

Speaking of Animals

(Grammatical and philosophical observations)

There have been a lot of changes in the past decade in public thought in regards to animals in society, primarily through propaganda generated by those in the animal rights movement who would change society's view of animals to the point where their good comes above the good of humans. Following are some observations in terms used and philosophy differences.

You don't adopt animals, you buy them, steal them (many under color of law), or they are given to you, and you OWN them. They are your property. You don't adopt your car, house or furniture, you buy them and you own them. Animals are unique because they live and other property doesn't. It's your duty to treat them humanely, but they are your property.

You adopt children or ideas. Children are yours to raise and to teach, but you don't own them. You are their guardians. You don't own ideas. They are intangibles. Ideas and children are both best when shared with the world at the right time. We eat neither children nor ideas. We do, however, eat animals. Vegans choose not to eat animals, but put a vegan in the wild, and the animals will have no problem adding a vegan to their food chain. They will have no guilt over doing it. Animals live by instinct....kill and eat, or die and be food.

Dogs and wolves will grow and survive without human help. They don't need humans for their survival. A young animal set free has the instinctual skills to hunt for food and sharp teeth to protect itself. Young human children will die without their parents or other adults if left on their own. Nature made animals with tougher skins and coats that thicken in winter and thin in summer. They have a full set of sharp teeth at a few weeks of age and sharp claws at birth. They have stronger endorphins to be able to ignore pain to survive.

When we choose an animal for a pet, we own it and are responsible to care for it until it dies or we find it a new home with someone else. If we raise an animal for food and then kill it, it's called harvesting food, not murder. Murder is another word highjacked by animal rightists. In their view, if you take an animal to a vet and have it killed, it's okay. If you shoot it, it's murder. The animal that was shot is safe to use as a food source for scavengers (food chain/circle of life thing), but one euthanized with chemicals is not. It's wasted. If hunters shoot deer for meat on their table, normal people call that feeding your family. Animal rightists call it murdering the deer.

Forgive us for understanding the differences between animals and humans and understanding the circle of life as nature intended us to. We are tired of having our language highjacked by idealists who put all animal species above our own species, and demand that we care enough to protect animals even to our own detriment (or death). Forgive us for having hands on experience with animals, remembering their place and ours in the circle of life, and for tiring of dealing with people who think Disney cartoons about animals who can talk and plan and think and have human emotions is reality. These people go ballistic over pigs being butchered to feed a nation and think the farmer who was eaten by his pigs deserved it. Maybe that will help you understand some of our sarcasm a bit better.

We believe animals should be treated humanely but we understand they ARE animals and not furry humans. They need to be respected for who and what they are, and always keep in mind the potential to turn on us under the right circumstances. We feel loss at having to kill a pet, but a pet that turns on you feels no remorse. The pigs who ate the farmer felt no guilt, only relieved their hunger. That is the reality of life with animals, not the Disney version. Own them, love them if you choose to, and take care of them, but respect them for what they are, and do not idealize them for what you want them unrealistically to be.

Nancy G.