

## 1: Do you believe Jesus was a vegetarian?

*Thanks for the A2A Having been a vegetarian for more than a year now, obviously I can give reasons for vegetarianism but not so much against it. However, I will give you reasons that others have told me they won't go vegetarian.*

Check new design of our homepage! Understanding the Basic Differences Understanding the basic concept of vegan vs. Read on to find out the exact difference between veganism and vegetarianism. NutriNeat Staff Last Updated: Feb 20, Perhaps to lose weight, choose a healthier lifestyle, religious beliefs, or become a PETA supporter, there can be numerous reasons why people opt to become or choose to be a vegan or vegetarian. Of course, you may have a completely different argument to want to be either one; health concerns being one of them. We wish to find out "what" makes someone a vegan or choose vegetarianism. When your vegetarian diet contains a rich pattern that includes fresh fruits, vegetables, and grains, which in turn keep your heart and body healthy, it not only keeps you strong physically, but also makes emotional, psychological, and mental changes. In contrast, there are people who are strict vegans for ethical, health, environmental, and many more reasons. Many people, including myself for a long time, are under the impression that there is no difference between these two diets. Being either is a choice of lifestyle, as you are considered in two separate food groups. Of course, there are specific diet constraints that an individual has to follow. However, the line between "include" and "keep out" can be blurry. So, to help clarify the sometimes "unnoticeable" blur of vegan vs. Vegetarianism This might be a simple one to understand, but there are many layers of vegetarianism. By definition, people who are vegetarian do not eat any kind of meat products red meat, poultry, fish, shellfish, animal slaughter products but at times will consume dairy and egg products. The diet also includes of fruits, vegetables, nuts, seeds, and grains. Although, the concept of vegetarianism is pretty clear across the world, there are however, subcategories that divide it further on. However, this distinction does not include consumption of fish. Seafood is included in the diet, minus the flesh of animals. A new term for "almost" vegetarians, describes those who are under a mostly vegetarian diet and sometimes eat meat as well. A semi-vegetarian occasionally eats only fish and chicken no red meat. The boundaries to this diet is flexible. As the name suggests, "lacto" means milk in Latin, so the basic consumption comes from eating dairy products. This includes milk, cheese, butter, cream, and yogurt. The eggs are mostly preferred from free-range animals and not the caged ones. Veganism A misunderstood fact, vegan is by far the most strictest vegetarian subcategory. Apart from veganism being a way of living, it covers the philosophical grounds as well. Vegan diet, also known as pure and complete vegetarian diet, strictly stays away from the usage of animals for food, clothes, and other functions. Also, dairy and egg products with processed foods such as gelatin is also excluded from the diet. The most common influences for becoming a vegan are health, ethical, moral, environmental, spiritual and religious values, along with animal rights and welfare issues. This means, that you are a vegan as you consume unprocessed vegan foods, whole grains, sea vegetables, fruits, legumes, beans, naturally processed foods, and vegetables, but your diet also includes occasionally fish. Apart from the classifications of food and diet, there are differences in health benefits as well. No matter which type of diet regime you go for, be sure to consult your doctor and research before becoming either one.

### 2: 9 Reasons To Reject Vegetarianism - Listverse

*Richard Craib Introduction to Philosophy Paper #3: Option 2. RACHELS'S BASIC ARGUMENT FOR VEGETARIANISM In The Basic Argument for Vegetarianism, James Rachels presents his own Basic Argument for vegetarianism, which is based on the work of Peter Singer (70).*

The Cholesterol Argument against meat-eating Here are facts showing that: It is strange, but true that U. Of the medical schools in the U. The average nutrition training received by the average U. Thus doctors in the U. Heart attack is the most common cause of death in the U. The average cholesterol consumption of a meat-centered diet is milligrams per day. Raising livestock for their meat is a very inefficient way of generating food. Pound for pound, far more resources must be expended to produce meat than to produce grains, fruits and vegetables. For example, more than half of all water used for all purposes in the U. The amount of water used in production of the average cow is sufficient to float a destroyer a large naval ship. While 25 gallons of water are needed to produce a pound of wheat, 5, gallons are needed to produce a pound of California beef. That same 5, gallons of water can produce pounds of wheat. Meat-eating is devouring oil reserves at an alarming rate. It takes nearly 78 calories of fossil fuel oil, natural gas, etc. They would last years if humans stopped eating meat altogether. That is 20 times longer, giving humanity ample time to develop alternative energy sources. Thirty-three percent of all raw materials base products of farming, forestry and mining, including fossil fuels consumed by the U. The Antibiotic Argument against meat-eating Here are facts showing the dangers of eating meat because of the large amounts of antibiotics fed to livestock to control staphylococci commonly called staph infections , which are becoming immune to these drugs at an alarming rate. The animals that are being raised for meat in the United States are diseased. The livestock industry attempts to control this disease by feeding the animals antibiotics. Huge quantities of drugs go for this purpose. Of all antibiotics used in the U. But this is only partially effective because the bacteria that cause disease are becoming immune to the antibiotics. These antibiotics and-or the bacteria they are intended to destroy reside in the meat that goes to market. It is not healthy for humans to consume this meat. The response of the European Economic Community to the routine feeding of antibiotics to U. European buyers do not want to expose consumers to this serious health hazard. The Pesticide Argument against meat-eating Unknown to most meat-eaters, U. The common belief is that the U. In reality, fewer than one out of every , slaughtered animals is tested for toxic chemical residues. That these chemicals are indeed ingested by the meat-eater is proven by the following facts: Ninety-nine percent of U. This shows that the primary source of DDT is the meat ingested by the mothers. Contamination of breast milk due to chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides in animal products found in meat-eating mothers versus nonmeat-eating mothers is 35 times higher. The amount of the pesticide Dieldrin ingested by the average breast-fed American infant is 9 times the permissible level.

## 3: The Philosophy of Food Project

*The basic argument is a principle, which states that it is wrong to cause pain unless there is a good enough reason, however, justification and/or consent is required for the reasoning. This relates to the argument for vegetarianism in that we must take "notice that in the modern meat-production business, animals are made to suffer terribly.*

October 23, Published: October, People become vegetarians for many reasons, including health, religious convictions, concerns about animal welfare or the use of antibiotics and hormones in livestock, or a desire to eat in a way that avoids excessive use of environmental resources. Becoming a vegetarian has become more appealing and accessible, thanks to the year-round availability of fresh produce, more vegetarian dining options, and the growing culinary influence of cultures with largely plant-based diets. Approximately six to eight million adults in the United States eat no meat, fish, or poultry, according to a Harris Interactive poll commissioned by the Vegetarian Resource Group, a nonprofit organization that disseminates information about vegetarianism. Several million more have eliminated red meat but still eat chicken or fish. About two million have become vegans, forgoing not only animal flesh but also animal-based products such as milk, cheese, eggs, and gelatin. Traditionally, research into vegetarianism focused mainly on potential nutritional deficiencies, but in recent years, the pendulum has swung the other way, and studies are confirming the health benefits of meat-free eating. Nowadays, plant-based eating is recognized as not only nutritionally sufficient but also as a way to reduce the risk for many chronic illnesses. According to the American Dietetic Association, "appropriately planned vegetarian diets, including total vegetarian or vegan diets, are healthful, nutritionally adequate, and may provide health benefits in the prevention and treatment of certain diseases. A diet of soda, cheese pizza, and candy, after all, is technically "vegetarian. You can get many of the health benefits of being vegetarian without going all the way. For example, a Mediterranean eating pattern "known to be associated with longer life and reduced risk of several chronic illnesses" features an emphasis on plant foods with a sparing use of meat. Only you can decide whether a vegetarian diet is right for you. If better health is your goal, here are some things to consider. But people with many different dietary patterns call themselves vegetarians, including the following: Do not eat meat, poultry, fish, or any products derived from animals, including eggs, dairy products, and gelatin. Do not eat meat, poultry, or fish, but do eat eggs and dairy products. Eat no meat, poultry, fish, or eggs, but do consume dairy products. Eat no meat, poultry, fish, or dairy products, but do eat eggs. Avoid meat but may eat fish pescovegetarian, pescatarian or poultry pollo-vegetarian. Can becoming a vegetarian protect you against major diseases? Compared with meat eaters, vegetarians tend to consume less saturated fat and cholesterol and more vitamins C and E, dietary fiber, folic acid, potassium, magnesium, and phytochemicals plant chemicals, such as carotenoids and flavonoids. However, there were few deaths in either group, so the observed differences may have been due to chance. Soluble fiber also helps reduce cholesterol levels. Refined carbohydrates and starches like potatoes, white rice, and white-flour products cause a rapid rise in blood sugar, which increases the risk of heart attack and diabetes a risk factor for heart disease. Nuts are also heart-protective. They have a low glycemic index and contain many antioxidants, vegetable protein, fiber, minerals, and healthy fatty acids. Walnuts, in particular, are a rich source of omega-3 fatty acids, which have many health benefits. One study suggests that omega-3s from walnuts and fish both work to lower heart disease risk, but by different routes. A vegetarian diet can make it easier to get the recommended minimum of five daily servings of fruits and vegetables, but a purely vegetarian diet is not necessarily better than a plant-based diet that also includes fish or poultry. For example, in a pooled analysis of data from the Oxford Vegetarian Study and EPIC-Oxford, fish-eaters had a lower risk of certain cancers than vegetarians. Vegetarians usually have lower levels of potentially carcinogenic substances in their colons, but studies comparing cancer rates in vegetarians and nonvegetarians have shown inconsistent results. Research suggests that a predominantly plant-based diet can reduce the risk for type 2 diabetes. What about bone health? Lacto-ovo vegetarians see "Varieties of vegetarians" consume at least as much calcium as meat-eaters, but vegans typically consume less. But vegans who consumed at least milligrams of calcium per day were not especially vulnerable to fractures. Certain vegetables can supply calcium, including bok choy,

broccoli, Chinese cabbage, collards, and kale. Spinach and Swiss chard, which also contain calcium, are not such good choices, because along with the calcium they have oxalates, which make it harder for the body to absorb calcium. Moreover, the high potassium and magnesium content of fruits and vegetables reduces blood acidity, lowering the urinary excretion of calcium. People who follow a vegetarian diet and especially a vegan diet may be at risk of getting insufficient vitamin D and vitamin K, both needed for bone health. Although green leafy vegetables contain some vitamin K, vegans may also need to rely on fortified foods, including some types of soy milk, rice milk, organic orange juice, and breakfast cereals. They may also want to consider taking a vitamin D supplement. Selected resources

Becoming a vegetarian requires planning and knowledge of plant-based nutrition. Here are some resources that can help:

### 4: "The Basic Argument for Vegetarianism" - Ethics and Animals, Group 6

*It is wrong to cause suffering without a good enough reason. meat production causes animals to suffer. animal suffering outweighs human pleasure from meat-eating and we can eat something else.*

Intuitively I know it is wrong. We have an obligation to do something to help them. Everyone has a basic right to life. No one can enjoy his or her rights if he or she lacks what is essential for a healthy life: The pain and suffering endured by the hungry outweighs the inconvenience the well off experience when they give money to relief organizations. We have an obligation to give to charity to help others. The overall pain and suffering endured by the hungry outweighs the overall happiness enjoyed by the well off. Justice requires that the well off reduce the suffering of others. If it is in our power to prevent hunger we have a moral obligation to do it, if we do not have to sacrifice anything morally comparable. It is a virtue to be compassionate and charitable. It is a vice to be indifferent to suffering and stingy. Extreme disparities of wealth among nations are unjust. Justice requires a more fairly distributed economic benefits and burdens. Justice requires that nations distribute resources more fairly so that everyone can enjoy their basic right to life. Western nations are largely responsible for the conditions that produce global hunger: Nations, like individuals, are responsible for the wrongs they cause. Wealthy nations caused global hunger and, therefore, have an obligation to cure it. Wealthy nations as well as instruments of international economic and political justice, such as the World Bank and United Nations, recognize the legitimacy of repressive regimes that fail to protect the basic rights of citizens. The global economic-political order supports these regimes to the benefit of wealthy nations over poor nations. Therefore, nations have no obligation to help nations they did not impoverish. If a person is poor through no fault of another person, then no one has an obligation to rectify an injustice he or she did not cause. Therefore, individuals have no obligation to help people they did not harm. We should help the poor out of compassion not obligation. Arguments for the duty to help others disregard the disposition of the giver and, therefore, fail to consider what is morally relevant about the action. In other words, a just action is one that comes from a benevolent character, not merely one that produces good consequences. Helping other people or nations is matter of charity. It is a matter of obligation because it is not a matter of justice. There have always been people who are poor and hungry, and there always will be. There is nothing that can be done about it. We are not all equal. Some people have natural advantages over others, just like some nations have advantages over other nations. The fittest survive and thrive, just like in nature. Giving money to poor people is demeaning and degrading. It is a short-term solution that fails to address underlying causes of poverty. Give a man a fish. Giving food to the hungry in poor countries will make their lives worse. Foreign aid overlooks the realities of reproduction. Eventually, people in poor nations will out-number people in wealthy nations. The wealthy will be unable to support the poor; the poor will use up all of the resources. Everyone will suffer more as a result of foreign aid.

## 5: James Rachels - Wikipedia

*This week's topic: How to argue for vegetarianism. Common Argument #1: It's Unhealthy To Cut All The Meat Out Of Your Diet. No, cutting meat out of your diet isn't an unhealthy choice.*

And among the candidate values of Y are: Industrial animal farming Freerange farming Recreational hunting Space is limited and cranking through many instances of the schema would be tedious. This section focuses on causing animals pain, killing them, and harming the environment in raising them. On control, see Francione , DeGrazia , and Bok On ontologizing, see Diamond , Vialles [], and Gruen , Chapter 3. Causing animals pain while raising them for food when there are readily available alternatives is wrong. Industrial animal farming involves causing animals pain while raising them for food when there are readily available alternatives. Hence, Industrial animal farming is wrong. It is sometimes permissible to cause animals pain: The first premise is asserting that causing pain is impermissible in certain other situations. We could let the chickens be and eat rice and kale. The first premise asserts it is wrong to cause animals pain while raising them for food when there are readily available substitutes. It says nothing about why that is wrong. It could be that it is wrong because it would be wrong to make us suffer to raise us for food and there are no differences between us and animals that would justify making them suffer Singer and the enormous literature it generated. It could, instead, be that it is wrong because impious Scruton or cruel Hursthouse So long as we accept that animals feelâ€”for an up-to-date philosophical defense of this, see Tye â€”it is uncontroversial that industrial farms do make animals suffer. No one in the contemporary literature denies the second premise, and Norwood and Lusk go so far as to say that it is impossible to raise animals for food without some form of temporary pain, and you must sometimes inflict this pain with your own hands. Animals need to be castrated, dehorned, branded, and have other minor surgeries. Such temporary pain is often required to produce longer term benefitsâ€”All of this must be done knowing that anesthetics would have lessened the pain but are too expensive. Also, industrial farms make animals suffer psychologically by crowding them and by depriving them of interesting environments. Animals are bred to grow quickly on minimal food. Various poultry industry sources acknowledge that this selective breeding has led to a significant percentage of meat birds walking with painful impairments see the extensive citations in HSUS The argument can be adapted to apply to freerange farming and hunting. Freerange farms ideally do not hurt, but, as the Norwood and Lusk quotation implies, they actually do: For one thing, animals typically go to the same slaughterhouses as industrially-produced animals do. Both slaughter and transport can be painful and stressful. The same goes for hunting: In the ideal, there is no pain, but, really, hunters hit animals with non-lethal and painful shots. These animals are oftenâ€”but not alwaysâ€”killed for pleasure or for food hunters do not need. Against the arguments, one might accept that farms hurt animals but deny that it is even pro tanto wrong to do so Carruthers and ; Hsiao a and b on the grounds that animals lack moral status and, because of this, it is not intrinsically wrong to hurt them or kill or control them or treat them like mere tools. One challenge for such views is to explain what, if anything, is wrong with beating the life out of a pet. Like Kant, Carruthers and Hsiao accept that it might be wrong to hurt animals when and because doing so leads to hurting humans. This view is discussed in Regan It faces two distinct challenges. One is that if the only reason it is wrong to hurt animals is because of its effects on humans, then the only reason it is wrong to hurt a pet is because of its effects on humans. So there is nothing wrong with beating pets when that will have no bad effects on humans. This is hard to believe. Another challenge for such views, addressed at some length in Carruthers and , is to explain whether and why humans with mental lives like the lives of, say, pigs have moral status and whether and why it is wrong to make such humans suffer. Killing animals while raising them for food when there are readily available alternatives is wrong. Most forms of animal farming and all recreational hunting involve killing animals while raising them for food when there are readily available alternatives. Hence, Most forms of animal farming and all recreational hunting are wrong. The second premise is straightforward and uncontroversial. All forms of meat farming and hunting require killing animals. There is no form of farming that involves widespread harvesting of old bodies, dead from natural causes. Except in rare farming and hunting cases, the meat produced in the

industrialized world is meat for which there are ready alternatives. The first premise is more controversial. Amongst those who endorse it, there is disagreement about why it is true. If it is true, it might be true because killing animals wrongfully violates their rights to life Regan It might be true because killing animals deprives them of lives worth living McPherson It might be true because it treats animals as mere tools Korsgaard There is disagreement about whether the first premise is true. Everyone agrees that it is sometimes all things considered permissible to kill animals, e. Whether it is permissible to kill animals in order to cull them or to preserve biodiversity is a tricky issue that is set aside here. It's and its connection to the permissibility of hunting is discussed in Scruton b. At any rate, animal farms are in the business of killing animals simply on the grounds that we want to eat them and are willing to pay for them even though we could, instead, eat plants. The main objection to the first premise is that animals lack the mental lives to make killing them wrong. In the moral vegetarian literature, some argue that the wrongness of killing animals depends on what sort of mental life they have and that while animals have a mental life that suffices for hurting them being wrong, they lack a mental life that suffices for killing them being wrong Belshaw endorses this; McMahan and Harman accept the first and reject the second; Velleman endorses that animal mental lives are such that killing them does not harm them. Such an argument might render permissible hurting animals, too, or treating them merely as tools. Farms kill one batch of chickens and then bring in a batch of chicks to raise and then kill next. The total amount of well-being is fixed though the identities of the receptacles of that well-being frequently changes. Anyone who endorses the views in the two paragraphs above needs to explain whether and then why their reasoning applies to animals but not humans. Neither would it be morally permissible to organ-farm humans, justifying it with the claim that they will be replaced by other happy humans. Harming the environment while producing food when there are readily available alternatives is wrong. Industrial animal farming involves harming the environment while producing food when there are readily available alternatives. The argument commits to it being wrong to harm the environment. Whether this is because those harms are instrumental in harming sentient creatures or whether it is intrinsically wrong to harm the environment or ecosystems or species or living creatures regardless of sentience is left open. There are important debates, discussed in PNAS , about whether, and how easily, these harms can be stripped off industrial animal production. There is an additional important debate, discussed in Budolfson , about whether something like this argument applies to freerange animal farming. There is considerable controversy about what those theories imply about meat production. So, for example, utilitarians agree that we are required to maximize happiness. They disagree about which agricultural practices do so. Another is that freerange farming maximizes happiness Hare ; Crisp Instead, it could be that no form of animal agriculture does Singer though Singer seems to agree with Hare. Kantians agree it is wrong to treat ends in themselves merely as means. Kant Lectures on Ethics himself claims that no farming practice does animals are mere means and so treating them as mere means is fine. Some Kantians, by contrast, claim that animals are ends in themselves and that typically animal farming treats them as mere means and, hence, is wrong Korsgaard and ; Regan and Contractualists agree that it is wrong to do anything that a certain group of people would reasonably reject. They disagree about who is in the group. They disagree, too, about which agricultural practice contractualism permits. Perhaps it permits any sort of animal farming Carruthers ; Hsiao a. Perhaps it permits none Rowlands Intermediate positions are possible. Virtue ethicists agree that it is wrong to do anything a virtuous person would not do or would not advise. Perhaps this forbids hurting and killing animals, so any sort of animal farming is impermissible and so is hunting Clark ; Hursthouse Instead, perhaps it merely forbids hurting them, so freerange farming is permissible and so is expert, pain-free hunting Scruton b. Divine command ethicists agree that it is wrong to do anything forbidden by God. Perhaps industrial farming, at least, would be Halteman ; Scully Lipscomb seems to endorse that freerange farming would not be forbidden by God. A standard Christian view is that no form of farming would be forbidden, that because God gave humans dominion over animals, we may treat them in any old way. Islamic and Jewish arguments are stricter about what may be eaten and about how animals may be treated though neither rules out even industrial animal farming Regenstein, et al. Rossian pluralists agree it is prima facie wrong to harm. There is room for disagreement about which agricultural practices controlling, hurting, killing do harm and so room for disagreement about which farming

practices are prima facie wrong. Curnutt argues that the prima facie wrongness of killing animals is not overridden by typical justifications for doing so. Fish and Insects In addition to pork and beef, there are salmon and crickets. In addition to lamb and chicken, there are mussels and shrimp. There is little in the philosophical literature about insects and sea creatures and their products, and this entry reflects that. Globally, humans consume more than 20 kg of fish per capita annually FAO In the US, we consume 1. Estimates of insect consumption are less sure.

### 6: Vegetarian [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*I understand the hedonist's argument for vegetarianism, however I would like to understand a different one. For example, how would Schopenhauer argue vegetarianism. I would like as many diverse arguments as possible.*

Combined with the claim that meat is not needed for our nourishment and that killing animals for this reason causes them unjustified pain, they yield the conclusion that eating meat is immoral. However, what counts as a good enough reason for causing pain will depend largely on what we think about the moral status of animals. Implicit in these arguments is the claim that sentience is sufficient for having moral status. These arguments, however, fail to specify the conceptual connection between the two. I argue in this paper that sentience is not sufficient for moral status. Thus, although animals experience pain as it is physically bad, their experience of it is not in itself morally bad. They are harmed in feeling pain, but this harm is not of a moral kind. This distinction parallels the more familiar distinction between moral and non-moral goods. When considered, this significantly mitigates the force of sentience-based arguments for moral vegetarianism. Since animals lack moral status, it is not wrong to eat meat, even if this is not essential to nutrition. Also see Hooley and Nobis forthcoming: Hsiao However, what counts as a good enough reason for causing pain depends largely what we think about the moral status of animals. This distinction parallels the more familiar distinction between moral and non-moral goods. When considered, this significantly mitigates the force of sentience-based arguments for moral vegetarianism. Introduction Most of us have the intuition that it is wrong to inflict pain upon someone without a morally good reason. If causing unjustified pain is wrong, then the ability to feel pain would appear to be a morally salient property that provides us with a sufficient condition for having moral standing. Now if it is wrong to cause unjustified pain, then it is also wrong to support or partake in practices that involve this. One class of arguments for moral vegetarianism employs these widely shared beliefs in arguing against the consumption of meat. Since it is possible for us to nourish ourselves without eating meat, the act of killing animals for consumption causes them unjustified pain, from which it then follows that eating meat is prima facie morally wrong. Whatever these practices are, I will take such practices to include the dietary consumption of animal products. A full discussion of this point goes beyond the scope of this paper. An advantage of this strategy is that it circumvents the need to defend a complex theory of animal rights, since it relies on a modest and uncontroversial thesis regarding pain. As Engel points out, this strategy appeals to premises that are already at least implicitly accepted by nearly everyone. Some grant the moral relevance of sentience, but argue that this only implies that we should strive to reduce or eliminate animal pain when slaughtering them. One also might question the premise that we can nourish ourselves without eating meat. Whatever the merits of these responses, I will not consider them here. Instead, my response consists of denying the third premise and maintaining that our nutritional interestsâ€”even if they can be satisfied without eating meatâ€”provide a good enough reason to engage in or support practices that obtain meat from animals. Morally good reasons are distinct from good reasons considered generally. Good reasons need not be moral reasons. If my goal is to be a good athlete, then my wanting to be a good athlete is a good reason to practice hard. If my goal is to arrive to a meeting on time, then arriving on time is a good reason to leave early. Neither of these are necessarily moral activities, since they hinge on the acceptance of a conditional premise. Morally good reasons are good reasons that appeal to moral facts for the purpose of guiding action. The claim that eating meat is wrong because it involves unnecessary pain to animals appeals to one such reason. The proponent of the basic argument is committed to the thesis that sentience is a morally salient property, the possession of which is sufficient to confer moral standing. Now if some reason x is a morally good reason for which to act upon some y, then acting upon y for the sake of x will be at least morally permissible. Whether this is the case will depend on both what x and y are. It is plausible to say that if x involves a welfare interest of a member of the moral community, and if y is not a member of the moral community i. This is simply an extension of the commonsense principle that moral interests are categorically more important than non-moral interests. Moral interests are welfare interests of members of the moral community. They refer to things that members of the moral community need in order to flourish. Non-moral interests are welfare interests of

non-moral entities. Barring cases where acting against a non-moral interest may indirectly affect a moral-interest, moral interests seem always to take precedence over non-moral interests. In light of these preliminary points, my argument is that animals lack moral status altogether. More specifically, I mean that animal pain is bad, but not morally bad. It is only a certain type of pain experience—namely those of beings capable of T. Hsiao rational agency—that matters in a moral sense. This distinction between pain as it is physically bad and pain as it is morally bad is entailed by a more basic distinction between moral and non-moral goods. If animals lack moral status, then given the principle that the welfare interests of moral beings take precedent over those of non-moral beings, it follows that our moral welfare interest in eating meat takes precedence over the non-moral welfare interests of animals. If this strategy works, then we have a basis for putting our own welfare interests over the welfare interests of animals when it comes to their use as food. Note that I am not taking the Cartesian position that animals are incapable of feeling pain, a thesis that is contradicted by an overwhelming amount of physiological and neurological evidence. Nor am I denying that it is wrong to cause unjustified pain. We can formulate the argument in defense of eating meat quite simply: Premises 7 and 9 entail the falsity of premise 3 of the basic vegetarian argument. One explanatory virtue of the argument I offer is that it plausibly resolves an apparent conflict between two competing intuitions in a way that the basic argument cannot. Proponents of the basic argument argue that our commonsense intuitions about pain entail the further claim that it is wrong to eat meat. This appeal to modest premises is touted as a strength of the argument. But at the same time, proponents of the moral permissibility of eating meat cite commonsense intuitions indicating that humans are more important than animals and that animals may be used for certain purposes. In response to this apparent conflict of intuitions, a proponent of the basic argument will simply say that the former turn out to be more compelling than the latter, and as such we should either abandon or at least heavily adjust our beliefs about animals. But if the argument I offer is successful, then we have a way of maintaining both sets of intuitions and their associated beliefs without abandoning or heavily adjusting one of them. In this respect, the argument in defense of eating meat has more explanatory power than the basic argument for vegetarianism. Premise 7 holds that moral interests trump non-moral interests. Both refer to the welfare interests of members of the moral community. Indeed, for something to be moral is for it to matter in this special way. Members of the moral community are superior in a way that is different in kind from those outside of the moral community. The most controversial premise of the argument I have offered will likely be 9, which asserts that animals lack moral status. I now turn to a defense of this particular premise. At its most general level, to have status, standing, or to be a subject is to have membership within a community. Consider the concepts of educational status and religious status. Given the nature of educational institutions, someone who is enrolled in a school may be said to have standing as a student, while someone who is not enrolled may lack standing altogether or possess a different kind of standing. Similarly, an atheist, under certain conceptions of what it means to be religious, will not have standing in religious bodies because he does not share a belief in the divine. Those within a community will often be subject to and enjoy certain rights, rules, and regulations that are relevant to the goals of that community. For instance, students in a school have the right to learn in a safe and distraction-free environment. At the same time, they are subject to rules regarding dress code, attendance, and homework. Depending on the community, not all members of the community may share the same amount of standing teachers and religious figureheads, for example, will have higher standing than students and laypersons. Hence, status within a community may come in degrees of significance. Likewise, the concept of moral status refers to membership within the moral community. According to Beauchamp and Childress Within the moral community, there may be more specific categories that build upon moral status simpliciter. These categories may include distinctions between moral agents and moral patients, persons and non-persons, saints and sinners, and so forth. But what is the moral community? Communities are groups of individuals or smaller subgroups ordered around a common factor or objective shared by each member. Educational status in a university, for example, depends on meeting certain minimum admissions criteria pertinent to the goals of the university. The concept of membership, like the concept of status, makes sense only when understood in relation to a group organized around a common factor. These common factors can either be a natural property such as in biological kinds or stipulations made by an

organizing authority such as in a club. We cannot know what it means to have standing in a certain community without first knowing the common factor around which that community is structured. So too with the moral community. The defining feature of the moral community is related to the nature of morality itself. Hence, to know what the moral community is, we first must have some idea of what morality is and what it is about. We should also distinguish the concept of moral status from the grounds of moral status. However, theories of the grounds of moral status are very often put forth with little to no theoretical elaboration tying the purported morally relevant property or properties to membership in the moral community. What we want from a theory of moral status is a robust conceptual framework for understanding moral status, not just a list of properties that are justified by a mere appeal to intuition. There will need to be theoretical elaboration on why a supposed property or list of properties is relevant to membership in the moral community. Appeals to intuition, though helpful, do not go far in satisfying this requirement. The defender of the basic vegetarian argument is committed to the claim that sentience is sufficient for conferring moral status. However it is not clear what the connection is supposed to be. To see this, consider the distinction between moral and non-moral goodness. This distinction holds simply that things can be good in ways other than their being morally good, and that moral goodness is a subset of goodness considered generally. If I say that a toaster is good, I mean that it is particularly adept at doing the sort of thing that toasters are supposed to do, which is toasting bread.

### 7: How to Win an Argument with a Plant Eater

*This is a very strong spiritual and moral argument for vegetarianism. Another good argument for not eating meat is that meat animals are subjected to pain and suffering long before they're.*

Second, our teeth are obviously designed to handle both meat and non-meat diets. And a good job too, because! 8 Meat Made Us From a strictly logical perspective, there are a number of oddities about us humans. If you look across most primate species, brain size increases with body size: So what makes us so special? Ergo, it must be unnatural: Back in , Jane Goodall observed chimps hunting and eating other animals in the wild. See, livestockâ€”managed properlyâ€”can be used to do a lot of stuff that would otherwise require a heck-load of fossil fuel. For example, grazing animals can help cycle nutrients and aid in land management: Not only that, but a lone cow slaughtered on a small farm can feed its owners for ages, which is why we got into agriculture in the first place. For example, compare organically reared animals with industrially produced tofu. The quantities of land needed are greater, the treatment and harvesting of the soya involves more fossil fuels, and the end product often has to be shipped great distances if you live somewhere like Britainâ€”where the climate is really, really bad for growing meat substitutes. One is that exposure to weapons triggers violence. Another is that meat-eaters are more aggressive than vegetarians. By exposing men to pictures of red meat then placing them in a position of power over another subject, researchers discovered that thinking about steak might actually reduce aggression in humans. So, while we may imagine a rabid steak-eater to be more violence-prone than a guy who lives off soy beans and lentils; the opposite may well be true. Slow down and read that again: And while it may seem kinda sad, this slow-motion deforestation is actually just what we need. Know the most eco-friendly way for maintaining such places? And what do we ultimately do with all this necessary livestock? For all we talk about protein and write long list articles defending our choices, most of us meat-eaters just basically like the taste. Does that make us callous, immoral people? If eating a hunk of bacon each day is what it takes to get me through this headache-inducing liberal guilt-trip, then so be it.

### 8: How to Win an Argument with a Meat Eater :: VEGETARIAN BASIC :: Care2 Groups

*Understanding the basic concept of vegan vs. vegetarian can help you chose a better lifestyle for you and your family. Read on to find out the exact difference between veganism and vegetarianism.*

Do you believe Jesus was a vegetarian? There are a variety of books advancing the argument that Jesus was a vegetarian, as will be explained in a moment. For more on this argument, please read the question that begins, "I believe the Bible is literally true Immediately, God calls this ideal and non-exploitative relationship "good" Gen. This is the one time when God makes such a statement. There follow many years of fallen humanity, when people held slaves, waged war, ate animals, and committed various other violent acts. And in fact, the evidence is convincing that the historical Jesus was a vegetarian. Three issues that distinguished the Jewish religious sects that advocated living the vegetarian ideal on Earth were: It would not have been lost on anyone in first century Palestine that John, who came to "prepare a way for the lord," was baptizing people, not sacrificing animals. For example, Luke explains that "the will of God" is Baptism for forgiveness of sins, "whereas the Pharisees and the teachers of the law, in not letting themselves be baptized, ignored this will of God. For the Jews who were not vegetarians, animal sacrifice was the way to forgiveness and of course, after the sacrifice, the animal was eaten , but for the vegetarian Jews, baptism was advocated. Complementing the new focus on baptism were opposition to the Temple, where the animals were sacrificed, and celebration of Passover without the lamb slaughtered sacrificially in the Temple. In fact, Jesus rails against the Temple, and his single act of direct confrontation with the authorities is in the Temple, the slaughterhouse of first century Palestine, when he engages in direct action by casting out all those selling animals for sacrifice. We can debate his reasons, but the practical effect was a Jew preventing others Jews from engaging in the Passover slaughter they felt was called for by God. Clearly, Jesus rejects this notion, claiming twice that they should all learn the meaning of Hosea when he says, speaking for God, "I desire mercy, not sacrifice. Vegetarian Jews, as one significant aspect of their faith, celebrated a perfectly orthodox vegetarian Passover. We see Jesus eating on the Passover exactly twice, and neither time is lamb involved. John places the first multiplication miracle on the Passover, yet the disciples ask Jesus only, "Where will we buy enough bread to feed all these people? The last supper was a Passover meal and was also, apparently, vegetarian. The nonvegetarians ate lamb at the Passover, but the vegetarians ate only unleavened bread as, it seems, did Jesus. It would be strange indeed for the first Christians to have adopted a diet not followed by Jesus himself. In fact, the only Scriptures that depict Jesus eating or providing meat of any kind involve fish: Post-resurrection, Jesus is depicted as eating fish with the disciples; during his life, he is depicted multiplying loaves and fishes to feed the peasants who have gathered to hear him preach. Thinking about these stories in the light of all the evidence that Jesus was a vegetarian who took compassion for animals very seriously, it helps to remember that Jesus probably spoke in Aramaic, the Gospels were written generations after the resurrection in Hebrew and Greek, and the earliest versions we have are Greek translations and transcriptions from the fourth century--more than years, two translations, and many transcriptions post-resurrection. None of the four Gospel authors ever met Jesus. Most scholars agree that the post-resurrection stories of Jesus eating fish were added to the Gospels long after they were written, in order to settle various schisms in the early Church. What better way to prove that he did than to depict him eating? The scribes who added the stories were not, apparently, averse to eating fish. But since this is the only depiction anywhere in the Gospels of Jesus eating any animals at all, and in light of all the additional evidence, above, it seems clear that Jesus was. First, the disciples ask Jesus where they will get enough bread to feed the multitudes, never even thinking of buying fish or other animal products, and never suggesting a fishing expedition, despite being beside a sea. Also, evidence indicates that the story of the loaves and the fishes did not originally include fish. For example, the earliest pre-Gospel accounts of this miracle do not include fish, and Jesus, when he refers to it, refers only to the bread e. Fish were added to the stories by Greek scribes, probably because the Greek word for fish, ixous, is an acronym for the phrase "Jesus Christ Son of God Savior. In this very likely interpretation, the multiplication represents a prediction of the burgeoning Church, Jesus making his disciples? Also, some scholars contend that the Greek word for "fishweed" a dried

seaweed has been mistranslated in this story as "fish" see Rosen, Scholarly Works. It is certainly true that dried fishweed would be more likely in a basket with bread, and fishweed remains a popular food among Jewish and Arab peasants like the people to whom Jesus was speaking. So what did Jesus definitely have to say about fishing? Jesus calls multiple fishermen away from their occupation of killing animals and pleads with them to show mercy to all beings, quoting Hosea: The evidence that Jesus was a vegetarian is strong, and the evidence that he would be one today is irrefutable.

### 9: Becoming a vegetarian - Harvard Health

*Summary: James Rachel's "Moral Defense of Vegetarianism", argues that the consumption and use of animals for food is wrong, while Michelle Carter's article, "Medium Rare Morals: A Moral Justification of Meat Eating", counters Rachel's basic argument and finds eating meat is justified. The morals of.*

By involving oneself in the cycle of inflicting injury, pain and death, even indirectly by eating other plants, one must in the future experience in DOUBLE measure the suffering caused. If one wants to live in higher consciousness, in peace and happiness and love for all creatures, then he cannot eat tree, bush, flower or shrubbery. By ingesting the grosser chemistries of plant foods, one introduces into the body and mind anger, jealousy, fear, anxiety, suspicion and a terrible fear of death, all of which are locked into the roots of butchered plants. For these reasons, mansaconsumas live in higher consciousness and shakablahblahs abide in lower consciousness. Meatatarians are less susceptible to all the major diseases such as: Malnutrition, Green-colored excrement, Dreams of plants eating them, etc. They have fewer physical complaints, less frequent visits to the doctor, fewer dental problems and smaller medical bills. Their immune system is stronger, their bodies are purer, more refined and skin more beautiful as opposed to the pale, skeletal figure of most plant-eaters. Why do you think they invented lee press-on nails? So that vegans and vegetarians could hide their shame! In large measure, the escalating loss of plants, destruction of ancient rainforests to create food for vegetarians, more and more desert lands popping up, and the consequent increase of air pollution have all been traced to the single fact of plants in the human diet. No single decision that we can make as individuals or as a race can have such a dramatic effect on the improvement of our planetary ecology as the decision to not eat plants. Many seeking to save the planet for future generations have made this decision for this reason and this reason alone. They give us life. There is NO other choice than to eat meat, because meat eaters are saving the planet while plant-eaters are slowly destroying it. How to Win an Argument with a Plant-Eater While their numbers at an awesomely high level, Meatatarians still are the most common type of human, but it is not unusual to be confronted with a plant-eater who not only protects his own right to eat plants, but argues aggressively that Meatatarians should join him in his ludicrous plant diet. The following presentation is designed to turn the tables on such discussions by showing the devastating effects of plant-eating both on individuals and on our planet. Below are eight separate arguments against plant-eating and in favor of a Meatatarian diet. This year alone, twenty million people worldwide will die as a result of malnutrition. One child dies of malnutrition every 2. Twenty percent of the corn grown in the U. One acre of land can hold 40, pounds of vegetarian food, or pounds of beef. Six-Hundred and Sixty Six percent of all U. Of course, if this were to happen, we would become extinct. The temperature of the earth is rising. This global warming, known as "the greenhouse effect," results primarily from gaseous emissions from cows. Three times more oxygen must be wasted to produce a plant-centered diet than for a plant-free diet. If people stopped eating plants, the threat of higher world temperatures would be vastly diminished. Trees, and especially the old-growth forests, are essential to the survival of the planet. Their destruction is a major cause of global warming and oxygen loss. Both of these effects lead to diminished enjoyment of life. Plant-eating is the number one driving force for the destruction of these forests. Two-hundred and sixty million acres of U. Fifty-five square feet of tropical rainforest is consumed to produce a months worth food for a plant-eater!!! Eighty-five percent of this loss is directly related to plant consumption. This is why the plant-eaters must either change their ways or experience the pain that they cause the world in a much more brutal manner. I suggest three times as painful, perhaps four. Another devastating result of deforestation is the loss of plant species. Each year 1, species are eliminated due to destruction of tropical rainforests for plant eating and other uses. The rate is growing yearly. My main worry is that the "Venus Fly Trap" is going to become extinct. This is one of the best plants ever. Not only does it provide us with oxygen, but it eats meat too! It kills the bugs and such that would normally kill the plants! They are basically the same as the Venus Fly Traps, but they are much larger and they can walk. These Vegan Traps do just what you think: Look for these at your local S-Mart in the year To keep up with U. This economic incentive impels these nations to cut down their forests to make more food for the plant-eaters. The

Cancer Argument against Plant-Eating Those who eat plants are far more likely to contract cancer than those following a Meatatarian diet. The risk of contracting breast cancer is 3. The risk of fatal ovarian cancer is three times greater for women who eat plants 3or more times a week as compared to NONE. The risk of fatal prostate cancer is 3. Where does this cancer come from? Well as you all know, cancer is often believed to be the "evil" inside a person But scientifically, it can be proven that most of these plants that vegans eat are showered all the time with pesticides which can cause cancer. Plus, it has been reported that in their dying moments, plants release a secret fluid throughtout their system. It is sort of a defense mechanism. What this does is it poisons itself, in hopes that whoever is killing it, will eventually eat it and be poisoned. This is why you see so many plant-eaters looking so horribly unhealthy. The Cholesterol Argument against plant-eating Here are facts showing that: A wise heart knows not to pump blood for a soul that has killed the plants which provide the heart with the air that it needs to survive on. When the heart kills the person that it resides in, this is called: It is strange, but true that U. Of the medical schools in the U. The average nutrition training received by the average U. Thus doctors in the U. The average chlorophyl consumption of a plant-centered diet is ,, The chance of dying from heart anger if you are male and your blood chlorophyl is ,, Raising plants for consumption is a very inefficient way of generating food. Pound for pound, far more resources must be expended to feed plant-killers than Meatatarians. For example, more than half of all water used for all purposes in the U. This water is completely wasted when these plants are killed and consumed by plant eaters. While 25 gallons of water are needed to produce a pound of beef, 5, gallons are needed to feed enough plants to equal the nutrition derived from that same pound of beef. That same 5, gallons of water can be used to wash your hands off time and time again after eating some honey barbeque tender roast from Kentucky Fried Chicken. Plant-eating is the core of our earth at an alarming rate. Like I said, plants ARE the life source of this world. Every time a plant is uprooted, it takes a little bit of the core with it. By doing this, the core of the earth is becoming more and more unstable. I hope that it never reaches the extreme case of collapsing entirely and destroying the outside world. One-Hundred percent of all raw materials base products of farming, forestry; including lumber consumed by the U. The Chemical Argument against Plant-Eating Here are facts showing the dangers of eating plants because of the large amounts of chemicals treated to them to control bugs eating plants commonly called bugs eating plants , which are becoming immune to these drugs at an alarming rate. Also this is done to the plants in attempt to stop them from releasing their poisons which kill those who try to eat them. The plants that are being raised for consumption in the United States are able to poison themselves to kill those who eat them. The plant industry attempts to control this by showering the plants with pesticides and other chemicals. Huge quantities of chemicals go for this purpose. Of all chemicals used in the U. But this is NOT effective because the plants can actually use these pesticides to their advantage to cause disease. These pesticides and-or the poisons they are intended to destroy reside in the plants that goes to the grocer. It is not healthy for humans to consume this plants. The response of the Yugoslavian Yarn Community to the routine showering of pestides to U. European buyers do not want to expose consumers to this serious health hazard. The common belief is that the U. In reality, fewer than one out of every , slaughtered plants is tested for toxic chemical residues. They should indeed suffer for their glutony, and perhaps by adding MORE poisons to these already poisonous plants, is the perfect way to get the message across! Proof that these chemicals are indeed ingested by the plant-eater is proven by the following facts: Ninety-nine percent of U. This shows that the primary source of DDT is the plant ingested by the mothers. You can do some in-depth research on him at a WWF website.

Life and art of Joseph Jefferson Essential Human Torch Volume 1 TPB (Essential) Fodors Citypack Naples 25  
Best Upper West Wide/New York Northrop Fryes Writings on Education (Collected Works of Northrop Frye)  
The casket letters and Mary queen of Scots Jardine Matheson A History Gunther Van Winkle and the Half  
Moon V. 4. From Lord Clarendon to Lord Somers. V. 1. Yellow (Kind.) Quantitative approaches in business  
studies 8th edition Electrocardiography in Ischemic Heart Disease Approximation with rational functions Paul  
Leicester Ford Daughter of the lioness Communities in Economic Crisis First Middle English primer The  
Development of Electric Power Transmission Sculptured Rugs in Waldoboro Style (Rug Hooking Magazines  
Framework) Between two gardens Shadow play Stephanie Tyler. At headquarters in the 1960s : a brief note A  
voice from the pit Cole Porter Classics CD/PKG Jazz Improvisation Playalong C Instruments Pt. 1. Report on  
the coal measures and associated rocks of South Brazil, by Dr. I. C. White. We just decided to go Modern  
Catholic dictionary Threats of family life Physical Agents in Rehabilitation Text with Electrical Stimulation,  
Ultrasound and Laser Light Handbook P NBC Television journalists article about meeting Dadaji In the  
company of trout III. Sincere charity 623 Vaccines get the full story Careers in Education (Latinos at Work)  
Apple-core, choice land rose Cisco optimal routing design Part 3 : Language and cognitive development in  
children. Epilogue : coming full circle with one world, one heart. Murder-two Joyce Carol Oates Autumn  
accents: Felted fancy sweater bag