A pig feels the world as something, and relates to others around him as similar beings. It is here that we find the source of personhood. Individuality does not exist in solitude, but in relation to others.

* * *

It is because of this that the role of moral concern toward animals should be adopted. Not only do they have personhood, but the capacity to recognize that personhood forms the grounds for our own personhood. Something is amiss in our capacities and very nature, if animals are viewed as mechanical objects: we are not individuals before we relate to other animals as individuals, too.

Elisa Aaltola, Ph.D.
Finnish ethicist and moral philosopher

................
We should not only give animals individual value and see them as persons, but actually owe them more than mere recognition: one-sided "interaction" and their personhood requires that drastic changes be made in how animals are perceived and treated.

The personhood of animals ought to be not only 1) acknowledged, and 2) respected, but also 3) ensured. It can be argued that there is a duty to enable the "flourishing" of animal capacities by offering animals contexts in which they can be "persons."

Animals that can experience are persons. This carries clear implications from the point of view of the individual value of animals, the political concept of "animal rights" and the manner in which animals are used for different purposes.

The personhood of animals implies individual value, which 1) is based on (an) intrinsic characteristic(s) of the animal, 2) confers direct obligations toward the animal as a whole, and 3) the consequences/obligations of which are experienced by the animal.

Moreover, the basis of the suggested personhood provides new dimensions to animal ethics, as animal individuality is not described only through a given capacity, but also through various relations (to the animal herself, surroundings, other beings, the context, etc.). Most importantly, animals are not passive entities that are only to be "protected" (as "protectionists" or "welfarists" argue), but active individuals, whose activity needs to be acknowledged, respected, and ensured.

("Personhood and Animals: three approaches" © 2008 cep.unt.edu and oxfordanimalethics.com)

Elisa Aaltola, Ph.D.
Finnish ethicist and moral philosopher
Research Fellow, Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics

.................
My position is that Jesus' teachings on mercy in the Beatitudes require an open-ended ethical inquiry. I ask, for example, how a Christian may speak of mercy in the terms of Jesus Christ, and deny mercy to creatures of God who, as we do, experience pain and suffering. Isn't it the case that Jesus constantly went beyond the letter of the law to its spirit?

(Encounter)

Brother Aelred
Australian Franciscan monk

[...]ions of farm animals daily endure lives of abject misery in factory farms. Barely able to move, they endure acts of cruelty that would be illegal if [done to companion animals]. Imagine a life without sunshine, without freedom, without being able to socialize, without hope.

* * *

Welcome to the "life" of a factory-farmed animal. How has this happened? As custodians of this planet, we have been guilty of playing favorites. We have designated some animals friends and some animals food. Yet they are no different. All share the same ability to suffer, the same need and desire to experience life, joy, meaning, and purpose.

(edgarsmission.org.au)<>
I am sure that everyone has had important teachers in their lives [who] have inspired and guided them. I have too—except that mine perhaps are a little more unusual, in that the most important teachers in my life have been animals. And one in particular—now a very large white pig called Edgar, who came into my life in 2003 and changed it forever. Because of all that Edgar and my animal friends taught me—because of all I learned about the treatment of their kind—I decided to create Edgar's Mission Farm Sanctuary. What is our mission? To promote the power of kindness [to] all animals. [N]ot just animals that share our hearts and homes, not just pets and ponies, but all animals, such as Edgar and his kind, need and deserve our compassion, kindness and understanding as well. ("Vegan Voices" veganpoet.com)

Pam Ahern
Australian founder, Edgar's Mission Farm Sanctuary

..............
An animal is a living, breathing being
we have a responsibility to care for.
We humans are born into the heavenly state.

* * *

It is disobedience that removes us.
In order to make a difference for the animals,
we must focus on...bringing the humans
back into the obedience state.
Animals are not disobedient,
so we can learn from the animals.
The animals have always been [in a heavenly state].
(remarks at Best Friends Animal Sanctuary
retreat for religious leaders, August 3, 2007)

Imam Qasim Ahmed
American founder and director, Islamic Learning Institute

[based on William Blake's "Auguries of Innocence"]
"A Robin redbreast in a cage
Puts all Heaven in a rage."

......
One robin caged and Heaven's mad!
But when to just that one someone
you add vast flocks of battered battery birds
and half starved calves in crated herds
and multitudes of tethered sows in narrow stalls
these horrors rouse all Heaven to a rage so wild
its former rage seems a wonderous mild.

Patrick Allen

Any term referring to the supposed "humane production"
of animal products is an oxymoron.

* * *

Some of the most egregious cases
of animal abuse we have encountered
have come from so-called "cage-free" facilities
and "family" farms.

* * *

Many people get upset when they learn the real truth,
and even feel betrayed because respected organizations,
on whom they relied for accurate information,
told them that certain animal products
were a "humane" or "compassionate" choice.
No one wants to believe (or be told)
that they support any kind of animal abuse
—especially when they thought they had made a significant lifestyle change motivated by their desire to not support an injustice.

* * *

The fact of the matter is that we all make choices throughout the day that have enormous impact on others. As consumers, we must never forget that every time we eat, we are either making a peaceful choice or a destructive choice, and that the animals have NO choice. We can choose not to support cruelty to animals. We can choose to explore the endless possibilities that a plant-based diet offers. We can choose not to support environmentally destructive animal agribusiness. We can choose to be healthy, educated, and compassionate. And as advocates for the animals, we can either tell the whole truth to the public or not. It's up to us to choose. Either way, the consequences are our responsibility. The power of choice is the greatest power we have to make a difference. ("Farmed Animal Experts Speak Out" humanemyth.org)

Michele Alley-Grubb
American co-founder, Peaceful Prairie Sanctuary

Compassion towards people and compassion towards animals are not mutually exclusive. A truly sympathetic person cannot turn his or her feelings on and off like a faucet, depending on the species, race, sex or creed of the victim. God teaches us in Psalms 36:6 and in Matthew 6:26 and 10:29 that his compassion encompasses all creatures, human and animal. Shall we not imitate our Heavenly Father?

<> When we Christians are compassionate to animals, we are imitating our Heavenly Father. If non-Christian people are leading the way in respect for the lives of animals, it is because we Christians have failed to be the light Jesus commanded us to be. We should be an example of boundless mercy. <>
Not only is it totally Scriptural to be a vegetarian, but when done in service to the true and living God, it may well be as close to a heavenly lifestyle as one can get!

(What the Bible Says about Vegetarianism: God’s Best for All Concerned © 1991)

Frances Arnetta
Founder, Christians Helping Animals and People

Sport hunting is an evil that has no redeeming virtues. Regrettably, most people (including many members of environmental organizations) consider public hunting to be a minor ecological issue, or no issue at all. But modern sport hunting, and the system that helps to perpetuate it, is a significant factor, and in some areas the primary factor, that has destroyed the balance of nature.

* * *
Wildlife biologists have been nurtured on the hunting philosophy and have been taught that ecosystems can be improved by manipulation. Unfortunately, the more man tampers with Nature, the more he must rely upon "management" activities to maintain a semblance of ecological balance; and these activities are harmful to established ecosystems.  
(The American Hunting Myth © 1985)  
Ron Baker  
American naturalist and author  
.................

We humans, stratified, divided, and warring among ourselves, are nonetheless the indisputable ruling class of planet earth. In fighting for our own intra-human liberation, we have largely ignored or trivialized the oppression and violence perpetrated in our name...against nonhuman animals.  
(The New Abolitionists © 1987)  
B. R. Boyd  
.................

Man kills in one day more cattle than all carnivorous animals do in a hundred years. Notwithstanding this, no cattle—no animal—fears man, and even cows let themselves be milked by man, and this would be impossible to perform if man were a carnivorous animal.  
* * *  
Man and animals are in a state of evolution, and there is no doubt that the future belongs to the vegetarians. Plants and fruits will be the only nourishment in the future, not only for man but for animals. Even the carnivorous species will have to adapt themselves to a diet of plants, or they will die out. "And the cow and the bear shall feed; and their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox" (Isaiah, 11:6). The custom of eating meat is outrageous and immoral. It is one of the means by which man separates himself from his natural environment, and also a means of working against biological evolution in general and against morality.  
("Our Natural Food" World Vegetarian Congress speech, 1957)  
Charles Brandt  
British philosopher  
.................
There is no question of any advantage to be gained at all. Animal experiments confuse the issues and their results will never have scientific precision. There is absolutely no connection between vivisection and human health. The general belief in the value of animal experimentation is the result of brainwashing that the public has been submitted to for a long time. (Israel Medical and Juridical Society lecture, November 1, 1986)

The abolition of vivisection must be total. In a single year in the USA, 1.5 million people have been hospitalized because of side effects from drugs, which had all been preventively tested on animals. Animals are completely different from humans and no animal species can serve as an experimental model for man.

* * *

There are more than four hundred methods of medical research that do not require animals. But far more important than any research is prevention. And prevention is being practically ignored by the medical organization because it costs little or nothing. We must change method and we must change the law. We must have abolition, and it has to be total. ("Vivisection or Science: A Choice to Make" 1989 speech to the Italian Parliament on behalf of The International Congress of Doctors Against Vivisection)

Arie Brecher, M.D.
Israeli pediatrician

************

Our love of God should be extended as far as possible to all God's creatures, to our fellow human beings and to animals.

* * *

In His love, God caused them all to exist, to express His feelings for beauty and order, and not merely to provide food and companionship for man. They are part of God's creation and it is God's will that they should be happy, quite as much as it is His will that we should be happy. The Christian ought to be bitterly ashamed for the unnecessary suffering that men still cause their animal brothers.

The Reverend E. E. Bromwich, M.A.
English clergyman

************
Vegetarianism helps us to preserve and protect our health, environment, culture, community, society, and spirit l’dor vador, from generation to generation. Ecclesiastes 3:19, which is attributed to King Solomon, says: "The fate of men and the fate of animals, they have one and the same fate. As one dies, so does the other, and they all have the same spirit."

What we do to animals and the environment, therefore, we are ultimately doing to ourselves and our communities. We are fouling our own nest. Like Leo Baeck, I am struck with "ethical optimism." We can do better. Rav Kook, the first Chief Rabbi of pre-state Israel, famously wrote "hayashan yitchadesh, v’hechadash yitkadesh, the old shall be made new, and the new shall be made holy." A shift toward vegetarianism can also be a major factor in the rededication, revitalization, and renewal of Judaism, as it would further demonstrate that Jewish values are not only relevant but essential to everyday personal life, communal development, and global survival. If you want to make a powerful and positive difference and have more meaning in your life, living by Judaism's highest ideals, participating in a lifelong, life-affirming spiritual process, then vegetarianism is the best gift you could give yourself, your family, our community, and our world.
To paraphrase Hillel:
Do not do unto other beings
what would be hateful if done to you.
All the rest is dessert. Now go and eat!
("The Planet-Saving Mitzvah: Why Jews Should
Consider Vegetarianism" Tikkun July/August 2009)
Daniel Brook
American author, speaker, sociology instructor

The way to stop useless and unnecessary animal experimentation
is simply to make it unprofitable:
Eliminate the funding by the government agencies
or eliminate the agencies.
* * *
If the flow of taxpayer dollars that supports
the foolish or cruel or dangerous practices of official science
is cut off, these practices will stop.
* * *
From a scientific standpoint, what is pertinent
is that what are called "animal model systems"
in cancer research have been a total failure.
* * *
The tens of millions of animals killed
in the mass-screening for new cancer drugs died in vain.
The hundreds of millions spent by the National Cancer Institute
on this futile effort were diverted from genuine cancer research
that might have provided useful drugs.
* * *
The money was spent and the animals were killed for two main reasons.
First, it was a highly profitable undertaking
for certain medical schools and research institutes
that were incapable of doing any genuine cancer research.
Second, it was sustained by a superstitious belief
in a grossly unscientific notion: that mice are miniature men.
* * *
Since there is no way to defend the use of animal model systems
in plain English or with scientific facts,
they resort to double talk in technical jargons.
* * *
The virtue of animal model systems
to those in hot pursuit of the federal dollars
is that they can be used to prove anything
—no matter how foolish, or false, or dangerous this might be.
There is such a wide variation in the results of animal model systems
that there is always some system that will "prove" a point.
Fraudulent methods of argument never die and rarely fade away. They are too useful to promoters.

* * *

The moral is that animal model systems kill not only animals, they also kill humans. There is no good factual evidence to show that the use of animals in cancer research has led to the prevention or cure of a single human cancer. ("Animals in Cancer Research: A Multi-Billion Dollar Fraud" *Fundamental and Applied Toxicology*, November 1982)

Irwin D. J. Bross, Ph.D.
American cancer research specialist and author

I don't understand why anyone would want to kill a hawk. I have a lot of friends who hunt and this is an aspect of their personality I don't understand. I would rather spend a day in jail than go hunting.

Judge Bailey Brown

We are today living through a new watershed in human-animal relations, one that appears likely to affect our material, social, and imaginative lives as profoundly as the original emergence of domestic species. (Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships © 2005)

<>[on man's ever-changing relationship with animals]

Postdomesticity refers to a group of attitudes and practices that arise in societies that rely heavily on animal products—meat, milk products, leather, etc.—while most people living in the society have no contact at all with the producing animals. Feelings of guilt and shame about animal slaughter in all its forms (hunting, meat-packing, fur harvesting, etc.) are central characteristics of postdomesticity. These feelings underlie an increasing sensitivity to animal rights and opposition to hunting, trapping, fur farming, and use of animals as experimental subjects. They also motivate people who have no relevant religious or cultural background as vegetarians to choose a vegetarian life-style. I call this "elective vegetarianism."

* * *
Some of its trends, such as humane societies, "scientific" zoos, and pet shows, can be traced back to Victorian England. The major period of onset of postdomesticity in the United States, however, was the 1960s and 1970s. This is when animal liberation and elective vegetarianism began to make headway. And it is also the time when the general public began to take great interest in scientific efforts to narrow the distance between humans and animals, whether through trying to teach apes and dolphins to communicate or through field-work designed to show the complexity of animal social life in the wild.

As for where this took place, postdomestic attitudes have spread most rapidly in England, the United States and Canada, and Australia and New Zealand. Continental Europe is only now following in the same path. Most other parts of the world (except Japan, which manifests a very different pattern of human-animal relations) still belong to the era of domesticity when domestic animals other than pets were more or less present in the lives of most people, and utilization of animal products was taken for granted.

* * *

Postdomesticity emerges from the extreme objectification of domestic animals in the late domestic era. By this, I am referring to animals being treated solely as sources of consumer products by the animal industry. Yet when the domestic era began some ten thousand years ago, this sort of material exploitation was much less important than traditions of considering animals as spiritual entities that carried over from the late predomestic era. Predomesticity was the previous period of tens of thousands of years when humans foraged for subsistence along with many other animal species.

* * *

A contradiction is growing between ever-increasing meat consumption worldwide—largely prompted by growing income levels—and increasingly assertive opposition to animal exploitation. There does not seem to be an obvious point of compromise between these trends. It is likely, therefore, that animal rights will gradually be incorporated into a "Western" philosophical viewpoint that is held out to the rest of the world as a mark of a higher standard of civilization. Analogies will doubtless be drawn to women's rights, racial equality, and respect for minorities.
This will probably be strongly resisted by societies that see animal rights advocacy as an effort to keep meat on the table in American homes, but limit meat-eating in the rest of the world. Thus I would expect human-animal relations to become a central matter of debate...in coming decades. At the same time, I expect to see ever more attempts to come to grips with the question of how humans, as an animal species, should ethically relate to other species. And I expect to see greatly expanded research on these questions among historians, anthropologists, and ethicists.

(Interview with Richard W. Bulliet Columbia University Press August 2005)

Richard W. Bulliet, Ph.D. American author and professor of history

The sorrowful cow bellows

As calf is handled
By the farmer.
The calf's legs sway beneath him,
As the veal crate awaits.
It would be better not to have been born at all,
For in the veal crate, a cruel dark existence lies ahead.
The days spent with her calf are over for the noble cow.
Her swollen udders long for nuzzling calf,
Exchanged now, for cold electrical nozzles.
The sound of the milk trucks can be heard nightly,
Rumbling away from the farm,
Stealing the calf's very sustenance of life.
She bellow pitifully as she listens.
Soon she will be artificially inseminated again. 
Meantime, at the market, her day-old calf
No longer stands,
His weak legs collapse on market floor.
And as the hammer of doom,
Swings down on his sad pathetic life,
The milk trucks still rumble on.
("The Daily Pinta" Christian Vegetarian Association UK)
**Madelaine Butler**
British poet

-------------

All animals perform tremendous acts of service
whether or not we label their activity as such.
Companion animals, and wild animals too,
simply by virtue of their presence in our lives and in the world,
serve to uplift our spirit
and draw us closer to an experience of the divine.
Every creature comes to serve in its own capacity.
The animals remember this;
many human beings have forgotten.
St. Francis of Assisi said:
"Be conscious, O man, of the wondrous state
in which God placed you, for he created you and formed you
to the image of his beloved Son—and yet all the creatures
under heaven, each according to its nature,
serve, know, and obey their creator better than you."
In this new age of consciousness we are being called
to examine how we arrived at the present state
of Holocaust against the animals
and to do our part in healing our relationship with them.
Dr. Michael Fox, veterinarian..., says:
"It is not a question of us drawing some arbitrary line
as to which creatures and to what extent we should exploit them.
Rather, we should draw a circle, a boundless circle of compassion
to include all creatures and Creation
within the scope of our respect and reverence.
By so doing, we enrich the significance of our own lives
and enhance our own spiritual development."
Animals are a healing ministry upon the Earth.
They are children of God just as we are,
Emissaries of Light and Love helping to facilitate the blossoming
of the One Consciousness of which we and they are a part.
They do this job magnificently and with tremendous courage.
Animals can, if we allow them to,
bring us out of the past into present time.
If we meet them in present time, and honor their true gifts to us, our relationship with them can be redeemed. The time for atonement has come, at-one-ment. When we feel our oneness with all living things the past is healed. In a state of present awareness and oneness, we are brought into alignment with the continuous outpouring of the Divine Essence of God, which is Love, and we are healed—for healing in the true sense is the lifting of the Spirit into Grace. Each of us can be a part of the healing of humanity's relationship with animals. Every time we feel an outpouring of love for an animal, or perform some small kindness toward them, we can offer up that love and kindness to the spirit of all animals.

When we catch a glimpse of a beautiful wild creature, we can take time to thank it for its magnificence and for gracing our life in that moment. Our thanks will be received by the animal and our love transmitted to all others of its species and the entire over-soul of animals as well. Each day we can offer deep appreciation to our own animal companions for their presence in our lives.
* * * * 
Dr. Fox says that it makes him angry when people talk about blessing animals. He says "the animals don't need our blessing. We need their blessing!"
So let us ask for the blessing of the animals, their forgiveness and their mercy. In this way we will bring light to the darkness and suffering of which we have been a part, —and we will begin to dissolve all obstacles to the shimmering presence of Love that is the true identity of every being.
It is said that the beating of a butterfly's wing is felt by the farthest star.
All things are connected.
With each act of kindness, with each loving thought, with each prayer, the entire world is lifted closer to a state of grace for all beings.
("Healing Humanity's Relationships With Animals" animalliberty.com)
<> 
All through my life animals have been my wise friends and spiritual companions.
Dogs, cats, horses, rabbits, mice, birds and more recently a fox and a coyote.
They each had a sacred gift to share with me.
* * * *

[A]nimals have been some of my greatest teachers and my life has been profoundly enriched by their presence. From them I have learned about joy, spontaneity, humor, acceptance, surrender, devotion, fidelity, death and resurrection.
* * * *
And when it comes to angels...I have begun to realize that many angels have whiskers and wet noses... and even those winged ones sometimes have beaks!
("The Forgotten Angels" animalliberty.com)
Sharon Callahan
American writer and photographer
Animal communication specialist
................

We have a moral responsibility. How well this responsibility is met could very well determine the outcome of our civilization. So long as there is violence and cruelty to animals, so long will we be steeped in violence and cruelty to mankind. The manner in which we treat animals is a good indication of the moral character of our society.
Many times I'm told I should stop protecting animals and start protecting people. I'm deeply concerned about the poor/the children/the elderly/the sick and those persecuted because of race, color and creed. Their suffering is my suffering, but at least they can talk for their own defense; animals cannot! ("The Rights of Animals")
C. Richard Calore
American founder, National Cat Protection Society

[on vivisection]
When evaluated on the basis of real usefulness to humanity, "scientific research" is a fraud, whether intentional or not.
William A. Cave
President, American Anti-Vivisection Society

Do we, as humans, having an ability to reason and to communicate abstract ideas verbally and in writing, and to form ethical and moral judgments using the accumulated knowledge of the ages, have the right to take the lives of other sentient organisms, particularly when we are not forced to do so by hunger or dietary need, but rather do so for the somewhat frivolous reason that we like the taste of meat? In essence, shouldn't we know better?
(Contemporary Issues in Animal Agriculture © 1999)
Peter Cheeke, Ph.D.
American author and professor of animal nutrition

I'm a vegetarian and sort of a conscientious objector. I object to eating my patients, so for this reason

I don't like to treat animals that are raised for food.
(The Register Herald June 26, 2001)
Barbara Clayton, D.V.M.
American veterinarian
I regard being vegetarian as a calling, as a permanent and joyous fast, as a component of the more merciful life-style that Christ and St. Francis beckon us to live. For myself, I cannot reconcile Christ's call to "be merciful" with the horrors of the slaughterhouse. When I remember the Lord's call to "feed the hungry", I cannot buy quarter-pounders for my family of four, knowing the pound of meat we will eat required 25 pounds of plant food to produce. When I read in the Prophets how Yahweh often calls Himself "Lord of all flesh," I can no longer bring myself to eat flesh.

* * *

Job's call to "learn from the animals" has not earned our teachers any greater respect.

Balaam's donkey is the only animal in Scripture to converse directly with man —and why does God give her this power?
So she can beg for her life—offer her devotion and humility in the face of Balaam's irrational, murderous rage.

* * *

Why do the same people who profess concern about the "balance of nature" wreck that balance by crushing the environment under the vast numbers, befouling waste-products, and gargantuan resource consumption of millions of meat-victim animals?
(response to a letter in *The Franciscan Times* episcoveg.weblogger.com)

<>

When the dream of God is fulfilled, where will they put the slaughterhouses?

**Weston F. Cook, Jr.**
**American writer**

----------

We require now to extend the great principles of liberty, equality and fraternity over the lives of animals. Let animal slavery join human slavery in the graveyard of the past.

**Patrick Corbett, Ph.D.**
**British professor of philosophy**

----------

Not having known anything better does not alleviate the suffering of the animal. Its fundamental desires remain and it is the frustration of those desires that is a great part of its suffering. There are so many examples: the dairy cow who is never allowed to raise her young, the battery hen who can never walk or stretch her wings, the sow who can never build a nest or root for food in the forest.

* * *

Eventually we frustrate the animal's most fundamental desire of all—to live.

* * *

You cannot justify or defend a practice on the grounds that it is profitable. After all, a great many crimes are very profitable too. We should ask ourselves not how much an animal's life is worth to us but how much it is worth to the animal—for whom it is everything.

* * *

Everybody is entitled to their own opinion but freedom of thought does not always imply freedom of action.
You may believe that animals should be killed,
that black people should be enslaved
or that women should be beaten,
but that does not necessarily give you the right
to put your beliefs into practice.
Freedom is conditional;
do as you please but not through the suffering of others.
* * *
To indoctrinate is to impose an idea
without acceptance of question or criticism.
The animal rights movement is built
of people who refuse indoctrination
—free-thinking individuals who will question and criticize
and are not afraid to tell others what they have found.
That is education.
* * *
You do not need to experience the abuse of animals
first hand to be able to criticize it
any more than you need to experience
rape, slavery or war to criticize those.
You only need to know that they are there.
No one, mercifully, will ever be witness
to all the suffering in the world
but the responsibility to try and end that suffering lies with us all.
(excerpts from The Manual of Animal Rights)
David Cowles-Hamar
British singer, The Bigger the God rock quartet
...............

Since 1996, we have rescued and cared for
hundreds of cows, pigs, sheep, goats, chickens and turkeys,
the vast majority of whom came from small farms,
where they were being raised for meat, milk or eggs.
As someone who has witnessed first-hand
the terrible neglect and abuse of animals on these sorts of farms,
I know that small-scale farming
is no more humane than large-scale industrial farming.
* * *
We often see visitors at our sanctuary
who are convinced that they are helping animals
by purchasing "cage free" eggs or "local" beef.
When they learn that the vast majority of our animals
were rescued from small-scale farms,
they are surprised and confused,
as they have heard so many good things
about these types of operations.
We now have to spend much more time describing in detail what really goes on at so-called "free-range" farms, where the animals may have a little more room to move, but are still treated terribly. And no matter what, they are all eventually killed in the same way as those who come from the large-scale industrialized farms.

* * *

During our educational tours, we describe how our sanctuary animals were rescued from farms where they were starved, neglected and abandoned. We explain that the best thing people can do to help animals is to stop eating them. We encourage people to try the wide variety of delicious plant-based foods and meat and dairy alternatives. After meeting and interacting with rescued animals and realizing that they are all individuals who have distinct personalities and are worthy of care and respect, visitors often feel motivated to change.

We hope that by offering people an opportunity to meet these former victims and by telling their stories, we can help to dispel the myth that the raising and killing of any animals could ever be considered humane. ("Farmed Animal Experts Speak Out" humanemyth.org)

Terry Cummings
American co-founder, Poplar Spring Animal Sanctuary

Children feel what their elders forget, our touching kinship with animals.

Bertha Damon
American author

-------------
I fail to understand why teaching kids not to eat meat and not to kill animals, which I think is teaching respect for life, is considered coercion, whereas teaching them to eat meat is not.  

Robert Donjacour

A gorilla stood alone in a concrete cell.  
Our eyes met, and his expressed deep anger and grief.  
My grade-school class was visiting the zoo, a place I found heavily oppressive.  
Four at a time, my classmates climbed onto a camel for a ride. Because she looked burdened and miserable, I refused.  
At age seven or so, I saw a boy intentionally stomp a caterpillar. "It would have been a butterfly!" I cried.  
My childhood companions included a red-eared slider turtle, parakeets, and dogs. I loved each of them intensely, and when they died I intensely mourned. Yet, throughout childhood I ate nonhuman animals' flesh, milk, and eggs and wore their hair and skin. Decades later as a graduate student, I used rats in experiments. Somehow the child who had mourned a turtle, pitied a camel, and protested the killing of a caterpillar had become a vivisector. What enables such contradictions? To great extent, evasive and deceptive language. When we indirectly participate in nonhuman victimization, the victims usually are visually absent. Standard linguistic usage keeps them verbally absent as well. As a child, I ate "bacon" and "ham" without giving a thought to pigs. If anyone had spoken of pig flesh or remains,
I might have considered their slaughter.
As a graduate student, I ordered ten rats, like so many test tubes, for experimental use because they were "laboratory rats" and I was a "researcher."
Those labels permitted self-disguise.
I didn't see myself as an abuser—not yet.
Then I observed vivisection for the first time.
At the University of Pennsylvania every veteran vivisector in the psychology department treated rats with callous indifference.
I heard rats scream as their ears were hole-punched for identification.
I saw them flung by the tail into metal boxes that fit them like coffins.
There they stayed 23 hours a day, unable to look out.

So that they would work for food, some rats were kept half starved. Others received electric shocks.
Still others were subjected to painful injury such as stomach puncture.
Termed "procedures" and "methods,"
all forms of torture escaped moral judgment.
Initially, like the department's other vivisectors,
I viewed rats as mine to use. My experiments (which my advisor called "the world's most benign")
didn't cause pain, but they did entail deprivation.
By nature, rats are social, lively, and curious.
They eat a wide variety of foods.
Individually confined to small wire cages,
"my rats" endured isolation, inaction, and an unchanging environment.
Two hours a day they had access to one type of food pellet, always the same.
In addition to sharing the same monotonous
surroundings and routine,
all ten rats belonged to the same albino strain
and had been born the same day.
In the language of vivisection they were "standardized."
But each had a highly distinct appearance,
intelligence, and personality.
Brutus had an overbite,
Horace a nick in one ear that gave him a rakish look,
Rufus a face so round that he resembled a harp-seal cub.
Marcus immediately learned the experimental task;
Terence never did.
Only Livy ever creased his brow and looked cross.
Cato was easygoing, Pliny tense.
Long and muscular, Zeno moved
boldly, unlike Virgil, who was small and frail.
The more I saw the rats as individuals,
the more I considered their desires and needs.
I arranged for bigger cages. Still too small.
I put a chew toy inside each cage. Not good enough.
When the experiments ended,
the rats had no more use as "tools,"
so my advisor instructed me to have them killed.
To me, however, the rats were persons.
To kill them would be morally wrong: murder.
I obtained permission to adopt all ten.
The rats reacted to increased freedom and variety with excitement.
Eagerly they explored my apartment and ate new foods.
At his first taste of cantaloupe, Rufus somersaulted with joy.
When I had handled them in the lab,
the rats always had been gentle,
however harsh and stressful their circumstances.
Now they showed affection.
If I sat on the floor and called his name,
Rufus would scurry to me from across the room.
If I sat on the couch, Virgil would climb up to perch on my shoulder.
Brutus liked to sit in my lap and be petted.
Thinking about the use of rats in vivisection,
I felt grief, disgust, and shame.
Someone recommended Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation*.
All sentient beings warrant moral consideration, Singer reasoned;
a nonhuman's suffering should count no less than a human's.
But humans regularly attach little or no importance
to other animals' suffering, he demonstrated.
They show species bias: speciesism.
The word had a powerful effect.
Out of speciesism I had failed to consider most nonhuman animals,
the vast majority of the world's living beings. Institutionalized speciesism takes many forms, Singer noted. In particular, he exposed the speciesism and cruelty of vivisection and "animal agriculture." My actions had displayed as arrogant, self-serving, and self-deceiving a mindset as sexism or racism. The concept of nonhuman rights completed my shift in worldview. No conscious being should be treated like an exploitable thing, Tom Regan argued in *The Case for Animal Rights*. He stressed the moral rights of individuals, nonhuman and human. Currently the law recognizes only human rights. Regan proposed changing nonhuman animals' legal status from property to person (rights-holder). Yes, I thought. Universally, humans exploit and kill other animals because legally they can. As history shows, humans readily take advantage of those with less power. Because they receive little moral consideration from humans and lack political power, nonhumans are especially vulnerable to concerted abuse. Combining Regan's ideas with Singer's, I concluded: Sentience entitles nonhuman animals to legal rights, which must protect them, as individuals, from speciesism. I left the psychology program, stopped eating flesh, and soon avoided all animal-derived food. Having previously worked as a writer and editor, earned master's degrees in English education and English literature, and taught high school and college English, I returned to a focus on language and worked as a writer-editor, primarily on college English textbooks. Increasingly I noticed that standard English usage legitimizes, trivializes, and conceals speciesist injustice. As a feminist, I knew that words can foster oppression or liberation, deception or truth. Sexist and speciesist language share certain features, I found—such as pronoun use, metaphors, and syntax that discount the experiences of those deemed inferior. In *The Sexual Politics of Meat* Carol Adams linked sexism and speciesism. She also cited evasive and speciesist language that serves the flesh industry. Her analysis prompted me to think more about connections between nonhuman and human oppression, and about the role of euphemism and definition in keeping nonhumans oppressed.
I began to write this book.
As I examined the discourse of people who exploit nonhuman animals, persistent falsehoods emerged:
denial of nonhuman sentience and individuality,
disingenuous claims of necessity, a habit of blaming the victim.
But the problem was larger;
speciesist language pervaded human discourse.
Individuals who never would utter a sexist or racist word
spoke of nonhuman animals with careless contempt.
Unwittingly, even animal rights advocates
used speciesist language—including me.
Language can perpetuate or combat speciesism.
Whether nonhuman animals are property or persons
is a matter of definition.
A single word, such as speciesism, can enlighten.
The term animal rights points the way to justice.
To achieve justice for all beings,
we must overcome speciesism's linguistic ploys.
We think in words and act them out.
Equitable laws and practices require equitable language.

**
Animal equality is a synonym for justice.

**
Used accurately, anthropomorphism refers to the false attribution
of uniquely human characteristics.
It isn't anthropomorphic to believe
that owls, iguanas, and orangutans
have thoughts, feelings, and personalities.
It is anthropomorphic to believe that they should wear shoes,
would benefit from a college education,
or must have human thoughts, feelings, and personalities
or none at all.

**
Human supremacists resist applying the same vocabulary
to humans and nonhumans.
Separate lexicons help maintain a false dichotomy
that bolsters human conceit and soothes human conscience.
The greater the apparent psychological distance
between nonhuman and human animals,
the more secure humans' assumption
of species superiority and uniqueness.
This assumption provides a rationale for exploitation.

**
The boundary for rights belongs between beings and things,
not between human and nonhuman animals.

**
"Animal" law is slave law. It must be abolished. The same body of law that protects humans must protect nonhumans, extending to them all applicable rights currently reserved for humans.

* * *

Like human equality, animal equality doesn't mean equal abilities; it means equal moral and legal rights. In a just society, comparable human and nonhuman interests, such as the desire to live and be spared suffering, would carry equal weight.

* * *

Whether nonhuman or human, all animals are persons. In our need for protection and our right to justice, we all are the same.

(Animal Equality: Language and Liberation © 2001)

<>

Whenever you see a bird in a cage, fish in a tank, or nonhuman mammal on a chain, you're seeing speciesism. If you believe that a bee or frog has less right to life and liberty than a chimpanzee or human, or you consider humans superior to other animals, you subscribe to speciesism. If you visit aquaprisons and zoos, attend circuses that include "animal acts," wear nonhuman skin or hair, or eat flesh, eggs, or cow-milk products, you practice speciesism.
Speciesism is both an attitude and a form of oppression.

Whenever the media report that someone has killed "an endangered animal" or "an endangered species," they too confuse an individual with a species. Any animal threatened with a gun or arrow is endangered. Hunters kill members of endangered species. Conversely, animals who are personally safe are not endangered, even if they belong to an endangered species.

U.S. law is even more speciesist than the U.S. public. Most U.S. residents believe that it's wrong to kill animals for their pelts, but the pelt industry is legal. Most believe that it's wrong to hunt animals for sport, but sport hunting is legal. Two-thirds believe that nonhumans have as much "right to live free of suffering" as humans, but vivisection, food-industry enslavement and slaughter, and other practices that cause severe, prolonged suffering are legal.

If healthy, homeless humans were rounded up and killed, no one would call the killing facilities "shelters."

If I were in a Nazi concentration camp and someone on the outside asked me, "Do you want me to work for better living conditions, more-humane deaths in the gas chamber, or the liberation of all concentration camps?" I'd answer, "Liberation."

I'd regard any focus on better living conditions or more-"humane" deaths as immoral.

The test for speciesism is simple: If the victims were human, would you be speaking and acting as you are? If not, don't speak and act that way when the victims are nonhuman.

Sentience, defined as any capacity to experience, is the only logical and fair basis for rights. In nonspeciesist philosophy, all sentient beings have rights. What's more, all sentient beings are equal.

Like human equality, animal equality doesn't mean much if it doesn't include equality under the law.
Nonhumans should share, in full, all applicable protections that the law affords to humans.

* * *

If an act is "horrific" or "unconscionable" when committed against humans, it's equally horrific and unconscionable when committed against other animals.

* * *

Why emancipate nonhumans?
Enslavement is wrong, murder is wrong, and causing innocent beings to suffer is wrong. Fully as much as humans, all nonhumans are entitled to life, freedom, and other basic rights. Humans deny this for only one reason: speciesism.

(Speciesism © 2004)
Joan Dunayer
American author

The trapping of wild animals for their pelts is impossible to justify in terms of conservation or animal welfare.
(excerpt from an article in the Biologist, 1986)
Nigel Dunstone, Ph.D.
English biologist and professor
It is just as wrong to kill an animal
as it is to kill a human being,
and only human chauvinism, speciesism,
and the inordinately high opinion
the human race has of itself
prevents it from accepting this simple fact.
Charles B. Edelman

[on his bygone days as a trapper]
If I had continued down that path,
I have no doubt that today
I would be happily employed by some state wildlife agency.
I would be wandering through the hallways and offices
of some state building, performing my duties
of promoting the annual furbearer harvesting
and unquestionably accepting the principles of wildlife management.
Times change, however, and so do some people.
(Foreword to Jaws of Steel: The Truth about Trapping © 1991)

* * *

[on seeing a squirrel caught in a trap]
The entire episode of the squirrel and the trap
could not have lasted more than five minutes.
Yet that brief moment in time had an impact on me
like being hit by a truck.
I thought of all those animals I'd trapped in my younger days; all those lives I'd so thoughtlessly snuffed out for a few, lousy dollars. They had meant so little to me then. As if I'd somehow determined that since they were smaller than I or non-human, their lives were worth less than my own simple wants and wishes.

* * *

"How can we love life so," I thought to myself, "and yet treat other living things so badly? Why is it so difficult to comprehend that an ever-so-common creature, like the little, furry gray squirrel, just might enjoy and appreciate living as much as I?" I thought about that for a long time.

(Jaws of Steel: The Truth about Trapping © 1991)

<> A quick surge in a deer population can occur if hunting is implemented where it hasn't been before. In any event, if hunting is started, it'll have to continue.

* * *

In my experience with wildlife managers, a hunt that is followed by a reduction in deer population size is considered effective; a hunt that is followed by a stabilization in deer population size is considered effective; and a hunt that is followed by a rise in the deer population size is considered effective—because, the rationalization continues, without the hunt the population would have grown even more. Under these rules, failure is impossible.

("Why Killing Deer Makes Poor Park Management" speech in 1998)

Thomas Eveland, Ph.D.
American wildlife ecologist, former trapper, author

I've always loved animals, but I grew up in a society that treats them as possessions, as things—a "meat and potatoes" world. I had no idea [that] the flesh I consumed came from wide-eyed cows and innocent fluffy chickens. And while I knew I always wanted to work with animals, it took time and several life lessons before I found a job that truly benefited them.

* * *
In certain ethnic communities, it's tradition to have baby goat meat during the Easter holiday. So our farm was overwhelmed every spring by people looking for baby goats. We would weigh the 25-to-35-pound kids, and the customers paid. They were then hogtied and literally thrown into a trunk or the back of a pick-up truck like a piece of luggage. Jim soon was saying, "I will carry the goat," and he would gently put the goat into their vehicle.

One day we were standing by the gate of the goat barn, listening to one of our baby goats being driven away, crying in the trunk of the car. It was at this horrific moment that Jim and I looked at each other with tears in our eyes and began our journey to a no-kill life.

* * *

I don't care if you say a prayer before they're slaughtered or if you simply send them into the slaughterhouse. Their throats are still slit. They feel pain. They gasp for air. I can't imagine what goes through their minds. If you look into their eyes you can see the fear, and the abandonment. You've loved this animal, and then you've sent them off to this horrible death. So I can't imagine "humane" and "farming" going together for raising any sentient being. The words just don't go together for me. Jim and I have since left the dairy industry and converted our farm into a sanctuary for farmed animals, wildlife, and companion animals. Now when I go to the grocery store, I have such a hard time going by the meat department.

* * *

I see people going over and selecting their cuts of meat,
and I want to take them by the hand and explain to them that this came from a living being who had feelings just like all of us. That meat came from a cow who had babies, had a family—or tried to have a family. I want people to understand these are sentient beings who, if left to their own devices, have a real bond with their own kind, and with us humans too, if allowed to. And yet I see people picking up the slabs of meat, and they have no concept of where that meat came from or how that animal suffered when he or she was slaughtered.

It's not their fault. It's just the way of life society teaches us, the way of life I was taught before my own experiences led me down another path. So for Jim and me, there is now a very clear distinction between humane and inhumane farming. Humane farming is cultivating a plant-based diet. Inhumane farming is breeding any sentient being for production and consumption. ("Farmed Animal Experts Speak Out" humanemyth.org)

Cheri Ezell-Vandersluis
American former dairy and goat farmer
Co-founder, Maple Farm Sanctuary

................
So long sweet girl. Your life was so terribly short.
So curious were you, but always keeping just far enough away.
When we first met you would peek out at me,
always running back under the building then coming out again.
You would do this for the longest time.
Even when your sisters had gotten used to seeing me leave food,
you were always cautious, but eventually you feared me less.
If only I could have caught you sooner.
You were gone, your body was limp and lifeless,
when, finally, I was able to touch you.
I found you with your sister.
She had been laying on you, probably to share body heat.
She scurried off, but you didn’t. It had been very cold.
As I carried you, I wished so much that I had caught you sooner.
So sorry that society has let you down. So sorry I have let you down.
You have never known how wonderful it could be to be held and loved.
How pleasurable it would be to sit in a warm sunlit window
from the safety of a loving home, or to have a cozy bed to lie in,
and to simply not live your life in fear.
No one tried to take care of you, but I did.
No one cared for you, but I did.
No one will notice you are gone, but I will.
I will miss you. So long moça, doce.
Kevin Farias
Flickr photographer and friend to feral felines
I believe animals should be respected as citizens of this earth. They should have the right to their own freedom, their own families, and their own life.

John Feldmann
American musician

For much of my life I continued to not "see" cattle trucks and to eat flesh and to wear fur and leather and ivory and drive cars with pigskin seats, and to kill pests like mice and rats with poisons and traps and to look to medical research and animal studies to save me from the consequences of my booze and nicotine habits. I did not notice the living animals involved. I was a good human, and if hauled before some animal Nuremberg in the sky would have been hard pressed to understand, "Why me?"

(Gitel & Berne: Or What I Learned from a Drive in the Country)

Lois Flynne
American founder, Community of Compassion for Animals

The very nature of progressive movements throughout history is to tell others to stop doing something harmful or degrading (e.g., using humans as slaves, sexually harassing women, forcing children to work in sweatshops, harming the environment, etc). Yes, the abolitionists, suffragists, feminists, and civil rights activists were called extreme...and some vegetarians are called extreme. But maybe it's just because vegetarianism is not yet a cultural norm. Old habits—and appetites—die hard, and there is usually a lot of resistance before things change.

* * *

But still, if we are to continue evolving—physically, emotionally, and spiritually—we really do have to look at how our dinner choices affect not only the environment, but even more importantly, the well-being (or intense suffering) of other creatures. So yes, on the one hand, the move to eating a plant-based diet may look extreme because most people don't do it. But on the other hand, we can still have our BBQ (soy dogs and veggie burgers) and feel good about it.

("A Few More 'Inconvenient Truths'"
huffingtonpost.com February 2, 2007)

Kathy Freston
American author of health-and-wellness books

© 2010 CREATURE QUOTES. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
It appears that the first intention of the Maker was to have men live on a strictly vegetarian diet. The very earliest periods of Jewish history are marked with humanitarian conduct towards the lower animal kingdom.

* * *

It is clearly established that the ancient Hebrews knew, and perhaps were the first among men to know, that animals feel and suffer pain. 

*(Guide to Judaism © 1971)*

**Rabbi Simon Glazer**

* * *  

When we hear about sled dogs running nonstop for 10-to-14-hour stretches without proper food, rest and shelter, we assume they are being pushed to these extremes for some noble purpose. But they are not. The dogs are racing in Alaska's Iditarod, which starts the first Saturday of every March.

* * *

Iditarod supporters liken this 1,150-mile race to a romantic adventure in which pioneer-spirited individualists and indomitable beasts are united in a struggle against almost insurmountable odds to conquer the harshest forces of nature. But when we look closer, the romantic notions and noble purposes evaporate, leaving us with a clear view of dogs who are terribly exploited.

- Dogs suffer and die in the Iditarod
- The dogs who pull the sleds are not the invincible animals Iditarod officials portray. Instead they burn themselves out running for hours without food or rest over treacherous terrains, enduring painful injuries, serious illnesses, and even death.
- The dogs are subjected to brutally cold winds, blinding snowstorms, subzero temperatures, and falls through ice into frigid waters.
- A short list of what can happen to dogs during the race includes: death, paralysis, frostbite of the penis and scrotum, bleeding ulcers, bloody diarrhea, lung damage, pneumonia, ruptured discs, viral diseases, broken bones, torn muscles and tendons, sprains and dehydration.

* * *

In 2009, two dogs on a doctor's team froze to death in frigid winds. Dogs have also died from pneumonia, blood loss due to ulcers, spinal injuries, heart failure, strangulation in lines, drowning and "sudden death syndrome"
—a fatal condition in which a dog's muscles and organs deteriorate during extreme or prolonged exercise. They've died from regurgitating and then inhaling their own acidic stomach contents, causing them to choke to death.

Dogs have been killed by snow machines and moose. They've been kicked to death and shot by their own mushers. The 1976 Iditarod winner, Jerry Riley, was accused of striking his dog with a snow hook (a large, sharp, and heavy metal claw). In 1996, one of Rick Swenson's dogs died while he mushed his team through waist-deep water and ice. Frequently, the Iditarod does not reveal the cause of death.

* * *

During the race, veterinarians do not give the dogs physical exams at every checkpoint. Mushers speed through many checkpoints, so the dogs get the briefest visual checks, if that. Instead of pulling sick dogs from the race, veterinarians frequently give them massive doses of antibiotics to keep them running.

The Iditarod's chief veterinarian, Stu Nelson, is an employee of the Iditarod Trail Committee. They are the ones who sign his paycheck.

So why would he say anything negative about the Iditarod?

* * *

On average, about 50 percent of the dogs who start the race do not make it across the finish line.
According to a report published in the *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 81 percent of the dogs who finish the race have lung damage. A report published in *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* found that these dogs have long-lasting airway malfunction. At least 142 dogs have died in the race thus far. There is no accounting of dog deaths in the race’s early years and no one knows how many dogs die after the race each year.

* * *

Dog beatings and whippings are common.

During the 2007 Iditarod, eyewitnesses reported that musher Ramy Brooks kicked, punched and beat his dogs with a ski pole and a chain because his dogs refused to run.

Jim Welch says in his book *Speed Mushing Manual*, "Nagging a dog team is cruel and ineffective.... A training device such as a whip is not cruel at all but is effective." And: "It is a common training device in use among dog mushers...."

* * *

"They've had the hell beaten out of them," retired Air Force colonel and 40-year Alaska resident Tom Classen told *USA Today's* Jon Saraceno. "You don't just whisper into their ears, 'Okay, stand there until I tell you to run like the devil.' They understand one thing: a beating."

Classen continued, "These dogs are beaten into submission
the same way elephants are trained for a circus. The mushers will deny it, and you know what? They are all lying."

* * *

Iditarod winner Dick Mackey admits in *Iditarod Classics* that he and Rick Swenson used whips to drive their dogs across the finish line: "I reached in my sled bag and pulled out a whip just as he glanced around and saw it. So he reached in and pulled out his. And that's the way we came down the street, just driving those dogs for all there was in us."

- Iditarod mushers sit, lie down and sleep while dogs race
- Mushers sit on seats and sometimes lie down and sleep while their dogs pull them, on average, more than 100 miles a day.
- When mushers sleep, they often fall off their sleds, and their dogs run away.
- For example, Outdoor Life Network reported that Rachael Scdoris, while navigating a treacherous cliff, "fell asleep then crashed into a thick spruce, snapping her guideline. The dogs ran away."

Iditarod musher Jeff King said that "riding in comfort is the number one goal."
The *Anchorage Daily News* reported in 2004 that King had "developed a new, sit-down sled that some have labeled the Iditarod Barcalounger. King said it helps him get more rest, although he almost lost his team this year when he got to resting so well he went to sleep and fell off. He's since added a seat belt."
- Training for Iditarod injures and kills dogs
- During training runs, Iditarod dogs have been killed by moose, snow machines, and various motor vehicles, including a semi tractor and an ATV. They have died from drowning, heart attacks and being strangled in harnesses. Dogs have also been injured while training. They have been gashed, quilled by porcupines, bitten in dog fights, and had broken bones, and torn muscles and tendons.
- Most dog deaths and injuries during training aren't even reported.

- Iditarod dog kennels are awful places
- When they are not racing, what happens to dogs in their prison-like puppy mills is enough to make your stomach turn. Many kennels have over 100 dogs, and some as many as 200. It is standard for the dogs to spend their entire lives outside tethered to metal chains that can be as short as four feet. It has been reported that dogs who don't make the main teams are literally never taken off their chains.
Chaining such social animals is the equivalent of solitary confinement. The tethers also make the dogs easy marks for attacks by wolves, coyotes and other animals, and vulnerable to lightning strikes and injuries. Contrary to their natural instincts, the dogs are forced to eat, sleep, urinate and defecate in the same space.

* * *

Mushers breed large numbers of dogs to get a handful of good racers. Boosting the cruelty quotient, dogs not good enough to compete or who aren't worth breeding—who are simply unwanted—are routinely shot, clubbed or dragged to death.

Mike Cranford, a former Iditarod dog handler, wrote in Alaska's Bush Blade newspaper, "On-going cruelty is the law of many dog lots. Dogs are clubbed with baseball bats and if they don't pull are dragged to death in harnesses."

- The Iditarod is not a commemoration -
Iditarod administrators promote the race as a commemoration of sled dogs saving the children of Nome by bringing diphtheria serum from Anchorage in 1925. However, the co-founder of the Iditarod, Dorothy Page, said the race was not established to honor the sled drivers and dogs who carried the serum.

In fact, 600 miles of this serum delivery was done by train and the other half was done by dogs running in relays, with no dog running over 100 miles.

This isn't anything like the present-day Iditarod.

- The Iditarod is fueled by greed -
The Iditarod is a morally bankrupt race run by people who won't tell the true story about the cruelties the dogs suffer.

The Iditarod is also a public relations ploy designed to turn mushers into sports heroes, and to line the pockets of mushers, race officials and Alaskan businesses, including the Anchorage Daily News. The race's economic impact for Anchorage (pop. 260,283 per 2000 census), the home of the ceremonial start, is estimated to be well over $5 million.

For many mushers, participation in the Iditarod has meant lucrative book deals, advertising contracts, speaker fees and a big boost for their sled dog tour and dog breeding businesses.

* * *

The Iditarod, with all the evils associated with it, has become a synonym for exploitation.
People with common sense understand that the race imposes torture no dog should be forced to endure.

* * *
The Sled Dog Action Coalition, an organization committed to helping the Iditarod sled dogs, posts on its website, www.helpsleddogs.org, an extensive list of Iditarod sponsors and promoters as well as individual musher sponsors. ("Alaskan Iditarod Abuses Dogs" April 2010)

Margery Glickman
American founder and director, Sled Dog Action Coalition

I was born in the mountains of North Carolina near Grandfather Mountain and Mt. Mitchell. Hunting, killing and butchering animals was a way of life for the mountain people. I killed my first hog at age eight. I had expected the animal to fall as if by magic when I squeezed the trigger of my grandfather's old .22 caliber rifle. I was both surprised and alarmed when the animal screamed with pain and agony. "More carefully," my uncle said, "You have to hit him in the head." When the rifle cracked the second time, the animal fell dead. I couldn't sleep that night—I could still hear the animal's screams. The adults laughed the next day when I told them it just didn't seem right to shoot an animal when he was locked helplessly in a pen. I dreaded October each year—that was the month when the hogs and steers were killed and butchered.

* * *

Spring brought another dreaded time, when the man came to castrate the pigs and dehorn the cattle. I would hold my ears to shut out the sound of their agonized screams. "Don't be a sissy—you'll get used to it," I was told, but I never did. Sundays usually brought another unpleasant task: catching a chicken and "wringing" its neck.

* * *

To make matters worse, the butchered birds and animals had often been pets. I had a pet chicken named Red. I trained Red, a big red hen, to sit patiently on a fence post for hours until I set her down. I also had a pet turkey named Fred. As is the fate of most turkeys,
Fred ended up on the Thanksgiving table.
The crowd roared with laughter when I said,
"I'm not thankful. Fred was my friend and I'm not going to eat him."
* * *
By the time I was fourteen I was a "crack shot."
Squirrel hunting was my favorite
because the elusive gray squirrels were hard to hit.
One day I grazed a big gray squirrel
and he fell right in front of my dog Rex.
The squirrel was putting up a furious battle....
I sat down and thought for awhile.
I couldn't help but admire the little animal.
He had wanted to live!
* * *
The mountain people often shot the red squirrels...for shooting practice.

The red squirrels were not good to eat so they were thrown away.
But that didn't sit right with me either.
I doubted that God made his boomers just to shoot at.
One morning, as I sat on top of a steep hill
waiting for the sun to come up and the game to start moving about,
I noticed many small oak trees on the hill.
Acorns are heavy, especially this variety.
They were as big as chestnuts and probably weighed several ounces.
I hadn't seen this particular variety before.  
I strolled down the hill and crossed a small valley  
to another hill and found the parent tree,  
a huge oak about four feet in diameter. I was puzzled.  
How did the acorns travel across a valley to another hill?  
The wind didn't blow them...and floodwaters don't run uphill.  
I saw something move out of the corner of my eye.  
It was a gray squirrel leaping from a huge oak...across the valley.  
I dropped the squirrel with a single shot.  
Imagine my surprise when I picked up the squirrel  
and he had one of those huge acorns lodged in his mouth!  
I had been shooting the planters of the forests!  
On the way home I said to myself,  
"So that's why God made squirrels."  
* * *  
[on returning home from the military]  
I still hunted some but I thought about the squirrels.  
If they were nature's planters, what were the other animals' jobs?  
Later I noticed holly bushes in sheltered mountain valleys,  
over 20 miles from their natural growing range.  
It was quite obvious that birds  
had carried the seeds this great distance.  
By the time I was thirty I had quit hunting entirely  
and began studying the birds and animals.  
I read books on ecology and the environment.  
And I returned to the forests  
—this time with a camera instead of a gun.  
I watched the squirrels carefully.  
They would always follow the same path through the trees,  
swinging like trapeze artists.  
Occasionally I would see a flying squirrel  
gliding silently through the trees  
or a ruffled grouse blasting away like a rocket.  
I marked the spots where the nuts carried by squirrels fell  
and returned in the spring to find small trees growing in those areas.  
I also observed the "worthless" red squirrels burying nuts.  
It occurred to me that nut-bearing trees...all depended  
on the little animals to transport their seed throughout the forests.  
* * *  
[on hunters' destruction of the animal kingdom]  
 Hunters are directly responsible—to name a few—  
for the extinction of the passenger pigeon  
as well as many kinds of island-dwelling birds.  
The buffalo very nearly became extinct after hunters  
[retained by commercial interests] went after them  
largely to wipe out the Indians' [main] food supply.
Starve'em to submission.  
This strategy left more than 50 million  
of the great creatures on the plains to decay in the sun.  
Hunters have brought the mountain lion,  
the grizzly bear, the whooping crane,  
and even the symbol of our nation, the bald eagle,  
to the brink of extinction.

I began studying hunters from "the other side of the fence":  
When working with hunters I would ask their opinions of hunting.  
One hunter's reply was,  
"God made animals for me to eat—what else are they good for?"  
Another said, "It makes me forget my troubles to hunt and fish."  
I thought long and hard about his statement.
Humans vent their frustrations from daily life on innocent wildlife. Hunting is a one-sided game with only one winner—human beings. This is why hunters refer to birds and animals as "game." When the hunter has hunted down and killed an animal, he has "won" the game. More often than not, the creature is killed for pleasure instead of for food. A certain sadistic pleasure is derived by killing another creature. When a human kills an animal the act fuels his ego: he has mastered the creature by taking its life. Why else would a trophy hunter spend thousands of dollars, hike through steaming snake- and insect-infested swamps or climb steep cliffs to kill a magnificent member of another species? Why else would he cut off the head of his victim and leave the body to rot? Why else would he take the head to a taxidermist and mount it...? He has dominated and killed the "beast," and therefore hangs its head up for all the world to see that he is the mighty and fearless hunter. It is nothing but fuel for the insecure ego of small men. The hunter, with the scent of death in his nostrils, has little respect for his neighbor who enjoys seeing the creatures on his property alive. "No hunting" and "No trespassing" signs are torn down or shot full of holes. A hunting license is a permit to kill indiscriminately. Our government sells out our wildlife for the price of a hunting license. Soon after becoming an anti-hunting advocate, I found my tame mallard ducks shot and floating on their pond. They too had enjoyed living and I enjoyed them. But some pervert found pleasure in their death. Once I observed hunters exterminating a covey of Bob White quail. Their cheerful calls could no longer be heard around the small mountain community where I grew up as a child. TRADITION is perhaps the worst enemy of the animals: even our holidays call for the killing of birds and animals. These barbaric traditions, including hunting, rodeos and other cruel sports, are taught to children and thus passed down from generation to generation. Only a little more than a century ago blacks were considered to be animals and were treated as such. Similarly, during the second World War, Jews were considered to be subhuman by the Nazis, or perhaps even subanimal, and were killed by the millions. Even today we abuse our fellow humans through boxing, wrestling and other cruel sports.
Humanity lives not by reality but by habits
—often anchored in selfishness and staggering ignorance.
It is this aspect of human nature we must work against.
If my story can, in some small way, influence
the traditional way of thinking and the ignorant beliefs
about our fellow creatures, I would be greatly pleased.
This story is to aid our fellow creatures
who have long suffered at the hands of mankind.
May they someday live in peace, without suffering and fear.
("Why I Quit Hunting" Animals Agenda November 1986)
Roy Dallas Gragg
American naturalist

It is not easy for vested parties to admit
that their sacred, highbrow professions
are really just grand scale speculation
with human health at stake and animals as currency.

[A]nimal testing for medications is itself an institution,
unshakable despite its inexhaustible drawbacks.
Even an FDA official confessed that "most of the animal tests we accept have never been validated. They evolved over the last 20 years, and the FDA is comfortable with them."

Few scientists stop to reflect whether consumers
are getting their money’s worth
as long as they themselves are making money.
Those who do speak out at their own risk.
Still, a rebellious few insist that
human lives have been lost needlessly
through the delays in treatment
and from fallacious results of animal studies.

The size and force of their propaganda avalanche
suggest that animal experimenters
are resting on uncertain foundations.
If animal experiments are so great,
why then protest so much and expensively?
They have to, because keeping the truth quiet is costly.

The powers-that-be lull even animal lovers into reluctant support
with their claims, perpetrated through the lay media.
The media routinely reinforces white coat capers
with uplifting articles about mouse cancer cures
and rats with lowered cholesterol, 
and drugs that look like they will alleviate 
neurologically devastating diseases 
like MS and Alzheimer's in mice. 
These are "news." They sell papers and capture public sentiment. 
As we have pointed out, no one ever seems to get around 
to confirming when or if humans will benefit 
from these rodent-based revelations. 
* * *
Trillions of taxpayer and charity dollars continue to funnel 
into wasteful experiments which are of no use 
to the consumer who supports them. 
That is why we call animal experimentation "white coat welfare."
* * *
We must shake our tacit acceptance 
of all animal-based medical research! 
The public who is both benefactor and would-be beneficiary 
must demand human solutions to our health dilemmas. 
Are these professionals somehow exempt 
from the criteria that govern the rest of us? 
Would your employer allow you to be this unproductive 
and maintain your job?
We do not have unlimited time, money and scientists. 
(Even if we did, research on animals would still be bad 
because of all the misleading data and human suffering it creates.) 
If the trillions of dollars wasted on the animal model had, 
instead, gone to human-based alternatives, 
who knows what could have been accomplished by now?
(Sacred Cows and Golden Geese: The Human Cost 
of Experiments on Animals © 2000 reprinted with the 
permission of Continuum International Publishing Group)
C. Ray Greek, M.D. and Jean Swingle Greek, D.V.M. 
American physician and veterinarian 
Co-founders, Americans for Medical Advancement
............... 
I think of veganism humbly and holistically. 
It's about taking personal responsibility 
in a world so full of needless suffering. 
It's challenging one's self to open one's eyes 
and question society's assumptions and habits. 
It's about critical thinking and compassion 
and how we would like to see the world evolve. 
Michael Greger, M.D. 
American physician, author, lecturer
...............
The exploitation, oppression, abuse, and violence inflicted on literally billions of animals in this country each year, particularly under accepted standard industry practices that are (mostly) legal but hidden from public scrutiny, are as much a peace and justice issue as domestic abuse, human trafficking, or any other type of human oppression and violence that Episcopalians are already vocal about. The difference seems to be that there is a perceived benefit by humans, who are the dominant culture of this world, in using animals for food, fur, entertainment, sport, and science. We accept or defend: killing them if they are worth more to us dead; killing them if they have no use to us at all; killing them if they eat our food, or the food of our livestock, or our livestock in the case of predators who become victims of our "management." And if we can earn money by some sort of animal use, we vehemently defend our exploitation-of-choice. We don't live peaceably with nature, with wildlife who have the audacity to encroach on our suburban sprawl, or with the animals who are bred for our use, even if we can talk about "Stewardship of Creation" on a superficial level once a year at our annual "pet blessing" services. We don't even have one prayer for animals in any of our authorized prayer books. If people believe they benefit in some way at the expense of animals, or that animals are "the least of these" on the back burner of a long list of world problems, who is willing to speak out on their behalf? Who will challenge people and institutions to seek the most humane or cruelty-free alternatives that are available, to make personal changes in the way they choose to live, to support charities that don't exploit animals or fund animal torture, to get active supporting animal protection legislation, and to create a serious Christian standard of what it means to be "Stewards of All Creation" which includes the overlooked captive and domestic ("property-status") animals? ("Animal Advocacy: Bridging a Gulf Between the Church and the Outside World" Episcopal.Grassroots.com)

Sue Grisham
American co-founder, Episcopal Network for Animal Welfare Founder, EpiscoVeg.com

……………
[Unlike hunting, photographic safaris allow humans to] take back a treasure or trophy without harming the animal in any way. * * *

Humans are the only species in the world with the power and therefore the responsibility to take care of other species. (interview with kindnews.org September 2008)

Robert B. Haas, J.D.
American author and photographer of wildlife books Chairman, Haas Wheat & Partners

Suppose that tomorrow a group of beings from another planet were to land on Earth, beings who considered themselves as superior to you as you feel yourself to be to other animals. Would they have the right to treat you as you treat the animals you breed, keep and kill for food? <>

The vast majority of those who eat meat never consider its rights and wrongs; society condones it, and that is sufficient reason to think no further. So it is the vegetarian who is called upon to explain his odd behavior, and not those who support the unnecessary slaughter that meat-eating requires. It requires very little moral sense to realize that the taking of life is an important matter,
yet for most people the choice
between a nut cutlet and a beefsteak
is about as important as that
between chipped and boiled potatoes;
a matter of taste, not morality.
<>
No one can claim to have a genuine interest
in the welfare of animals
if they continue to condone their unnecessary slaughter.
To continue to eat the object of your concern
is a stunning piece of self-deception.
(Animals, Men and Morals: An Inquiry into the
Maltreatment of Non-humans © 1972)
John Harris
British writer and editor
.................

[on a Nazi concentration camp victim's parting words]
The last thing my father told me
before he was taken to his death...
was to love all creation.
<>
The Holocaust affected my family by killing them all,
except for my mother who died of natural causes in Israel in 1996.
I became convinced that my debt for my survival
was to dedicate my life to the pursuit of justice, in general,
and justice for the most oppressed—farmed animals—in particular.
The Holocaust experience, including the hiding, crowding, caging,
cattle cars, brutality, and routine of mass extermination
has promoted my empathy
for what farmed animals go through every day.
(Q&A with Vegetarians In Paradise December 2002/January 2003)
<>
In the midst of our high-tech, ostentatious, hedonistic lifestyle,
among the dazzling monuments to history, art, religion, and commerce,
there are the "black boxes."
These are the biomedical research laboratories,
factory farms, and slaughterhouses
faceless compounds where society conducts its dirty business
of abusing and killing innocent, feeling beings.
These are our Dachaus, our Buchenwalds, our Birkenaus.
Like the good German burghers,
we have a fair idea of what goes on there,
but we don't want any reality checks.
(review of Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story
of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment
Inside the U.S. Meat Industry, Gail Eisnitz © 1997)
I always felt that there was something ethically and aesthetically obscene about taking a beautiful, feeling animal, hitting him over the head and cutting him into pieces and stuffing the pieces in my face.

* * *

I know first hand what it's like to be treated like a worthless object, to be hunted by the killers of my family and friends, to wonder each day if I will see the next sunrise, to be crammed in a cattle car on the way to slaughter.

(speech at the 2008 Animal Rights Conference)

We're not only denying basic resources to animals, we're also committing the ultimate sin of using animals as a resource—for food, for clothing, for experiments, for entertainment.

Alex Hershaft, Ph.D.
American founder and president, Farm Animal Reform Movement, World Farm Animals Day and Great American Meatout
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P 1 "SMILING PIG" (*Sus scrofa domesticus*)
Location: Dalton, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
Photo by tobrian/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/30420931@N04/3957286372
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/30420931@N04

P 3 "PEEK-A-BOO" TO FOUR LITTLE BO PEEP SHEEP (*Ovis aries*)
Location: Edgar's Mission, Willowmavin, Victoria, Australia
Photo by Pam Ahern, founder of Edgar's Mission
Home page: www.edgarsmission.org.au

P 4 THE ONE AND ONLY EDGAR THE PIG (*Sus scrofa domesticus*)
Location: Edgar's Mission, Willowmavin, Victoria, Australia
Photo by Pam Ahern, founder of Edgar's Mission
Home page: www.edgarsmission.org.au

P 7 WHITE-TAILED DEER (*Odocoileus virginianus*)
Location: National Bison Range Wildlife Refuge, Montana, U.S.A.
Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.bobschillereff.com/p529500049/h1c6ba877#h1c6ba877
Photographer's website: www.bobschillereff.com

P 10 JAGUAR (*Panthera onca*)
Location: Zoo de Guyane, Macouria, Guyane
Photo by Yannick Turbe — Prosper973/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/prosper973/3262053975
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/prosper973

P 14 "THANK YOU MOO"—NO MORE MOURNFUL MOOS FROM SADIE (*Bos taurus*)
Location: Animal Place Sanctuary, Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Photo by rinalia — Marji Beach/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4328321547
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia

P 16 "MY NAME IS...SLEEPY"—AND I'M A MUTE SWAN CYGNET (*Cygnus olor*)
Location: Victoria, British Columbia, Canada
Photo by Gary Woodburn — FreeSpirit5/Flickr and © Gary Woodburn Photography
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/freespirit5/4413425643
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/freespirit5
Photographer's website: www.pbase.com/woody

P 18 FRIENDS OR FOOD—WHY DO WE DIFFERENTIATE?
Locations: Vacaville and Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Five photos by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr

Far left: "THE BEST HORSE EVER"—WENDY, A LOVELY PAINT
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Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3838005571

Left: "GEORGE: CAN I HAS TREAT?!?" JACK RUSSELL/RAT TERRIER MIX
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3917720787

Center: "NEW BUNNY LARISSA" AT ANIMAL PLACE SANCTUARY
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4151013371

2nd from right: "THE POOK/OSCAR CAT: YOU DO NOT EXIST, HUMAN"
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3917720747

Far right: "PRETTY SADIE"—A HAPPY HOLSTEIN AT ANIMAL PLACE SANCTUARY
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4544424254
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia

P 19 BALAAM AND THE ANGEL (1836)
Oil painting by Gustav Jaeger Bileam Engel (1808-1871) of Leipzig, Germany
Artwork seen here: en.wikipedia.org/Gustav_Jaeger_Bileam_Engel (Public Domain)

P 22 CLOVER, A RESCUED LAMB (Ovis aries)
Location: Poplar Spring Animal Sanctuary, Poolesville, Maryland, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.animalsanctuary.org/animals/lamb_clover.html
Home page: www.animalsanctuary.org

P 23 MOUNTAIN GORILLA (Gorilla gorilla beringei)
Location: Kinigi, Northern Province, Rwanda
Photo by Hjalmar Gisason — hjallig/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/hjallig/2338576325
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/hjallig

P 24 TWO HAPPY PET RATS—NOT LAB RATS (Rattus norvegicus)
Location: The Netherlands
Two photos by Milly — tsuyu ^^/Flickr and © Tsuyu Photography

Left photo: REBEL, A SEALPOINT SIAMESE RAT
Left photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/s-tsuyu/4322501455

Right photo: KIARA, A BURMESE DUMBO-EAR RAT
Right photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/s-tsuyu/4322486479

Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/s-tsuyu
Photographer's website: www.tsuyu.nl

P 28 ZEBRA FINCHES (Taeniopygia guttata)
Location: Aviary, Sewerby Hall, Bridlington, Yorkshire, England, U.K.
Photo by Martin S. Dean — the.deanery/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/14623539@N05/2806148376
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/14623539@N05

P 30 "I'VE GOT THIS SMILE ON MY FACE"—RED FOX SURPRISE (Vulpes vulpes)
Location: Hortobágy National Park, near Balmazújváros, Hungary
Photo by Csaba Tökölyi — csabatokolyi/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/csabatokolyi/4383815311
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/csabatokolyi
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P 31 GRAY SQUIRREL "PEANUT WITH SNOW ON THE NOSE" (*Sciurus carolinensis*)
Photo by Darlene O'Steen — sampler_girl/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/dirkyo/4319219112
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/dirkyo

P 33 SASSAFRAS, JUST A KID (*Capra aegagrus hircus*)
Location: Maple Farm Sanctuary, Mendon, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/maplefarmsanctuary/2614157928
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/maplefarmsanctuary
Home page: www.maplefarmsanctuary.org

P 34 PIGGYWIGGY, A RESCUED PIG (*Sus scrofa domesticus*)
Location: Maple Farm Sanctuary, Mendon, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/maplefarmsanctuary/2614156190
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/maplefarmsanctuary
Home page: www.maplefarmsanctuary.org

P 35 "SO LONG, SWEET GIRL"—IN MEMORY OF A FERAL CAT (*Felis catus*)
Location: Tacoma, Washington, U.S.A.
Four photos by Kevin Farias — Kevin_F2008/Flickr
- Top photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/4239579543
- Left photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/4196303959
- Center photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/4239387499
- Right photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/4196303963
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias

P 38 SLED DOG BURIED BY SNOWSTORM DURING IDITAROD RACE
Photo courtesy of Sled Dog Action Coalition
Photo seen here: www.helpsleddogs.org/Images/snowdog.JPG
Home page: www.helpsleddogs.org

P 39 FOX, A SIBERIAN HUSKY (*Canis lupus familiaris*)
Photo by Sue & Martin Curtis — Sue & Marty/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/sjcurtis/372641289
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/sjcurtis

P 43 "WALLPAPER"—RED SQUIRRELS CHOW DOWN (*Sciurus vulgaris*)
Photo by Matt Binstead — Sweetmart/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/mattbinstead/4274555033
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/mattbinstead

P 45 BALD EAGLE (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)
Location: Grouse Mountain, British Columbia, Canada
Photo by Julie Scott — jscott7357/Flickr and © Julie-ry Photography and Jewellery
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/jscott7357/3627958892
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/jscott7357
Photographer's website: www.julie-ry.com
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P 50 ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP (*Ovis canadensis canadensis*)
Location: Jasper National Park, Alberta, Canada
Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: [www.bobschillereff.com/p211038016/h285df87f#h285df87f](http://www.bobschillereff.com/p211038016/h285df87f#h285df87f)
Photographer's website: [www.bobschillereff.com](http://www.bobschillereff.com)

P 52 "CUTE EASTER BUNNY"—FRIEND FOR ALL (HOLI)DAYS (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*)
Photo by Jay Diaz — KoolPix/Flickr
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/koolpix_nature/4453901722](http://www.flickr.com/photos/koolpix_nature/4453901722)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/koolpix_nature](http://www.flickr.com/photos/koolpix_nature)
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