

**CHAPTER 21. AUTHORS WITH 1965-1969 BIRTHDATES**



**If she or he had the choice  
between the open savannah or the forest  
and the inside of a building filled with people,  
what do you think the elephant would choose?**

**"Having a Care in the World"**

Martin Rowe (1965- )

British co-founder, *Satya* and Lantern Books



# Creature QUOTES

(CONTINUATION OF QUOTES FROM PAGE 1 AUTHOR)

\* \* \*

[on the "blessing of the animals" ceremony at a church]

We can bluster that we care for the environment and its denizens;  
we can shout all we like about the disappearance of wildlife  
and the pollution of the waters and the land and the air;  
we can pronounce gravely that animals are divine,  
or they possess rights, or they are God's gift.

But until we recognize that the greatest blessing we can confer  
upon an animal in the industrialized world (if not elsewhere)  
is not to kill and/or eat her or him,  
then all of the above, all the piety and prostration,  
—the howl of the wolf or the rumble of the whale—  
is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The Cathedral of St. John the Divine is,  
without doubt, an extraordinary place:  
suffused with all that is good about a diverse city  
and a passionate commitment to social change and outreach.  
It is not ultimately at fault here.

What is, is somehow a failure of nerve,  
something within all of us that allows us to talk the talk  
without really walking the walk.

\* \* \*

Yet it is surely not too much to ask those who preach  
the glory of the animals and confer blessings upon them  
to say to the animals of their own species,  
including themselves:

"Think of whom you eat; think of whom you wear;  
think of whom you kill. Think hard and long and honestly.  
And then, and only then, talk about blessing."

("A Blessing for Some" *Satya* November 1, 1994)

< >

The recent tragic outbreak of avian flu throughout the world  
and the economic and human health crisis it has created,  
reminds me of a strange little passage  
in chapter eleven of the Book of Numbers in the Torah.  
The story goes like this.

Deep in the wilderness and far from Egypt,  
some hungry and dispirited Israelites protest to Moses  
about the manna God has given them to eat.

"If only we had meat to eat!"

they wail in the lively New International Version's translation.

"We remember the fish we ate in Egypt at no cost  
—the cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions and garlic.

But now we have lost our appetite;  
we never see anything but this manna!"

# Creature QUOTES

Moses takes the issue to God:

"Where can I get meat for all these people?" he asks.

"They keep wailing to me, 'Give us meat to eat!' "

Don't worry, God replies to Moses, the people will have meat—and not just for a day, but for a whole month, until it comes out of their nostrils and they hate it.

This is, says God, because they have rejected Him and complain about leaving Egypt.

God drives flocks of quails in from the sea, and the Israelites spend 36 hours gathering them in and piling them deep throughout the camp.

Their joy, however, is short-lived:

"While the meat was still between their teeth and before it could be consumed, the anger of the Lord burned against the people, and he struck them with a severe plague" [Numbers 11:33].

The Israelites bury the dead and, before they leave the cursed spot, give it a name: *Kibroth Hattaavah*, or "the graves of craving."

It's a marvelous, if terrifying name: a literal tombstone for the consequences of gluttony and disobedience, of forgetting God and not valuing the freedom God has given them.

It's also a name that seems very contemporary.

After the outbreaks of mad cow disease, swine fever, and hoof-and-mouth in Britain or the avian flu that has led to the deaths of over 50 million birds, as well as thousands of civet cats and pigs throughout Asia, the name shows, dishearteningly, how little has changed since this tale was first told thousands of years ago.

Why are we still digging "the graves of craving"?

\* \* \*

It's about a world out of balance.

Something has gone wrong when, either routinely or not, we kill such vast numbers of animals without remorse; when animal bodies are burning in massive pyres throughout the countryside,

as was the case with foot-and-mouth disease, or stuffed alive into black plastic bags, as is the case with avian flu.

Can we not imagine there are consequences to our denial of basic freedoms to our fellow creatures in the factory farms or our massacre—there is no other word—

of tens of millions of animals because of the economic liabilities of "tainted" meat or the desire for "cheap" food.

Are these the ashes in our mouths?

The graves of craving show us what happens if we fail to recognize that our own freedom, our own exodus,

depends on moderating our basest and most venal impulses in favor of respect for God's bounty.

They suggest a recognition that everything that has the breath of life should be treated with respect. It is clear that we have lost that respect—from West to East, animals are merely the instruments of our greed, commodities to be slaughtered, gassed, burned, beaten, caged, and abused: scapegoats for our own insatiable hunger.

The Bible offers other visions of our relationship with food and animals.

In the New Testament, Jesus reflects tenderly and exasperatedly on Jerusalem, using a metaphor sadly all too rarely seen on today's farms: "How often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings" (Matthew 23.37). If God remembers the lives of every single sparrow (Luke 12:6), whose worth is virtually nothing to humans, then what is the accumulated "memory" of the millions of birds, and other creatures whose lives end each hour?

God's food, naturally, is vegetarian—given in love to his people, and, like the original creation, good.

Is it too much to hope that Isaiah's eschatological vision of a peaceable kingdom on a holy mountain, where there is no violence between species, might be drawn nearer in this world

by the actions of those to whom God has given dominion?

Is it too much to hope that people of conscience might look at what is happening these days and say that they, for a day, a week, a month, a year, and maybe for the rest of their lives,

will avoid adding one more body to the graves of craving?

("At the Graves of Craving" [Satya](#) February 16, 2004)

< >

Why don't you care about human beings?"

is a comment often thrown at people such as myself who are involved in animal advocacy.

It's a comment that...seems to strike at the core of who we are as a species.

\* \* \*

It is evident that, in spite of the work done by philosophers, theologians, and theoreticians to raise the status of animals to beings-in-themselves with their own rights and interests, most people on the street still consider animals so radically "other" that even to conceive of caring for them in the same way as one would care for a human being

# Creature QUOTES

is at best misguided and at worst obscene.  
This worldview is not particularly coherent or well thought-out.  
There is a great chain of being in most folks' minds  
with higher mammals, dogs, and cats at the top  
and food animals and "vermin" at the bottom.

\* \* \*

[I]t has always struck me as strange  
that the environment is considered to be something "out there"



—where the buffalo roam and there isn't another human being in sight.  
As the prefix "eco" (from the Greek word for "home") makes clear,  
the eco-system is nothing more nor less than where we are.

\* \* \*

As long as we as humans continue to think of animals  
and the environment as "not us" and "out there"  
then we'll continue to degrade lifeforms on this planet  
and soon make Earth Day unnecessary by not having any Earth left.  
So what's the best answer for the question,  
"Why don't you care about human beings?"

\* \* \*

I would probably say that it is because I care so passionately about us as human beings that I believe all of us can —and have a responsibility to—make the world a little less violent, without in turn rendering our planet a homogenous strip of backyard grass with a couple of birds and maybe a squirrel in it to constitute the natural world.

It is that I care about who we eat, where we live, what we drink and breathe, and that I care about how we treat the most silent and defenseless among us.

It is because I don't want to wake up one day and realize that the world is no longer worth living in, that there is silence in the trees, the denuded forest, the poisoned lakes, and the human heart and in this most tragic of ways find out that not only is there now nothing to care about but that the very means of caring has gone.

So, for what it's worth, that's how I care about human beings.

("Having a Care in the World" *Satya* March 1, 1995)

**Martin Rowe (1965- )**

**British co-founder, *Satya* and Lantern Books**

.....

California is burning, Mexico is drowning and Sub-Saharan Africa is dying of thirst.

In the wider context of these disasters, how we treat animals seems to be a disproportionately small concern.

But why is California burning, and Mexico drowning and Africa parched?

We hear talk about this country's addiction to oil.

It's nothing compared to our addiction to meat.

A recent U.N. report found that the methane produced from the flatulence of cows causes more damage to the atmosphere than all the exhaust from trains, planes and automobiles combined.

Turns out, how we treat animals is a linchpin to so many other pressing issues of the day, particularly when it comes to the environment.

Quite literally, animals *are* the environment, so their fate is our own.

And if we can't muster enough character and compassion to look after their welfare, we, too, will go the way of the kiwi and soon the polar bear and perhaps already the honeybee.

# *Creature* QUOTES

**When people look back at this point in time, they'll say one thing: that instead of simply carrying on with business as usual, we radically altered our priorities and reassessed our relationship to the planet. I'm confident they'll say this because if we simply carry on with business as usual, there will be no posterity. Which means that right now we have a chance, not simply to change the course of history, but to actually keep it going. I was born and raised in the outback of the Philippines to missionary parents, right on the edge of a jungle and near a farm.**



**I grew up with animals of all kinds, our pets (dogs, cats and bird), farm animals (cows, goats, pigs, chickens) and the wild native animals (snakes, bayawaks, monkeys, and birds of every kind).**

I had a holistic view of animals  
and from a young age felt quite an affinity to them...  
well, to some of them, at least.  
I grew up, in other words, understanding that they were,  
quite simply, an indispensable part of the fabric of life.  
And now here I am, some thirty years later,  
essentially making the same claim.  
But now, according to the stereotype of an Evangelical Christian,  
I'm supposed to care about animals primarily for how they taste  
and not, as I did when I was child, for who they are.  
But who says?  
Certainly not Scripture.  
Certainly not Jesus.  
And certainly not this Proclamation.  
As a minister in the mainline evangelical tradition,  
I have a very compelling reason  
to treat animals with compassion:  
because they are a part of God's creation,  
and dominion is not domination.  
The center of Christ's commands is, in fact,  
a radical call to compassion. Indeed, to love.  
But there's no place here  
for tawdry theological sentimentalism.  
Leave my dog or cat to its own devices  
and it will kill for meat.  
But an animal takes only what it needs,  
and that's the difference between them and us.  
We don't stop at need.  
We want and want and want, and as a result,  
we're killing our planet out of sheer greed.  
So at the end of the day, this Proclamation  
is fundamentally about two things:  
compassion and restraint,  
which are really opposite sides of the same coin.  
So what's the verdict?  
Are we going to drown ourselves in gluttony and greed  
at the expense of animals and their suffering  
and as a result forfeit not only their future  
but the future for our children,  
or will we, in a bold, difficult, even audacious move,  
restrain our appetites and,  
for one exalted moment, stay the knife?  
May God bless the work before us.

([speech](#) at the Religious Proclamation for Animal Compassion  
Conference in Washington, D.C., November 7, 2007)

<>



*Creature*  
QUOTES

[on Michael Vick's attempt at redemption]  
[I]n case there are still some out there  
who aren't convinced that a former dog-fighting overlord  
can or ever should be working in cahoots with the Humane Society,  
I offer you two names:  
Saint Peter—Three-strikes-and-you're-out-denier of Jesus Christ,  
who improbably becomes the founder of the Christian Church.



Saint Paul—Self-proclaimed Public Enemy Number One of Christians,  
who improbably becomes its greatest evangelist.

\* \* \*

The road to sainthood, it appears,  
goes through the valley of wretchedness.  
Am I proposing that Vick be beatified? Not even close.  
But I am suggesting that  
some of the most powerful advocates for a cause  
often began as one of its chief antagonists.  
Michael Vick, in other words, could very well  
turn out to be a Good Samaritan.  
To that end, I offer him my handshake of reconciliation.  
As a Christian, it's the least I can do.  
As a lover of animals, it's the most.  
I hope he is successful.  
A lot of dogs are counting on it.

(Guest Voices: "Michael Vick's Redemption, and Ours"  
ON FAITH column *The Washington Post* June 19, 2009)

**Reverend Michael Bruner, M.Div. (1965- )**  
**American Presbyterian minister**  
**Adjunct professor of theology and English**

.....

But, they're "just" chickens.  
I couldn't tell you how many times  
I have heard this phrase uttered.  
Sadly, this attitude is very common.  
Indeed, it is this mindset  
that allows this kind of behavior to go unchecked.  
It continues to grow and fester inside the person  
committing the cruelty until the brutality crosses over  
into their behavior toward other people.

\* \* \*

I have heard management say,  
"They are just line workers. They are a dime a dozen."



Obviously they care even less  
about the chickens processed every night.  
The [chickens] don't strike a single chord  
on the heartstrings of this type of person.  
Before very long, there are no strings left to strike a chord on.  
This is inhumanity.  
This is also what happens  
when a person discounts the suffering  
of anything by saying, "it is just" anything.  
The list only grows longer with time.  
It doesn't really matter much  
what species is being cruelly abused and mistreated  
(well, except to the particular creature suffering).

# Creature QUOTES

\* \* \*

**Society cannot afford to try to draw the line at which species we allow to be treated in a cruel and violent way. We have to realize that it does not matter one bit what kind of creature it is that is being treated wrong. The problem is that it happens at all to any living creature.**

**("But, They're 'Just' Chickens"**

**[cyberactivist.blogspot](http://cyberactivist.blogspot) September 30, 2003)**

**Virgil Butler (1965-2006)**

**American slaughterhouse worker turned whistleblower**

.....

**Animal exploitation,**

**because it exploits animals *as property*,  
is chattel slavery.**

**Animal exploiters completely own and control animals  
as property, resources, and commodities  
and any "restrictions" on the behavior of the property owner  
are solely for the efficient exploitation of animals as commodities.**

**We don't approve of human slavery  
no matter how "humanely" or "kindly"  
a slave owner treats his or her slaves.**

**We reject the institution of slavery in all of its forms  
because the institution itself is immoral.**

**The institution itself is immoral**

**because it systemically and necessarily  
reduces its subjects to mere objects  
existing solely to satisfy the means of others' ends;  
affords no protection to the exploited  
beyond what is deemed appropriate  
for efficient exploitation as a commodity;  
and necessarily reduces sentient beings  
with emotional lives, desires, and aversions to mere things  
—as if they were insentient broccoli, corn, rocks, or trees.**

\* \* \*

**The institution of animal exploitation (i.e. slavery)  
is a moral blind spot in our culture exactly as human slavery  
was a moral blind spot 160 years ago in America.**

**We need to examine and question our cultural prejudices  
just as 19th century Americans  
needed to examine their cultural prejudices.**

**If we are morally opposed to the institution of animal exploitation  
and the cruelty and gross injustice it necessarily entails,  
as any decent person who is aware of the facts...ought to be,  
our moral baseline must be veganism.**

**("What Is Wrong with Vegetarianism?"**

**[unpopularveganessays.blogspot.com](http://unpopularveganessays.blogspot.com) September 9, 2009)**

<>

**[W]hen the herd engages in atrocities,  
most of us are all too willing to go along, or at least ignore it.  
In fact, the herd instinct of humans  
can be found underlying and significantly contributing to  
virtually all atrocities in history and the present:  
genocides, slavery, witch-burnings,  
and the moral status and uses of animals,  
including their property status and slaughter by the billions.**

\* \* \*

**Many readers today will say,  
"Yeah, sure, the first three (genocide, slavery, witch-burning)  
are bad but the moral status and use of animals is fine as it is."  
I'll just remind these readers that the societies and people  
engaging in the first three  
thought those were "fine as they were" also.  
Again, humans never engage in activity  
that we have not "rationalized" in some way.  
We see the atrocities of other societies and other times clearly,  
but we tend to be so very blind  
to the atrocities of our own society and time.**

**("Determinism in Human Behavior  
and its Implications for Advocacy"**

**[unpopularveganessays.blogspot.com](http://unpopularveganessays.blogspot.com) February 18, 2008)**

**Dan Cudahy (1965- )**

**American certified public accountant and blogger**

.....

**Research suggests that eating other animals  
brings about an inner discomfort, or inconsistency,  
that people are generally unaware of.  
The question, then, is how can the average American,  
who very likely considers her- or himself  
nonviolent toward other animals,  
eat their bodies and experience no apparent discomfort?  
The answer to this question may be explained, at least in part,  
through an understanding of carnism.  
Carnism is the word I began using several years ago  
to denote the ideology of meat consumption.  
Ideologies are social belief systems that have  
enormous power to shape people's attitudes and behaviors.  
Ideologies are often so embedded in society that their influence  
is mostly unconscious—and therefore unquestioned.  
Typically, ideologies are only recognized  
when they are an exception to the "normal" way of thinking  
(what we call the "dominant ideology").  
This is why there is a name, vegetarianism,**

# *Creature* QUOTES

for the ideology that considers the consumption of other animals inappropriate or unethical.

The dominant ideology in our society maintains that eating other animals is normal and even necessary.

However, there is no name for this ideology.

We therefore tend to view eating animals not as a choice, but as a given.

This way of thinking makes society view the consumption of animals as normal, natural, and legitimate.

Ideologies can hide contradictions between people's behaviors and their values.

They allow people to make exceptions to what they would normally consider ethical, without even realizing it.

This is how we can understand carnism.

If we consider carnism to be an ideology, then we can explain why it is possible to love some animals and eat others.



We have been so socialized to believe in the legitimacy and necessity of carnism that most people do not even think of their meat as having once been an animal.

Indeed, most people begin eating meat before they can even talk, and the process of maintaining the invisibility of the animals who become food continues for the rest of our lives.

In my own research,  
I found that certain ways of thinking support carnism.  
Interviewing carnists (meat eaters) and meat cutters,  
I learned that, in order to eat or process the bodies of other animals,  
individuals needed to use a degree of "psychic numbing"  
—the separation of thoughts from feelings  
and of beliefs from practices.

This...was expressed through a variety of defense mechanisms.  
Among the most notable are:

- denial ("animals don't really suffer when being raised and killed for meat")
- justification ("it's acceptable to eat... animals...bred for that purpose")
- avoidance ("don't tell me that; you'll ruin my meal")
- dichotomization ("I think of some animals as companions and some as food")
- dissociation ("when I look at meat, I don't connect it with an animal—if I did, I would be disgusted and unable to eat it").

One might ask, then, if such defenses are necessary for the consumption of meat, why continue to eat meat? Why not just go vegetarian? The answer to this is complex. In a nutshell, though, carnists often continue as carnists due to a number of factors,

perhaps the most prominent of them being fear. A comprehensive list can be found in Carol Adams' wonderful book, *Living Among Meat Eaters* (2003).

Since ideologies tend to perpetuate themselves, it should be no wonder that the carnistic system works quite hard to ensure that its members remain loyal, using fear as an effective tool toward this end.

For instance, many of us have been led to believe that if we stop eating meat, we will become unhealthy, be seen as antisocial, weak or less "manly," flaky, and a host of other stereotypes.

These notions are communicated through the mass media, in which vegetarians are often portrayed as strange or radical. They are also conveyed through carnistic "education" campaigns and marketing, where meat is associated with health, strength, community, and normalcy.

\* \* \*

[W]hat may be one of the most important points to remember as vegetarians is that mental health comes not from unquestioningly participating in what we have learned is normal (consider the average German in Nazi Germany), but from practicing what we believe is right.

# Creature QUOTES

**It comes from living in accordance with our deepest values, values such as personal authenticity, integrity, empathy, and compassion for all beings.**

**What better model for a peaceful planet?**

**What better lesson to teach our children?**

**("Food for Thought: Carnism and the Psychology of Eating Meat")**

< >

**[on hypothetical dinner guests refusing to eat Golden Retriever stew]**

**What's going on here?**

**Why is it that certain foods cause such emotional reactions?**



**How can a food, given one label, be considered highly palatable and that same food, given another, become virtually inedible?**

**The stew's main ingredient—meat—didn't really change at all.**

**It was animal flesh to begin with, and it remained that way.**

\* \* \*

**Why is it that we have such radically different reactions to beef and dog meat?**

**The answer to these questions can be summed up by a single word: *perception*.**

**We react differently to different types of meat not because there is a physical difference between them, but because our perception of them is different.**

**Such a shift in perception can feel like a shift in lanes on a two-lane road:**

# Creature QUOTES

crossing the yellow line radically alters our experience.  
The reason we can have such a powerful response  
to a shift in perception is because our perceptions  
determine, in large part, our reality;  
how we perceive a situation—the meaning we make of it—  
determines what we think and how we feel about it.  
In turn, our thoughts and feelings often determine how we will act.  
Most Americans perceive dog meat  
very differently than they do beef;  
therefore, dog meat evokes very different  
mental, emotional, and behavioral responses.  
One reason we have such different perceptions of beef and dog meat  
is because we view cows and dogs very differently.  
The most frequent—and often the only—contact we have with cows  
is when we eat (or wear) them.  
But for a large number of Americans,  
our relationship with dogs is, in many ways,  
not terribly different from our relationship with people:  
We call them by their names.  
We say goodbye when we leave and greet them when we return.  
We share our beds with them.  
We play with them. We buy them gifts.  
We carry their pictures in our wallets.  
We take them to the doctor when they're sick  
and may spend thousands of dollars on their treatment.  
We bury them when they pass away.  
They make us laugh; they make us cry.  
They are our helpers, our friends, our family.  
We love them. We love dogs and eat cows  
not because dogs and cows are fundamentally different  
—cows, like dogs, have feelings, preferences, and consciousness—  
but because our *perception* of them is different.  
And, consequently, our perception of their meat is different as well.  
(*Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows:*  
*An Introduction to Carnism* © 2009)

<>

Language has always played a key role in liberation,  
a fact well known by both those who benefit from  
and those oppressed by the status quo.

\* \* \*

The animal rights movement...has relied on  
the restructuring of language  
to shift consciousness regarding nonhuman animals;  
*pets* have become *companion animals*,  
*something* is now *someone*, and *it* has become *she* or *he*.  
Words have historically been used to sustain and legitimize



the social construction of violence.  
Violence is only considered violence  
when it is directed at the dominant group;  
when carried out toward others, it is relabeled  
so as to become more morally acceptable and legitimized.

\* \* \*

[V]iolence toward nonhuman animals is referred to instead as  
*vivisection, dissection, euthanasia,*  
*experimentation, sport, and meat production.*  
This reshaping of language camouflages violence  
against a background of social norms,  
making the participating in violence  
an unconscious given rather than a conscious choice.  
Despite linguistic advances for animal rights,  
what is perhaps the greatest threat to nonhuman animals  
still rests beneath a veil of linguistic deception.  
Meat production and consumption,  
the most far-reaching and widely supported form  
of nonhuman animal exploitation, remains an unnamed ideology.  
And an ideology unnamed can consume its host like a hidden tumor.  
Until we recognize that, at least in the industrialized world,  
meat production and consumption are choices,  
and that these choices are based upon a philosophical position,  
we cannot hope to deter the mass slaughter of nonhumans  
and move toward animal liberation.  
Large-scale human meat eating rests on the speciesist assumption  
that humans are superior to other animals and that therefore,  
sacrificing nonhumans for the human palate is ethical and legitimate.  
We have, however, recognized that the opposing dietary standpoint  
—vegetarianism—is, indeed, an ideology.  
For this reason, we do not call vegetarians  
"plant-eaters" or "non-meat-eaters"  
because we understand that vegetarianism,  
though its principles are *manifested*  
in the act of abstaining from the consumption of flesh,  
is actually a philosophy in which the subjugation of other animals  
is considered unnecessary and unjust.  
This inequality of ideological identification  
demonstrates our collective meat bias.  
It is, in fact, quite common to label only those beliefs  
which run counter to the dominant culture.  
We assume that it is not necessary to assign a term to ourselves  
when we adhere to the mainstream way of thinking,  
as though its prevalence makes it an intrinsic part of life  
rather than a widely held opinion.  
Meat eating, though culturally dominant,

reflects a choice that is not espoused by everybody.

Some people refer to meat-eaters as carnivores; yet, human meat-eaters are actually omnivores, as they consume both flesh and plants.

Moreover, the terms *carnivore* and *omnivore* suggest a biological predisposition toward flesh, while contemporary, wide-scale meat eating is not a physiological necessity but an ideological choice; the millions of healthy vegetarians who have persisted throughout the centuries are testament to this.

Neither *carnivore* nor *omnivore* expresses the beliefs beneath the behavior.

For the reasons listed above, I have chosen to employ the terms *carnism* and *carnist* to describe the ideology of meat production/consumption and its proponents.

Carnism stems from the Latin *carn*, meaning *flesh* or *body*, and is the root in *carnage*.

\* \* \*

By naming the belief system which underlies the acts of meat production and consumption we are better able to acknowledge that slaughtering nonhuman animals for human consumption is not a *given* but a *choice*; a choice that is based upon an ideology in which the domination and exploitation of other animals is considered a natural human privilege.

To say "I eat meat" or "I am a meat-eater" denotes an action devoid of a philosophical viewpoint, whereas to say "I am a carnist," describes a choice, an identification with a particular belief system.

Using the verb, *eat*, in the labels *meat-eater* or even *flesh-eater* places the focus of the consumption of other animals on what one *does*, rather than what one *is*.

Language is a powerful tool in shaping values and beliefs.

Because language both reflects and reinforces culture, the words we use will either challenge or bolster the status quo.

This is why, for example, technicians in laboratories are taught not to name the animals on whom they experiment, lest they begin to perceive the *tool* or *subject* as a *being*.

This is also why slaughterhouse workers refer to the animals they slaughter by their inanimate names, even before they are killed: chickens are called *broilers*, hens are *layers*, bulls are *beef*.

By turning beings into objects it becomes possible to treat their bodies accordingly.

The restructuring of language is crucial to the vegetarian movement. Our society masks murder beneath an elaborate lexicon

that turns corpses into cuisine.  
The naming of carnism is another step  
toward nonhuman animal liberation;  
it enables vegetarianism to challenge  
not only the practice of meat production and consumption,  
but also the ideology upon which such acts stand.  
In this way, the primary objective of vegetarianism  
becomes not simply the eradication of meat eating,  
but the abolition of carnism.

("From Carnivore to Carnist: Liberating the Language of Meat")

**Melanie Joy, Ph.D., Ed.M. (1966- )**

**American author and professor of sociology and psychology**

.....

Some people come to veganism from environmentalism,  
though not every vegan's diet is necessarily better for the planet.  
The discussion about the environment  
usually originates in the massive problems  
created by the factory farming of sentient nonhumans.  
Of course, as a result, "ethical meat" becomes an option  
unless one realizes that killing when you don't need to  
is killing when you don't need to,  
no matter if it occurs in a slaughterhouse  
or in a mobile slaughter operation or in a backyard.

\* \* \*

The arguments against factory farming...are legion.  
But they too lead one to accept "ethical meat" as an option  
because their focus is on suffering.  
If you want to reduce suffering, there are indeed ways to do that.  
But why cause suffering at all when you don't need to?  
Though most people don't think about it this way,  
when you choose to eat animals or wear animals  
or use products that were tested on animals  
or have animal byproducts in them, you are choosing harm.  
You are choosing violence.  
You are choosing domination and enslavement  
and forced breeding and unnecessary slaughter.  
And not only that, you are exchanging your hard-earned dollars  
for that harm and violence and domination.  
You are paying someone to create a being  
for your use and enjoyment, and then [to] kill that being.  
No matter how nicely a farm treats the animals it creates,  
that farm is creating sentient nonhumans for the sole purpose  
of killing them for the enjoyment of others.  
Because their flesh and secretions taste good.  
Because it's a "tradition" (read: we've done it for years

# Creature QUOTES

so we keep doing it...because we've done it for years).  
We in the developed world...do not need to use animals  
in order to survive or thrive or please our palates.  
We do it because we want to and we choose to,  
and we ought to think about what else we're choosing in the process,  
and not deny or shy away from the implications of our choices.  
No amount of apologizing to the carcass on your plate  
will change the reality that you have paid someone  
(if you haven't done it yourself)  
to kill another being who experiences pleasure, pain,  
boredom and frustration, when you didn't need to.  
And no amount of "blessing" the "food"  
or "thanking" the animals for their sacrifice  
(when there was no sacrifice, there was only slaughter)  
will mean anything to the animals whose lives were taken.  
Veganism, to me, is about justice.  
It's about not fetishizing one species  
while making an industry of torturing others.  
It's about allowing individuals to live their natural lives,  
and not turning them into profit-making machines.  
("On Going Vegan" [animalperson.net](http://animalperson.net) November 1, 2009)

<>

[on a self-pitying law-school student in bucolic Vermont  
being brought up short by another's legitimate misery]  
When I stepped onto the narrow parking strip  
between the Village Green and the coffee shop,  
I stopped in my tracks to avoid being leveled  
by a speeding, mud-caked, vintage Saab  
with a Grateful Dead dancing bears sticker on it.  
In a stroke of the surreal, my heart beat frantically  
as my eye was yanked from the cheery, colorful bears on the sticker,  
to a mammoth black bear, tethered to the back  
of a white pickup truck, and held down with chicken wire.  
He was bleeding from several bullet wounds,  
and visibly in excruciating pain.  
He was groaning and whimpering,  
and his eyes spoke of grave injustice.  
I was instantly nauseated  
when the driver of the truck and his accomplice  
emerged from the truck to greet a half-dozen locals  
who had gathered to admire, not the bear,  
but the fact that the men had shot and caught him.  
They chuckled and smiled  
as the magnificent creature wailed and showed his teeth.

\* \* \*

And then the whole lot of backslapping, ecstatic locals

# Creature QUOTES

entered the coffee shop, as the once-mighty bear lie writhing in pain. I recall deciding not to vomit, as the moment wasn't about me. If I could have shot the poor bear on the spot, I would have. Or at least I say I would have. But all I had was, well, nothing but my energy and my intention that the bear forgive us all and make the most peaceful transition possible to wherever he was going. Even to nothingness, as that would have been an improvement over his current situation. I walked around the truck to get a good look at the bear



and I approached his face. I hadn't yet perfected the art of not getting hysterical when I saw an injured animal, so I was quite a sight, I'm sure. Heaving and sobbing, I spoke to him. With my usual flair for nomenclature, I called him Black Bear. I begged for his forgiveness and I tried to explain that men are so fearful that they might not be as significant as they have deluded themselves into thinking, that they will do all kinds of irrational things and call those things proof that they are indeed king of the hill. Like sneaking up on unsuspecting creatures and shooting them from behind, for instance. Somehow men have convinced themselves that that is a worthy activity, and they even have the gall to call it sport, as if it's a fair game played on equal footing.

Or as if the other team is even aware  
the game is being played and has agreed to participate.  
That's not sport. That's cowardice.  
And these fearful men say they're helping the population,  
and that many animals would die from starvation  
if it weren't for their valiant efforts.  
Meanwhile, their targets aren't starving or ill creatures at all;  
they aim for the big, healthy creatures  
who might breed a new generation of hardy animals.  
I really did say all of this.  
And then, in a whisper and continuously disrupted by blubbing,



I sang "Somewhere Over the Rainbow" to the majestic Black Bear.  
I stared into his eyes while envisioning him breaking free  
from the prison the men made of the truck,  
and the prison the men made of his now mortally-wounded body.  
I then thanked Black Bear for giving me the gift of perspective.  
I was having a self-indulgent day,  
and I discovered that there's no better cure  
for that kind of depression than being with someone else  
whose agony makes yours look insignificant,  
if not embarrassingly ludicrous.  
I transformed my pain into pure love and gratitude  
and showered Black Bear with it.  
And I'm not sure when it happened, but at some point he died,  
eyes wide open and pointed in my direction.  
I closed them and lay a hand on his face and then on his gigantic paw,  
and felt him with me as I wandered into the woods,  
imagining I was escorting him back to his home.

("Black Bear" [animalperson.net](http://animalperson.net) December 17, 2009)

**Mary Martin, Ph.D. (1966- )**

**American writer, editor, consultant, blogger**

.....

A No Kill detractor, content to allow killing to continue indefinitely, writes that I have no proof for the proposition that pet overpopulation is more myth than fact and that No Kill is therefore unattainable. When I argue that pet overpopulation is a myth, I am not saying that our work is done. Nor am I saying that people aren't irresponsible with animals. It doesn't mean there aren't a lot of animals entering shelters. It doesn't mean it wouldn't be better if there were fewer of them being impounded. Nor am I saying shelters don't have institutional obstacles to success. But it does mean that the "problem" is not insurmountable. And it does mean we can do something short of killing for all savable animals right now, today: if all shelters had the desire and will to do so, and then earnestly followed through.

\* \* \*

Unfortunately, many people in this movement have no language for success and remain steadfastly determined to find excuses for why present No Kill success cannot be replicated in their own community. No matter what information is offered, no matter how successful No Kill becomes, the answer for them remains: "It can't happen here."

\* \* \*

[on the facts that contradict "It can't happen here"]

Current estimates from a wide range of groups indicate that 4 million to 5 million dogs and cats are killed in shelters every year. Of these, given data on the prevalence of aggression in dogs in society (based on dog bite extrapolation) and save rates at the best performing shelters in the country from diverse regions and demographics, about 90% of all shelter animals are "savable." The remainder are either hopelessly ill or injured or vicious dogs whose prognosis for rehabilitation is poor or grave. That would put the number of savable dogs and cats at roughly 3.6 million on the low end and 4.5 million on the high end of the spectrum. But even at the high end, it means that we only need to increase the market for shelter pets by 2-3% in order to eliminate all population-control killing. Today, there are about 165 million dogs and cats in homes. Of those, about 20 percent come from shelters. Three percent of 165 million equates to 4.9 million, more than all the savable animals being killed in shelters. This is a combination of what statisticians call "stock" and "flow."

# Creature QUOTES

**In layman's terms, some of the market will be replacement life (someone has a pet die or run away and they want another one), some of that will be expanding markets (someone doesn't have a pet but wants one, or they have pets but want another one). But it all comes down to increasing marketshare (where they get their pets from). These same demographics also tell us that every year about twice as many people are looking to bring a new dog into their home than the total number of dogs entering shelters,**



**and every year more people are looking to bring a new cat into their home than the total number of cats entering shelters. On top of that, not all animals entering shelters need adoption: some will be lost strays who will be reclaimed, others are feral cats who need neuter and release, some will be vicious dogs or hopelessly ill/injured and will be killed.**

**\* \* \***

**From the perspective of achievability, the prognosis is very good. And we have seen this in action in various communities like San Francisco, Charlottesville, Washoe County, and others.**

**\* \* \***

**Demographically, these communities share little in common. What they do share, however, is shelter leadership**



committed to saving all the lives at risk.  
And they are proving the validity of the data.  
Statistics aside, the fundamental lesson from the experiences  
of Washoe County and other successful communities  
is that the biggest variable to whether animals live or die  
comes down to the choices made by the leaders of the shelters.

\* \* \*

Let's assume "pet overpopulation" is real and insurmountable.  
To do that, we have to ignore the data.

\* \* \*

We also have to ignore the experiences of successful communities.  
We have to pretend they do not exist.  
How does this change the calculus?  
Shelters nationally are killing  
roughly half or more of all incoming animals.  
That puts us at the 50-yard line.  
And although the evidence is fairly overwhelming to the contrary,  
let's say the Naysayer is right (data, success, and reality be damned)  
and we can never cross the goal line because of "pet overpopulation."  
What is wrong with getting, say, to the 20-yard line or 10-yard line?  
If all shelters put in place the programs and services  
of the No Kill Equation, the model which brought  
rates of shelter-to-killing in...San Francisco...Ithaca...Reno...  
Charlottesville...and points in-between to all-time lows,  
we can save millions of lives nationally,  
regardless if we ever achieve a No Kill nation.

\* \* \*

Americans are progressive, caring, compassionate,  
and generous when it comes to dogs and cats.  
We spend \$40 billion a year on the care of our animal companions,  
catering to pet owners is a top growth market  
for the travel and care industries,  
and giving to animal-related causes [is] the single  
fastest-growing segment of American philanthropy.  
Yet...our animal shelters do not reflect  
these progressive and compassionate values.  
Instead, they are often antiquated, regressive,  
dilapidated, and even cruel.  
If we replace the directors who allow this  
with those who would champion progressive approaches,  
if we improve their efficiency and effectiveness,  
we can begin to carry the ball down the field of play,  
saving lives by the millions.  
Whether we cross the goal line or not,  
those of us who value life intend to reform these shelters  
for the simple fact that these animals deserve better,

thus bringing shelters more in line  
with the values most of us hold about companion animals.  
The smug Naysayer who challenges our efforts  
appears to be content with allowing this to continue,  
the animals be damned,  
while he continues to regurgitate insupportable clichés  
about "too many animals, not enough homes."  
Killing is killing, regardless of the Naysayer's  
Machiavellian arguments that it is "necessary."  
That it is wrong and that it should be stopped  
is a basic principle of compassion he lacks.  
And with friends like this,  
the animals in shelters do not need enemies.

("The Myth of Pet Overpopulation"  
[www.nokillblog.com](http://www.nokillblog.com) May 12, 2008)

< >

How did we come to be a movement that embraces the Orwellian logic  
that killing is not killing, that killing is kindness?  
They can offer all kinds of excuses, justifications, arguments.  
None of it is true. None of it has integrity.  
None of it should be acceptable to animal lovers across the U.S.  
When you deny responsibility for the killing,  
when you in fact deny that you are even killing,  
choosing to hide behind euphemisms like putting them to sleep  
—or euthanasia—the impetus to change your own behavior,  
which might impact that killing, disappears,  
and the task of killing is made easier.

\* \* \*

Right now, except for the No Kill Advocacy Center,  
there is not a single national organization  
[focusing] on companion animals that is aggressively promoting  
implementation of the No Kill Equation,  
the only proven way to end the killing of animals in shelters.  
It is like No Kill has not been achieved.  
It is like the key to ending the killing has not been discovered.  
The nation's animal welfare organizations are not promoting  
the only effective model at ending the killing  
of savable animals in shelters.  
There are some, like Alley Cat Allies and Best Friends,  
which agree with all the programs,  
but only the No Kill Advocacy Center is promoting it nationally  
as the key to ending the systematic killing  
of five million dogs and cats in U.S. shelters every year.

\* \* \*

While animal shelters defend shelter killing  
of even healthy and friendly animals,

most dog and cat lovers, armed with the facts, find it abhorrent. The achievement of No Kill requires forcing shelters to reflect our values and battling their campaigns of misinformation and distortion. Most Americans love animals but unfortunately many [are] led to believe that killing is a necessary evil and that there is no other way. Until recently, the large, wealthy, entrenched animal welfare organizations have successfully dominated the national discussion on companion animals, and they have misused that power to falsely claim that animals are being killed because of the public, despite shelters trying their very best. In reality, nine out of ten dogs and cats can be saved in shelters if they innovate, modernize, and...rigorously implement the programs and services which save lives. But until recently, there has been little pressure to do so, as the organizations which are supposed to be holding these agencies accountable, instead are complacent about killing and, in fact, defend it even when it is not necessary.

\* \* \*

We have the power to build a new consensus, which rejects killing as a method for achieving results. And we can look forward to a time when the wholesale slaughter of animals in shelters is viewed as a cruel aberration of the past. To get to that point, we must learn from history and reject our failures. Whether we realize, appreciate, or believe it, as history marches toward greater compassion toward non-human animals, No Kill's conquest of the status quo is inevitable.

(interview with Jennifer Moore [itchmo.com](http://itchmo.com) February 27, 2008)

**Nathan J. Winograd, J.D. (1966- )**

**American author, speaker, consultant to animal shelters**

**Founder and director, No Kill Advocacy Center**

.....

A popular argument used by the dolphin hunters in Taiji when asked why they kill dolphins by the thousands every year is: "We've been doing this for hundreds of years; it's our tradition." Some people immediately accept this explanation and back off without asking any further questions. "If killing dolphins is their tradition, then it must be OK," seems to be their line of reasoning, and it is a dangerous one—it makes it too easy for those who inflict pain on others to continue doing it unchallenged.

# Creature QUOTES

The term "traditional dolphin hunt" glorifies the dolphin slaughter, creating images of proud men carrying out courageous deeds to ensure the survival of their tribes.

But the dolphin hunters of Japan are part of modern society. They do not live in tribes, what they do requires no bravery, and they certainly are not proud of what they do, which is illustrated by the tremendous amount of time they spend hiding their activities from the world.

Any person capable of forcing large groups of marine mammals into a tight space, from which there is no escape, can do this job.

We have heard the dolphin hunters' laughter as they held up their tools before turning to finish their work concealed behind tarp, barbed wire and chain link fences. The dolphin hunters' argument...illustrates a fundamental hypocrisy: While the dolphin hunters...waste time standing still and refusing to accept today's knowledge about dolphins as an intelligent, self-aware and highly evolved species, they are not against progress as long as they can benefit from it.



They use modern technology to carry out their so-called "traditional dolphin hunt," thereby turning it into something entirely different from what it was hundreds of years ago. Taking advantage of high-speed motorized boats, radios and walkie-talkies, they are able quickly to locate and hunt down thousands of dolphins and other small whales during the six-month-long hunting season. But as soon as anyone questions the justification of the hunt,

they immediately revert back to their argument of keeping things the way they have been for hundreds of years.

So while the dolphin hunters hide behind "tradition," their modern dolphin killing machine marches on, eradicating entire dolphin schools in its destructive path.

We urge everyone never to accept the term "tradition" as valid reason for any action.

Tradition is no excuse for cruelty.

("Cruelty in the Name of Tradition"

[savejapandolphins.blogspot.com](http://savejapandolphins.blogspot.com) December 7, 2009)

**Helene Hesselager O'Barry (1966- )**

**Danish writer-photographer**

.....

The wealth of knowledge we have about the realities of modern animal husbandry forces the critically thinking, compassionate person to conclude that modern society's appetite for personal pleasures and comforts through food comes at the expense of a voiceless other, namely the animals.

As a Jew who has spent years learning Jewish sources that indicate that part of the mission of an ethical, value-driven society is to protect its weakest members, the decision to abstain from foods directly related to animal abuse is a mandate.

\* \* \*

Modern societies permit atrocious living conditions and heinous mistreatment of animals for the food industry. The reasons for this abuse are economic —produce vast quantities of product at the least possible expense. Modern, secular thinking allows for sentient creatures to be treated like inanimate objects, but Jewish tradition, which expresses the concepts of humility and responsible stewardship, does not. Unarguably, Jewish law legislates human interaction with animals. My decision to abstain from the consumption of animal products is an expression of my adherence to Jewish law, and it expresses my disapproval and disdain for the cruel practices of the industry.

Mounds of evidence prove that both the government and the food industry, and even Jewish leadership, have betrayed our trust in the prevention of animal cruelty and suffering.

**Rabbi Adam Frank (1967- )**

**American-Israeli educator**

.....



**Here are these exquisite, immensely powerful creatures,  
who willingly give us their labor in return for our stewardship.  
They have attended us throughout history,  
bearing us across frontiers and into battle, pulling our plows,  
thrilling us in sport, warming us with their beauty.  
We owe them more than we can ever repay.  
To send these trusting creatures to slaughter  
is beneath their dignity and ours.**

**Laura Hillenbrand (1967- )  
American writer on horse racing**

.....

## *Creature* QUOTES

In the spring, Grandpa would come home from the feed store with dozens of little yellow chicks, peeping and blinking at a new world only a few days old. Grandma would set up the brooder house where the chicks would spend their lives over the next few months. They would peck and scratch the ground outside during the day, and at night they would huddle under heat lamps locked up from the night. When I was seven years old, a particular chick caught my fancy. He wasn't any smaller or bigger than the others, but we had a connection. When I would walk in to sit and watch the baby chickens, he would come running to me. He'd jump in my lap to be held and petted. He had a way of looking me in the eye. He seemed like a long-lost friend



somehow trapped in the world of being a chicken. I named him Foghorn. And I loved him. Chickens grow fast. Soon August arrived. My aunts, uncles and cousins rolled down the dusty gravel road toward the farm to take part in the traditional family event. Grandma boiled water in huge pots out in the pump house, and Grandpa sharpened the long, steel blade of a homemade machete. Midmorning came. My cousins picked up the nearly full-grown chickens by their legs and carried them to my Grandpa. I followed behind cradling Foghorn.

# Creature QUOTES

I handed Grandpa Foghorn, who looked at me and blinked.  
Grandpa folded Foghorn's wings to his sides and held his legs  
all with one giant hand and lay him down on the tree stump.  
Seconds later, he handed Foghorn's bleeding body back to me.  
I held him upside down by his legs as I was told to do  
and let the blood drain from his severed neck.  
As I stood in line with my cousins  
to take Foghorn to the scalding pots  
to make it easier to pluck out his feathers,  
I looked back at his head lying in a heap with the others  
—one last blink, beak open.  
I was lost in a fog of confusion.  
A friendship was lost that day along with my kindred spirit.  
And a trust was broken—trust between my grandparents and me  
and between me and my friend.

\* \* \*

[on the family's pig factory farm]

Back then, we kids worked all aspects of the farm  
—the mucking, castrations, dealing with downed pigs.  
The screams are still in my head.  
What they say about family farms being "humane" is simply not true.  
While in college, I brought Barbara (now my wife) back to the farm.  
As we were about to head back to school,  
we came upon a "downed pig"  
who was struggling and breathing heavily.  
I knew she wouldn't make it. I told my stepfather about her.  
He handed me the rifle and told me to "take care of it."  
I just couldn't do it.  
Barbara and I gave her some water and said our goodbyes.  
Her face and eyes are burned deeply on my soul.  
We promised her we would go vegetarian  
—and so started our journey.

\* \* \*

[on the inception of Nonviolence United]

I'd hang out with my environmentalist friends  
and they'd point over at my human rights friends and say,  
"Why don't they get it?"  
And I'd hang out with my human rights friends  
and they'd point at my animal rights friends and say,  
"Why don't they get it?"  
And my animal rights friends would point at  
my human rights and environmentalist friends and ask,  
"Why don't they get it?"  
That's why we started NonviolenceUnited.org  
—we recognized the common ground  
and knew we can work together to build a better world.



*Creature*  
QUOTES

Still I find that animal protection folks tend to be more open to talking about other social justice issues outside their immediate circle.

I think their broader circle of compassion somehow allows them a deeper sense of empathy.

\* \* \*

[on studying social justice advocates Gandhi, King, and Chavez]

These were leaders who brought diverse people together around two major ideas: that because we are all connected, the path to progress is through Nonviolence; and that people can change the world with their consumer choices. NonviolenceUnited.org was started to help unite people under these main ideas.

("Nonviolence United" interview by Paul Berry for [humanetour.com](http://humanetour.com) July 6, 2009)

< >

I didn't have to read or learn about the cruelty to animals inherent in raising animals as food—I lived it.

\* \* \*

The screams of the animals are still in my head.

And I had my hands in every gory detail.

I am so sorry.

Becoming vegan began as atonement, but has since become my greatest joy and, honestly, my reason for living.

Being on the vegan path has opened my heart and mind to worlds I never would have known.

I am so grateful.

\* \* \*

Gandhi said, "Happiness is when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in harmony."

I thought I cared about animals; I said I cared about animals; and now what I do and how I eat are in line with my values.

That's what going vegan offered me—happiness.

("Vegan Voices" [veganpoet.com](http://veganpoet.com))

< >

The question isn't whether or not you can make a difference. You are making a difference.

But what kind of difference are you making?

What kind of difference do you want to make?

Each of our choices in the past built the world we live in today.

And each of our choices from this moment forward will build the world we live in tomorrow.

We will build a world reflective of our values

when our everyday choices are aligned with those values.

# Creature QUOTES

## **Every Dollar Is A Vote.**

**Every dollar you spend or choose not to spend is a vote.  
You voted yesterday. You'll vote today—maybe hundreds of times.  
Will you vote for human rights, a clean environment  
and compassion for animals?**

**If your words which plead for humanity  
are drowned out by the clamor of your coins,  
you're saying to unthinking businesses,  
"Yes, keep doing what you're doing...and do it in my name!"  
How can it be that 95% of Americans feel it is wrong  
to unnecessarily hurt and kill helpless animals,  
yet 95% of Americans continue to unnecessarily  
hurt and kill helpless animals—so they can eat them?  
Why the disconnection?**

**Every day you are invited to make choices.  
Align your choices with your values...and change the world.**  
(© A Life Connected—A Project of [NonviolenceUnited.org](http://NonviolenceUnited.org))

**Matt Bear (1967- )**

**Co-creator of [NonviolenceUnited.org](http://NonviolenceUnited.org)**

.....

[on photographing rescued farm animals at sanctuaries]

**My goal is to create images that become windows  
into the souls of the creatures,  
because beyond the appearance of their bodies  
their souls are much like ours.**



**If I can relate that through my work  
then I feel my work can change hearts.**

One by one, we will light the candles  
to dispel the darkness of exploitation.

\* \* \*

Once we begin to see all of the lies and inconsistency  
in something as basic as our food choices  
then we begin to see how that is tied in  
to things like land use, energy use, and consumerism.  
Once we begin to understand how animals are exploited  
then it becomes easier to identify the ways  
that groups of humans are exploited by other groups of humans.

\* \* \*

Veganism is a way of life that can open our eyes  
to many other ethical decisions we make each day  
with what we choose to buy, the companies we support,  
the way we conduct ourselves as ethical beings in the world.  
The goal is not to be so pure  
that we have to live outside of society in a cave.  
The goal is to integrate into society  
and influence the course of history  
towards a more compassionate future.  
When animals are treated well, humans will be treated even better.

("Vegan Voices" [veganpoet.com](http://veganpoet.com))

**Derek Goodwin (1967- )**

**American photographer and artist**

.....

[A]bout 99 percent of the U.S. adult population  
continues to eat animal products—and...most people  
still think we vegans are the crazy ones!  
But...who's really disconnected from reality here:  
us peaceful "gatherers" who follow a philosophy of ethical eating,  
or the "hunters" who stuff their mouths with the fried corpses  
and reproductive secretions of other species  
and then stick their fingers in their metaphorical ears  
whenever someone reminds them who they're eating?

\* \* \*

[M]ost people are unwilling or unable  
to look at the world from the animals' perspective.  
If they tried, and caught even the briefest glimpse  
of just how vast and horrendous the atrocities  
we commit against other species are,  
such an insight might be enough to spark  
the beginning of a transformation.  
Sadly, most people seem afflicted by a form of moral blindness  
that is perpetually reinforced by a lifetime of indoctrination,  
from the "four food groups" poster on the classroom wall,

to the litany of fast-food commercials  
continually inundating the airwaves.  
It seems that, as children, we are instinctively enthralled



with the similarities and differences between us and other species,  
but our attitudes about animals are shaped  
(and usually distorted) by what adults tell us.  
Remember, people are *taught* to fish and hunt,  
even if we use shopping carts rather than  
hooks or guns to entrap our helpless prey.  
We *learn* that in the "natural order" of the world  
(defined by us humans),  
our kind occupies the very top of the food chain,  
and that we must kill to survive.  
We are *told* that it is humanity's God-given right—nay *sacred duty*—  
to subdue all other creatures,  
to keep them in check and under our control  
lest they overturn our divinely-dispensed domination.  
Incidentally, this anthropocentric arrogance  
has already caused the extinction of countless species  
and will almost certainly bring about  
our own destruction someday if we don't stop it.  
Therefore, at this stage in evolutionary history,  
I believe that appreciating the complexity and intelligence of animals  
is not only intrinsic to the ongoing process  
of our becoming fully human, but the key to our very survival.  
Fortunately, each of us can (and must)  
do something concrete to bring about this paradigm shift  
—starting (as always) with ourselves.

("Cheap Thrills: The Pleasures of Wildlife Voyeurism"  
[animalrighter.blogspot.com](http://animalrighter.blogspot.com) May 28, 2009)

**Mat Thomas (1969- )**  
**American freelance writer and editor**

.....

Change is coming, and for the animals, it can't happen soon enough. Whether it's the 8-10 million perfectly adoptable animals euthanized in the United States each year, the 660,000 slaughtered for food every hour, or the appalling cases of cruelty where perpetrators get little more than a slap on the wrist, the time has come to change the way we speak about, and perceive, non-human animals. Animal rights and welfare organizations have existed for years, and yet even today, one of the most daunting challenges remains how to alter perceptions.

The question remains, "How can our vision of animals transcend the antiquated view of treating them as 'things' or 'commodities' rather than sentient beings, with needs and complex emotional and intellectual lives of their own?"

Part of the solution rests in countering the archaic and incorrect assumption that animals are non-thinking, non-feeling objects to be used, exploited and objectified.

The remainder of the solution, more than likely, lies within each of us—if we are willing to look at ourselves, and change our own behaviors.

Humans are but one species on the planet, and our mere presence by no means entitles us to unquestioned superiority.

The time has come for change—in actions, thoughts and language. The time has come for a paradigm shift with respect to ending stereotypes and human authority over another species.

\* \* \*

Animals cannot speak for or defend themselves, and must rely on those who believe there is a moral, ethical and legal obligation to protect them from abuse, exploitation and neglect—members of one species protecting the rights and well-being of another.

\* \* \*

In 1999, In Defense of Animals launched the "Guardian Campaign," to elevate the status of animals above mere property, commodities or things, by changing perceptions of animals through subtle, but critical change in language.

\* \* \*

The "Guardian Campaign" was created to reflect growing public support for a redefined public standard of relating to animals. With animal-companions taking an ever-increasing, and more important, role in families, more and more people began to refer to themselves

as "guardians," instead of "owners," recognizing the deep personal relationships humans develop with non-human animals. Replacing the term "owner" with "guardian" may seem like an insignificant play on words, something trivial, but history has shown that movements are spearheaded by words, and this very change in semantics can stir people to action, and alter history.

\* \* \*

Currently, almost 6 million Americans and Canadians are officially recognized as "guardians," and the number is growing.

\* \* \*

Here are a few of the benefits "guardians" bring to their communities and the animals who live there:

- Guardians Recognize Animals as Individuals, Not Objects
- Guardians Recognize Changing Public Attitudes
- Guardians Reduce the Number of Animals in Puppy Mills
- Guardians Help Decrease Abuse and Abandonment
- Guardians Positively Impact Local Communities

\* \* \*

Changing people's perceptions about animals won't happen overnight, but it will happen. The key to facilitating such change lies in humane education and fostering an awareness that animals exist for their own reasons, not simply to benefit humans. Many open-minded and compassionate adults have already embraced the idea of being a "guardian" instead of an "owner," but the impetus for permanent change lies in educating future generations about animals, and our responsibilities to them.

Children must be empowered to make the world a better, more compassionate place.

Once these children become adults, they will pass on experiences to their kids, and so on.

The cycle of compassion needs to begin now.

With the right educational support and parental reinforcement, it can and will perpetuate itself.

(Guest Editorial: "Building Compassion From the Ground Up" *The Peaceable Table* [vegetarianfriends.net](http://vegetarianfriends.net) November 2009)

**Bruce Zeman, Jr. (1969- )**

**American radio talk show host, speaker, author**

**Author of "Nathan's Law"\* (May 10, 2004)**

**[\*Nathan's Law, named after guardian Bruce's Dachshund, is the first ordinance in New Jersey that recognizes animals as family members, by adding "guardian" to one city's legal definition of animal "owners"]**

.....

Today, many people see creation from a self-serving perspective,  
assuming that animals were created for our unrestricted use.  
But...animals were not created for us to exploit.  
Rather, we were created to guard and protect them.

\* \* \*

Since we cannot identify ourselves with animals  
in the same way as with other humans,  
animals force us to transcend our limited human perspectives.  
To open ourselves to that which is different  
is an exercise in spirituality.

\* \* \*

Relationships are about reciprocity.  
We can't expect only to change the other,  
but must also be open to change ourselves.  
To be a friend of animals means  
being ready to learn and receive from them.

\* \* \*

Few of us apply the Golden Rule  
in our relationship with oppressed animals.  
It may be because of lack of interest, or lack of knowledge.  
In order to practice the Golden Rule,  
we must be aware of others' needs.

\* \* \*

The only legitimate sacrifice is the one that is self-chosen.

\* \* \*

Conformity is a problem when it supports  
ingrained forms of oppression.  
Prejudices about animals run deep in our society,  
making them difficult to uncover.  
Even good, otherwise clear-sighted people  
contribute to the oppression of animals.  
Their example provides further justification for meat-eating.  
It's difficult to do right when many people are doing wrong.  
It's even more difficult when your own role models are doing wrong.  
But the judgment falls on each of us as individuals.  
We can't excuse our own lies and violence  
by pointing to what someone else did.

*(Every Creature a Word of God © 2008)*

**Annika Spalde (1969- ) and Pelle Strindlund (1971- )**  
**Swedish authors of books on social justice and peace**

.....

## **END OF CHAPTER 21. 1965-1969 BIRTHDATES**



## Photo Credits for Chapter 21. 1965-1969 Birthdates

P 1 "THIRSTY FAMILY" OF AFRICAN ELES DRINK IN SYNC (*Loxodonta africana*)

Location: Addo Elephant National Park, near Port Elizabeth, South Africa

Photo by Gaby Gang — cosmopolitan\_photography/Flickr

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/cosmopolitan\\_photography/4157392853](http://www.flickr.com/photos/cosmopolitan_photography/4157392853)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/cosmopolitan\\_photography](http://www.flickr.com/photos/cosmopolitan_photography)

Link to elephant sanctuary: [www.addoelephantpark.com](http://www.addoelephantpark.com)

P 1 "SOCIAL DINING" ASIAN ELES EAT IN SYNC (*Elephas maximum*)

Location: Elephant National Park, near Chiang Mai, Thailand

Photo by Peter K. — bekop/Flickr

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/83119253@N00/4420174960](http://www.flickr.com/photos/83119253@N00/4420174960)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/83119253@N00](http://www.flickr.com/photos/83119253@N00)

Link to elephant sanctuary: [www.elephantnaturepark.org](http://www.elephantnaturepark.org)

P 5 SNOW-COVERED BUFFALO (*Bos bison*)

Photographers are usually not identified on this site, but own photo copyrights  
Non-commercial, educational, inspirational use of this site's photos is permitted

Photo link: [firstpeople.us/Snow-Covered-Bufferalo](http://firstpeople.us/Snow-Covered-Bufferalo)

Home page: <http://www.firstpeople.us>

■ American Indians.

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

P 7 (left) CORAL SNAKE (*Hemibungarus calligaster gemianulis*)

and (right) SPITTING KING COBRA SNAKE/PHILIPPINE COBRA (*Naja philippinensis*)

Photographers are generally not identified on this site, but own photo copyrights

Photos are free, with no permission required

Photo of Coral Snake seen here: [www.freesnake.com/cr114.html](http://www.freesnake.com/cr114.html)

Photo of Cobra Snake seen here: [www.freesnake.com/spittingcobra10.html](http://www.freesnake.com/spittingcobra10.html)

NOTE: The pictured Coral Snake may not be identical to the Old World Coral Snake (*Hemibungarus...*) noticed by the quote's author when he grew up in the Philippines

P 7 PANAY MONITOR LIZARD/WATER MONITOR/BAYAWAK (*Varanus salvator*)

Location: Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia

Photo by Nur Hussein/Wikimedia User (Creative Commons 3.0 license)

Photo seen here: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:WaterMonitor\\_Penang.jpg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:WaterMonitor_Penang.jpg)

P 9 "NOBLE PITBULL MINA" (*Canis lupus familiaris*)

Location: Northern California, U.S.A.

Photo by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3646996979](http://www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/3646996979)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia](http://www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia)

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 41)



(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 40)

**P 10 "GRANDPA" ROOSTER ENJOYS RETIREMENT LIVING (*Gallus gallus domesticus*)**

Location: Animal Acres, Acton, California, U.S.A.

Photo by Erin Pfeifer

Photo link: [animalacres.org/Grandpa\\_the\\_Rooster](http://animalacres.org/Grandpa_the_Rooster)

Home page: [www.animalacres.org](http://www.animalacres.org)

**P 13 "BABY LAMB ... CUTENESS" (*Ovis aries*)**

Location: Battle Hill Farm Forest Park, Wellington, New Zealand

Photo by Elise Pallesen — elise\_maree/Flickr

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/xx-tweety-bird-xx/2924022592](http://www.flickr.com/photos/xx-tweety-bird-xx/2924022592)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/xx-tweety-bird-xx/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/xx-tweety-bird-xx/)

**P 13 BEDLINGTON TERRIERS (*Canis lupus familiaris*)**

Photo by David Owsiany (Creative Commons all licenses)

Photo seen here: [http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Bedlington\\_terrier.jpeg](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Bedlington_terrier.jpeg)

**P 15 "THE SENTINEL" TUCKER, GOLDEN RETRIEVER DOG (*Canis lupus familiaris*)**

Location: Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Photo by Edward — kisses\_are\_a\_better\_fate\_than\_wisdom/Flickr  
(Creative Commons 2.0 license)

Photo seen here: [en.wikipedia.org/Golden\\_Retriever\\_Tucker](http://en.wikipedia.org/Golden_Retriever_Tucker)

and here: [www.flickr.com/photos/16209788@N00/460032648](http://www.flickr.com/photos/16209788@N00/460032648)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/16209788@N00](http://www.flickr.com/photos/16209788@N00)

**P 21 AMERICAN BLACK BEAR (*Ursus americanus*)**

Location: Tennessee, U.S.A.

Photographers are usually not identified on this site, but own photo copyrights  
Non-commercial, educational, inspirational use of this site's photos is permitted

Photo seen here: [firstpeople.us/Black-Bear-Tennessee/Gallery\\_1\\_Bears](http://firstpeople.us/Black-Bear-Tennessee/Gallery_1_Bears)

Home page: <http://www.firstpeople.us>

■ American Indians.

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

**P 22 "SKY PALETTE"**

Location: Kittatinny Mountain, Walpack Township, Sussex County, U.K.

Photo by Nicholas T/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/nicholas\\_t/150069741](http://www.flickr.com/photos/nicholas_t/150069741)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/nicholas\\_t](http://www.flickr.com/photos/nicholas_t)

**P 24 "MAILING SCOOTER"—A RESCUED CAT (*Felis catus*)**

Location: Tacoma, Washington, U.S.A.

Photo by Scooter's "Dad" Kevin Farias — Kevin\_F2008/Flickr

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/3820545237](http://www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias/3820545237)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias](http://www.flickr.com/photos/kfarias)

Photos of feral cats that Kevin feeds (see Chapter 24, p 35): [FeralCatsColony](http://FeralCatsColony)

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 42)

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 41)

P 24 MISSY—ONCE A STRAY DOG IN MISSISSIPPI (*Canis lupus familiaris*)

Location: Canton, Connecticut , U.S.A.

Photo by Missy's "Mom" Ginny

Meet Missy's rescuer, Shelly Bookwalter: [Animal-Planet-New-Summer-Series-2010](#)  
Shelly co-hosts Animal Planet show's *Last Chance Highway*, which premieres in the summer of 2010. Through [Petfinder.com](#), Shelly finds homes for stray dogs from the South—as many as 150 per week. The show's co-host, Kyle Peterson, loads the canines into his tractor-trailer once a week for the trip to their new families on the East Coast of the U.S. For a small adoption fee, the dogs' new guardians receive, in return, a grateful bundle of joy, as Missy has proved to be.

P 28 BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN MOM AND CALVES (*Tursiops truncatus*)

Location: Chanonry Point, Inner Moray Firth, Scotland, U.K.

Photo by Peter Asprey (Creative Commons 3.0 license)

Photo seen here: [en.wikipedia.org/Bottlenose\\_Dolphin\\_With\\_Young](http://en.wikipedia.org/Bottlenose_Dolphin_With_Young)

Photographer's website: [www.dolphinpix.com](http://www.dolphinpix.com)

P 30 STATUESQUE WILD MARE (*Equus ferus caballus*)

Location: Sand Wash HMA, Sand Wash Basin, Colorado, U.S.A.

Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.

Photo seen here: [www.bobschillereff.com/p797930665/h3520d4f2#h3520d4f2](http://www.bobschillereff.com/p797930665/h3520d4f2#h3520d4f2)

Home page: [www.bobschillereff.com](http://www.bobschillereff.com)

P 31 "CHICKEN LITTLE" (*Gallus gallus domesticus*)

Location: Ekeren, Belgium

Photo by Jannes Pockele — [jpockele/Flickr](#) (Creative Commons 2.0 license)

Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/jpockele/144511642](http://www.flickr.com/photos/jpockele/144511642)

Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/jpockele](http://www.flickr.com/photos/jpockele)

Photographer's website: [silent.rave.org](http://silent.rave.org)

P 34 SIMON, A GOAT GLAD TO BE RESCUED (*Capra aegagrus hircus*)

Location: Farm Sanctuary, Watkins Glen, New York, U.S.A.

Photo © October 2003 by Derek Goodwin/© Derek Goodwin Photography

Photo seen here: [veganica.com](http://veganica.com)

Photographer's website: <http://derekgoodwin.com>

P 36 CHIMPANZEE BOBBY SLEEPS IN MOM JESSIE'S ARMS (*Pan troglodytes*)

Location: The Center for Great Apes, Wauchula, Florida, U.S.A.

Photos by Patti Ragan

Bobby seen here: [www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=34](http://www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=34)

Jessie seen here: [www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=46](http://www.centerforgreatapes.org/residents-details.aspx?id=46)

Home page: [www.centerforgreatapes.org](http://www.centerforgreatapes.org)

End of Photo Credits for Chapter 21. 1965-1969 Birthdates

