals should be the subject of serious moral concern may seem a rather strange idea. After all, the gulf between us and them is so enormous—so the theory goes—that we can’t possibly think of them in the same way as ourselves.

We eat them, hunt them, laugh at them, wear them, inflict pain upon them. Our language itself reflects the bias. "Animal" or "pig" are just two of many terms of abuse commonly used. Intelligence, cooperation and altruism are all allegedly human characteristics, while territoriality, aggression and dominance are considered to belong to the realm of animal nature. But the myth has to be sustained, for some deeply rooted practices may be threatened. Animal experimentation and factory farming are the two greatest examples of "speciesism" at work. We have chosen to deny other animals fundamental consideration purely because they happen to belong to other species of animal. Like racism, speciesism is arbitrary and irrational. And it explains why otherwise decent people can condone suffering on a vast scale, pay for it with their taxes, and bestow titles and honors on those who carry out the atrocities.

*(Toward Animal Rights © 1983)*

**Martyn G. Ford, Ph.D. (1954- )**
British professor of biology

----------

My perspective of veganism was most affected by learning that the veal calf is a by-product of dairying, and that in essence there is a slice of veal in every glass of what I had thought was an innocuous white liquid—milk.

*(quoted in The Vegan Sourcebook, Joanne Stepaniak © 2000)*

<> One of the comments often aimed at those such as myself, who write about famous vegetarians of the past—and how many of them were paragons of virtue
who practiced non-violence and compassion—is the following: "But wasn't Hitler a vegetarian?"

* * *

Robert Payne, Albert Speer, and other well-known Hitler biographers...mentioned Hitler's predilection for such non-vegetarian foods as Bavarian sausages, ham, liver, and game.

* * *

In her *Gourmet Cooking School Cookbook* (1964), Dione Lucas, drawing on her experiences as a hotel chef in Hamburg during the 1930s, remembered being called upon quite often to prepare Hitler's favorite dish, which was not a vegetarian one.

* * *

I decided to look up the specific passages in Payne's biography of Hitler and Lucas's *The Gourmet Cooking School Cookbook* that cast doubt on Hitler's vegetarianism. Sure enough, Robert Payne, whose biography... *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler* has been called definitive, scotches the rumor that Hitler might have been a vegetarian. According to Payne, Hitler's vegetarianism was a fiction made up by his propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels to give him the aura of a revolutionary ascetic, a Fascistic Gandhi, if you will.

* * *

"In fact, he was remarkably self-indulgent and possessed none of the instincts of the ascetic. His cook, an enormously fat man named Willy Kanneneberg, produced exquisite meals and acted as court jester. Although Hitler had no fondness for meat except in the form of sausages, and never ate fish, he enjoyed caviar."

* * *

Not even the loosest definition of vegetarianism could be stretched to fit these gastronomic abominations. Yet, because non-vegetarians often have an elastic definition of what constitutes a vegetarian, they think that people... who eat fish, pigeon and sausages are vegetarians. By this criterion, even jackals and hyenas, who eat fruits and vegetables between kills, could be classified as vegetarians. Dr. Roberta Kalechofsky makes a similar point in her essay entitled *Hitler's Vegetarianism: A Question of How You Define Vegetarianism*: "Biographical material about Hitler's alleged or qualified vegetarianism are contradictory."
He was sometimes described as a 'vegetarian,'
but his fondness for sausages, caviar,
and occasionally ham was well known.
On the other hand, on the basis of foods
he was known to like or eat, 'red meat' is never listed."
* * *
Even as early as 1911, the 11th edition of Encyclopedia Britannica
(one of the most widely consulted reference works)
defined vegetarianism as follows: "vegetarianism, a comparatively
modern word, which came into use about the year 1847, as applied
to the use of foods from which fish, flesh and fowl are excluded."
* * *
Nevertheless, modern biographers who should also know better,
have enshrined the myth that Hitler was a vegetarian
simply because they have failed to do their homework in this regard;
so their books, while scholarly in other respects, are flawed.
* * *
[D]uring the Reich, vegetarians were forbidden
to organize new groups or to start publications.
A leading vegetarian magazine, Vegetarian Warte,
suspended publication in Frankfurt in 1933.
A competing journal, The Vegetarian Press,
was allowed to limp along during the Nazi years,
but it was severely hamstrung:
It was prohibited from using the term "vegetarian movement,"
and it was barred from publishing the time and place
of vegetarian gatherings.
* * *
[V]egetarian societies were declared illegal and were forced
to become members of the German Society for Living Reform.
Members of these former vegetarian societies
were subject to searches in their homes;
during these raids, the Gestapo even confiscated books
that contained vegetarian recipes.
* * *
Finally, I decided to check the reference to Hitler's favorite dish
in Dione Lucas's The Gourmet Cooking School Cookbook.
It's worth noting that Dione Lucas was a sort of precursor
of the popular television "French" chef, Julia Child.
* * *
During the 1930s, prior to her coming to the US,
she had worked as a chef at a hotel in Hamburg,
where Adolf Hitler was one of her regular customers.
On one of my book hunting forays,
I found a copy of her [cookbook] in a second hand book shop.
Blowing off the dust and cobwebs that had settled on its covers,
I opened it and turned to page 89. There, as plain as the Chaplinesque mustache on the Fuhrer's face, was Hitler's favorite recipe. "I learned this recipe when I worked as a chef before World War II, in one of the large hotels in Hamburg, Germany. I do not mean to spoil your appetite for stuffed squab,

but you might be interested to know that it was a great favorite with Mr. Hitler, who dined at the hotel often."

* * *

When Hitler had consulted his doctor as to the most efficient method of committing suicide, his doctor recommended that he shoot himself through the temple, and at the same time, bite down on an ampoule of potassium cyanide. It is noteworthy that Hitler, this alleged vegetarian and lover of animals, had no compunction about first testing the cyanide on his dog Blondi.

* * *

[I]t doesn't hurt to have it finally settled on the record that Pythagoras, Leonard da Vinci, Tolstoy, Shaw, Gandhi, and Singer were vegetarians, but that Mr. Hitler—who liked his pigeons stuffed and roasted—was not.

(Hitler: Neither Vegetarian Nor Animal Lover © 2004)

Rynn Berry, M.A. (1954- )

American lecturer and author of books, essays, articles, plays Historical advisor, North American Vegetarian Society (NAVS)

................
Raising animals for food was never done because it was humane; it began systematically about 10,000 years ago and continued and spread because it appeared to benefit humans and humans only. The more successful it became, the more destruction it wrought for humans and the more suffering it inflicted on nonhuman animals, until today it continues because of the massive conspiracy of silence surrounding it due to the industries' power and influence, public and official ignorance, and its resulting popularity.

* * *

[on the distinctions between veganism, abolition, and animal rights]
I see vegan living...as important because it is consistent with how animal rights will eventually require all people to live; for showing how easy, enjoyable, and healthful it is to live as human beings should live; and for minimizing our impact as individual human beings on nonhuman animals, ecosystems, and the biosphere. Veganism won't in itself lead to animal rights, even if promoted so successfully that no human any longer consumes or uses anything from animals or uses anything tested on animals. Prohibiting human cannibalism,...and punishing people for murder, assault, rape, theft, and other violence did not in itself establish basic legal rights for all human beings, including equal treatment under the law. Rights are specific legal constructs in and of themselves and must come to exist for nonhuman animals as they do for humans. A key reason rights will have to precede abolition of animal exploitation is that rights are so empowering and liberating, and humans currently have legal rights to own and exploit nonhumans and to use other property, land, water, and air as if nonhuman animals were not worthy of consideration. That is why putting abolition before rights has not worked: Law enforcement and courts base what they do on human supremacy and other ideas the animal-rights movement has proven wrong....

* * *

[Backlash is strong when popular industries communicate that "fringe" groups want to limit their freedom of choice or care more about animals than about people who exploit animals for a living and who would supposedly go broke if animals had rights. Promoting abolition as a means to rights—rather than as a result of rights—is like blowing out a fire while embers remain lit: the embers keep reigniting the fire.

* * *
Rights are a very recent concept in human existence. Most people don't yet understand them despite the universal need for them. Even fewer people understand animal rights than understand even the basics of human rights. That makes it easy...for tyrants and their sycophants to put property rights above all else and have their way regardless of the common good. Corporations, industries, and some other entities are organized and well-financed. The general public is not—let alone nonhuman animals, who have no voice at all in the human arena. [I]t remains difficult for most people to see benefits to themselves in animal rights. 

*[Yet] until people embrace animal rights, the human plight will continue worsening along with that of nonhumans.*

I believe animal rights is a moral, spiritual, and practical necessity. (interview with Claudette Vaughan abolitionist-online.com May 2007)

>* [on thoughts the author has had, during two decades of animal activism, concerning the demonstrable uselessness of campaigns against cruelty]*

**If reform is going to be based on nonhuman animals' moral rights that we intend to establish in law and custom...,**

why are we [in the movement] constantly exposing cruelty [instead of literally working to establish those legal rights]? **The animal rights movement puts forward the right [of animals] not to be exploited at all, not to be the property of humans, not to be in situations where cruelty to them can easily occur or where they rely on people to "care."**

But people moved to respond to cruelty naturally assume the objective must be merely to minimize cruel practices, regulate exploitation, improve the anticruelty statutes, and the like. **The demonstrated failure of [the anti-cruelty] approach is the main reason for the animal rights movement in the first place. From a strategic standpoint, it makes no sense to me to call an effort "animal rights" that relies on proving cruelty—or that emphasizes nonhuman animals people readily care about, such as baby seals, [yet completely disregards] the trillions of fish abused and destroyed by the same people and institutions. I see animal rights as a radical social movement—radical in the "root" sense of the word, seeking fundamental change. [T]he animal welfare approach [on the other hand] is not a social movement, in my opinion.*
Since it has been practiced in various ways for centuries or millennia, [animal welfare] is just a new manifestation of the status quo, updating and further popularising the status quo through the use of current media—television, the Internet, modern graphics, extreme marketing & fundraising....

I asked myself, "If these animal welfare activities do not move the human world toward recognition of nonhuman animals' rights, how would one do so? What would animal rights campaigns look like? With so much well-intentioned and sometimes-successful emphasis on "saving animals" or "doing whatever it takes to help the animals," how would one promote animal rights, and how would one persuade other people who care about nonhuman animals to help?"

By no means have I found complete answers to those questions. But here is my basic theory:

Nonhuman animals' rights will not be established as long as very few human beings know what animal rights is, and almost no one, including most animal activists, opponents of animal rights, and people who write or speak publicly about it, really knows what animal rights is.

Some activists dismiss [genuine animal rights theory] as "philosophizing when there is so much work that needs to be done."

In a society already languishing under anti-intellectualism (a devaluing of the marketplace of ideas on which democracy is supposed to be based and which should be at the heart of any reform movement) and [under] a "just do it" mentality,

the problem is not as surprising as it is...an unfortunate obstacle. The animal rights-advancing reason for only purchasing foods and products not obtained through animal exploitation is not that consumer choices alone can abolish animal exploitation; it is that strengthening "cruelty-free" or "animal-friendly" enterprises and weakening animal-abusing ones will diminish the hold of speciesist, human-supremacist, and anti-animal-rights ideologies on human beings and societies. Money is power and power controls mass media and public discourse, including advertising, marketing, public relations, and "education."

There is no quick or easy way to obtain protection for nonhuman animals, but there is no way ever without obtaining legal rights for them.

So much is said about the animals' rights—as if they already existed in the real world outside of our beliefs, plans and aspirations—that it is easy to confuse "saving" animals, giving animals good homes, eating plants only,
purchasing only "cruelty-free" household and personal-care products, and doing other good things for animals with advancing [animal] rights. So I see the primary task of the animal rights movement as educating [people about] what animal rights is (and is not) and moving people to help advance animal rights or to get out of the way and stop impeding animal rights and supporting human supremacy.

* * *

[on people mistaking liberating animals from labs for real animal rights]
I see animal liberation as animal welfare in more militant form, animal welfare with loudspeakers and raised fists. Freeing a small number of animals from laboratories, for example, or even freeing all of those currently used in laboratories, would not in and of itself establish any legal rights for...animals. An animal rights campaign can make significant educational inroads without saving any animals or forcing any corporation's hand..., while welfare or liberation campaigns can save animals or change corporations for the better without advancing animal rights—particularly when they do not use the campaign as a platform from which to educate about animal rights. The distinction between welfare/liberation and rights isn't by a degree of militancy, but of precisely what we are promoting. Conventional animal welfare is the status quo without serious threat, whereas liberation threatens some people's financial interests and puts some other people on notice. Both strike me as appealing to people who care about animals [but who] choose not to promote rights per say.

* * *

One's heart can easily be in the right place while one's tactics and strategy fail or while success in short-term objectives has no connection to potential success in long-term goals.

* * *

[R]ights are necessary to accomplish large-scale liberation, not vice versa.

* * *

Liberation keeps the dispute framed as being between those who think the status quo is right and those who think it is wrong. "It is right to use animals humanely for medical research and to use fur to keep warm" versus "It is wrong to conduct cruel experiments on nonhuman animals who cannot consent and to torture and kill nonhuman animals to sell their skins for clothing humans don't need." I don't see talk of rights on either side of that exchange, even though the public and some activists confuse the liberation side of it with animal rights.
That dispute can go on and on with no talk of rights, no explanation of why human beings should not be the only rights-holders, no education that corrects speciesism or human supremacy. Especially when cruelty and suffering are deemed the core "issues." Thinking animal liberation can get very widespread support underestimates the willingness of the vast majority of people to listen to defenses of the status quo and their unwillingness to consider challenges to it. Few people change their minds without seeing a rapid groundswell. That is not happening in favor of animal liberation. It ends up inadvertently supporting the status quo because the industry-government-media complex so easily portrays "angry," "lawbreaking" "animal rights activists" —as they're often wrongly called—as enemies of the common good. The truth is that if animal liberationists had their way, the common good would be served.

* * *

[A]nimal welfare...cannot provide meaningful protection to large numbers of Earth's sentient beings because:

- it accepts human supremacy...and nonhumans' property status;
- it is based on "caring about" nonhumans [who are] exploited and abused by humans, not on abolishing exploitation and abuse,
- [so] it does not articulate a new world view aimed at reforming the human-nonhuman relationship fundamentally (to do so would eliminate welfare organisations' insider status and their ability to build large memberships and gain large amounts of financial support)
- it works to limit "cruelty" or "gratuitous cruelty," not to abolish a system that is inherently cruel, so it treats tiny and sometimes illusory reductions in cruelty as "victories," enhances the popularity of officials only willing to propose tiny changes, and promotes acquiescence in the inherently cruel status quo by insisting progress is being made for the animals;
- it subverts important basic words like "humane" by promoting notions of "humane slaughter," "more humane animal research," and the like. When we understand the true meaning of "humane," we understand [that the animal welfare model] promotes a through-the-looking-glass perspective on the entire world, a perspective like that taught by the "Great Chain of Being" and other false, pseudo-intellectual foundations of the status quo.

* * *
Animal welfare represents the human-nonhuman status quo, conventional thinking based on the pre-scientific, elite-serving "Great Chain of Being."
So, many elected and appointed officials are glad to champion animal welfare or to appear to serve that "cause."
We have to remember that, for officials, a sine qua non of keeping the job is always to avoid threatening or injuring wealthy and influential private interests.
Large animal-exploiting industries claim to support animal welfare—and some of them do.
[Animal welfare] doesn't mean protecting animals against suffering, destruction, or exploitation; it just means agreeing to regulations and "standards" to maintain an image of caring about the animals.
By going along with that but never advocating for animal rights, officials don't risk anything and typically bolster their careers.

* * *
Not only with regard to nonhuman animals but in all areas, I see no evidence of his or other legislators' raising significant challenges to any entrenched financial interest. That means no significant change in the human-nonhuman relationship from those quarters in the near future.

* * *
Legislation can favor the eventual establishment of animal rights by abolishing a form of exploitation without substituting another form. The problem with animal welfarist legislation, and especially work for animal welfare disguised as animal rights or erroneously called "animal rights," is that it reinforces the animals' property status and the status quo generally.
It declares officially and publicly that animals lacking rights and existing as property can receive humane treatment, so no fundamental reform is needed.
Because of these dynamics inherent in electoral and legislative politics, and because so few people know what animal rights is and therefore the public cannot truly signal to its officials that it favors establishing rights, I believe it is not yet a good time for the animal rights movement to emphasize legislation to advance animal rights.

* * *
Even when nonhuman animals' legal rights are established, I believe it will take considerable time before most humans recognise the rights of copperhead snakes, brown recluse spiders,
and brown rats precisely as they recognise the rights of pandas, elephants, and "domestic" dogs.

Research shows certain appearances—not just cultural prejudices—determine which animals humans define as "cute" and therefore supposedly more lovable and worthy of more respect than others. I don't say I want things to be that way; I just believe that is how things will play out due to a combination of human nature, past practices and attitudes, and the nature of change. That is reason to fight for animal rights, not reason not to.

* * *

I believe first an animal rights movement will need to develop based on justice, compassion, increased recognition of the ravages of speciesism, equality under the law for all sentient beings, and education based on a genuine search for the truth that leads humanity out of the human supremacy syndrome.
That will have to leave the animal welfare regime as we know it by the wayside as a thing of the past and an obstacle. 
[The true meaning of "welfare," like that of "humane," once restored, will describe what nonhuman animals experience: wellbeing. I think improved education and the taboo against speciesism will improve enforcement of the established rights of nonhumans and that the improved enforcement of those rights will strengthen the taboo against speciesism.

* * *

Taking the right course—creating a humane future—needn't diminish human dignity, as some already complain. True dignity comes from enhancing everyone's life and prospects, not just one's own. Animal rights will apply empirical science more thoroughly and enhance our dignity by including an appropriate measure of humility and infinitely less violence and oppression. I believe it is the best bet for nonhuman animals and their ecosystems and therefore also for humans.

(interview with Claudette Vaughan abolitionist-online.com March 2006)

<> We wouldn't let our universities teach that people should own each other or [that people] are natural cannibals. Yet our land-grant universities (LGUs) routinely teach similarly false and repugnant notions: that it is right for nonhuman animals to be property; that human beings evolved as hunters and meat-eaters; that eating from animals is good for people—all contrary to experience and established knowledge. Our LGUs call their meat-industry courses "animal science." But science means knowledge, not industry promotion. "Animal science" promotes our most destructive industries by teaching slaughter, breeding, fattening, and eating of animals at horrendous cost to all of us.

* * *

There can be little or no progress on inhumane treatment of nonhuman animals or the other big human problems—war, poverty, sexism, racism, other human prejudice, disease, global warming, pollution, forest destruction, soaring medical and insurance costs—as long as our LGUs serve the meat industry rather than the public interest. Inhumane treatment of animals—animal use and ecosystem disruption—is the root cause all of those problems share in common.
* * *  
[In all my years of advocacy for animal welfare]  
everything has steadily worsened  
—the number of animals used and killed,  
the degree of suffering they endure, and  
human suffering from inhumane treatment of other animals.

All of this confirms the belief I share with leading theorists,  
that inhumane treatment of animals  
—animal use and ecosystem disruption—  
will always worsen and there will always be more cruelty  
no matter what anyone says or does,  
as long as humans fail to establish and enforce  
equal basic rights of all individual animals, regardless of species,  
to be free from use and ecosystem disruption by humans.
("Ten Thousand Years Is Enough" Responsible Policies for Animals)  
David Cantor (1954- )  
American founder and executive director,  
Responsible Policies for Animals  
.................
I first fished at age five, with my brother Greg, who is one year younger. Each of us caught a perch out of a lake in St. Paul, Minnesota. Fascinated, we watched the two perch swim around in a small bucket until first one and then the other died. I don't remember what happened to their bodies, but I know they were not large enough to eat.

Perch are plentiful, and easy to hook, and are therefore considered to be a good species for practice fishing. Many members from both sides of my family were fishers, as well as hunters, trappers, and ranchers. A couple of dead perch didn't rate much concern. Like most children, we learned what we were taught, setting aside whatever qualms we may have felt. Our mother raised us to care for cats and dogs, and we regularly took in strays, despite housing project rules which forbade it. However, we were told that fish had no feelings, and we killed them with abandon.

* * *

Our first decade or so were spent pursuing panfish,
as they were prevalent around the lakes we were able to walk to. Sometimes family members and friends drove us to other lakes. On a good day we would fill up buckets or stringers of sunfish, crappies, bullheads and perch. Sometimes they were eaten, and sometimes they were simply thrown away. The most important thing was the acquisition: the victory. In our early teens we also fished for carp. Although they are considered a "trash" species, not recognized as "game," they are much larger and fight much harder. Carp typically were left to suffocate on the shore. We were told this was good for the other fish in the lake, as carp supposedly turned the bottom to mud. Sometimes I would give a fleeting thought to whether these animals suffered as they lay gasping on the shore. Like catfish and bullheads, carp take a long time to suffocate.

* * *

At one point I decided that live bait fishing was cruel and not particularly "sporting," and I pursued my prey thereafter with artificial lures or dead bait. This, I felt, would be more humane. As time went on, we increasingly often addressed matters of ethics and conservation, at least superficially. Spokespeople for fishing began talking of catch-and-release. This, they assured, would secure both the future of our victims, and the tradition of humans harassing and killing them. In catch-and-release, we would hook our prey, allow them to suffer as they fought for their lives, and then release them, hoping they would survive to endure this torture again. What we never bothered to admit was that any supposed quest for food, our supposed primary objective as hunters, played no part in our new ethic. Yet we could not admit that the vast majority of us were pulling hooks into the mouths, eyes, tongues, throats and internal organs of animals simply because we loved the feeling of their struggle against our cruelty.

* * *

At about the same time catch-and-release became popular, there came another move to make fish abuse more "sporting." [T]he ethical gurus decided that fishers should use lighter gear to fight our victims.

* * *
For me, ultra-light methods were a very successful method of destroying many species of fish. Of course, using ultra-light gear condemned our victims to more suffering than ever in the name of sportsmanship. We thought it was great. A small fish could be fought not for a couple minutes, but perhaps for a quarter of an hour, half an hour, or more. As someone who invested heavily in ultra-light gear, I was able to in some cases extend my victims' misery for hours.

* * *

As I reached my early twenties, I continued my quest for bigger fish. * * *

A library book about shark fishing almost immediately convinced me to try it. * * *

At first, my conversion to shark fishing seemed to quell a fairly quiet but nagging voice suggesting that killing animals, especially those much smaller than me, was not completely defensible as a hobby.

Many fish species are under incredible pressure from humans, but I told myself, as sport fishers still tell themselves, that commercial fishers do the real damage. Commercial fishers, of course, claim the opposite. In truth, there is a fine, often indistinguishable line between the two factions. We are all guilty, though few who still fish will admit it. * * *

I succeeded in killing a 7 ½-foot, 230-pound mako shark, [subjecting] him to five hours of agony before killing him.
For some years the mounted shark hung as a trophy on my office wall. At home were other mounted animal bodies, testimony to my insecurity, insensitivity, and willingness to kill for fun. As I look back, the whole thing seems quite macabre.

* * *

I stole the lives of uncounted victims of many species. But what should have been a killer's dream come true was somehow losing its luster over time and death.

* * *

On occasion we would go night fishing for tuna offshore. Tuna are large, very strong fish, with rigid bodies. Once pulled onto the deck of the boat, they beat their tails incredibly fast and furiously. They can break a fisherman's foot. When the bite was on, the deck could literally be full of tuna struggling for life. In order to keep them still, we simply put a cloth over their exposed eye to block the light and calm them, much as you would calm a horse. This was a problem. Much like a horse? How much like a horse? I wouldn't do this to a horse. Why was I doing this? For years, I managed not to answer that question.

* * *

There was also the time that sea birds were bothering our lines in the chum slick.

* * *

One bird was particularly bold, and refused to react to yells, waves or anything else I did to dissuade him. So I shot him.
At that close range, he was dead immediately.  
His body upended, and his legs flailed.  
While my logical mind knew he was gone, 
my conscience told me that I had done something rotten, 
and to finish it. But the shotgun jammed.  
The next thirty seconds seemed like thirty minutes  
as the bird's legs kicked and "ran," and slowly came to a halt.  
It was almost half an hour before his body floated out of sight.  
I watched almost the entire time,  
knowing I was the world's biggest asshole,  
trying desperately and unsuccessfully to convince myself  
that I had a good reason to do it.  
* * *  
Then my brother and I encountered  
a baby mako shark next to the boat, in our chum slick.  
Mako sharks are fearsome-looking,  
with large gnarly teeth and coal-black eyes  
that make them look as if always enraged.  
But this miniature version...was just plain cute,  
like a lion cub trying to strut his stuff  
with baby growls and tiny hops, feigning attack.  
My brother Greg asked if he could catch the baby,  
and have him mounted.  
This was a common practice, but one that I abhorred.  
This was, after all, a baby.  
* * *  
Initially I refused to allow the capture,  
but when the baby hung around to gorge on the chum,  
a sorry version of brotherly love won out.  
No effort at all was required to capture the baby.  
Greg stuck a dead hooked mackeral in front of him,  
he grabbed it, was hooked,  
and Greg swung him into the boat, into a fish hold.  
We did not shoot or even hit the baby in the head:  
that would ruin the mount.  
I don't remember how long it took him to die, but it was very long.  
Every now and then I would open the hatch  
to see if he was dead yet, and he would look at me.  
Sharks can move their eyes to a point,  
and they can and do follow activities around them.  
I will never forget that baby watching me as I waited for him to die.  
This was probably the lowest I dropped in my long history of killing.  
* * *  
[on a huge mako shark who got away]  
I moaned and groaned my disappointment  
[over a big shark who had eluded me]
to the marina manager, with whom I had become good friends. His response was not what I expected. He looked me in the eye and said, "Steve, I'm glad you didn't kill that fish." I was so taken aback, I said nothing. He told me that such a large mako was almost certainly a female. He said he recently learned that females had to attain many hundreds of pounds before even reaching the age of giving birth. With the mako population in serious decline, he said, we had to stop killing them. This made sense to me, even if I still wanted that "trophy." But then he said, "I'll tell you the truth, I just don't know how much more of this killing I can take." Now that nagging voice I was hearing for years wasn't just in the back of my mind any more. It was being voiced right in front me, by a friend. I didn't know what to say, except to murmur that I respected his right to his opinion. I didn't say that I was having a tougher and tougher time trying to deny this feeling in myself. * * * One of the last straws occurred at a most odd time. I was fishing with a friend and working companion named Rick, with whom I had taken a number of successful fishing trips in the past. We hooked a 200-pound mako shark right at the end of the day. The fish jumped repeatedly and fought hard, all of which we should have enjoyed immensely. Having brought the victim to the side of the boat, I made a good shot with my .357 magnum revolver, right on top of his head, resulting in an instant kill. Rick and I brought our victim right up next to the boat, and as was customary, I sank my hunting knife right behind his head to sever the spinal cord. * * * As the beautiful luminescent blue of the mako began to turn to turn gray with death, I turned to Rick and said, "You know, I just don't enjoy this the way I used to." There. I had said it. That nagging feeling that had dogged me for so long now had a voice, and was my own. But things got stranger when Rick, his smile disappearing, said, "You know, I feel the same way." What was my world coming to?
On the way to my boat in 1989, I chose to stop and see the infamous Hegins Labor Day pigeon shoot. After witnessing my first pigeon shoot, my perception of my animal trophies was never the same. But I did not quit killing easily. Initially, it never crossed my mind that I would actually stop doing what I had done for three decades.

My intention was to stop these vile pigeon shoots, and then go on with the vile things I was doing. I approached many of my hunting and fishing friends for help in fighting pigeon shoots, which...were not only unethical, but cast all of us "legitimate sportsmen" in a bad light. With the exception of my brother, none of the great hunting "conservationists" were willing to take any time away from killing to actually try to help animals.

It was about a year before I gave up blood sports. God knows how I fought to continue to kill. Leaving blood sports meant accepting a whole new set of values, and eventually coming to terms with owing a debt I could never repay. But after Hegins, it became clear that I would have to try.

"Would you still fish if they had vocal cords?"
I believe the answer in most cases would be no. Fishing is as popular as it is precisely because fish do not have the ability to communicate suffering as readily as cats, dogs, cows, or other mammals. But I know they suffer tremendously, just as we would if subjected to such horrendous treatment. While many people may at first be taken aback at the mere suggestion that fish can suffer, I believe society can grasp the concept. And if we can make people feel for those who cannot cry out their suffering, how much more will they feel for those who can? ("I Was a Fish Killer" Animal People, May 1996)

Steve Hindi (1954- )
American founder and president, SHARK SHowing Animals Respect and Kindness

...............
[on seeing a print ad for an "innovative sow management system" that pictures a mother pig wedged between immobilizing metal bars, with her nursing piglets separated from her, outside the farrowing crate; that offers to "provide sows and piglets with animal-friendly comfort, enhance sow condition and security, and increase pigs weaned and weaning weights"; that promises "proven German-engineered stalls for optimal animal comfort and higher returns on investment"; and that sends this warm greeting to sows everywhere: "HAPPY MOTHER'S DAY"]

I can hardly think of anything that's more cruel than keeping a new mother separated from her young. Yet this is what the industry calls "animal friendly comfort." Every instinct tells the sow to care for her baby, just as a human mother longs to touch, smell, hold her infant. But she's imprisoned—unable to fulfill any natural desire. It's heartless to deny this maternal instinct, prohibit contact. And sadder still is the fact that her piglets are all she has. This is the sow's whole world: mothering. She's not like a human mother, who has the distractions of a shopping list, a book to read, a telephone call to make. In contrast, this animal's entire being is centered around experiencing this inborn need—to mother. The ad says this system prevents injury to the sow's young and keeps them "protected" from her—implying that she would otherwise inadvertently crush them. But of course without enough room for even her own body, how could she avoid accidentally harming them in a...crate?

Left to her natural habitat, a mother pig would gently kneel on her front legs and, with great care, lie down to allow her young to suckle. She would also have selected an area free from predators and with sufficient forage. She would have had straw for bedding. a place away from her nest to relieve herself, and so forth.
This would all be natural to her, just as salmon know to spawn upstream. But nothing of what is natural exists in animal agriculture today. Its practices, and our acceptance of them, have brought shame to the human species. We've defiled the nurturing earth with an infestation of warehouse-like factory farms, manure lagoons, slaughterhouses. And we certainly have shown contempt for the devotions entitled to mothers. The industry has made machines of the female body, exploiting sows who will never be able to share affections with their young, hens who will never hatch a chick,... and don't even get me started on dairy cows! With reverence for motherhood and deep respect for the bringers of life: Happy Mother's Day. ("Animal Ag Wounds Mothers, Offends Life" May 10, 2009)

<> To those who refuse to relinquish their privilege of might over reason, I implore you: Allow us to advance as a species. Discard this abusive and archaic notion that we are "better" than others simply because we refuse to acknowledge that other species have a right to their own purpose. I realize contemporary thought wants to claim that all we have we owe to the use of animals as resources. That the taking of them and their slavery and flesh has meant our very survival. But I present the view that no one has any idea how much better off we would be as a civilization had we chosen different means. No one can say for certain that our present existence is the apex of what might have been had we shifted our technology and abandoned the primitive use of nonhumans. * * *

And I don't know. Is the world in such fine shape? On a grand scale there's global warming, droughts, depleted oceans, species extinctions, melting polar ice caps, deforestation, and many other planetary issues. And within our own species we have pandemics, famine, obesity, antibiotic resistance, wars, corruption, violence and crime. Can anyone really say that another path might not have been better?
Likewise, no one can say for certain
how much more advanced we would be
if human slavery had not anchored our progress.
Or wars.
And if man is indeed "the best" and "superior,"
don't we owe it to ourselves to find a better way
beyond the violence and the killing?
("Rights to Animals: Gives Progress to Man" September 14, 2009)
<>
Some people treat everything like trash.
Take, for instance, the friend of a friend who is suddenly homeless.
I've been helping him sell his belongings at a garage sale.
I didn't mind (much) the greasy (animal fat-covered) kitchenware.
I managed to overlook bad housekeeping and ignorant food choices.
But then a load of boxes arrived at my home—one of them with this:
A filthy, dust-covered, mounted dead fish.
A precious, autonomous being who at one time
lived freely in his own environment,
his home being the pristine, fluid contours of the sea.
But one day friend-of-a-friend set about
with his sharpened knives, gaffs and steel hooks
to "catch" his inferior prey.
Friend of a friend spent good time and money
in the hunt for this sea creature.
Friend of a friend felt the power of his boat
that led him to his favorite "fishing spot."
Friend of a friend has charts and gauges
and instruments to lead him to his victims.
Friend of a friend cast his line, securely affixed to his reel and rod
—an extension of his masterly persona.
Friend of a friend went through many others before.
Some were "keepers"—he tossed them into the frigid iced cooler,
and they flapped and croaked while they gasped for their last breath.
Others were "shit fish"—good enough to carve alive as bait
for the next creature to "nibble" on.
* * *
Friend-of-a-friend enjoys one thing
from the capture of these innocent beings: "The Fight."
A good day fishing is one that includes lots of experiences
with fishes who struggle hard, who have size or a strong will to live.
This helps friend-of-a-friend believe it is a "sport"—"a contest."
Of course 99% of the "rules" are made by him.
So, not surprisingly, he finally achieves his victory!
He lands the big one!'
So joyful is he that photos are taken, and bragging rights claimed,
with weights and lengths of the subdued beast.
A tale will be told many times over
of how the creature almost got away.

And so special is this story that friend of a friend
chose to immortalize his moment of conquest with a mounted trophy.
A stuffed carcass, covered with dust, for sale as "trash"
at a yard sale, at a friend-of-a-friend's borrowed home.

* * *
I tried to be kind to him—even as he told me a story
about throwing living fishes at fellow fish-hunters on the boat.
I gather they all laughed with amusement
at the cheapness they could reduce life to.
So friend-of-a-friend, I can only close with one thought.
You have more in common with the person
who threw the dog in the trash (click on link at top of blog)
and with Michael Vick's lust for blood
than you would ever care to acknowledge.
("Yard Sale, Fish Trophy, Michael Vick & Vegan Advocacy" August 10, 2009)
(The above blogs, edited with permission, are on beaelliott.blogspot.com)
Beatrice Elliott (1954- )
American social reformer, feminist, blogger
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P 1 GRAY WHALE (*Eschrichtius robustus*)
Location: Baja, Mexico
Photo by Daniel Kleiman — Danny’s Picturez/Flickr & © Daniel Kleiman's Photography
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/dannyboy23/4087780911
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/dannyboy23
Photographer's website: www.danielkleiman.webs.com

P 1 HUMPBACK WHALE FLUKE (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)
Photo by Tony Hisgett—ahisgett/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Fluke.jpg
and here: www.flickr.com/photos/hisgett/221991228
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/hisgett

P 4 HARBOR SEAL (*Phoca vitulina*)
Location: Coastline of Maine, U.S.A.
Photo by Chuck Whitney (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Courtesy of Gale — yeimaya/Flickr and © WhaleBlog
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/yeimaya/89347342
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/yeimaya
Home page: http://whaleblog.blogspot.com

P 8 CARIBOU (*Rangifer tarandus*)
Location: Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska, U.S.A.
Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.bobschillereff.com/p841562811/h78e2189#h78e2189
Photographer's website: www.bobschillereff.com

P 14 (LEFT) "HOLD THE LINE" WHITE ROOSTER (*Gallus gallus domesticus*)
and (RIGHT) "RUNAWAY BOY" WHITE DUCK (*Anas domesticus*)
Location: The Netherlands
Photos by Maria Jo — ♥okkibox/Flickr and © Okkibox Fine Art Photography
Rooster photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox/4104825725
Duck photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox/3502671464
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox
Photographer's website: www.okkibox.nl

P 15 FARM SANCTUARY'S 2007 CELEBRATION FOR THE TURKEYS (*Meleagris gallopavo*)
SAMMI (LEFT) AND AYA CHOW DOWN ON THEIR THANKSGIVING FEAST
Location: Watkins Glen, New York, U.S.A.
Photo by Jo-Anne McArthur/© Jo-Anne McArthur Photography
Photo license: Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 2.0
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/farmsanctuary1/2105419817
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/farmsanctuary1
Photographer's websites: www.joannemcarthur.com and www.weanimals.com

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 91)
(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 90)

P 18 CABOOSE, A PIG (*Sus scrofa domesticus*)
Location: Animal Acres, Acton, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Erin Pfeifer
Photo seen here: animalacres.org/Caboose_The_Pig
Home page: www.animalacres.org

P 19 PUNKY DOODLE, A HOLSTEIN COW (*Bos taurus*)
Location: Animal Acres, Acton, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Erin Pfeifer
Photo seen here: animalacres.org/Punky_Doodle_The_Holstein
Home page: www.animalacres.org

P 23 CLARA, A TURKEY HEN (*Meleagris gallopavo*)
Location: Animal Acres, Acton, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Erin Pfeifer
Photo seen here: animalacres.org/Clara_The_Turkey_Hen
Home page: www.animalacres.org

P 30 NYANGO, AN ENDANGERED CROSS RIVER GORILLA (*Gorilla gorilla diehli*)
Location: Limbe Wildlife Centre, Limbe, Cameroon
Photo by Julie Langford (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Cross-river-gorilla.jpg

P 32 CHIMPANZEES MAYOS (left) AND NANGA EBOKO CRES (*Pan troglodytes*)
Location: Limbe Wildlife Centre, Limbe, Cameroon
Left photo seen here: www.limbewildlife.org/animals/chimpanzees/mayos
Right photo seen here: www.limbewildlife.org/animals/chimpanzees/nanga

P 37 BELLA GETS TICKLED BY CHIMPANZEE FRIEND JACOB (*Pan troglodytes*)
Location: Center for Great Apes, Wauchula, Florida, U.S.A.
Photo by Patti Ragan
Bella seen here: www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=4
Jacob seen here: www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=15
Home page: www.centerforgreatapes.org

P 40 LELAND, A GRAND OLE TURKEY—IN MEMORIUM (*Meliagris gallopavo*)
Location: Animal Place Sanctuary, Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3154611697
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia

P 44 "REACH FOR THE PRIZE!" GIRAFFE BROWSES ON LEAF (*Giraffa camelopardalis*)
Photo by Valerie Abbott — ucumari/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari/3858358875
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari

P 45 "LOOKING BEYOND" GIRAFFE PORTRAIT (*Giraffa camelopardalis*)
Watercolor by Madeleine Tuttle

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 92)
PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 91

P 47 "ME, ME...DON'T FORGET ME...I WANT TO BE IN THE PICTURE"
THREE GIRAFFES GAZE WAY...DOWN...THERE... (Giraffa camelopardalis)
Photo by Valerie Abbott — ucumari/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari/3928968364
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari

P 49 "LITTLE BABY GIRAFFE BUTT" (Giraffa camelopardalis)
Photo by Valerie Abbott — ucumari/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari/2842611571
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/ucumari

P 54 COUGAR KITTEN PLAYS KING OF THE HILL (Puma concolor)
Location: Big Cat Rescue, Tampa, Florida, U.S.A.
Photo (left) seen here: bigcatrescue.biz/Cougar-Photo-2329
Photo (right) seen here: bigcatrescue.biz/Cougar-Photo-2330
Home page: www.bigcatrescue.org

P 57 WOLF PUPS HANG OUT (Canis lupus)
Photographers hold copyrights but are not identified on this website
Non-commercial, educational, inspirational use of photos is permitted
Photo seen here: firstpeople.us/Wolf-Pups/Gallery_1_Wolves
Home page: http://www.firstpeople.us

American Indians.
First People is a child friendly site about American Indians and members of the First
Nations. 1400+ legends, 400+ agreements and treaties, 10,000+ pictures, free
clipart, Pueblo pottery, American Indian jewelry, Native American Flutes and more.

P 60 "ALIVE" PIG PORTRAIT (Sus scrofa domesticus)
Watercolor by Madeleine Tuttle

P 65 (LEFT) AMERICAN STAFFORDSHIRE TERRIER IN TULIPS (Canis lupus familiaris)
Photo by de:Benutzer:Mank (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo link: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/American_Staffordshire_Terrier

P 65 (RIGHT) "IT'S ALL BLACK AND WHITE..." HOLSTEIN CALF (Bos taurus)
Location: Stodmarsh, Kent, England, U.K.
Photo by Keven Law — law_keeven/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00/2508353373
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/66165659@N00

P 69 PIGEONS AT A PARK IN ORLANDO, FLORIDA, U.S.A. (Columba livia)
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/ntripp

P 76 PENELope, A RESCUED BASSET HOUND (Canis lupus familiaris)
Location: Broome County, New York, U.S.A.
Photo by ArtMutt/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/7253497@N04/4043772577
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/7253497@N04

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 93)
P 78 BABY KOALA EYES YUMMY EUCALYPTUS LEAVES (*Phascolarctos cinereus*)
Location: Australia
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/CraigRJD
Article on poisoned eucalyptus trees: [iol.co.za/Australia's_Koalas_May_Disappear](http://iol.co.za/Australia's_Koalas_May_Disappear)

P 79 CLIMBING PERCH (*Anabas testudineus*)
Illustration published in *The Royal Natural History* (1894-1896)
Illustration by Richard A. Lydekker (Public Domain photo)

P 81 SHORTFIN MAKO SHARK (*Isurus oxyrhinchus*)
Source: SWFSC/NOAA (Public Domain photo)
Photo seen here: [http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Isurus_oxyrhinchus.png](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Isurus_oxyrhinchus.png)
NOAA is the U.S. National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
SWFSC is the Southwest Fisheries Science Center within NOAA Fisheries Service

P 82 "SOMEBODY SAY DINNER TIME?" ASKS MR. SEAGULL (*Larus occidentalis*)
Photo by Keven Law — [law_keven/Flickr](http://www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00) (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00/2145012371](http://www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00/2145012371)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00](http://www.flickr.com/photos/66164549@N00)

P 86 "SUCKLING PIGS IN SEPIA" (*Sus scrofa domesticus*)
Photo by Keith Marshall/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/keithmarshall/3310467622](http://www.flickr.com/photos/keithmarshall/3310467622)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/keithmarshall](http://www.flickr.com/photos/keithmarshall)

P 89 FRIENDLY LARGEMOUTH BASS—MORE THAN IN NAME! (*Micropterus salmoides*)
Location: Lake Mead, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada, U.S.A.
Photo by Chris-Håvard Berge/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/chberge/3751870558](http://www.flickr.com/photos/chberge/3751870558)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/chberge](http://www.flickr.com/photos/chberge)
Photographer’s website: [http://zibbit.org/blogg](http://zibbit.org/blogg)
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