
We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by photon - 2009/05/12 01:58

We earthlings are not equal? Thought that would get your attention!

I have this to say:

Humans do have different thinking abilities than other creatures but that does not make us more worthy of life than other creatures. Nor do our thinking abilities make us superior in that sense, yet we have spiritual qualities and can feel compassion for earthlings who are are not seen as our kind.

Most (if not all) animals do put their own species first. A cat who is not particularly hungry, will catch a mouse and then cruelly play with that mouse. A bird will eat a worm while from what we see, the worm is in obvious pain! Some animals are vegetarian but most hunt for animal food and most eat their pray while still alive! So like it or not, that is the order of things on this planet and it has often made me wince and feel horrible because I feel for suffering victims.

But why is that? Could it be that there is something about our human nature that is different from "survival of the fittest" animal nature?

What some humans are doing is much worse than what other creatures do for food (sometimes even for sport) yet like many of us, who have seen Earthlings, Earthlings all but broke my heart.

Again, why? Why do we feel for other creatures as we do?

The answer is that there is something different about humans - and whereas we are all earthlings and are equal in that sense, at the same time humans are obviously not the same as other earthlings.

So should humans try to be equal with other creatures who (in the survival of the fittest) hunt other animals for food?

I say NO and as it says in the video Earthlings, there is an important part of our humanity that "speaks well of us" - and it is my fervent belief that upon finding (and acting upon) that part of us which is different to other earthlings, we become true to our real human nature and essence.

Presently many people stay in denial but when looking deep down inside, we know better than to inflict needless suffering on other earthlings. And apart from immediate and commercial greed, it is needless for us to do so. We do have the ability and the means, to survive without deliberately harming other creatures.

The following is transcribed from the closing commentary of Earthlings:We enter as lords of the earth

bearing strange powers
of terror and mercy alike.

But human beings
should love animals

as the knowing love the innocent
and the strong love the vulnerable.

When we wince
at the suffering of animals,

that feeling speaks well of us,
even if we ignore it.

And those who dismiss love
for our fellow creatures

as mere sentimentality

overlook a good and important part of our humanity.

But it takes nothing away from
a human to be kind to an animal.

And it is actually within us
to grant them a happy life

and a long one

On the heath,
King Lear asked Gloucester.

"How do you see the world?"

And Gloucester,
who is blind, answered,

"I see it feelingly"

"I see it feelingly" Do we feel for fellow earthlings? The above beautiful words, confirm to me that we have it in us to feel and to do so is a very "important part" of our human nature but sadly, some choose to deny this at present.

Because we humans have complex conscious minds and have a capacity for spirituality (but please, do not confuse spirituality with religion), we have it in us to love and to have compassion for other creatures as:
"the knowing love the innocent and the strong love the vulnerable".

That smacks in the fact of the "survival of the fittest" mindset and if we do not stop the suffering, and stop it soon, even humans will not survive for much longer. Then how foolish and ignorant of humans who should know better than to turn a blind eye!

Let's all make the connection(s). :)

John

=====

Re: We earthlings are not "equal"!

Posted by Desert Girl - 2009/05/12 04:19

You are absolutely spot on! John! I very much enjoyed your post. Cheers.

Some Earthlings are more equal than others!

(Taken from the classic Animal Farm "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others!")

Some animals eat plants, some animals eat other animals. They do it because they must, they have no other choice, they evolved to do so and the balance and function of the ecology depends on it. Humans however do have a choice. We no longer have to eat to survive, all our needs are taken care of. We don't have to kill to eat. While a lion may kill and use violence on a victim to eat, he may also force rape onto other lions, also in order for his species to survive. Just because a particular animal behaves in a certain way, doesn't mean we have to do it too. A lion kills and sometimes rapes, but we do not draw our moral conclusions from observing what other animals do. We do not justify killing other animals for food, or raping to procreate just because some other animals do it. We draw our own moral conclusions by thinking logically about it.

Desert Girl.

I saw the wedge tail eagle flying above me again today, crying out.

=====

We humans are not "equal"!

Posted by Liberación Igualdad - 2009/05/12 10:55

OK, where to start?

Of course, it will come as no surprise that I disagree with many things written by John here. Just as DG has her 'PeTA radar on' all the time, I have my "Anthropocentric radar" myself.

John's position re-affirms my stance against supernaturalism in general, and 'spirituality' in particular, as it is, in almost all cases, deeply anthropocentric (and as I see it, anthropocentrism can only lead to injustice.)

I won't repeat my arguments shared in the other thread, but it specially annoys me when I'm confronted with anthropocentric views that are based on faith-conjectures and/or based on things which existence is not only "unproven", but actually lacking any evidence whatsoever (such as this thing some call 'spirit'.)

I agree that humans have different thinking abilities. Of course, crows also have different thinking abilities. And pigs, and pigeons, and fishes, et cetera. Difference is simply an observation, and is an obvious and essential part of every single species.

I was reading in another forum (scientific forum) a thread someone started asking about this apparently 'super-special' quality of humans, and one guy was arguing that in fact, humans were different from all other animals, and, drawing from this, he was trying to imply that there had to be some 'interference' to evolution (yes, creationist wishful thinking again.)

I had to ask him whether he could name me one, or, to be more accurate, TWO species that are NOT unique. He never responded back. No surprise! If species X is not species Y then of course they are different, and of course, both of them are unique.

So what can we draw from the fact that species X is 'unique'? I'd say, basically nothing.

It's important to note, though, that when someone talks about 'equality', he/she most probably isn't literally talking about individual X being equal in all respects with individual Y. After all, as a matter of fact, there are no 2 'equal' humans. Yet we talk about 'equality' among humans.

I understand that this is it because we are talking about a moral issue, rather than a literal one, where every human counts as one, and none more or less than one. In that sense we are 'equal'. And in that sense I argue that all sentient beings are 'equal'.

Also, equality is not a concept that admits 'degrees'. You are either equal or you are not! The sentence "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" doesn't make any logical sense.

John, you say that "most (if not all) animals do put their species first" and I completely agree. I don't think I've met human animals who DON'T put their species first. Have you?

I've met some strict vegetarians (i.e. following a vegan diet) who don't oppose vivisection for what they see as a "sadly necessary practice for the well being of humans". Talking about putting one's own species first?

Then we have those humans who hunt for sport, those who kill insects for amusement or because they are 'annoying', those who enslave, exploit and kill other animals to eat their flesh and sexual secretions (the VAST majority of humans, may I add!) just because they taste good, et cetera.

Enough for humans 'not putting our species first'.

I have no doubts that humans can feel empathy for certain other animals, even if they still put their own species first. But is this 'uniquely' human?
I argue that it is not!!

Let's not talk about the obvious empathy we see from dogs and cats towards humans, and the countless stories about dogs or cats who risk their own life to save humans from danger.

When I was a little kid, I lived with Kitty (female cat) and Lassie (female dog). They were very close friends! Kitty got pregnant and a few days after she gave birth she stopped taking care of the little fellas... so Lassie took care of them! My mother told me that she even 'breastfed' them! :ohmy: Don't even ask me how she could produce milk without giving birth. Strange things happen!

Altruistic behavior performed by individuals from one species helping others from other species has been documented. Even friendship has been. Cooperation between, not only individuals, but entire groups of different species too. If anyone

is interested I think I can dig some links out and post here.

Are we going to believe that these actions are just 'instinct', no real sign of empathy? That "animals" are 'hard-wired', or worse still, that they had some 'wire' problems and that's why they act like that sometimes? Yet, on the other hand, when humans do the same it's because we are so special, and because we have a 'spirit'? :S

Finally, survival of the fittest applies to all living entities on this planet (although random chance -accidents- also play a role... like me dying because someone chose to drive his car drunk). However, 'fitness', in an evolutionary sense, doesn't necessarily mean individual capacity and competition; it might very well mean the ability to work in groups and cooperate.

So why not do the latter?

Cheers!

Samuel.

PS: I don't like the way that closing commentary presents the issue. It basically says that humans should be charitable towards to other animals, instead of being fair and just with them. And of course, the whole thing is fairly anthropocentric. Well, it is a welfarist message, after all. :angry: 'nuff disagreement for this post.

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/12 11:34

The quote from Animal Farm is actually meant to be sarcastic. It's commentary on the empty statement that all animals are equal. It's a clever spin on the notion.

It's like saying that all humans are equal, but Anglo American Males from age 35 to 55 are "more equal than others".

You understood it perfectly (it doesn't make sense), but out of context, you missed the satire.

I don't think the message from the film is inherently anthropocentric, but instead an analysis of how we find ourselves. We are the lords of the Earth. Why? Because our might has made us so. That is where we are right now. We have the capacity to end the vast majority of life (surface life, anyway) on Earth in a matter of hours. We can control nearly all life on Earth and bend the systems of our planet to our will.

So, I take the message as being: we have might, but that doesn't mean we have the right.

I think it is fair to say that of all the differences between beings in our ecosystem, we are the most estranged species. I mean that we are the farthest from the natural order of things than any other species on Earth, and that makes us universally different. Our brains are more powerful than those of other species, if we're looking at brain power on a spectrum of growth, capacity, elasticity, and complexity.

So I get what you mean about saying that we're all equal in a moral framework, and I also agree that there is no stringent continuum in terms of mammalian intelligence, but there is SOME degree of comparison through which humans come out above others. And that's not anthropocentric. It's just reality.

I believe that given the brain power, all species would begin to exploit other animals. We see this to varying degrees in species that have an intelligence similar to that of humans: elephants, porpoises, apes. If, as you say, the fittest survive, then a cheetah's ability to raise prey in captivity will fall under the category of fitness, and that cheetah will survive much better than others. And you can bet that the Cheetah will be using this method again. In fact, only those with this tendency, will have a good chance of survival.

There will still be altruism among these advancing species, just as there is altruism among Homo sapiens. However, if might equals survival then it follows that the tendency for might makes right, in the form of ingenuity passed to future generations, is something within us all. It's genetic.

Ok. I'm sleepy.

Mike

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Liberación Igualdad - 2009/05/12 12:52

Mike, I think I might be losing some of my sense of humour with these debates! B)

I know I tend to focus too much on details that might be deconstructed as anthropocentric on everything I read, so that's why I won't elaborate on the things that bothered me from that message. In any case, the "lords of the Earth" bit wasn't one of them; I understood it exactly as you explained it.

About humans being the 'most estranged species' I'm not sure, but it may very well be. I say I'm not sure because I think it largely depends on what parameters we are focusing on. Focus on 'brain power' and then yes, we are. Focus on phenotype, and you might conclude that the platypus is the most estranged.

I found this article, called Gaps in the Mind, very interesting. It talks about our 'discontinuous mind' when it comes to looking at other animals, in this case, especially at other apes.

In any case, what I find anthropocentric is not the mere observation that we are different, or that we have 'greater brain power'. Rather, that suddenly, everything about humans is unique; and we don't even bother to look around, and see if this or that characteristic is really unique!

And then we also invent things and claim these are also unique to humans. To me, that's an anthropocentric attitude.

Intelligence, rationality, language, empathy, altruism, and many other things that many claim to be uniquely human have been proved not to be (and we can see it everywhere if we just watched other animals behave). Then we have these things we supposedly and uniquely have, like 'not putting our species first' or 'having a spirit/soul', etc.

I really can't explain that as anything else than the result of anthropocentric thinking. I might be wrong, but I see no other explanation.

You raise a good point on the last part of your post. Perhaps the only reason why we are vegans is because we aren't compromising our survival at all by doing so. Otherwise we would be just like every other 'heartless and savage animal' (and I'm talking about human animals there!) :lol:

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/12 14:20

I should have known that "estranged" could be a problematic word.

"Estranged"...como...enajenado? No esta dentro del sistema? Por ejemplo, un hijo se fuera suyo familia para mucho tiempo esta "estranged".

Yikes. I think I'm losing my Spanish. Sam, you probably have a harder time translating my Spanish than you do understanding my English. :-)

Otherwise, yes, there are far "stranger" creatures than humans on this planet.

In the absence of any substantial evidence or a means of testing it, spirituality is an artifact of increased intelligence and the development of symbols.

Have you read this book? The God Part of The Brain

There is now developing evidence that there are physiological differences between brains that are religiously oriented and those that are not. That doesn't necessarily argue against the supernatural, but it does seem a little odd that an omnibenevolent being would allow genetics to keep me from allowing Jesus Christ into my heart as my personal savior.

Mike

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Weren't you sleepy 2 hours ago? Watcha doin' up now?! Are you like these weird geniuses that need nothing more than 2 hours of sleep a day?

(Ok, more reasonable answer is you were after-lunch-sleepy, just for a nap, but that isn't interesting, is it?)

Anyways, although I didn't know for sure what 'estranged' meant, I supposed it was like "set-apart" or something like that. I just looked it up on the dictionary and I was rather close. My platypus example wasn't aimed at 'stranger' but at 'estranged', btw.

"No está dentro del sistema?" Hehe, that is sooo not Spanish. I mean, there are no grammatical errors there, but I have never heard that phrase as trying to convey what I think you tried to convey.

"Por ejemplo, un hijo se fuera suyo familia para mucho tiempo esta "estranged".
Now that was horrible! :P

In general, it is easier to understand your fancy English words than your Spanish, but just because Saint Google can help me with the former.

I had seen that website before. Very interesting stuff, but no, I haven't read the book. You can't get decent books here in Chile, I'm telling ya. We just have to rely on altruistic north-american donors, sending copies for free, if we want to know about the world, you know?

it does seem a little odd that an omnibenevolent being would allow genetics to keep me from allowing Jesus Christ into my heart as my personal savior.
No hell = No fun! :woohoo:

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by photon - 2009/05/14 02:15

Liberación Igualdad wrote:OK, where to start?

Of course, it will come as no surprise that I disagree with many things written by John here. Just as DG has her 'PeTA radar on' all the time, I have my "Anthropocentric radar" myself.

John's position re-affirms my stance against supernaturalism in general, and 'spirituality' in particular, as it is, in almost all cases, deeply anthropocentric (and as I see it, anthropocentrism can only lead to injustice.)

I won't repeat my arguments shared in the other thread, but it specially annoys me when I'm confronted with anthropocentric views that are based on faith-conjectures and/or based on things which existence is not only "unproven", but actually lacking any evidence whatsoever (such as this thing some call 'spirit'.) Your air of having superior knowledge is troublesome (i.e. causes trouble by the apparent dishonest attempts against whatever I say) and now with your suggestion that I have an anthropocentric view I find it deeply offensive for more reasons than you comprehend because of your 'advanced' education.

<http://www.heartquotes.net/Einstein.html> The only thing that interferes with my learning is my education.

<http://www.pantheist.net/society/> Because Pantheists identify God with Nature rather than an anthropomorphic being, Pantheists oppose the arrogant world-view of anthropocentrism. I would say that the above is quite close to my view but I also have other reasons that when taken into perspective, are very much against anthropocentrism. You say I am anthropocentric? Nothing could be further from the truth but then you go a step further than anthropocentrism, by showing yourself to be egocentric apparently because of your pride in your (so-called) superior education and what you accuse me of in regard to (other) animals, is very similar to how you show yourself towards people such as me!

<http://www.pantheist.net/society/anthropocentrism.html>

"Anthropocentrism" means human chauvinism. Similar to sexism, but substitute "human race" for "man" and "all other species" for "woman." Human chauvinism, the idea that humans are the crown of creation, the source of all value, the measure of all things, is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness.

I have only been on this forum a few days yet this isn't the first time that you 'clever' guys have misrepresented and twisted my views in order to win over an argument that when carefully looked at, you didn't actually win!

Most people do have some concept of a God or gods and we do need most people with us if we are going to stop the obscene cruelty and slaughter of fellow earthlings. Yet you guys appear to be more interested in disproving a belief in any god, so I have little alternative than to conclude that you have hijacked the forum for your own agenda. What's more, it now becomes clearer than ever that you are against the spirit of Earthlings and please don't argue over my use of the word 'spirit' from your 80% predominant left brain!

Liberación Igualdad wrote:I agree that humans have different thinking abilities. Of course, crows also have different thinking abilities. And pigs, and pigeons, and fishes, et cetera. Difference is simply an observation, and is an obvious and essential part of every single species.

I was reading in another forum (scientific forum) a thread someone started asking about this apparently 'super-special' quality of humans, and one guy was arguing that in fact, humans were different from all other animals, and, drawing from this, he was trying to imply that there had to be some 'interference' to evolution (yes, creationist wishful thinking again.)
<http://www.google.co.uk/search?q=drake+equation>

<http://www.setileague.org/general/drake.htm>

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/origins/drake.html>

There is no hard scientific evidence that intelligent life exists anywhere beyond Earth, yet when asked if there's anyone else out there, most people have a strong opinion one way or the other. When astronomers answer the question-typically in the affirmative- they are playing a numbers game. There are hundreds of billions of galaxies, each bearing hundreds of billions of stars and perhaps billions of planets, so even if intelligent life is rare, we can't be completely alone, the argument often goes. And I do agree with that argument that most astronomers support, which is well within the probabilities. So your 'pupil' could well be right about intervention into the evolution sequence and there is much evidence of this in writings that go back thousands of years. You make an assumption that all the information about gods from the past cannot be correct, because you say it cannot be proved. Yet at the same time, you acknowledge modern writings on the assumption that your selected modern scientists must be so much more intelligent than people of the distant past! So I am very tempted to use the word arrogance, which would be very similar to the bigotry of many religions.

A view which says there is very likely intelligent life beyond our planet, when taken in context is far from anthropocentric. My own view is that there are both gods and "the God of all" not just because I have read some ancient writings but because the universe is made of information and is in continual creation. You can call that creationist if you like but it is clearly not the same as religion that says humans on earth are at the centre of the universe or have any right to be anthropocentric over other creatures.

Liberación Igualdad wrote:I had to ask him whether he could name me one, or, to be more accurate, TWO species that are NOT unique. He never responded back. No surprise! If species X is not species Y then of course they are different, and of course, both of them are unique.

So what can we draw from the fact that species X is 'unique'? I'd say, basically nothing. No, what can be drawn is uniqueness. Then just because someone doesn't want to answer you, it doesn't mean you have won the argument and sometimes, it can mean the reverse.

Liberación Igualdad wrote:It's important to note, though, that when someone talks about 'equality', he/she most probably isn't literally talking about individual X being equal in all respects with individual Y. After all, as a matter of fact, there are no 2 'equal' humans. Yet we talk about 'equality' among humans. Then shouldn't that make me equal to you? So why are you fighting what I believe to be true? You have 'better' knowledge than I do? Perhaps in some respects you might and I can plainly see that you do not know it all.

Liberación Igualdad wrote:I understand that this is it because we are talking about a moral issue, rather than a literal one, where every human counts as one, and none more or less than one. In that sense we are 'equal'. And in that sense I argue that all sentient beings are 'equal'. All sentient beings are 'equal' in the sense as above while at the same time are unique. Being unique does not mean that humans have the right to hurt other creatures but some animals do have that right, because of the way they evolved. I am not denying for a moment that other creatures don't think and feel (in fact I think that the universe as a whole is conscious and does 'think') but humans have unique and advanced thinking abilities (some more than others) over the so-called lower creatures and the use of complex language, technology and so on.

Just because we have it in our power to do so, it does not give us any right to abuse other creatures. What it does give us is greater responsibility to use our abilities in the interests of all creatures, as we are able to do so. One thing we can

do to help, obviously, is refuse the use of animal products and another is to promote the video Earthlings.

So yes this is a moral issue and it has to do with (dare I say it?) spiritual values, please not meaning religion as such but meaning what we know and feel deep down inside that is not the cold logical side of the mind that thinks only of itself.

Liberación Igualdad wrote:Also, equality is not a concept that admits 'degrees'. You are either equal or you are not! The sentence "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" doesn't make any logical sense. DG said that not me, but I do understand what she means. Then of course, you like being logical but 'logical' is not always correct or right, especially when not all the facts have been considered which is usually or always the case!

I do hope you agree that this universe is about much more than cold logic or what we understand about mathematics. Please see the video, Dangerous Knowledge. It's about several great mathematicians and you should find it interesting. <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5122859998068380459>

Liberación Igualdad wrote: John, you say that "most (if not all) animals do put their species first" and I completely agree. I don't think I've met human animals who DON'T put their species first. Have you? I have met several people who don't! Then hopefully, all of us on this forum are not putting our own species first! How about you?

Unless you haven't met your ego self (which would be impossible) you have just revealed your anthropocentric world-view/mindset and motives to us all !

Gotya!

My radar is on. :woohoo:

Liberación Igualdad wrote:I've met some strict vegetarians (i.e. following a vegan diet) who don't oppose vivisection for what they see as a "sadly necessary practice for the well being of humans". Talking about putting one's own species first? You have met some? That wouldn't be all now would it? So what exactly is your point by saying that some vegetarian/vegans do not fully support the ethos of Earthlings???

Liberación Igualdad wrote:Then we have those humans who hunt for sport, those who kill insects for amusement or because they are 'annoying', those who enslave, exploit and kill other animals to eat their flesh and sexual secretions (the VAST majority of humans, may I add!) just because they taste good, et cetera.

Enough for humans 'not putting our species first'.Oh?

Liberación Igualdad wrote:I have no doubts that humans can feel empathy for certain other animals, even if they still put their own species first. But is this 'uniquely' human? I argue that it is not!! I admit it's not a uniquely human trait but I couldn't eat a worm alive (or dead) like some birds do and I would much rather choose to eat seeds and plants. That of course isn't a birds' fault, it's the way some birds evolved to not feel compassion for what those birds eat and same with many animals but not all.

We humans can not only live on a veg diet but it's better for us both physically and spiritually...

But please do not confuse my definition of spiritual with religion or a belief in fairies as such. Spiritual (which contains the word 'spirit') is to do with the spirit in the sense of what we know which goes far beyond conventional logic and even beyond our use of words (which have been designed to make us think in ways that benefit those who profit from the cruelty of earthlings).

Words can be deceptive, as they put things into narrow boxes of meaning but the real spirit of a meaning doesn't do that. Then you will most likely will be saying that what I say above is not scientific nor logical but by doing so, you will have missed the meaning!

Listen, I am not asking you to believe in the 'supernatural' because everything that exists is natural, otherwise it would not exist. And just because you and others cannot explain or prove what you see as 'supernatural', it doesn't have to mean that what you think is the whole truth.

Liberación Igualdad wrote:Let's not talk about the obvious empathy we see from dogs and cats towards humans, and the countless stories about dogs or cats who risk their own life to save humans from danger.

When I was a little kid, I lived with Kitty (female cat) and Lassie (female dog). They were very close friends! Kitty got pregnant and a few days after she gave birth she stopped taking care of the little fellas... so Lassie took care of them! My mother told me that she even 'breastfed' them! Don't even ask me how she could produce milk without giving birth. Strange things happen! You admit?

Liberación Igualdad wrote: Altruistic behavior performed by individuals from one species helping others from other species has been documented. Even friendship has been. Cooperation between, not only individuals, but entire groups of different species too. If anyone is interested I think I can dig some links out and post here. As I have. Yes of course there are some relationships between species, yet this is relative because do eat other animals but I trust, we on here don't. Does that make us 'better' than other animals? No but it can mean that we have a capacity to be wiser (then please don't argue over the word "wiser" because any notion that "wise" is absolute).

Liberación Igualdad wrote: Are we going to believe that these actions are just 'instinct', no real sign of empathy? That "animals" are 'hard-wired', or worse still, that they had some 'wire' problems and that's why they act like that sometimes? Yet, on the other hand, when humans do the same it's because we are so special, and because we have a 'spirit' ? Frankly, I am tempted to think that with your logic you are hard wired! Then isn't every creature special in its own way? However, if with your 'logic' you oppose the ethos of Earthlings, why are you here? Could it be that (rather than in full support of Earthlings) you promote atheistic views which are at the expense of people who do have a concept of God or gods who would otherwise join us?

Please note that I have my radar on too and what does my radar see? It sees a forum hijacked by 'scientific logic' which has little to do with the real spirit (there's the word again!) of Earthlings.

Liberación Igualdad wrote: Finally, survival of the fittest applies to all living entities on this planet (although random chance - accidents - also play a role... like me dying because someone chose to drive his car drunk). However, 'fitness', in an evolutionary sense, doesn't necessarily mean individual capacity and competition; it might very well mean the ability to work in groups and cooperate.

So why not do the latter?

Cheers!

Samuel. You seriously insult me, then patronisingly say Cheers? We are all earthlings and indeed we should cooperate! But without making honest efforts to understand a mind such as my own you accused me of anthropocentric tendencies? While at the same time by context, you suggest that what Earthlings says is both illogical and unscientific? As though your science is the only logic there is? What? Who the hell do you think you are? Well, I tell you. You have a false identity which is not the real you or me. So my radar is switched on and what I see through my radar is an ego which is based on your so-called learning and knowledge. So there are many things that your ilk do not accept as proof, so forgive me if I am wrong, while like it or not, I have no alternative but to conclude that you do not accept the message of Earthlings but have a somewhat different agenda - namely proving your atheism through which you suppose is the true logic.

Liberación Igualdad wrote: PS: I don't like the way that closing commentary presents the issue. It basically says that humans should be charitable towards to other animals, instead of being fair and just with them. And of course, the whole thing is fairly anthropocentric. Well, it is a welfarist message, after all. 'nuff disagreement for this post. The closing commentary on my original post is in line with what Earthlings actually says, as can be plainly seen from the transcript from the closing words of Earthlings.

I am not trying to push you off the forum but this is what you and others are doing to others, by your insistence that your logic (which isn't the logic of Earthlings) is correct.

Yes, I have my radar on and through my radar, as Earthlings says: "I see it feelingly" And although feelings are not always right, sometimes they are. And you can't prove otherwise but would instead likely point to any gaps, yet your own theories and beliefs have many gaps!

In view of the opposition from such as yourself, I might be not be very inclined to post my thoughts on this forum/board again - yet because that is apparently exactly what you want because you have other agendas, I might stick around for awhile yet.

John

=====

Re: We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Desert Girl - 2009/05/14 06:22

Phew! And I thought I wrote long posts! Sorry couldn't read it all, so I'll let you talk amongst yourselves and I'll just pop in from time to time with the time that I have! This is my bedtime reading! Reading facebook comments is so trivial! I like to come here where I know I can find meaning! And debate!!! My favourite.

I am happy about being a pantheist! Buddhists are pantheists too, and it's the closest I've come to agreeing with any religion! I believe we have a spirit and it IS God and God is everything. And when I say God is everything I mean the universe and all the matter in it, all the time/no-time, dimensions, gravity, voids, stars black holes, planets, oceans, moons, star dust, rocks, comets, and all biological life. God is everything and it is nothing, and that's what we are. I cannot prove it except that I feel it. That is the only knowingness that I have. I do not believe that our thoughts and feelings and consciousness is strictly chemicals in our brain. I believe that our spirit does exist after the body does not. No I cannot prove it and that's when faith steps in doesn't it. I am also open to the idea that I am wrong! But seeing as neither can be proved, I accept my own belief. My father, a devout atheist and logical, scientific thinker admitted to praying! And mentions the word spirit sometimes too. I'm the same. Most "atheists" I meet believe they have a spirit, and so I guess I'm one of those too, but I found a better label.

Nighty night all you wonderful people. The last post reminded me of a cartoon by my favourite poetic cartoonist of all time Michael Leunig. A man is on his knees praying in a peaceful contented state to a cardboard box. A group of people approach him and the leader laughs at him and explains "Look, there's nothing here, you believe in nothing! I'll prove it to you. See?" as he smashes the cardboard box. The praying man looks extremely sad and devastated by what he did to his box. The group laugh their heads off and call him an idiot. Then they walk away. The praying man is left holding the pieces. Then he sticks them back together with sticky tape, erects the box back in front of him, clasps his hands in front of his heart, closes his eyes and begins to pray to the box again, contentedly with a gentle smile.

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/14 06:50

Wow. Sam upset someone. That's a first.

Everybody just cool it.

John, I'm glad you say you'll stay around, because you've made a gross overstatement about Sam's character. Stick around and read. You'll find your error, and he will most likely do the same.

Only within the past few weeks has the idea of god come up on this board. I don't know that we'll do the film, the message, or the movement any good if members of the board make people (people who are committed to working towards non-violence) feel unwelcome.

In fairness, John, you started this thread and made some bold assertions on this forum. It's only fair that they can be refuted...but civilly.

The main point here is that no logical assertion about the existence of a god can be made, because the contention is something unprovable, untestable, and overall unknown.

So just as an atheist cannot logically say "there is no god", one cannot logically say the opposite.

Is there a god?

Meh. To me, it's not a relevant question to anything I say, do, or think. Therefore, this will most humbly be my last post on this topic.

As for speciesism, blah. I love animals, you love animals. Fine. Are we still paying to have them killed? Are we killing them ourselves? No? Then good. Let's work on getting other people there, first.

See? Now hug it out.

Mike (the arbitrator of peace)

=====

Re:We earthlings are not

Posted by photon - 2009/05/14 09:33

Mike wrote: Meh. To me, it's not a relevant question to anything I say, do, or think. Therefore, this will most humbly be

my last post on this topic. As for speciesism, blah. I love animals, you love animals. Fine. Are we still paying to have them killed? Are we killing them ourselves? No? Then good. Let's work on getting other people there, first.

See? Now hug it out.

Mike (the arbitrator of peace) Mike, I love you for being a peacemaker (which is something very close to my heart) however when someone twists my words around and then accuses me of anthropocentrism, when it can be seen that what that person is doing is a projection, I have to dispute what that person is saying, whether I like it or not.

And again I say, that if we do not include people who have a concept of God or gods (and with them being the majority), we will not stop the suffering of earthlings whom I genuinely see as my earthly kin.

Mike, I often cry for our fellow earthlings but crying does no good on its own. Then on here I am faced with people who are intent on twisting my words in much the same way as religion has done which all but destroyed my life! So I trust you now know why I have my 'radar' on, to detect those who have other agenda.

Liberación Igualdad wrote: John, you say that "most (if not all) animals do put their species first" and I completely agree. This was taken slightly out of context and Liberación Igualdad wrote: I don't think I've met human animals who DON'T put their species first. Have you? So John answers Sam as thus: I have met several people who don't! Then hopefully, all of us on this forum are not putting our own species first! How about you?

=====

Re: We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Liberación Igualdad - 2009/05/14 10:30

First of all, I want to offer my sincere apologies if my words offended you, John. It wasn't my intention at all, and I'm really sorry for that.

Sadly, writing (especially on internet forums) have that particular characteristic of leaving an awful lot to interpretation, since the same words can be interpreted differently if one thinks the individual who wrote it was angry, attacking, calmed, joking, etc.

Second, I don't consider myself to have a higher degree of intelligence or 'education' (whatever that is) than anyone else. What I do have, though, is a high interest in putting my thoughts and beliefs on the table, together with the thoughts and beliefs of others, and debate them. I'm usually not content with simply sharing thoughts. I just love debating... what can I do?

However, I try to do so only when my interlocutor is also interested.

For example, many individuals come to this forum and in their very first post share their beliefs about 'god', the need for 'spirituality' or the importance of connecting with our 'souls' to solve these problems. As I don't think they want to debate, nor do I think they have a hidden 'agenda', I never respond to these specific points.

In the case of pantheism and atheism, I thought we had agreed to debate, not simply share our thoughts, hence, my insistence on arguing my position. Of course, I accept that sometimes the 'heat' of a debate might make me seem as if I'm being aggressive/insulting/whatever, and this may lead to the thought that I'm really arguing against an individual instead of addressing specific arguments. I think, however, that I have only referred to arguments, and not to the individual.

(I'm always learning in this respect -how others perceive my words- and I'll try to improve it).

Also, sometimes I do misunderstand what my counterpart is saying, and this leads me to conclusions that aren't accurate. But that's when my counterpart can clarify.

I can assure you that I haven't consciously misrepresented your views trying to 'win' (especially since I don't think a debate is about 'winning' or 'losing'). Also, I never meant to harrass you, or put forth my own 'agenda'.

Anyways, I'll respond to a few specific points you made and that'll be it.

Most people do have some concept of a God or gods and we do need most people with us if we are going to stop the obscene cruelty and slaughter of fellow earthlings. Yet you guys appear to be more interested in disproving a belief in any god, so I have little alternative than to conclude that you have hijacked the forum for your own agenda.

As Mike said, we've been only talking 'god' for a couple of weeks. I've been here for more than a year, so, although I understand why you'd think otherwise (having been here precisely these 'god-talking' weeks), your conclusion that we're

here simply to further our atheist 'agendas' is not accurate.

Like Mike, I understand that there is no way one can 'disprove' god or many other things, but one can 'disprove' certain things that some present as 'proof' of god, such as misunderstandings of evolution, for example. As I'm very interested in evolution myself, I think it's important to dispell these misunderstanding if, in my incomplete knowledge, I'm capable of doing so.

Also, I don't think that rejecting someone's views is synonymous with rejecting her/him. I have had heated debates with good friends who are theists, and our friendship has never been jeopardized because of it.

Half-seriously and half-jokingly I've been called a 'sinner', 'devil worshipper', 'infidel' and many other things (and I've called them 'schizophrenic' and 'fairy believers' back!)... but, gladly, real-life conversations are different from internet ones.

So your 'pupil' could well be right about intervention into the evolution sequence and there is much evidence of this in writings that go back thousands of years.

He could be right, but not because of his argument. I simply argued that 'uniqueness' is no good argument, since all species are unique, and their uniqueness is precisely what gives evolution its basis.

You make an assumption that all the information about gods from the past cannot be correct, because you say it cannot be proved. Yet at the same time, you acknowledge modern writings on the assumption that your selected modern scientists must be so much more intelligent than people of the distant past!

I have never even referred to ancient cultures. I haven't written, or implied, that modern scientists are 'more intelligent than people of the distant past', either.

It is my understanding that, since we are the same species, 'our' intelligence (today) is not higher or lower than that of 'them' (many thousand years ago). What is different is the knowledge accumulated (culture) and the technology.

I sincerely don't know what made you think that I believe the things you say I do in that quote.

Then shouldn't that make me equal to you? So why are you fighting what I believe to be true? You have 'better' knowledge than I do? Perhaps in some respects you might and I can plainly see that you do not know it all.

Yes, I think we are equal. But I don't think that 'equality' entails agreement about everything, or staying silent when one disagrees.

And no, I don't have (overall) 'better knowledge' than you as I don't know it all. As you say, in some respects I might, in others you might have better knowledge.

I have met several people who don't! Then hopefully, all of us on this forum are not putting our own species first! How about you?

Unless you haven't met your ego self you have just revealed your anthropocentric mindset and motives to us all! I think that regardless of my conscious efforts and intention not to, I think deep inside I am speciesist, because I think I am, in fact, hard-wired to be one (Jeff, DG's partner, wrote something similar in another forum and it made perfect sense to me). I suppose in cases of true-conflict my speciesist mindset would come up.

From the acceptance of this I try to get rid of speciesism in every aspect of my life that I can control.

However, this isn't really what I wanted to aim at, but I recognize that I phrased that sentence incorrectly. I didn't want to imply that ALL humans put their species first but that those that don't are nothing but 'exceptions' to the rule, and that these exceptions are also present in individuals from other species.

That's it.

My apologies again.

Samuel.

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/14 15:08

Just real quick:

You meant, "apologies", and not excuses, Sammy. The use of the word excuses in this particular context makes it sound like you're being sarcastic or uncaring. :-) There's really no such thing as a "sincere excuse". Stupid English language. Why can't words mean what they're supposed to mean?

Mike

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Liberación Igualdad - 2009/05/14 17:45

Seriously?

Shit! Last thing I wanted was to sound sarcastic, but there you go...

=====

Re:We humans are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Desert Girl - 2009/05/14 21:41

ha ha! My many sincere excuses!

=====

Re:We humans are not

Posted by Liberación Igualdad - 2009/05/15 10:13

Desert Girl wrote:

ha ha! My many sincere excuses!

Hey don't laugh! This is getting embarrassing now! :blush:

:P

=====

Re:We humans are not

Posted by photon - 2009/05/15 12:09

Mike wrote:Just real quick:

You meant, "apologies", and not excuses, Sammy. The use of the word excuses in this particular context makes it sound like you're being sarcastic or uncaring. :-) There's really no such thing as a "sincere excuse". Yes there is!

Mike wrote:Stupid English language. Why can't words mean what they're supposed to mean?

MikeOh but I do agree!!!

=====

Re:We humans are not

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/15 13:55

True enough, but in that case, using the word "excuse" sounds insincere (or at least disingenuous).

Nothing like a little language barrier and a comical blunder to lighten things up a little, yeah?

Makes me wonder what sorts of errors I made when my Spanish was better than it is.

I do remember an embarrassing incident when I learned the difference between un año and un ano (particularly whilst describing how many I had). :-)

Mike

=====

Re:We humans are not

Posted by photon - 2009/05/16 01:35

Liberación Igualdad wrote:First of all, I want to offer my sincere apologies if my words offended you, John. It wasn't my intention at all, and I'm really sorry for that.

Sadly, writing (especially on internet forums) have that particular characteristic of leaving an awful lot to interpretation, since the same words can be interpreted differently if one thinks the individual who wrote it was angry, attacking, calmed, joking, etc.

Second, I don't consider myself to have a higher degree of intelligence or 'education' (whatever that is) than anyone else. What I do have, though, is a high interest in putting my thoughts and beliefs on the table, together with the thoughts and beliefs of others, and debate them. I'm usually not content with simply sharing thoughts. I just love debating... what can I do?

However, I try to do so only when my interlocutor is also interested.

For example, many individuals come to this forum and in their very first post share their beliefs about 'god', the need for 'spirituality' or the importance of connecting with our 'souls' to solve these problems. As I don't think they want to debate, nor do I think they have a hidden 'agenda', I never respond to these specific points.

In the case of pantheism and atheism, I thought we had agreed to debate, not simply share our thoughts, hence, my insistence on arguing my position. Of course, I accept that sometimes the 'heat' of a debate might make me seem as if I'm being aggressive/insulting/whatever, and this may lead to the thought that I'm really arguing against an individual instead of addressing specific arguments. I think, however, that I have only referred to arguments, and not to the individual.

(I'm always learning in this respect -how others perceive my words- and I'll try to improve it).

Also, sometimes I do misunderstand what my counterpart is saying, and this leads me to conclusions that aren't accurate. But that's when my counterpart can clarify.

I can assure you that I haven't consciously misrepresented your views trying to 'win' (especially since I don't think a debate is about 'winning' or 'losing'). Also, I never meant to harrass you, or put forth my own 'agenda'.

Anyways, I'll respond to a few specific points you made and that'll be it.

Most people do have some concept of a God or gods and we do need most people with us if we are going to stop the obscene cruelty and slaughter of fellow earthlings. Yet you guys appear to be more interested in disproving a belief in any god, so I have little alternative than to conclude that you have hijacked the forum for your own agenda. As Mike said, we've been only talking 'god' for a couple of weeks. I've been here for more than a year, so, although I understand why you'd think otherwise (having been here precisely these 'god-talking' weeks), your conclusion that we're here simply to further our atheist 'agendas' is not accurate.

Like Mike, I understand that there is no way one can 'disprove' god or many other things, but one can 'disprove' certain things that some present as 'proof' of god, such as misunderstandings of evolution, for example. As I'm very interested in evolution myself, I think it's important to dispell these misunderstanding if, in my incomplete knowledge, I'm capable of doing so.

Also, I don't think that rejecting someone's views is synonymous with rejecting her/him. I have had heated debates with good friends who are theists, and our friendship has never been jeopardized because of it.

Half-seriously and half-jokingly I've been called a 'sinner', 'devil worshipper', 'infidel' and many other things (and I've called them 'schizophrenic' and 'fairy believers' back!)... but, gladly, real-life conversations are different from internet ones.

So your 'pupil' could well be right about intervention into the evolution sequence and there is much evidence of this in writings that go back thousands of years.

He could be right, but not because of his argument. I simply argued that 'uniqueness' is no good argument, since all species are unique, and their uniqueness is precisely what gives evolution its basis.

You make an assumption that all the information about gods from the past cannot be correct, because you say it cannot be proved. Yet at the same time, you acknowledge modern writings on the assumption that your selected modern scientists must be so much more intelligent than people of the distant past!

I have never even referred to ancient cultures. I haven't written, or implied, that modern scientists are 'more intelligent than people of the distant past', either.

It is my understanding that, since we are the same species, 'our' intelligence (today) is not higher or lower than that of 'them' (many thousand years ago). What is different is the knowledge accumulated (culture) and the technology.

I sincerely don't know what made you think that I believe the things you say I do in that quote.

Then shouldn't that make me equal to you? So why are you fighting what I believe to be true? You have 'better' knowledge than I do? Perhaps in some respects you might and I can plainly see that you do not know it all. Yes, I think we are equal. But I don't think that 'equality' entails agreement about everything, or staying silent when one disagrees.

And no, I don't have (overall) 'better knowledge' than you as I don't know it all. As you say, in some respects I might, in others you might have better knowledge.

I have met several people who don't! Then hopefully, all of us on this forum are not putting our own species first! How about you?

Unless you haven't met your ego self you have just revealed your anthropocentric mindset and motives to us all! I think that regardless of my conscious efforts and intention not to, I think deep inside I am speciesist, because I think I am, in fact, hard-wired to be one (Jeff, DG's partner, wrote something similar in another forum and it made perfect sense to me). I suppose in cases of true-conflict my speciesist mindset would come up.

From the acceptance of this I try to get rid of speciesism in every aspect of my life that I can control.

However, this isn't really what I wanted to aim at, but I recognize that I phrased that sentence incorrectly. I didn't want to imply that ALL humans put their species first but that those that don't are nothing but 'exceptions' to the rule, and that these exceptions are also present in individuals from other species.

That's it.

My apologies again.

Samuel. Apology half accepted - oh all right then, accepted! I must have been having a bad day and I spoke out of place. Forgive me.

But why did you mention anthropomorphism! lol I mean, that's like calling someone a Nazi! Then I guess I must have taken your words out of context. We do have things in common Sam, we both tend to argue over details - but I tend to rant more.

=====

Re: We earthlings are not

Posted by photon - 2009/05/17 03:04

Mike wrote: Wow. Sam upset someone. That's a first. And so I lost a 'brownie' point. Whatever...

Mike wrote: Everybody just cool it.

John, I'm glad you say you'll stay around, because you've made a gross overstatement about Sam's character. Stick around and read. You'll find your error, and he will most likely do the same.

Only within the past few weeks has the idea of god come up on this board. I don't know that we'll do the film, the message, or the movement any good if members of the board make people (people who are committed to working towards non-violence) feel unwelcome.

In fairness, John, you started this thread and made some bold assertions on this forum. It's only fair that they can be

refuted... but civilly. In all fairness, Mike, when insinuations appear to have been made that I am a speciesist, it should be understandable that I can get upset about such remarks. Apparently I took his words out of context and that should be understandable too.

Mike wrote: The main point here is that no logical assertion about the existence of a god can be made, because the contention is something unprovable, untestable, and overall unknown.

So just as an atheist cannot logically say "there is no god", one cannot logically say the opposite.

Is there a god? Is there a universe?

Ah but we cannot know how it could come about from nothing so therefore the universe doesn't exist?

Mike wrote: Meh. To me, it's not a relevant question to anything I say, do, or think. Therefore, this will most humbly be my last post on this topic.

As for speciesism, blah. I love animals, you love animals. Fine. Are we still paying to have them killed? Are we killing them ourselves? No? Then good. Let's work on getting other people there, first.

See? Now hug it out.

Mike (the arbitrator of peace) "Let's work on getting other people there, first" and I very much agree with that, Mike. :)

=====

Re: We earthlings are not

Posted by Mike - 2009/05/17 08:30

I will respond to this, John, only because it is more of a logic topic than a faith topic. Seriously, though, guys. I think we should all give the religious/spiritual stuff a rest for a while. I don't like the tone that keeps popping up on these threads. Maybe I'm just too much of a softy, or perhaps I gravitate towards true efficacy instead of rising tempers.

Ah but we cannot know how it could come about from nothing so therefore the universe doesn't exist?

No. Incorrect.

There are two logical fallacies, here. The first is that your premise begs the question of how the universe began by suggesting that we know it came from nothing and are now wondering how. This is not true.

The second fallacy is a non sequiter. The idea that because you don't know how something came to be means that it doesn't exist is false. That was your point, I know, but this does nothing to tie to my statement about the existence of a god. My statement wasn't that we don't know where gods come from, it was that we haven't proven whether they exist or not in any testable manner.

If a being stood before me exhibiting a combination of omniscience and omnipotence, and any or all of my five senses could experience its presence, I could reasonably assert that this being exists. I would not need to know where this being came from or how this being came into existence, because the sensory data could be sufficient for my belief. Peer review of my findings, however, would add to the empirical nature of them so I could remove such possibilities as hallucination or other factors impacting my own perception.

There are other ways to assert existence than direct sensory data, but this example is sufficient to explain how your conclusion does not follow from your premise, and your premise was inherently flawed to begin with.

This is where logic is not a subjective tool. Regardless of one's opinion on a particular topic, using arguments with those fallacies would not work towards proving a point.

Now back to work. All of you! We've got vegans to make and animals to save.

Mike

=====

Re:We earthlings are not

Posted by photon - 2009/05/17 11:14

Mike wrote:I will respond to this, John, only because it is more of a logic topic than a faith topic. Seriously, though, guys. I think we should all give the religious/spiritual stuff a rest for a while. Religious is not the same as spiritual and the message of Earthlings is a spiritual one.

Mike wrote:I don't like the tone that keeps popping up on these threads. Maybe I'm just too much of a softy, or perhaps I gravitate towards true efficacy instead of rising tempers.

John wrote Ah but we cannot know how it could come about from nothing so therefore the universe doesn't exist?

No. Incorrect. By saying incorrect, you mean the universe does exist? I agree that the universe does exist, Mike.

Mike wrote:There are two logical fallacies, here. The first is that your premise begs the question of how the universe began by suggesting that we know it came from nothing and are now wondering how. This is not true. Please explain what is meant here.

Then of course the universe does not come from nothing because nothing can come from nothing. Therefore, the universe comes from something.

Mike wrote:The second fallacy is a non sequiter. The idea that because you don't know how something came to be means that it doesn't exist is false. That was your point, I know, but this does nothing to tie to my statement about the existence of a god. 1) I thought that you wasn't going to talk about god. But seeing as the universe is much bigger and more powerful than we are, by definition, the universe would be god and 2) what I am saying is that there is logic and structure behind the universe, which points to a Mind and that is what I (as ancient gods also did) call the God of all.

Mike wrote:My statement wasn't that we don't know where gods come from, it was that we haven't proven whether they exist or not in any testable manner. I have spent most of my life (I am now 61) studying this subject and come to the conclusion there is much evidence for the existence of gods, then logically, there is even more evidence for God of all, because the universe does exist. So what does that do in regard to us earthlings? It puts things more into perspective, that humans are not the be all of everything and that on a cosmic scale, there is little difference in stature between humans and a worm or an insect. However, because we have more complex minds than some creatures have with our measure of spirituality (not to be confused with religion), knowing that we are all of the same, because we all came from the same stardust, we should know better than to abuse other creatures.

Mike wrote:If a being stood before me exhibiting a combination of omniscience and omnipotence, and any or all of my five senses could experience its presence, I could reasonably assert that this being exists. You could, if indeed such a being exists.

Mike wrote:I would not need to know where this being came from or how this being came into existence, because the sensory data could be sufficient for my belief. Peer review of my findings, however, would add to the empirical nature of them so I could remove such possibilities as hallucination or other factors impacting my own perception. Unfortunately, most peers are conditioned to perceive reality in a way to give a wrong result. For instance, look up "cold fusion" on the internet, because it is now becoming more apparent that "cold fusion" does in fact exist.

(photon) John

Re:We earthlings are not

Posted by Vishika - 2009/07/01 20:39

I think this is a great article by Adam, related to the first post.
Are humans superior to animals?

What does equality really mean? I think refers to an individuals importance in relation to another individual, in order to make the term meaningful in this context, and frame it in the mindset of the exploiter. And so equality may address the question: who is more worthy to survive?

My personal opinion on the matter is that sentient beings are equal.
It's fair to assume that we animals, all have an interest in a continued existence, and in not being exploited.
Now I don't know about insects, they are a constant source of confusion for me, but I'm sure we can all agree to afford

them this assumption.

It's hard to say that a human enjoys life more than a dog and vice versa. Even so, does ones ability to enjoy life qualify as valid reason for his or her continued existence? I don't think so.

Does ones lifespan matter, or the amount of time one has left?

Is ones "goodness" or utility to others make that person more equal/important?

Is the life of those you are responsible for or care about, mean they are more equal/important?

Is your life more equal/important than others lives?

Personally, I would answer no to the above questions. And because of that, I am at times upset over my current circumstance; being vegan in a non vegan world.

I think it is important to remember that we human animals can avoid contributing to the majority of direct or indirect harm other animals experience in today's society. And by harm I mean suffering, exploitation or death.

Unfortunately it is rare to be able to avoid all of it even if we are vegan. Some of us have to face daily, the questions I've asked above.

Surely we are also contributing to dispelling the idea that, "it is permissible for us to exploit animals, both human and non human", through our interaction with other human people.

So I also think it's just as important to keep in mind, that through this contribution, we can be more useful, to both non-human animals and human animals, than otherwise.

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by T.C. - 2009/07/05 06:44

Maybe this is out of line but:

Did it ever ocured to anybody that human beings might be just an attempt of the evolution to create a mammal-based parasite?

As far as my knowledge of typical parasite behaviour is: they use their host for their livelihood no regards if the host dies or not. In first case the par. does apparently also destroy his foundation for his own survival and condemns itself to extinction. In some cases the host doesn't survive in some cases the parasite (change of environmental influence the host is used to the par. not).

So who thinks there will be still humans in, let's say 1 million years from now, say:"Ay!"....

???

Thought so...

How much this topic will be discussed, it won't change a thing.

But one thing that make humans special to me is their ability to indivualize.

We all have our own individual way of being stupid as f...

Enough polemics.

One thing regarding the Anthrocentrism or whatever it's called.

If I would have to make a decision between saving a human being I don't know and a dog I don't know, I would definately go for the dog.

So far with this: putting the own species first...

Anyway, although I'm not a vegetarian or vegan and really do like meat, this movie really got to me.(Thinking about stopping eating dead animals.... mh, No!)

But it's true, most people would stop if they knew under which circumstances their food is prepared or had to kill them ont heir own, but some won't cuz they're ready to kill for food, like some carnivores. And others would grow their OWN veggies and soy.

-

Just one question to the non animal product eaters: what do you think about increasing exploitation of soil and human beings due to the rapidly growing soymarket, and don't tell me all of you are buying "fair trade" products.

-

But back to the topic. The individualism is from my point of view the reason why humans are not able to coexist

peacefully with anything not even amongst each other. Always the need to be special, outstanding from the masses, different from each other and they all TRY IT THE SAME WAY??? (Do animals have the problem of feeling inadequate?) An evolutionary problem? I think so...

All the other species are in the basic form we know them nowadays, for a far longer time than humans. So probably they had more time to develop a lifestyle which doesn't endanger themselves. to me it looks like humans are the only species which don't fit in the picture of a balanced world.

So far for "equality". Who said intelligence is a matter of braincapacity???

For example: Paris Hilton, not the brightest measured by academical standards but evolved the perfect premises to survive in her "environment"...

And if mankind is an evolutionary dead end, nature will take care of. Dinosaurs are gone as well (at least the clumsy and less adjustable ones).

So don't be afraid, don't weep about things which maybe meant to be.

NATURE WILL TAKE CARE OF.

The only mischief and torment animals have is mankind. but who's going to be the first sacrifice themselves for the sake of the other earthlings?

By the way are plants also earthlings? Do they suffer from overfertilization and genetic manipulation? Are they lucky? Is it cruel to eat raw vegetables?

I FEEL SO STUPID.

-finally my fav quote:

"Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need, but not every man's greed"

sad but true:kiss:

once again: awesome movie, one of the best I've ever seen. (if not the best...

at least the one with the most impact)

and to all activists: keep on doin' what ya doin! somebody has to. and I respect those who still think mankind could change and it is worth fighting for

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/07/05 08:06

Welcome to the forum. I'm glad you were moved by the film.

There are several things I'd like to point out in your post that will hopefully be food for thought.

1) "Did it ever occur to anybody that human beings might be just an attempt of the evolution to create a mammal-based parasite?"

No, because evolution is not a conscious system. It is merely a process of cause and effect. We got to where we were for any number of reasons, but a few of those reasons will arguably contradict some of your other statements.

That said, many humans ARE behaving in a rather parasitic way.

If you don't want to behave like a parasite (and it sounds like you don't) then now is the time to start looking at what choices humans make that are seemingly parasitic. We consciously destroy our planet. Therefore, we can consciously fight to stop the destruction and even work to repair it.

2) "If I would have to make a decision between saving a human being I don't know and a dog I don't know, I would definately go for the dog."

Ok, but this is also irrelevant to whether or not your actions are moral or immoral. Hopefully you wouldn't ALWAYS let the human die, otherwise that behavior is just as prejudice as ALWAYS saving the human. What it does show is that you're not going to save a human JUST BECAUSE it's a human. That's positive. It shows you're ready to start analyzing your options.

3) "Anyway, although I'm not a vegetarian or vegan and really do like meat, this movie really got to me.(Thinking about stopping eating dead animals.... mh, No!)"

Please continue talking to me about this statement. You've said that you favor non-humans over humans, and yet you say that you're not even thinking about not paying humans to kill animals. There are many ways that the human race is behaving in a parasitic way. One of them is the exploitation of animals for personal gain. The reason all omnivorous humans eat meat is because they really like it. Let's take a moment and connect that reason to the outcomes:

Humans pay to have other humans entrap, torture, and kill animals because they like the taste of their muscles and/or excretions.

Humans support an industry that causes immeasurable amounts of damage to the environment, because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

Humans support an industry that lies to the public and squashes all who oppose them, because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

Humans will reduce their quality of life through over-consumption, because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

Humans will exhaust a wide variety of critical natural resources (water, forests, animal populations), because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

Being a vegan means that you realize that "because I really do like meat" is no justification for being a planet-destroying parasite, and you recognize how important it is to teach others what you have learned so they, too, have a chance to make better decisions.

Ok, back to your post:

4) "Just one question to the non animal product eaters: what do you think about increasing exploitation of soil and human beings due to the rapidly growing soy market, and don't tell me all of you are buying "fair trade" products."

I think it's awful. Single crop fields are a terrible idea. But make no mistake: the VAST majority of soy beans grown are fed to the animals we pay to have slaughtered and fed to us. It's a common misconception that somehow if all humans were vegans that more vegetables would be grown and harvested. Unbelievable amounts of farmland, crops, etc are all due to our growing appetite for animal flesh.

That said, it's also important that you understand that I DO buy only organic, non-GMO soy for my tofu and my milk. These are all part of living a connected life and making choices where you're learning about the impact they have in the world. GMO foods are destroying ecological health as well as smaller farms. Pesticides are destroying the soil (and health of workers) at an alarming rate.

5) "The individualism is from my point of view the reason why humans are not able to coexist peacefully with anything not even amongst each other."

This is a really neat idea that you're presenting, and it's something that we all can recognize. The only thing I would suggest is that we look at whether or not this is a result of our genetic makeup, or if it is bad education combined with disconnection.

Think about it, we in the industrialized world are bombarded with a mix of consumerist propaganda and political agenda through all forms of media. These messages all tell us to stand out from the crowd, be unique, and do exactly what they tell us to do. And just as you say, we do as we're told and we all do it in THE SAME WAY. Notice, though, that we still enjoy social contact, social structure, family, friends, and other groups that allow us to belong. Social cooperation is something that comes naturally. We like to be a part of something.

This constant desire for greater gains, the very behavior that makes us parasitic, is something that we're trained in by people who gain more power every time we make selfish, disconnected decisions. It's not in our nature, it's in our televisions.

It's good that you brought up Paris Hilton, because that's an excellent example. She is just a vessel. She's a vehicle created by greed used to promote our own excesses. We've been trained to be drawn to people like her, because she is famous for nothing other than her excess wealth. We've been conditioned to love/hate/envy/loathe/pay attention to her.

6) "Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need, but not every man's greed"

Excellent quote. It's time for people to think about what qualifies as need. Do we NEED to do all the things I've listed above? Is our pleasurable desire for animal products a NEED? If it is not, then wouldn't this qualify as greed?

I hope you'll stay around on this board for a little while longer. My first post was very similar to yours. I've only been a vegan and an activist for about a year and a half. Things can change quickly once you're poised for an awakening.

Take care!

Mike

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Koshiro - 2009/07/05 16:06

It astonishes me to see how most people base their diet around soy when swapping from meat&diary products. Yes, it is a good substitute, but it is not perfect as we all know. I, personally, don't like the taste of (raw) tofu, it is somehow - accepting- tho not really good. Same goes for the baked one, usually it just ends like chewing on cardboard :S . However I do love it when it is simply 'dressed' with lots of olive oil and herbs, basil, garlic, pepper etc.

And I love olive oil (despite non liking olives? :blink:) and I put it nearly anywhere I can. Just pasta and olive oil can make a meal for me :laugh:

It has to be a good brand. Cheaper ones are quite bitter and taste horribly, waste of good olives you could say.

Same for soy milk as it was very good on the beginning, but then our shops simply stopped buying it for some weird reason and only the low-priced and even lower-quality drinks were on the shelves.

Those were horrible to say at least.

You do however have plenty of choices for 'ordinary' milk, Q10, E+, Low fat and other (idiotic) stuff like that which sells well.

And there are many types of soy, nearly a dozen for each type of use. Some are better for drinks and other for tofu, some make better sprouts and some make better flour.

However, on modern monocultural fields, you find only One! variety which is grown exclusively only for stock and bird feed. High yields, forget the good and delicate taste, Round-up Ready so no 'messaging' with all too 'horrible' weeds and so on.

These life-deprived lands grow money, not food. And then we put blindfolds on and say that massive environmental impact has nothing to do with our actions.

It is this immense greed that will send us to the early grave.

We have taken the 'burden' of sustaining life on our shoulders, saying we can do better than nature. Then later, when the whole system completely relies of us and needs us the most, we lift our hands and say we owe it absolutely nothing :angry:

Hard to say something about sustainability when one know to live only by exploiting. It is a dead end, and sooner you see it, the sooner you can turn back.

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by T.C. - 2009/07/09 07:13

Hey Mike,

First thought: Oh my good once more a mr knowitall with no sence for sarcasm...

But as I went on reading... yes my brain is definately feeding...

No offense, but it happens often that people take things too serious, well in this case it's nothing to joke about. But sarcasm to me is way to keep myself from just hating mankind. Sure sometimes I think the best way for saving the earth would be suicide. But then, who's there to tell the rest of the people that they're not the highlight of evolution or special because God made them master over earth and animals. So I'm condemned to stay alive. (got it?)

And trust me I DO make my decisions in Life really thoroughly. But beeing real consequent would mean living a way without any luxury and providing your own food. More or less the Amish way (without religion). So sometimes we have to (do we really?) make compromises and go not the best but the least harmful way. There's a German songwriter (famous for smoking XXX and being a pain in the a.. to the authorities) who said he's tryin' to live his life in a way that he can look into the mirror every morning with a clear consciencw, selfrespect and without being ashamed for himself. I heard this one the first time at his concert when I was 14. And I'm tryin' still to live up to my own expectations and beliefs. And this means definately not being awestruck by lifeforms created by the image of their god. Whatever this is going too far.

So far to nr. 1.

No2Ok, but this is also irrelevant to whether or not your actions are moral or immoral. Hopefully you wouldn't ALWAYS let the human die, otherwise that behavior is just as prejudice as ALWAYS saving the human. What it does show is that you're not going to save a human JUST BECAUSE it's a human. That's positive. It shows you're ready to start analyzing

your options.

Sorry for getting me wrong. I'm not analyzing. I am what some people would call a misanthropist. But as always the exception proves the rule, so I don't think ALL humans are AH. But most...

There once was a quote from a campaign against racism in Germany, translated: everyboby is a foreigner, almost everywhere! I changed it into:

Almost everyboby is an AH, everywhere.

So just to make sure I'm not misunderstood, I don't like humans but I have to live with it/them.

Just to give an example. there's this woman on this forum called Perrik. And, oh my god, she thinks it's cute that her kid should grow up with a dog because she did. WTF! But it gets better. How can she even consider thinking about buying a purebred, just, and that's the best, she wants a puppy... yeah, right just form the animal like you want them to be. And if the poor dog developes a personality, next stop animal shelter or highway. And... I thopught it's common knowledge that purebreds are less intelligent and also are more prone to sickness and have degenerated biological structures (German Shepherd, Irish Wolfhound amm.) just like the European nobility. and this selfish behaviour is something I just can't tolerate. And to be honest, if I meet people like her in real life, most of them consider me a unfriendly person just because I don't hold back if I think they suck. I mean, if I would think about having a dog I feel committed to think what's best for the dog and not for me. And I had some, all refugees from the bosnian war. and I in person took care that they got a good place to stay. and I'm still checkin' on them. No pets for selfish reasons, if at all. Cats, maybe because they're doing what they want anyway, and if you treat them bad they leave. A dog can't. The last one I took care of was a pinscher (red mini). and guess what, the former owner hung him up on his leash just to make sure he's not runnin' around his legs, hit him and burnt him with cigarettes. And after ten years of being taken from this SOB he still went mad when he saw somebody smoking and you didn't ease him down. And at first contact with male humans the same. It's just... if somebody watches this movie and still thinks about buying a purebred... god help, who will make me believe that humans can change? Even in Germany where they got really strict laws nowadays, I would not think about it in anyway.

You see how mad I can get about things like that... and there's no end.

No 3

Humans pay to have other humans entrap, torture, and kill animals because they like the taste of their muscles and/or excretions.

Humans support an industry that causes immeasurable amounts of damage to the environment, because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

Humans support an industry that lies to the public and squashes all who oppose them, because they like the taste of animal muscles and/or excretions.

I don't pay to torture and I don't support the industry.

I grew up on the countryside and so I'm used to provide for food for myself, even meat. and it's not like I have to have roastbeef or schnitzel every day, but now and then. And even if I pay people for killing these creatures for me... I choose carefully and only from people I know, and I know how.

You see i learnt to kill and slaughter pigs, cows chicken, ducks, rabbits and even guineapigs and dogs if they had and accident and it was just for saving them from suffering (I remember one time a bat) and I learnt to catch fish by hand. Don't think it's getting easier with the time as long as you have a conscience. And these animals werent held in cages or tortured. they had a quiet good life until they died. And it hurt everytime I had to, but it was part of my life.

There's the difference. The people who kill for profit are just ruthless killers with no conscience at all. And I think they wouldn't hesitate to kill a human too if they had to.

Something went really wrong in those peoples live.

Maybe I would also eat human flesh. but I heard it's not that tasty (not like chicken) and also really stringy.

But in some cultures it is considered a sign of respect to eat the body of a dead, so that he can live on through the ones who feasted on him/her. and sometimes to gain the power and strength of the enemy just killed.

So if I would talk myself out of this I would say they live on through me...

No4That said, it's also important that you understand that I DO buy only organic, non-GMO soy for my tofu and my milk. These are all part of living a connected life and making choices where you're learning about the impact they have in the world. GMO foods are destroying ecological health as well as smaller farms. Pesticides are destroying the soil (and health of workers) at an alarming rate.

Nope, don't agree. Sure regarding to soy beans you are right. I don't know where you're from but in Germany it became quiet fashionable to buy "organic" or wholefood products. So it's now available in evere grocery discounter. It's one of Chinas top exportproducts.

And these people, unbelievable, think just because it's labeled "organic" it has to be true. Most times it is. But, for example, potatos. The "organic" potatos have 10 to 20 times more copper than normal ones because this is the only way for farmers to provide enough yield using copper as natural fertilizer. And that's just one example.

Sure there are companies which are really trustworthy but, let's think about this, expensive as hell, could be a real problem nowadays. And the average family can't afford it. Sure if everybody is going to eat organic food it might get cheaper, rules of the free market, but just as long the next SOBs come along and try to make profit out of it (it already started). So eating flesh is still cheaper than eating healthy and vegan. You see as long as

animalkillingandtorturingflesheatingsociety is supported by the government nothing will change.
I'm on my way becoming vegan, but sometimes I can't help, and then a poor animal has to die.
One more thing. Due to my hobby as a drummer in a punkrock band I often come in contact with so called straightedge hardcore musicians or festivals, and really most of them can't cook. A fact that kept me a really long time from even thinking about becoming vegan. But what I do like is the cooking of these Krishna Guys, this food rocks. And really I try my best.
And finally: Think about it, we in the industrialized world are bombarded with a mix of consumerist propaganda and political agenda through all forms of media. These messages all tell us to stand out from the crowd, be unique, and do exactly what they tell us to do. And just as you say, we do as we're told and we all do it in THE SAME WAY. Notice, though, that we still enjoy social contact, social structure, family, friends, and other groups that allow us to belong. Social cooperation is something that comes naturally. We like to be a part of something.
Of course I didn't mean that it's within ourselves. Pure Pavlovization (I love words).
But who can tell a lie better than alier himself.
I'm working in this crappy mediacommercialadvertisingputtingmoreshitthanyoucantakeintoyourbrain industry and trust me you can't force people to believe things they're not willing to believe.
And how far is the www a part from desocialisation to society? Studies in Germany showed that the personal contact between young people is decreasing only chitchatrooms and SmS and mobilefonz. (and of course this article was presented by lieing media, again).
On the other hand it's a good thing. About ten years ago I wouldn't even had the possibility to know that you exist.
There'r always two sides of the coin.
Whatever...

Enough space wasted of the precious www.

Was nice being lectured and brainfed from you, and of course also blubbering all my thoughts out into the open webspace.

looking forward hearing from you
so long... and now a big, fat, juicy.... carrot! (no shit I'm serious, I love carrots)

=====

Re: We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/07/09 10:26

T.C.

I typically don't respond to people who are openly hostile without provocation. Whether or not you felt like you were being lectured, I was merely making suggestions based on things you said that didn't connect. I've never made a claim to "knowitall" and frankly, your name-calling is a bit childish. Should you choose to continue discussing on this board, I'd ask that you please be more respectful and mature.

What I will do, now, is point out your flawed reasoning. Not because I, personally, have the answers, but because your arguments are not logically consistent. I will explicitly indicate if I'm expressing my opinion. Otherwise, you can be sure that I'm indicating facts.

With that behind us, here we go:

There's a significant difference between being a misanthropist and being a speciesist. Saying that you hold little stock in the human species, is your opinion, though I think your sweeping generalizations are mostly unfounded. Saying, however, that you would treat a being differently BECAUSE he/she is a human, makes you speciesist. That is a prejudice based on species; not just a personal distaste for humankind.

So sometimes we have to (do we really?) make compromises and go not the best but the least harmful way.

Why do you distinguish between "best way" and "least harmful way"? And what do you mean by "do we really"? Are you unsure of your own comment, or is this your form of sarcasm that I'm misinterpreting?

Almost everyboby is an AH, everywhere.

You took the message from a logically consistent anti-hate, anti-nationalist advertisement, and altered it to meet your need for negativity, prejudgment, and hostility. In my opinion, this is a sad statement on your world view. Outside of my opinion, however, your comment is simply unfounded. There is no way you can support your claim. It is unnecessary, and it will be impossible for you to ever affect positive change in the world if you truly believe this.

And to be honest, if I meet people like her in real life, most of them consider me a unfriendly person just because I don't hold back if I think they suck.

That might not be the reason. There's a difference between thinking that someone is doing something wrong, and expressing it in an aggressive, ineffective way. If you approached them in the way you approached me, I could definitely see them think that you are being unfriendly. Telling them that they suck (if that's what you mean by not holding back) would surely be an unfriendly thing to say.

These women need their purebred dogs just as much as you need your "roastbeef or schnitzel" now and then. So, then, what's the difference?

You see i learnt to kill and slaughter pigs, cows chicken, ducks, rabbits and even guineapigs and dogs if they had and accident and it was just for saving them from suffering (I remember one time a bat) and I learnt to catch fish by hand.

In Germany, whether you hire someone to torture and kill someone or you learned to kill them yourself, the law sees this as an egregious violation of their rights. Saying that you know how to slaughter a pig does not mean you're not violating this pig's interest in living a full life. Sure, it might be less torturous, but if it is an unnecessary act, is morally right?

And it hurt everytime I had to, but it was part of my life.

I'm not sure what you mean by "had to". Was someone forcing you to do it? If so, that's awful, and I'm sorry you had to go through it. Killing animals was a part of my life, as well, but I'll never look at it as a justification for the way things are.

So if I would talk myself out of this I would say they live on through me...

People tell themselves all kinds of things to justify their behavior or to pacify their conscience. It doesn't make the behavior morally sound.

Nope, don't agree. Regarding your comments on organic foods:

It seems as though you present three arguments against buying organic products:

- 1) it may not really be organic (though you say that most of the time it is)
- 2) it may be too expensive
- 3) it will never work so long as we live in a meat-eating society

My responses are as follows:

- 1) Most of the time is far better than none of the time
- 2) If the majority of families in the developed world readjusted their expenses to meet their priorities, they could easily afford organic products. Maybe it means that they don't get as many channels on their TV every month, but surely this is an acceptable trade off, considering the benefits of organically grown produce.
- 3) There are many things that can never happen so long as we live in a meat-eating society. That is why I'm working so hard to educate people on the importance of becoming vegan.

As for cooking, I agree, the Krishnas make some delicious and incredibly affordable meals. There are lots of affordable solutions out there. I'm sorry your straightedge friends (most likely quite young, yes?) can't cook. But, if you do the cooking yourself, you might be able to get your mates to pay/clean for you and all you had to do was feed them!

Again, if you feel as though I was lecturing, please address that in a more polite manner, and be specific as to where in my post you thought I was doing this. I will continue to point out the faults in faulty reasoning, however, because the most important part of vegan education is dispelling false beliefs that cloud sound judgment. The only reason people eat animals is because of faulty reasoning and disconnected living. I will continue to try and reconnect people with their own values, but my intention is never to do so in an aggressive way. I assure you that I'm quite adept at the art of sarcasm, but I think you're confusing this with cynicism.

Enjoy your carrot.

Mike

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by T.C. - 2009/07/09 13:09

Dear Mike,

sorry you got me wrong and if I offended you.
I meant "lecturing" more in a respectful educational way.

No1: I'm not treating anybody differently because... I just really don't like them.
So it's your opinion that I am. being a speciesist would imply, 1. I'm not human myself or 2. I would really put a lot of thought into it, which I think isn't worthwhile.
And it's not preconceptive it's based on experience and daily observation.

No2: Best way would be: Living without unnecessary luxury, In harmony with nature. And therefore we would have to live like so called "primitive" people.
So as we all won't abandon our way of live, we live the least harmful way.
And there ARE people who are consistent, really consistent and willing to live their live without any compromises.

No3: I don't base my stupid ideas on facts. It's my opinion and theres something called freedom of speech. Further it's, as said before, based on my experience. And I can be really nice and persuasive if I want something to happen, so it's really not a thing having positive influence on my environment.

No4: No I'm always polite, up to a certain level of ignorance.

No5: Don't get me started on morality... do you grow your own food? If not do you know under which circumstances it's grown... (see No 7)

No6: Didn't ya? hm...

No7: 1.) I didn't said that buying organic food don't make sense. But the stuff you can buy in these grocery discounters is 30%crap ,30% a lie and the rest ok, except that it is grown under exploitational circumstances and mostly shipped around half the world (morality?). Why the hell should I buy potatos from Egypt or Israel? Or Apples from NewZealand. And if the people don't care about this fact do you really think they care about where their animal products come from.
2.) Organic food IS more expensive and I don't know your economic or social background but there are people in this world who can't afford it, yet, due to wrong economic politics and globalisation. And they don't even have a TV, get their cloths from welfare and sometimes also part of their food. Even in our "developed" world.
3). Keep on doing so!

And for my "mates", if between 30 and 40 is young than, yes they are (sure there'r also youngerones) but in fact it don't matter this was just slipslop. But I agree and as a matter of fact I have some vegan cookbooks myself.

Finally I would like to ask you, I agree with most things, do you really try to understand people. To me it sounds like you take things personal very quick or my ability to write things with the same expression I would say them fails completely. This knowitall thing is just because there are so many people who are always lecturing (and now not in a polite way) about spelling and how things are not logical and not based on facts. If there are facts I use them and if not it's just MY point of view and I'm really bored with people who can't tell the difference or don't, in any way, take their time and the care which should be given in communication.

So if you felt offended or insulted in any way due to the lack of my ability to express myself, I'm sorry.
But think about that this slaughtering and torturing has been a human tradition for thousands of years. And how will somebody learn to respect other species if he doesn't even respect his own. (to avoid further discussion on this topic: I respect them but therefor I don't have to like them).

And no, I'm definately aware of the difference between sarcasm and cynism.

And... thanks the carrot was great (organic and not from half way around the world)

write ya later.

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Mike - 2009/07/09 15:14

Ok. I think we're getting somewhere now that I understand there's a bit of a communication barrier. Tone is a tricky thing over the internet, and you started your post off with a negative one. I would never call out your spelling errors, because those are irrelevant to a discussion about human/animal rights, fairness, sustainability, vegan education, etc.

I'll respond to your enumerated points to make things easier:

1)I was basing my statement on your original comment about saving a dog versus saving a human. If your

disdain/dislike for all human beings stretches so far that you would always save the dog, then you are absolutely treating a human a certain way based solely on their being a member of the human species. It's not my opinion. I was drawing a conclusion from your own statement.

2) I think it is possible to live in a sustainable way without becoming primitive. It would mean that we consciously stop eating animal products and we consciously maintain zero population growth. But these changes are not that difficult. Go vegan. Have no more than two kids. I see what you mean about "way of life" but if we could just make these simple changes, first, then the rest may come easier. I definitely changed my way of life rather significantly. Am I at 100%? Nope. But I'm conscious of this, and I'm eager to help other people see the importance of doing the same.

3) I certainly hope you'll start to base some of your opinions on facts. You are free to say whatever you want, that is true, but this freedom doesn't mean that your opinions are valid. It just means they're yours to say. In my opinion, blue is prettier than red. This is an incontestable statement. In my opinion, the Earth is flat. Well, I'm still entitled to my opinion, but my opinion is incorrect. In my opinion, I should do whatever I please, so long as it brings me pleasure. Again, this opinion is false, because the laws of your country will not allow this. I should be able to harm animals so that I may enjoy the luxuries that come with doing so. This one is not as clear-cut, because legally, you're allowed to do this. Morally, however, you'd need to support your opinion with some sort of testable information.

4) Ok. Point taken. But I'm still curious how you distinguish between your killing of a farmed animal and a woman who buys her dogs from a breeder.

5) Your argument here seems to be if I am not growing my own food or can trace it specifically to its location, that morality has no grounds in my daily choices. I disagree. It's not all or nothing. My arguments for being vegan are not toppled because I occasionally screw up. I contend that with every step I take in the right direction (and the more people I convince to consider doing something similar) the better we will all be.

6) I'm not sure to what you're referring here.

7) I don't know where you've taken these figures from. But even if we were to assume that 39.99...% of all organic products are perfectly ok, that would still be a huge improvement over supporting the likes of Monsanto, DuPont, and other enemies of the Earth (and the consumer). In addition, organic is just one of many steps to take.

When I make purchases, I am conscious of the products that are vegan, have Fair Trade/Fair Labor options, made with recyclable/recycled materials, made with renewable energies, and locally produced (which my tofu is).

Even with all these changes to my lifestyle, I know that's not it. But just think of the extent of the impact if EVERYONE began making these connected decisions?

So long as fair labor and fair trade is established, buying local isn't as vital. But all of these steps are important. My choices change the world. They just do so on a very small scale. I need more people to join me before any huge changes can take place. The number of people becoming conscious must be greater than the number of people you describe as trying to take advantage of us with lies/mislabeling/and crap.

The only way to get there is through education.

Just think: your mates (I assumed they were young because of your mention of punk and straightedge...I forget that punk is no longer part of today's youth culture) wouldn't have to worry about cooking all that often, because the vegan options would be the majority of the options.

Respect, as you point out, is a key issue. But I think that most people have that respect locked away somewhere within them. It's just being squashed by all the distractions we've been given. The more you draw that awareness into people's minds, the more you realize that humans really are a rather compassionate animal. We're just easily distracted by greed.

Mike

Re: We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Gritt - 2009/07/15 00:19

I just watched this movie lastnight, and am repulsed that there are still human beings out there gaining financially from the unnecessary suffering of God's creatures, the kind of person that can inflict this kind of pain on animals, probably has no problem doing this to humans either, but only then will the human race in general, stop and comment on it. People I have been telling about this movie, have stopped me, saying that they dont want to hear about it, it disturbs them, but I

think everybody needs to see it, and not just once. One day when you stand in front of the Lord God Almighty, and he asks you what you did with your allotted time here on earth, I wonder what the answer will be, did you look out for your fellow creatures?

=====

Re:We earthlings are not "equal"!

Posted by lionandlamb - 2009/07/15 08:04

welcome Gritt! whatever got ya here we are happy to converse with you. I'm vegan almost 2 years, and yes, it was seeing Earthlings that really galvanized me (not without lingering trauma I might add) to go full throttle from semi-vegetarian to vegan activist overnight. But most people cannot handle the truth. I've come to the conclusion that Earthlings is not the penultimate tool to enlighten people. One has to tread carefully, and there is some merit to going very slowly with people. An outreach coordinator and very dedicated vegan activist that I know cannot watch Earthlings ... it makes him too ill. Someone on another message board described Earthlings as the 'Ludovico technique' -- a term coined from the movie 'A Clockwork Orange'. That gave me pause, and now I tend to agree. One has to take an educated guess on what would work best for a particular person.

Anyway, may I ask, are you vegan, or very interested and need to know more? And what do you think of this quote by writer Alice Walker: "The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for whites or women for men"?

Peace to ya

=====

Re:We earthlings are not

Posted by sandy - 2009/07/18 21:32

Mike wrote:

2) "If I would have to make a decision between saving a human being I don't know and a dog I don't know, I would definitely go for the dog."

Ok, but this is also irrelevant to whether or not your actions are moral or immoral. Hopefully you wouldn't ALWAYS let the human die, otherwise that behavior is just as prejudice as ALWAYS saving the human. What it does show is that you're not going to save a human JUST BECAUSE it's a human. That's positive. It shows you're ready to start analyzing your options.

Mike

It may not be consciously speciesist to save a human 100 times out of 100 in such a situation. At some level, perhaps, we identify more with those of our own kind (and species difference is at the end of a day, a significant one) and this could manifest itself as reflex reaction in extreme situations.

Mike wrote:

5) "The individualism is from my point of view the reason why humans are not able to coexist peacefully with anything not even amongst each other."

This is a really neat idea that you're presenting, and it's something that we all can recognize. The only thing I would suggest is that we look at whether or not this is a result of our genetic makeup, or if it is bad education combined with disconnection.

.....

It's not in our nature, it's in our televisions.

Mike

There are so many other tribes who live united, without materialistic and artificial divides in their community. so this tendency amongst most of us is definitely not genetic.

Yep, it's in our televisions. It's in our economy, in our politics, in our religions (sometimes). It makes up the fundamental fabric of our society.

And then there are people like John Robbins, Marshall Rosenberg and others who stand up for the other side. We can take our example from them.

=====

Re:We earthlings are not \"equal\"!

Posted by Minnimouse - 2009/07/29 04:53

Equal is the wrong word. You can not treat a person the same as someone else, because they are individuals. They have different needs and a different language from you depending on their upbringing (even though they may speak the same verbal language).

Equality is sameness, treating something the same as something else. Animals should not be treated the SAME as humans because they are different. It is not possible to treat them the same and expect them to appreciate it.

I am amazed even on here reading posts that say that animals lack the intelligence that humans have. Sure, there is the physical size of the brain and the structure. However, each animal is the best it can be, has the capabilities in whatever area they need to survive. This is the same with people. We are just as complicated as any other animal for the purpose we serve on the planet. This can never be "equal". A snails life could be just as complicated as our own but in a different way. This is an example of when something ISNT "equal" it surely must be below us or above us. Can't it just be different?

Humans like to think we are so aware. We only see a fraction of the colours that exist for a start. We only smell a fraction of the smells. Imagine how much we actually don't know about the world that animals do. Who are we to say we are more concious and aware? How blind are we really?

We watch animals feeling. We feel it at an intensity only capable of our brains and our bodies. How are we to know that an animal feels an emotion more intensely than we could ever imagine?

The world is not equal.

To see an animal shake with pain that is unmeasurable and watch eyes fade when their dignity it stolen. There is no excuse for torture or experimentation. Absolutely none, because it is not our right to even start to guess what that animal is going through. It's like the red button, if you don't know what it does, don't push it.

Leave them alone.

=====