

EAS END ALL SUFFERING

The End All Suffering FAQ

1. Why not work hard to make a vegan world?
2. Who are you?
3. Do you hate humans?
4. Why nonhuman animals too?
5. Isn't it an exaggeration?
6. But life is not only suffering, there are good parts too
7. I am sorry, I draw the line where there is violence
8. Don't you think that the slavery abolition proves that animals can be liberated someday too?
9. The human race perspective on itself and on the world has changed through time and will keep on changing, all we need is to be patient
10. The problem is that people don't know what is going on
11. In your website you write about human suffering, how can you compare human suffering to animals' suffering?
12. I agree that the human race is the world's biggest problem and the cause of most of the suffering but I am against extinction
13. It seems that annihilating the human race is more realistic than ending all the suffering, shouldn't we focus on that
14. How come you use death numbers as a bad thing?
15. What if there is suffering in other planets too? If we will annihilate ourselves we won't be able to help the other planets?
16. What about the animals who are in captivity now?
17. O.k. I agree, but don't you think it will take a lot of time and the chances are very small to succeed, so I better act within the conventional movement?
18. I agree with the ethical imperative to stop this world, but I think it is way too complicated
19. What can I do?

1. Why Not Work Hard To Make A Vegan World?

Because a vegan world is extremely improbable, and because even if it was probable, as unimaginably wonderful as it would be, a vegan world is still absolutely immoral.

We'll start with the improbability.

Have you ever thought why is it so hard to convince someone to go vegan?

The animal rights arguments are so simple and right. They are based on solid facts and evidences. Nobody can confront them rationally. So why is it so hard to convince someone to go vegan? [The reason is that reason is not enough](#). Good arguments are not relevant. Rationality has proved itself as an insufficient element in changing people's habits. Rationality can't beat motivation.

Collectively, we've had thousands of conversations, we've exposed the facts to thousands of people but only a very tiny fraction changed their habits in the end. Exposing the facts doesn't convince most humans. Humans prove again and again that their taste preference, convenience, habits, expenditures, profits, entertainment etc, are much more important to them than morality. Most of them are not even willing to hear the facts and listen to the arguments, not to mention stop financing animal abuse.

As you all know very well, it is not that they have to do something difficult or unusual, only to replace some of the ingredients in their food with some others.

You know the facts and arguments, there are so many good reasons, including egocentric ones, to go vegan, but humans insist on systematically torturing nonhuman animals, overlook about a billion hungry people, harm their own health and leave their children a highly polluted planet.

We find meat eating as the most classical characteristic of human nature - apathetic, impulsive, careless, selfish, dogmatic, narrow minded and without the slightest thought about present and future others.

The fact that the arguments are so strong and so well-based but still fail again and again, is the exact thing that should wake you all. Activists shouldn't get strengthened by their strong arguments but the other way around. When arguments that are so strong and so obvious don't work, there is something wrong with the addressees. It can't be that the problem is always with the way we deliver our message. Years of campaigns, hundreds of organizations with dozens of methods, it's time to ask, how did all of it accomplish so little?

Even when the animal rights movement gives up on the idea of developing care towards nonhuman animals and turns to care for the children's future, using "the environmental argument" or care for their own kind using "the hunger argument" or caring for themselves - the hopelessness summit, using "the health argument", it doesn't help. Nothing helps. [Not even when the animal rights movement reaches the lowest point](#).

Claims about the likelihood of a vegan world seem ridiculous considering that while we are asking ourselves, when will "artificial insemination" be considered as [rape](#) and slaughter as [murder](#), humans still see [rodeos](#), [bullfights](#), [horse racing](#) and [circuses](#) as sport and entertainment, [zoos as education](#), [a fox as a coat](#), [a donkey as transportation](#), [goldfish as decoration](#), and [a pig as Bacon](#).

Veganism is a social idea and as such it is impossible to unequivocally determine that the whole world can never be converted. Technically every human on earth can be vegan. But the question is will every human on earth be vegan? And the answer is unfortunately no. The required changes on the moral, social, political, judicial, cultural, ecological, agricultural, economic, religious and even geographic level are so vast that it is extremely unlikely that the world would ever be vegan.

The *Denmark Argument* in the [manifesto](#) refers to the closest documented case that a society ever came to being vegan. Of course it wasn't as a result of a moral decision but a step that was imposed upon them (blockade during the First World War). Ironically some activists use the Dane example as a proof that a vegan world is possible. But there is no question that humans can maintain a healthy, cheap, satiating vegan diet. The question is whether they will. And apparently they won't.

In spite of the harsh conclusions you should infer from the Danish episode and from the fact that even the [most selfish arguments](#) are not working, we believe that the strongest indication of how hopeless the chances are to create a moral change in society based on humans' compassion, is the way humans treat members of their own species. Please take the time and read our articles and posts about how humans systematically [exploit the poorest of their own kind](#), how they treat [half of their own species](#) and their own [posterity](#). Of course it shouldn't matter to which species someone belongs, but it does matter to them, and still, this is how they [treat each other](#).

Many activists are confusing realistic with theoretical possibility, inferring from other social change movements. But it is even hard to imagine a war free, non-racist, non-male chauvinist and slavery free world. Factually our world is not only none of the above, but extremely far from it.

Not that we agree with [the comparison many activists often like to make between human slavery and animal exploitation](#), but at least in the sense of the mindset of the exploiters, there are some crucial similarities (mainly the need to extremely devalue the "other"). However, currently humanity is even [getting further and further from ending human slavery](#), so what are the chances of convincing all humans to become vegans. There is a big difference between arguing that all humans can be vegan and arguing that all humans would be vegans. And it is very hard to imagine that happening in a world still deeply militaristic, racist, mysogonic and where slavery – [probably activists' main inspiration](#), is more prevalent than ever.

Who can seriously imagine a world without wars, hunger and poverty?

And if the neo-liberal global dominancy of the last half a century continues, it would only get harder to imagine that. Some lay their hopes on that in the last 60 years, two neo-liberal countries haven't fought each other. But 60 years is not long enough to infer historical inclinations, and more importantly, during all of this time, neo-liberal countries were and are fighting others, not to mention perpetuating poverty and hunger.

It is extremely unlikely as long as humans' lives are so disposable in so many parts of the world, that nonhumans' lives would be considered so nondisposable, that no human would ever exploit nonhuman (and it is even more extremely unlikely when so many humans, as you all know very well, are using other humans' misery as an excuse for themselves not to become vegans. That is so, regardless of their personal involvement in stopping human atrocities, and regardless of the fact that there is no objective reason why human atrocities should effect their personal decision to go vegan).

Most humans haven't even made much more socially acceptable ethical decisions than going vegan. It is impossible to educate most humans not to use one another, not to objectify each other, not to turn to violence in conflicts and crisis so easily, not to discriminate each other on the basis of race, gender, ethnical orientation, class, weight, height, looks and etc.

The homo-consumericus knowingly and systematically oppresses members of its own species for the most trivial material goods. The dynamic of psychologically repressing and soothing any uncomfortable thoughts about the numerous faceless human victims half way around the world that pay a huge price so that consumers wouldn't have to make the slightest compromise on their lifestyle is very much characteristic of the human race. The ease in which humans conduct horrendous acts towards one another is proven again and again by both social-science and in particularly psychology studies and by history and daily affairs. And ironically, slavery, activists' most popular example of how animal liberation is possible, is one of the [strongest examples proving the opposite](#).

But as strong and unequivocal as the arguments doubting the realism of a vegan world are, they are not the strongest case against the efforts to create this moral change. The most basic flaw is not that the desired change is an unrealistic one, but that it is not a moral one. [A vegan world is not a suffering free world](#).

A vegan diet is incomparably less harmful than animal based diet but it is still harmful and therefore cannot be a moral alternative.

When you are trying to convince humans to convert their diet to a vegan one, you are trying to cause them to stop taking part in the most horrible things and to take part in much less horrible things. You don't change

their consumption habits to moral and 100% cruelty free. [Plant based diet is cruel](#). The fact that there are diets that are much crueler doesn't make this one moral.

No matter how little we consume, we will cause suffering.

It starts with "land clearing", a clean term for mass occupation, displacement and murder, as every "agricultural land" was once home to countless number of animals. Though mostly driven by cattle grazing, deforestation is also caused for the growing of many crops that most vegans consume on a daily basis.

Like deforestation, in many cases [water](#) use is also treated as harm only non-vegans are responsible for, as if plant agriculture doesn't involve the plunder of water resources that other sentient beings rely upon.

When activists show the famous tables that compare the water use of producing one kilo of rice, soy and potatoes with chickens, pigs and cows meat, they show how less harmful they are, not how harmless they are. The fact that animal products consume much more water than vegan products makes them more violent than vegan products, but it doesn't make the vegan ones cruelty free.

And it is not only a matter of quantity, it is the obvious, barely questioned human control over the accessible fresh water. Humans use and manipulate the water flow all over the world, leaving entire regions dried, and all the beings living there are left to dehydrate.

Also, plant agriculture involves the deliberate targeting of other beings, most commonly by using chemicals. A produce shouldn't be considered vegan if poisons, conveniently called "pesticides", were spread all over it to intentionally kill other sentient beings who rely on it for food and shelter.

Apart from pesticides, herbicides and fungicides are also sprayed to make sure nothing besides the specific crop human desire, grows on that land. All those chemicals severely affect animals living in the sprayed area, as well as many who live far from it but are affected since these chemicals often drift.

Other vastly used chemicals are fertilizers. The suffering involved in them is even less visible but not less harmful.

The most common harm is leakage of fertilizers into other environments which results in a nutrient overload. Nitrogen and phosphorus pollution causes a massive algae population increase, and as a consequence of their bloom, marine animals are killed either by toxins they release, by their blocking of sunlight, or by creating oxygen levels decline that eventually lead to the suffocation of fishes, crabs and other marine animals.

Fertilizers are a strong symbol of humans' global occupation. They use them to completely reshape entire areas to fit their benefits, and hardly care who it harms in the short or long term.

In the hopeless search for the oxymoronic suffering-less consumption, some tend to cling on to organic agriculture, most often disregarding the fact that chemicals as pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers are used for organic products as well, as long as they are "natural poisons".

It suits the mindset of meat eaters, not animal rights activists, to be satisfied with the label "no pesticides", concluding that no actions were made to remove those who get near humans' "property". "No pesticides" label doesn't mean no disinfection and it definitely doesn't mean no violence. Other extremely violent "pest control" methods can include biological extermination, a violent repertory of traps, gassing, smoke bombing, fumigating, flooding and foaming burrows which are the farmers' main targets.

Also, organic fertilizers rely mainly on animal ingredients such as bone meal, blood meal, chicken feather meal, fish-based fertilizers, burned eggshells, and urea and manures. Since fertilizers are one of the greatest expenses in plant agriculture, buying organic produce means a financial support to animal exploitation.

Being less productive, organic agriculture requires more land to be "cleared", meaning more deforestation and more habitat destruction than the conventional vegetative agriculture requires.

Furthermore, since the crops are less handled they are more vulnerable to harsh climate and are more depended on the soil type so the growth is limited to smaller and fitter areas. And with a worldwide demand, it eventually means much more transportation.

Another harmful consequence of the organic crops' vulnerability is more packing, meaning more nylon, paper, plastic and etc. and more harms consequent of the packages manufacturing, mostly manifested in energy consumption, pollutants, and eventually more waste.

Since there are many places in the world where it is technically impossible to grow food that meets the nutritional needs year round, many humans can't solely rely on fresh, locally grown produce and so must rely on long-distance food.

Considering that a truly vegan world is not one in which commodities are [transported](#) all over the planet, the solution must be that humans won't live in these kinds of places. So, "all" that is left to do is convince them to move from these locations, to places where they don't "have to" systematically exploit nonhuman animals. Unless they do that, humans would either breed animals as food production machines, or pollute them, run them over or harm their habitats via the global transportation network.

But it is a little bit ridiculous to seriously discuss the issue of these places when currently most vegans are far from being outside this transportation based society. The world's communities are not self-sufficient. Transportation is the life blood of the world economy. Most vegans are participating in the destructive distribution system that enabled the food to get to the market.

What now is an unnecessary reality for most vegans, who conveniently choose to participate in the consumerist society, is an inevitable reality as long as there are more than 7.5 billion humans, living practically everywhere.

To seriously tackle the harms of transportation, humans must seriously limit their population size and their geographical spread.

Currently the AR movement has managed to convince about 1% of the human population to stop systematically exploiting nonhuman animals, without them needing to do anything extra except change the basic ingredients of their diet. So good luck with convincing them not to live in vast areas of the planet they wholeheartedly believe is theirs, because they can't efficiently grow vegetative food there.

And even local raw food is in many cases far from being unharmed. When it comes to raw fruits, vegetables, seeds and nuts, besides the earlier mentioned violent growing practices and the just mentioned violent transportation methods, there are several harmful stages which may include: cleaning, sorting, cooling, coating, drying and storage. Unprocessed foods are more sensitive and prone to go bad. Therefore in many cases, some processing stages are done around the produces, and not necessarily directly to them. Usually post-harvest processing is done in mechanized facilities, with conveyor belts, automated sorting, room size refrigerators and etc.

In many cases fruits and vegetables are covered with a wax coating, both to retain moisture and to make them more appealing and shiny in the grocery store. So not only that food items which are considered as the rawest, least processed foods on the shelves, go through several harmful processes, they contain bee wax or other secretions of insects as shellac.

And that is not the only connection between bees' exploitation and allegedly vegan food products.

Approximately one out of every three plant food items humans consume is made possible by pollinators, and honey-bees account for 90% of the pollination.

Farmers, who rely on [factory-farmed honeybees](#) for pollination, rent more than two million honeybee colonies every year in the US alone. The hives are mostly transported by trucks and sometimes by airplanes, from field to field according to blossom timings.

These are only a few of the harms when consuming raw food. And most vegans don't strictly stick to such a diet and also consume processed foods. Even the manufacture of products that are considered basic such as soy milk, sugar, tofu, bread, oils, tea and etc can include dozens of sub-processes like: Cleaning and removing unwanted parts such as the outer layers, separating the beans from the pod, extracting the interior which is common with seeds, liquefaction and pressing as in fruit juices and soy milk production, fermentation like in soy sauces and tempeh, baking, boiling, broiling, frying, steaming, shipping of a number of ingredients from different distances, wrapping, labeling, transportation of waste and of course transportation to the stores. All are comfortably invisible as the finished product lies on the shelf.

It is hard to have in mind deforestation and land degradation when buying tofu.
It is hard to consider the amount of energy spent on the label of a can of beans.
It is hard to see all the sub production processes harms on a loaf of bread.
It is hard to notice all the methane emissions of a rice milk carton.
It is hard to perceive the 4,000 liters of water that were used to produce a cotton shirt.
It is hard to smell the burning wood when sniffing a bar of soap.
It is hard to think of the traps set on the tip of dens when you buy cereals.

Many activists are not even aware of the endless list of harms involved in what they present as a moral solution. And the few who are, “solve” this problem by arguing that the ideal vegan world is one where humans grow their own food and so don’t use any means of disinfection, no packing, no further processing and no transportation. But that can only be technically relevant for a relatively tiny group of people. [The global course is exactly the opposite](#) - more urbanization, more huge supermarkets and less small retails, more industrial food, more corporate rule over every existing plant, more chemicals in the food and in the land it grew on, more packages, much more transportation and etc.

It is very hard for us to refer to factory farms which are the vastest exploitation systems ever created in the world, as symptoms but that is what they are, symptoms. And the only way to stop the symptoms of the problem is to identify the main root cause and directly work to abolish it.

Veganism is not the goal. Apparently it needs to be reminded to many activists all the time. Veganism became the prime concern of activists because of the suffering. But suffering is everywhere and in [everything](#). The oil industry, the logging industry, steel, wood, plastic, nylon, cars, roads, concrete, cosmetics, electricity and as we showed here, every vegan food industry causes suffering too. The problem is not only what humans choose to eat, the problem is [everything humans choose to do in this world](#), everything they choose not to do about it no matter how horrible it is, and most importantly for the issue in this question is what they can’t really choose not to do. Even the most caring and compassionate, non-speciesist humans on this planet are [bound to participate in a violent system](#), systematically hurting creatures they wholeheartedly believe they mustn’t. Causing suffering is inevitable. [There is no nonviolent option in this world](#).

Yet better but still a horrible one, veganism shouldn’t be advocated for, let alone as cruelty free. It averts activists from searching for truly cruelty free options.

The conventional pretense that a vegan diet is moral, and that the yearned vegan world will be a moral one, hurts the chances for a truly sufferingless world. Activists convince non-vegans and even themselves that there is a cruelty free option, and that it is accomplishable.

We don’t accuse activists for lying to the general public arguing for a cruelty free diet while it most definitely isn’t (it’s hard as it is to convince humans to go vegan). We accuse them of being conveniently ignorant if they truly believe veganism is non-violent, or of lying to themselves and to other activists if they are aware of the violence involved in veganism but still advocate it as a moral and non-violent option. Again, neglecting to mention the horrors of a vegan diet to the general public is totally understandable, considering how difficult it is to veganize humans, the biggest problem with the veganism focus is not perpetuating the conventional lie, but that once activists have found the “answer” they stop looking, and so veganism has become the goal of most activists.

Our aim is to make activists who truly believe in some of the slogans they promote, realize that as long as they aim at a vegan world their slogans are empty. They are calling for animal rights when even they would personally, necessarily and inevitably violate them. They are arguing against speciesism while they personally, necessarily and inevitably participate in a systematical discrimination against beings from other species. They are advocating for non-violence while they personally, necessarily and inevitably support violence every time they eat.

Truly believing that “in suffering we are all equal”, and that “everybody to count for one, nobody for more than one”, and that truly the suffering of no one is of less importance than the suffering of another, any other, can’t morally coexist with veganism.

That is particularly true since veganism totally disregards the suffering of trillions of sentient beings

happening every single second in what activists frame as nature and therefore [allow themselves to totally ignore it](#). But there isn't really a moral justification to ignore [all of this suffering](#), but rather [a moral obligation to end it](#).

Obviously there are activists who do realize that veganism is not cruelty free and consequently speak in terms of the least harm principle. But why compromise on the least harm option before searching for a no harm option? Compromise should come only after the desired outcome was found unachievable. Veganism advocates are actually more radical welfarists. Although they don't want to widen the cages but to break them, when the whole world is a giant oppression system, it is still reformism. It is still compromising on the amount of oppression within the system, instead of abolishing it altogether. Veganism is replacing the cruelest way of accumulating energy with a much less violent and oppressive system, which is certainly not equalitarian and non-violent.

Activists stress they make no compromises, and would never settle for wider cages. Nothing but total liberation. On the same line, we don't want a world with less suffering but a suffering-less world. Activists shouldn't aspire for a vegan world but for a non-violent and non-speciesist world. That is the goal of our movement and what every activist should [wish for](#) and [act on](#).

2. Who Are You?

We are former animal liberation activists who dedicated every minute of their lives to the nonhuman liberation movement, until we realized that we were giving all we've got in the wrong place and in the wrong way.

Probably like many of you, we also blamed ourselves for the failure of the struggle. And it was our fault, but not because we have failed to figure out how to change humanity, but because we have failed to realize that this is not what we should focus our efforts on.

Our failure was that we dedicated ourselves to the ridiculous attempt to change all the humans in the world, as if it is possible and as if it can achieve our suffering-free world desire.

The thought that it is not the solution, that it is not nearly enough, was always there. But it took some time for the inevitable conclusion to be internalized.

At some point we realized that [a vegan world is not possible](#) and that even if a vegan world was possible, [it would still be a cruel world](#), because even the most caring and compassionate, non-speciesist humans on this planet are bound to participate in a violent system, systematically hurting beings they wholeheartedly believe they mustn't hurt. Causing suffering is inevitable. [There is no nonviolent option in this world](#). So we realized that while we were aspiring for a suffering-free world, we were actually advocating for a very cruel world which only the long shadow of factory farms - the cruelest enterprises in world history, can conceal.

We realized that veganism shouldn't be the goal. It is not people's diet that bothered us, but the suffering, and [suffering is everywhere and in everything](#). Energy, electricity, transportation, furniture, cotton, steel, wood, plastic, nylon, roads, concrete, cosmetics, sewage and etc. Everything hurts somebody. The problem is not only what humans choose to eat, the problem is [everything humans choose to do in this world](#).

And not only that it is not just what humans are eating but everything that humans are doing, it is everything everyone does, humans and nonhumans. We became activists because we care about others' suffering. We always thought that suffering is bad and must be ended no matter who is suffering, by whom and where. However, practically we solely focused on the suffering humans are causing nonhumans as if the [suffering nonhumans are causing nonhumans](#) matters less to the sufferers. [We mustn't accept suffering just because it happens in what we refer to as nature](#), and [to nonhuman animals by other nonhuman animals](#).

Everything in this world is rotten from the roots. At some point we realized that the world doesn't need a

serious repair but to be destroyed.

We knew that we are far from being unique or exceptional with the annihilation thought. On the contrary, many activists wish for this world to be destroyed. Many activists say they would press the button when asked the hypothetical question. But unfortunately very few are willing to dedicate their lives to create such a button. Very few are willing to stop focusing on their tiny spot of influence, to stop looking for ways to make a few more vegans and start looking for ways to stop all of the oppressors from causing all of the suffering.

Our goal in establishing the End All Suffering movement is to turn this hypothetical abstract wish into an actual ideology and goal. Our vision is to form a conceptual, philosophical and substantial practical activist agenda who doesn't passively long for a "doomsday" event, but looks for [ways to actively bring it](#).

We realize that the fact that the problem is so immensely huge that it's almost impossible to really grasp, leads many activists to passively think big but actively work small. We want to change that so activists would think huge and act huge. Think global and act global.

We know how big, complicated and ambitious this aspiration is, and that the chances are small. But we also know that if no one tries, it will never happen. That's why we are addressing other activists, trying to convince them to join the suffering abolition movement. We are calling activists to put the advocacy leaflets down and pick up a leaflet of a relevant science faculty. The so [desirable button won't fall out of the sky, we must to create it](#).

3. Do You Hate Humans?

We realize that our website may come out as a human hate parade, but it is not. We don't hate humans, we hate suffering. Humans are the ones who are responsible for most of the suffering in the world so they have a significant representation in our materials. But they are not presented as suffering causers only. Humans' suffering is not absent at all, being represented in 8 articles ([More Than Ever Before In History](#), [Poor Priorities](#), [Compassion Spin](#), [Pepsi or Coca Cola?](#), [One Child Is More Than Enough](#), [The "Wrong" Gender, To Their Own Flesh And Blood](#), [Mutilate to Dominate](#)), as well as several [Visual Arguments](#) such as [World Peace](#), [Not A Human Hate Parade](#), [All Babies](#) and [They Will](#). So, human hatred is definitely not our motivation. We are not promoting the annihilation idea out of hate.

We don't want anything bad to happen to anyone. On the contrary, we want that all bad things never happen to anyone.

We also don't promote the annihilation project out of despair. It's not rage either. We are only interested in stopping the suffering, not in revenge.

It is not an impulsive reaction. It is a rational idea. The only rational idea, under the circumstances.

Humans have a tremendous capability to close their minds to all reasoning and shield themselves from moral arguments. We understand it is so, but mustn't [accept it morally](#). We are not directly accusing humans for what they are.

We are not into accusations. We are into solutions.

And on the same note, the [End All Suffering](#) doesn't refer to humans only. They are definitely the biggest problem but most definitely not the only problem. Suffering is the problem. And so ending sentient life must be the goal (see [Why Nonhumans Too](#) in the [FAQ](#), [Non-Anthropogenic Suffering](#) in the [article section](#) and [The Violence Even Activists Are Disregarding](#) in the [Blog](#)). Yet we definitely don't hate nonhuman animals.

One doesn't need to hate humans in order to think they must be annihilated, thinking that humans are not more valuable than nonhumans is sufficient.

Currently activists are giving humans unlimited opportunity to change while they keep their abusive routine and that is considering them as more important than all of their victims. And given the average consumption figures of each human, it turns out that each human is worth thousands of animals. An average American meat eater is responsible for the life of suffering of about 55,000 animals within his/her lifetime, including about 10,000 crustaceans, 1,860 [chickens](#), 950 [fishes](#), 55 [turkeys](#), 30 [pigs](#) and [sheeps](#), 8 [cows](#) and between 35,000 and 50,000 of non-directly consumed fishes and crustaceans who are either “by catch” or [animals captured and killed to feed the directly consumed animals](#). And of course that is without counting the chickens suffering in the [egg industry](#) and cows in the [milk industry](#). Also, this is without counting all the animals harmed by each human by the many other daily means of consumption (including [plant based ones](#)). [Morally opposing to stopping them](#), by all means necessary, [including killing them](#), means that each is worth more than the pain and suffering of all of these animals.

We don't need to hate humans to conclude that, only to non-biasedly and non-speciesistly observe the world.

4. Why Do You Want To Annihilate Nonhuman Animals Too?

A world with no [battery cages](#), [trawl nets](#), [TD](#), [slaughterhouses](#), [mastitis](#), [gestation crates](#), [mulesing](#) and [so many other atrocities](#), is a dream coming true, for almost all activists. But it would still be a world in which every single day, billions of sentient beings are suffering.

In many activists' minds humans are the only problem in this world which without them would be perfect. But...

In a humanfree world, hyena cubs would still viciously fight each other, tearing off slices of other cubs' faces including ears and lips, to get more food.

In a humanfree world, crabs would still be pulled apart limb by limb by otters.

In a humanfree world, fishes would still be digested alive by the stomach acids of a pelicans who gulped them whole.

In a humanfree world, wasps would still inject their eggs into a live caterpillar's body to ensure that when their descendants hatch they will have easy access to food as the larvae eat the caterpillar from the inside out.

A humanfree world is definitely not a masculinity-free world. Brutal fights for territory and for the "right" to mate would still occur in immense numbers. Walrus would still fight each other over territory with giant teeth that can reach up to one meter long and more than 5kg weight. And the biggest males with the biggest tusks would still push their way to the center of the iceberg pushing the females and pups to the edges where they are more likely to be attacked by an orca.

In a humanfree world, billions of insects would still get chemically liquefied before they are eaten by spiders. And snakes would still swallow whole animals and slowly digest them until hawks hunt them, digging in with their talons into the snakes' body until they give up fighting back, and then start to cut off pieces of their body and eat them.

Eels would still electrify other fishes to hunt them using up to 600V in a single discharge - this is 5 times the shock one would get from sticking a finger into an electrical socket.

Young offspring would still get murdered by opportunist males who want their own genes to be spread.

And in a humanfree world, duck, dolphin, seal and sea lion females would still be gang raped routinely as a way of mating.

For many animal rights activists nature represents perfection, a romantic and virtuous ideal we should aspire to, something that ought to be reverently preserved and never criticized. But the truth is that nature is where trillions of sentient beings suffer from hunger, thirst, diseases, parasites, injuries, extreme weathers, rape, infanticide, violent dominance fights, the constant fear of being attacked, actually being attacked, and only rarely from caducity.

Probably the first natural cause of violence that comes to mind is predation.

Predation is literally as old as life itself. It goes back to the most ancient life forms - single cell organisms.

As soon as there were living single cell organisms, one of their major functions was to acquire chemicals from their surroundings. As time went by, some organisms, by chance (mutation), started obtaining the organic molecules they require by devouring the cells around them, instead of gathering them from the surroundings. This turned out to be an efficient "strategy". About 3.5 billion years later there are fangs, claws, talons, venoms, webs, beaks, sonars, infra-red vision, tentacles and etc.

But besides predation, there are many other suffering causes in nature.

Every single second somewhere in the world, defenseless and frightened babies are left alone because their mother has to search for food, a turtle is burned alive as she can't out run the flames of a fire, a bird's feet are frozen to a branch since he couldn't find shelter from the harsh weather, a baboon monkey is in ongoing stress as an higher ranking female takes food out of her mouth and eats it herself, a nestling is thrown off the nest by the other siblings so they can get more food, a coyote is experiencing severe hunger as the rabbit he chased managed to escape instead of being torn apart, a female dolphin is being raped after she couldn't outswim a male or even a few of them who gang rape her, a badger drags his rotten legs with infectious wounds resulting from constant fights, a zebra is dehydrated but can't approach the ponds as the lionesses might be on the prowl, a lizard is being slowly devoured by a fungus that spread through the organs, a weak robin chick starves to death because his parents don't feed him as it makes more sense energetically to invest in his stronger siblings.

Unfortunately these examples are only a tiny glimpse of [the horrors happening every single moment in nature](#).

It is amazing how one magical word - Nature - can purify anything.

"In suffering we are all equal" - the argument so many activists use so often is true about all animals just as much.

All suffering should be stopped no matter how we define it, where it happens and by whom.

Activists should be obligated to preventing suffering no matter to whom, by whom and where it happens.

What makes animals worthy of moral consideration is their subjective ability to experience, not the objective conditions of their lives (such as to what species they belong to, where they live and their relations with other species) or their relations with humans.

The frequently quoted Jeremy Bentham is relevant here as well - "the question is not, can they reason? nor, can they talk?", but it also shouldn't be by whom they suffer, or where. The question is only can they suffer. Moral status is non-dependent. Sentient beings don't lose their moral status when their suffering happens in nature.

Our moral obligation to prevent suffering is driven from the fact that suffering is intrinsically bad for those who experience it. So if suffering is bad when humans cause it, there is no reason to think it is not so when it results from other causes, including the actions of other animals.

We mustn't accept suffering just because it happens in what we refer to as nature, and to nonhuman animals by other nonhuman animals. To the sufferers, suffering is bad when it is considered natural just as much as when it is considered unnatural. And the victims are not consoled by the fact that it is nonhumans that hurt them and not humans. If labeling a violent scene as 'natural' doesn't affect the suffering of the victims, then it doesn't have a moral effect.

How can a compassionate person watch sentient animals struggle to unleash themselves from an aggressive grip, hear their yelling and screaming, see their dying spasms and say that it is o.k? And using what kind of justification? That it's a natural panic?

When watching suffering of wild animals on the screen, many humans and certainly every animal activist, are dramatically emotionally moved by these horrific scenes. Some rationalize their way out of it by calling it natural and others by claiming it is inevitable, failing to infer the moral conclusion out of the situation - when something that horrible is such a natural and inevitable part of life, life is horrible. Activists mustn't rationalize their way out of horrible situations but act to change them.

Unfortunately the argument ‘what is natural is morally right’ is very popular, even in the animal liberation movement. That is despite that there is no conceptual connection between what is natural and what is moral. A natural behavior is the one that is probably the most successful in terms of survival and reproduction, not the one who successfully promotes moral ideals. Therefore many actions are perfectly natural but morally horrible.

To say that something is natural doesn’t add any moral value to it. It only says that it evolved spontaneously through time and improved or didn’t interrupt the reproduction of its beholder. Nature is indifferent to the suffering of its residents.

Activists shouldn’t consider nature as an ethical model but as an ethical problem.

Of course, some activists observe nature neither as an ethical model nor as an ethical problem. They are aware of the suffering, only they don’t think they are morally obligated to intervene. We find this argument false in the best case, and speciesist in the worst. We address the various claims they make, such as: that humans must not interfere in nature, that humans will only make things worse, that nonhuman animals are not moral agents, that nonhuman animals as opposed to humans have no other choice but to hurt others, that there are more urgent problems, that humans are obligated to help only the ones that they are responsible for their misery, in a post called [The Violence Even Activists Are Disregarding](#). For a complete answer please read it.

An idealized and a very partial view of nature, causes activists not only to ignore most of the horrible parts of the lives of animals in nature, it also causes them to ignore most of the animals.

Usually the idealized image of nature is consisted of adult individuals of large herbivore mammals pasture in a green field. However, there is nothing ideal in the lives of adult herbivores considering the constant social stress of many, the constant fear of predation of most, the harsh weather, the hunger, the thirst, the diseases, the frequent injuries from successful escapes from predation, and the excruciating pain of unsuccessful escapes from predation. And more importantly, herbivore mammals dying in adulthood are by no doubt extraordinarily exceptional and utterly unrepresentative of life in nature.

Most of the sentient beings on earth never reach adulthood, but live for a short and extremely brutal period, in most cases, lives of nothing but suffering.

This fact is particularly relevant for the case against nature as an ideal moral model since this mass scale horror is mainly driven by one of nature’s most fundamental elements – the reproductive strategy.

The two main reproductive strategies are called K-selection and r-selection. To put it simply, K-selection is putting all the energy on maximally preparing individuals to survive the environmental conditions, while r-selection is putting all the energy on the maximum number of individuals and minimum investment (in many cases none) in each individual.

Of course these strategies are combined in some way or another among different species, but generally that is the main framework.

Basically, the higher the value of r, the lower the value of K. So every single case of reproduction of r-selected species ends up with numerous individuals who will die shortly after.

Since the population of these species is more or less the same from generation to generation, then on average only one offspring will survive to replace each parent.

The absolutely natural process of r-selection reproduction involves, the starvation, dehydration or predation of hundreds or thousands of beings, often shortly after they start to be conscious. Only one individual out of them survives to sexual maturity, and then of course repeats this exact same scenario. The suffering of the rest of the individuals is meaningless in nature terms. The tragedy of trillions is nature’s triumph.

Of course not all the individuals of each reproduction will live long enough to become sentient (consumed while still in the egg at a very early stage for example) and there are those who argue that some never become sentient, no matter their age, because they are simply non-sentient. However, given that most animals practice r-selection, including invertebrates of course (by far most of the animals on Earth) and many vertebrates such as fishes, amphibians and reptiles, and given the enormous number of reproductions

and the enormous number reproduced beings, nature is not only far from being ideal, it is full of suffering on every level.

The philosopher Oscar Horta thinks that the existence of r-selection leads to the inevitable conclusion that there is far more suffering than happiness in nature. He gives an example to prove his point:

“Consider just one example regarding a certain species of animals, the Atlantic cod (Gadus morhua). These animals can lay from a few thousand to several million eggs. Let us suppose that they lay 2 million each time. It is estimated that in 2007 there were around 33,700 tons of Atlantic cod in the Gulf of Maine bank alone. An adult cod can weigh up to 25-35 kg. Assuming they have an average weight of 33.7 kg, there would be around a million of these animals (the average weight I have proposed is too high, though on the other hand I am assuming, for the sake of simplicity, that these animals are all adult animals). Assuming the cod population remains stable, on average only two of the eggs that a female cod lays in her life end up developing into adults. Thus, a total of 2 trillion eggs laid will fail to become adults. Assume each egg has a 0.1 probability of developing into a young, immature fish, a codling, and that there is a 0.1 probability that codlings are sentient. Finally, assume that on average they suffer for just ten seconds before they die. All of these are extremely conservative assumptions. Yet they entail that each time these animals reproduce we can expect that 200 billion seconds of suffering is experienced (and these are only the cods in the Gulf of Maine). Since there are 31,556,926 seconds in a year, this amounts to 6337.7529 years of suffering. If this continues over an average human lifespan (that is, six decades), the number of years of suffering generated would be 380,265.174. All this for a very specific species in a very specific area.”

Oscar Horta’s terrifying illustration is extremely important for several reasons:

Even non-negative utilitarians must infer that nature can’t be morally justified.

It further refutes the idealistic view of nature.

It further induces the moral need to act against it.

It further refutes the idealistic view of a vegan world which is many activists’ moral ideal.

The kinds of lives that the absolute majority of sentient beings on earth are forced to live, are of nothing but suffering. And that is a much more accurate view of nature’s true nature.

To positively view nature one must wear extraordinarily optimistic lenses when looking at individuals from K-selected species, and simply cover the eyes when looking at individuals from r-selected species.

A world with no humans is a dream come true only compared with a world with humans. On any other standard it is a nightmare.

Nature is hell but not since animals are devils. Nonhumans can’t be blamed for the horrors they cause. We include them in the solution not because they are guilty of cruelty but because they can’t help but cause suffering.

Our moral view is not about judgments, justice or punishments. It’s about viewing the cruel situation for what it is, recognizing that someone is a victim, acknowledging that suffering is suffering.

The fact that animals as opposed to humans aren’t cruel because they don’t inflict pain on purpose and since they don’t have other choices, doesn’t make the situation less cruel for the victims. There are no painkillers in lack of intention or in the lack of other options.

Predation is immoral despite that predators are not acting immorally. Intentional or not, necessary or not, there are still victims to their actions. A hurtful action is bad even when not a bad actor does it.

Actions, and surely situations, can be horrible even if no moral agents were performing them. One unequivocal example for that are natural disasters. Earthquakes are not moral agents yet we think they are bad. We can’t hold anyone responsible for their harms, but surely we consider harms made by earthquakes bad. And not only that we consider them bad, it is unlikely that anyone would argue that we shouldn’t interfere in favor of the ones hurt by an earthquake because it is a natural disaster, in fact most argue that it is our moral obligation to do so.

Many parts of reality are cruel without anyone guilty of them. The fact that earthquakes are not moral agents doesn't prevent us from thinking we should help its victims. So it's not moral agency which is relevant here. The lack of moral agents makes the situation invidious but we can certainly judge the situation as horrible.

When an earthquake happens we define it as a tragedy and bad luck for the ones hurt. If it happens in a certain place once a day, we would say that this is a very bad place to live in. That is despite that no one is doing it on purpose or can be held accountable. No moral agents, and still - a bad place. The same can be said about nature. Only that in nature the bad thing doesn't happen once a day but every single moment. We can say that nature is bad without anyone bad living in it. Just as we can say that natural disasters are bad without anyone bad causing them.

But of course moral agency is not the only reason for the difference in the feelings towards suffering caused by humans, and suffering caused by nonhumans. Most of the suffering humans cause to nonhumans is since they want to. Most of the suffering nonhumans cause to other nonhumans is caused since they have to.

However, the fact that suffering is always bad for the victim, makes an action that caused suffering bad whether there were alternatives or not.

How is it of any difference to the victims if there were other options available for the victimizers? No animal would stop running away in panic if the chasing animal would explain that there are no other options but starvation.

The fact that suffering is inevitable is not a reason to ignore it, but the primal reason why this world must be destroyed.

We don't want to annihilate nonhuman animals or human animals.

Annihilation is the mean not the goal. We want a sufferingless world.

We don't want fear, pain, hunger, thirst, diseases, injuries, parasitism, hypothermia, hyperthermia whether they happen in [battery cages](#), [laboratories](#) and [slaughterhouses](#), or in forests, savannas and oceans. Suffering is suffering. And unfortunately suffering is an inherent part of life. As long as life exists, suffering will too.

Like in any other situation, only when we acknowledge the roots of the problem, will we be able to solve it. That's why the few people who care about suffering, all suffering, must [do their best trying to end it](#).

5. Isn't It An Exaggeration?

You get furious when you are called extremists don't you? "It's reality itself which is extreme!" you say, "The ones who are trying to stop it are the only sane people around..."
So we'll answer in the same manner...

Tearing slices off sentient beings while they are still alive, trying to escape in panic, is an exaggeration.

Slowly digesting sentients after swallowing them whole, is an exaggeration.

Killing babies because they are someone else's offsprings, is an exaggeration.

Injecting eggs into a live spider's body to ensure that when the larvae hatch they are surrounded with "food", is an exaggeration.

Aggressively horning other males for territory and for the "right" to mate, is an exaggeration.

Chemically liquefying other beings before eating them, is an exaggeration.

A 15 meters wide swarm of around 100,000 driver ants warriors, working mutually as a single hunting unit swarming into any opening in the body of their prey (rats, scorpions, lizards and even young birds that are unable to fly), including the mouth and nose, suffocating or devouring them alive, is an exaggeration.

Skunks coming at night to caves full with bats knowing that sooner or later in such crowdedness some will lose their grip. Since baby bats are still unable to fly at their early age, when they fall on the cave's ground they are totally helpless. Exactly what the skunks are looking for. The cave is totally dark so the skunks don't see the fallen baby bat, they also can't hear them because of the strong shrieks of the tens of thousands

of other bats and they can't smell them as well (because of the strong ammonia odor) so they actually grope handling the cave until they bump into one and since they don't see where the head is, to avoid a bite they roll the baby bats on the ground over and over until they die. That is an exaggeration.

Letting the U.S. south east coast dolphins continue with their horrible fishing tactics of sweeping fishes into the riverbanks dooming them to death by suffocation and severe stress resulting from the rapid lift from water to land, is an exaggeration.

Another cruel hunting method the dolphins use is circulating sardine fishes driving them to swim against the water surface and against the stream, making a giant meat ball of sardines and then starting eating from it. If that is not exaggerated enough, birds who learned to interpret this dolphin behavior soon join the feast and eat the sardines from above too.

Octopuses use their eight sucker-lined arms to capture sentient beings, pierce their shells and inject poison that causes paralysis. It contains tetrodotoxin which causes motor paralysis and occasionally respiratory failure. The senses of the prey are often intact, meaning the victims are aware and remain fully conscious but unable to respond. Then the octopuses release salivary enzymes, loosening the flesh from the inner shell and then use their hard, parrot-like beaks to tear pieces of flesh. If this is not one of the most exaggerated methods of absorbing energy then what is?

Male Angonoka tortoise trying to flip one another over their backs when fighting over mating, is an exaggeration. And to further the exaggeration, after one succeeded he will sometimes bite the legs of the loser before he leaves him there to be boiled alive.

20 larvae slowly slicing a caterpillar's skin from the inside out after their mother wasp has injected them in the form of eggs into the caterpillar's body so they can have constant supply of food when they hatch, is an exaggeration.

And it even goes further than that - to protect the eggs the wasp injects a virus she produces in her ovaries that destroys the caterpillars' immune system, and if it is not exaggerated enough the wasp also injects a certain chemical that causes the caterpillar to protect the larvae while they cocoon themselves, until the caterpillar dies of hunger or disease since the immune system is destroyed.

These are just a few everyday glimpses of the routines of this world. Refusing to destroy it condemns a countless number of animals to suffering. And that's without a single word of how atrocious [factory farms](#) are, how brutal [experiments](#) are, how abusing [circuses](#) are, how maddening [zoos](#) are, how sadistic [bullfights](#) and [rodeos](#) are, how violent [humans' festivals](#) are and etc. This is because we focused on examples which would be part of the world activists dream of - a vegan one, while totally ignoring the [impossibility of reaching a non-speciesist world](#).

But it is an exaggeration to expect humans, who are so far from finding a sustainable, rational, and non-discriminative political, social and economic way to live with each other in the same country! Not to mention with their whole species (there is [always a war going on somewhere in the world](#), more than three new wars every year), so what are the chances of settling the relationships with other species on the base of equal consideration of interests?

To continue with the efforts to convince humans to stop consuming animal products because it hurts animals while they don't stop even when [it kills them and their families](#), while they eat whatever they want whenever they want, keep on smoking even though they know it hurts them and their own children, don't exercise, eat tons of sugar, fat and cholesterol, are too lazy to do something so easy and undemanding like recycling, is an exaggeration.

To continue with the efforts to convince humans to stop consuming animal products while most are still racist, sexist, nationalists, classist, ableists and chauvinist, is an exaggeration.

But even if we exaggerate for a moment and say that it is possible to make a vegan world, it would still be impossible to expect humans to live without hurting others. And so, even if a vegan world was possible...poisoning the world while producing food is an exaggeration. And more than 2.5 million tons of

poison are used each year. 10 or more cycles of pesticide sprays during one crop cycle are not uncommon, and sometimes the seeds are even sprayed before planting. Today it is estimated that the agricultural chemical industry is producing about 50,000 different pesticides based on approximately 600 active ingredients.

The methods farmers use to “defend” crops are an exaggeration and the diversity is scary. From the common leg trap that snaps as someone treads upon it, to creative mechanisms that shoot sharp spears once triggered, scissor-like knives that shut firmly or a noose that tightens and chokes. Burrows are attacked by varied toxic gases, liquids called fumigants and also with foaming agents which are pumped into the burrow system, quickly filling it entirely. Smoke bombs are also in use, and even flammable gases such as propane and oxygen are injected with a hose into the burrows and then ignited.

Flooding or burning fields after harvest is also common.

But the most "exaggerated" variation of "pest control" takes place in sugar-cane fields (since the canes are protected from burning by a very moist tissue), where the farmers begin to harvest the field on all sides going from the ends to the center, so many animals are packed at the last square. Then they burn the area while surrounding it with tractors, listers, pickaxes, mattocks, pitchforks and etc. The animals that were able to escape the flames, the smoke and the tractors, are clubbed to death by the farmers.

It is an exaggeration to expect that the plant based agriculture that feeds the whole world would use only wild pollination methods and the wind. It is not at all realistic and so even more honeybees will be exploited in the pollination industry which already exploits more than two million honeybee colonies per year in the US alone.

And forcing billions upon billions of bees, to go through routine examination and handling, artificial feeding regimes, drug and pesticide treatment, genetic manipulation, artificial insemination, smoking, air blasting, transportation (by air, rail and road), starvation and killing in order to grow vegan food, is an exaggeration.

In addition and regardless of the hurtful methods used during the production phase, vegan food has to somehow reach vegans. Vegans are bound to participate in the extremely exaggerated paving of the world, and in the exaggeratedly transportation based human society.

And it doesn't sum up with food only. Everything humans do is an exaggeration.

You all know about leather, fur and wool but did you know that cotton is the most pesticide-dependent crop in the world, accounting for up to 25% of all pesticide use?

In one year alone over 50 million pounds of pesticides are used on U.S. cotton fields.

Every T-shirt made of conventional cotton requires 1/4 pound of poison. It is not as bad as [wool](#) and [fur](#), but isn't it an exaggeration?

Expecting humans to give up their cars because they may kill other humans is a serious exaggeration in their eyes, so do it for squirrels, racoons and cats?

Treating the ocean like a giant dumpster, is an exaggeration.

Treating the ocean and the sky as traffic lanes, is an exaggeration.

About 2,400 square feet (in the U.S) as an average home size, is an exaggeration.

Expecting humans to stop building shiny glassed reflective skyscrapers just because around one billion birds die in glass collisions every year, is an exaggeration.

So is expecting them not to trim down city trees during the spring, which is the height of the nesting season for most birds and squirrels and also the time when a tree is directing all of its energy into producing new growth.

And more than anything else, nothing is more exaggerated than a life of suffering from birth to death of more than 150 billion sentient beings every year. So no, we are definitely not exaggerating.

Animal rights activism [can't achieve a vegan world](#) and even if it was achievable it would still be a [sufferingfull](#) and [extremely human dominated](#) world. [Food can't be produced without hurting someone else](#), it is just impossible.

Animal rights activism also totally ignores the innumerable and inapprehensible suffering that happens in every fraction of a second to [trillions of beings by other nonhuman animals](#). It is very cruel and cynical to think that it's part of life so there is nothing we can do about it. The fact that [all these atrocities](#), [all this suffering](#), is part of life, is exactly the problem.

We definitely can't change the system, but maybe we can eliminate it.

Will you choose to make this world a little less horrible, or devote the one life that you've got to end it?

6. But Life Is Not Only Suffering, There Are Good Parts In Life Too

Not if you are a farm animal.

Not for hundreds of billions of sentient beings whom their lives is one consecutive horrible experience. For hundreds of billions of sentient beings there are no good parts in life, only fear, pain and suffering. From birth to death. That's life for hundreds of billions of sentient beings bred into in this cruel world every single year.

Imagine a situation in which over 90% of the people in the world are physically deformed, suffering from constant pain most of their life time. A global nightmare.

Do you think that a statement such as the one above would be made if that world was real? Well not only that it is, our real world is much worse than the one you have just imagined.

This is an everyday reality for a population which is 7.5 times larger than the human one, annually!

This is the reality of 90% of the chickens raised for meat.

The lives of farm animals are so absent of good parts that by far [the luckiest "farm animals" on earth](#) are male chicks in the egg industry.

Unable to lay eggs and not genetically manipulated for profitable meat production, the males in the egg industry are killed as soon as they hatch.

That is how hellish this world really is if you look at life from [all earth's beings' point of view](#).

Trillions of others may not suffer from birth do death, but experience suffering most of their time. Hunger, thirst, cold, heat, injuries and diseases that never receive treatment, predation, constant fear of predation, rape, abuse from higher ranking members, are all common parts of [the everyday reality of animals in the wild](#). Nature is a [built-in suffering mechanism](#) in which animals either compete for resources or are themselves the resources. The reproduction strategy of most of the species involves producing a vast number of offsprings, though almost all of them would die very painfully, very young. Given that the population of these species remains stable from generation to generation, on average only one offspring survives to replace each parent. And then the horrible cycle continues.

The mechanism of life is rotten from its roots. No argument will make it prettier.

If you object the idea because life has its good parts too, we ask you to observe things from the point of view of one spermatozoon. What are the chances of the newborn baby to be happy?

Most humans think about life and about happiness from a human perspective only.

Well the chances of the one spermatozoon to be a happy human are not very good.

To state the obvious, there is a 50% chance it will be a female. Of course it doesn't mean she can't be happy, but it means she will be [automatically and systematically discriminated against for her entire life just because of her gender](#). Just one example out of many, merely for her gender belonging, there is a 25% chance that she will experience some sort of sexual abuse.

It has 12% chance to be white. 6% chance to be a white male. And less than 3% chance to be a white male in a western country.

It has more than 50% chances to be very poor. Obviously we don't think that poor, nonwhites from non-rich countries can't be happy, but they definitely have [worse starting points](#).

The spermatozoon has a 20% chance to live with lack of [safe drinking water](#) and 30% chance to live without water for basic hygiene.

6% chance it will be a [salve](#).

6% chance it will suffer a mental or behavioral disorder.

18% chance it will suffer from [hunger](#).

25% chance it will live in [dangerous, unstable situations](#).

20% chance it will be illiterate.

30% chance it will be in a constant risk of getting [malaria](#).

40% chance it will be at risk from dengue.

The list is practically endless but the point is clear.

There are so many suffering causes and that is when the spermatozoon in our little thought experiment turns to be an individual from the most privileged species on earth. Things get significantly worse when we calculate the spermatozoon chances to be happy if it turns to be ANY being in the world.

The spermatozoon has 14,000 times the chance to become an individual from a commercially exploited species than to become a human, based on a course of one year only (including estimations of directly consumed marine animals, by catch, and [fishmeal](#)).

Suffering is an inherent part of life. Choosing life is choosing suffering. The math is very simple. Most of the beings suffer most of the time. A non-speciesist perspective, necessarily leads to the conclusion that this world has to be stopped.

We think that ethics must solely focus on the bad experiences of the victims and not weight them against the good experiences of the ones benefiting from their victimization. It may sound trivial but utilitarianism for example weighs both sides of the equation, some schools even in an equal matter.

But not all of them. Negative utilitarianism for example doesn't consider good experiences at all as morally relevant. And so do we. We find negative utilitarianism as by far the most ethically relevant moral philosophy. But even if you don't, our solution does not deprive anyone of good experiences anyway. If no one exists, no one is harmed by the fact that potential good experiences are not fulfilled. The dead are not experiencing anything including not the deprivation of good experiences. So they will not be harmed by their death. Death is bad for the living who grieve and miss the dead. But the dead don't feel anything anymore, therefore can't be harmed. We realize it might be counter intuitive for some of you, but death is not bad for the dead. It can be good for them if they had suffered while living or neutral if they enjoyed their lives, but it can't be bad since the non-existent can't be harmed by the negation of good experiences. The dead are dead. They cease to exist. They can't be harmed at all. It's not that they are moved to an observation room where they can watch what they are missing by dying. The dead don't mourn the experiences they were deprived of when they die. The nonexistent don't feel anything anymore, they can't be pleased or harmed.

Don't confuse death with dying, thinking about dying, near death experiences or living under death threats. These are all by no doubt harmful experiences, but they are of living individuals regarding death. Humans can definitely suffer from death but only as long as they are alive.

So if the dead are not harmed by missing the good parts of life, and hundreds of billions of sentient beings a year have no good parts in their lives, how is a sentient-less world not the moral solution?

If there is no life no one will suffer. No one will experience a life full of suffering so others can have good parts and no one will suffer from their absence.

And if all that was rather too abstract and philosophical, consider a question based on a way more realistic scenario - What kind of a world do you prefer?

A world in which there is not even one suffering being (not to mention trillions), and a much lower number of beings that life and pleasure were prevented from them but they are not hurt by that since they were never even born (the never born are never hurt). Or a world in which billions of beings are daily tortured in order that a much smaller number of beings is able to enjoy the good parts of life?

7. I Am Sorry, I Draw The Line Where There Is Violence

First of all, hopefully, the practical method of the annihilation application would be as little violent as possible in the short-term. And obviously since the whole point is to stop all the violence that would ever happen unless annihilation is applied, then in the long-term it is the least violent option possible.

Secondly, there is no such thing as a nonviolent approach in this world.

So called "nonviolent actions" are indeed not violent towards animal abusers, but when failing to stop them, the "nonviolent" approach is actually violent towards the abused animals.

Besides a brief moral lecture, which each violent oppressor can choose to wave off at any time, a non-violent approach essentially grants violent oppressors with a full autonomy on the violence. They are basically free to choose who to hurt, when to hurt, how much to hurt and for how long. And that's exactly what's happening every time activists don't succeed in convincing the abusers to change their ways. Every animal rights persuasion attempt that doesn't end with a new non-speciesist vegan, means letting another human continue with his/her violent ways. Just informing humans that their habits are violent is not a non-violent approach if these humans choose to keep inflicting violence on the animals.

You can give them all the facts and show them all the evidences from factory farms, use every argument you know and deconstruct every excuse they throw, but it is still the abusers' call. Letting the violent oppressors decide is supporting a power based and violent world, because it is humans' ability to control the rest of the species that had put them in the place that it is seemingly their decision if to exploit the animals. Isn't it a violent standpoint to let the abusers choose whether to use violence or not?

If activists truly believe that in their relation to nonhumans all humans are Nazis, why aren't they all Partisan guerrilla fighters? The Partisans didn't handout leaflets with footages from inside Auschwitz along with the numbers of humans exterminated in gas chambers.

If activists honestly think that meat eaters are serial killers and vegetarians are rapists, then by this same logic they're accountable bystanders.

All the activists are aware of the fact that much more violence is inflicted in factory farms than the violence that would be required to overthrow the human tyrants. So why asking more than 150 billion victims per year to hold on until about 7 billion humans are convinced?

And how letting more than 150 billion victims per year wait, is less violent than looking for ways to eradicate 7 billion?

Arguing that the so called non-violent approach is not really violent since activists have no other options but asking the abusers to stop abusing is false, not only because there are other options (this whole website is advocating for one), but since activists are not choosing non-violent advocacy after a thorough examination of the options. Unfortunately, it is self-evident that what must be done facing the greatest horror in history is to inform the abusers about what they are responsible for.

Animal liberation activists' natural tendency and the first and last plan of action, is to explain to humans that their daily torturing of the weaker for their own minor benefits, habits and pleasures is wrong, and that in itself is wrong, violent and speciesist. It indicates how human oriented the moral scope is, and how bounded the discussion is.

It is crucial to emphasis that the point of this argument isn't that activists are actually violence supporters and speciesist because they don't kill meat eaters, but that they are because they don't think they ought to. We are not arguing that if you practically don't kill every human who wasn't convinced to stop consuming animals you are a speciesist. We are arguing that if you don't think that theoretically you must stop (by whatever means necessary) every human who wasn't convinced to stop consuming animals you are a speciesist since that human is going to keep abusing.

Given the average consumption figures, each human is worth thousands of animals. An average American meat eater is responsible for the suffering of about 55,000 animals within his lifetime (data based on [Countinganimals.com](#)), including about 10,000 crustaceans, 1,860 [chickens](#), 950 [fishes](#), 55 [turkeys](#), 30 [pigs](#) and [sheeps](#), 8 [cows](#) and between 35,000 and 50,000 of non-directly consumed fishes and crustaceans who are either by catch or [animals captured and killed to feed the directly consumed animals](#) (as fishmeal and fish oil). And of course that is without counting the chickens suffering in the [egg industry](#) and cows in the [milk industry](#).

Morally opposing to stopping humans by all means necessary, including killing them, means they are worth more than the pain and suffering of all of these animals.

We doubt that if animals could, they would choose a “non-violent” approach.

This issue reveals how the animal liberation movement, the only group representing the animals, is soaked with anthropocentric perspectives, talking and thinking in humans’ terms. What else can explain the constant use of nonviolence as a relevant term while the most violent one-sided assault in the history of this planet is raging?

Stopping all the suffering should be our goal and thinking how we can do that is where we must start, not from non-violent advocacy which is an extreme compromise on the animals’ expense. You start at the best option and only if it turns out to be irrelevant should you turn to such an extreme compromise as [a world with as many vegans as possible](#). Especially since even a totally vegan world (which is absolutely unrealistic) is a horrible world as we explain in the article [Vegan Suffering](#) and in the article [Occupied Territory](#).

A non-violent and non-speciesist approach should lead you to first consider the best option for the animals which is stopping this inherently violent and speciesist world by any means necessary.

Activists who oppose violence for non-practical reasons (“ideological reasons”) are violent and speciesists by letting non-vegans inflict much more violence on many more sentients.

On the other hand, activists who oppose the use of violence for practical reasons (while confusing sporadic killings which are truly impractical with [our solution](#)) are violent and speciesist, as they accept as a given that it is humans’ decision whether, whom, how many and for how long, they can abuse. They let this world continue instead of look for ways to end it.

Tactically or ideologically, practically the non-violence approach is speciesist and violent, since as far as the non-violence advocates go, animal liberation is a timeless effort, meaning until every human is convinced, no matter how much suffering and violence is inflicted on animals until then. The struggle has no timeframe or any limit on the number of victims. Humans are given an everlasting chance to change on the animals’ expense and no matter how many of them would be sacrificed for the sake of “non-violence”.

Asking the victims to suffer patiently until activists find a way to the hearts of the rest of humanity, or in other words, arguing that the horror will end when humans decide it will end, is pure speciesism and extremely violent.

The factor of time is even more violent and speciesist when you consider that it takes only 3 weeks for the number of animal victims to surpass the number of human victimizers, and yet it is the option of human annihilation that is perceived as violent.

So when activists say they draw the line where there is violence, they actually mean that they draw the line where there is violence towards humans.

Actually, most of the non-violence advocates do justify using violence in cases like assault, rightfully arguing for self-defense.

It begs the inevitable point- it's selfish to justify hurting someone in the name of self-defense but not in the name of defending someone else.

The self-defense exception condemns all the ones who can't defend themselves to a continuance suffering. Their suffering is obviously not less significant than the suffering of the ones who can defend themselves, and so deserve the same protection from violence regardless of their ability to fend for themselves.

None of the billions of animals born into an intensive system of exploitation and violence can fend for themselves. According to the non-violence theory they must find a way to somehow defend themselves, or hold their breath until the tiny minority of humans who are trying to defend all of them will succeed in convincing the vast majority. Does that seem like a moral approach?

Why is it so self-evident that humans should get to decide whether to keep abusing or not?

This is not a matter of serving justice, it is about reclaiming the power that should have never been given to humans in the first place and taking responsibility over everything happening in this violent world. It is not about the intrinsically unjust power balance between humans and animals in itself. Obviously we would compromise on it if there was a way not only to make all humans vegans and make veganism non-violent, but also to make sure it would stay as such forever.

So far we have accomplished less than 1% of the first mission which is also the only one theoretically possible.

Maybe the saddest thing about the non-violence approach is that it is impossible even theoretically.

Everything in life is on someone else's expense. No matter what and how little we consume, there is no way to avoid violence.

Even the most caring and compassionate, non-speciesist humans on this planet are bound to participate in a violent system, systematically hurting sentient beings they wholeheartedly believe they mustn't.

There is no non-violent approach in this world. Not practically and not theoretically.

The non-violent approach is basically oxymoronic. It can't exist in such a violent world where [beings constantly compete with each other over resources, not to mention that for many, other creatures are the resources](#). Violence is a derivative from life's most basic element - consuming energy. It is [impossible for any being to live on this planet without hurting](#) someone else and this ambition is particularly absurd when it comes to humans whose massive and violent footprint is with no comparison to any other being, even vegans with a very high environmental awareness.

Although it is much less violent than any other option, veganism is still a violent one.

Veganism is replacing the cruelest way of accumulating energy with a much less violent and oppressive system but certainly not an equalitarian and non-violent one.

A vegan diet is not cruelty free, and it is not because of a specific way a specific product is being produced. It is all the ways that all of the products are produced which is harmful. The list of harms in the plant based diet is endless. Violence is inevitable.

For a more complete picture please read our article [Vegan Suffering](#) and the post about [veganism as a none non-violent approach](#).

When the whole world is a giant oppression system, veganism is still a compromise on the amount of violence within the system, instead of abolishing it altogether.

Activists can argue that society is so inherently speciesist and violent that they are bound to act as if they are practically speciesist and support violence despite that they conceptually don't. But that is exactly the point we are trying to make. Our point is not to show that even animal rights activists are speciesist and violent, but that even animal rights activists can't **not** be violent and speciesist. The point we are trying to make is not about the particular activists in this particular era, but about AR activism in general, the mere conceptuality of AR activism which is bound to be violent and speciesist and therefore bound to be immoral. And in a vaster scope, if the world can't be moral, it clearly shouldn't be.

The only option for a truly non-violent world is one with no sentients. That is the goal of our movement and what every activist should [wish for](#) and [act on](#).

8. Don't You Think That The Slavery Abolition Proves That Animals Can Be Liberated Someday Too?

Slavery abolition is one of the greatest inspirations of the animal rights movement.

We find this inspiration utterly false and for several reasons which we broadly detailed in a series of posts about slavery.

In the [first one](#) we argue that neither the Thirteenth Amendment nor the American Civil War were a product of a moral struggle.

The Civil War broke for many reasons, none of which had to do with any sort of moral cause as the abolition of slavery. Wars don't break for moral reasons. And they definitely don't break between two sides over the rights of a third one. Wars generally break for money or power, and usually both. And so did the American civil war.

The historical review of the political, economic and moral climate before and during the American civil war, in an attempt to present the real reasons behind it, is crucial for the slavery discussion, since many cling on to these kinds of myths, building around them their activist philosophy, and since generally, it sheds light on human society and how things work in this world, and why.

In the [second](#) we argue that not only that the American civil war didn't break to end slavery, it didn't even really end it at all. Humans being humans, used an exception mentioned in 13th Amendment which is involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime, as a loophole to keep slavery active and thriving by systematically criminalizing African Americans (we don't mean the discriminative Jim Crow laws but the Black Codes, which was set as a legal basis for neo-slavery). In fact it took another century for slavery to really formally end in the United States alone.

And most importantly, regardless of the true reasons and causes for ending slavery, it never really ended, not in the U.S and definitely not all over the world. In fact as broadly detailed in the [third](#), [fourth](#) and [fifth](#) posts of the slavery series, [there are more slaves today than ever before in history](#) and that's what makes slavery ending as a successful test case for animal exploitation ending so absurd. If the comparison of industrial exploitation of animals and slavery is at all relevant, it is as a test case that proves the opposite. Since slavery never really ended, what activists should draw from the fight against slavery isn't inspiration, but disillusion, a wakeup call to look for [other ways to end animal suffering](#).

Slavery is now illegal in every nation on earth, yet it can be found in every corner of the globe. Even on the narrowest definition of slavery it's likely that there are far more slaves now than there were victims of the Atlantic slave trade.

In a way the fact that slavery is not legal anywhere but happens everywhere makes it worse because it means that slavery exists not because of political disputes between groups or anything of this sort, it exists and is so prevalent because humans don't care enough to stop it.

In our world it is much more important that crimes would be declared as such and be formally outlawed than actually doing something so they would truly cease to exist.

Exploitation systems exist because someone benefits from them, and since the ones who don't benefit from them (and therefore can be in the position to oppose them), are silent about them. The stronger benefits silently from slavery, the vulnerable suffers silently and the vast majority is just silent.

In order to seriously confront slavery, legislation and enforcement are far from being enough. Humanity must seriously confront slavery's origin which is poverty. For that, the rich world must decide to stop plundering the poorer world and minimize the luxurious lifestyle it enjoys. That's not going to happen. Slavery will exist as long as there are power gaps between humans, and there will always be power gaps between humans.

Obviously most humans prefer to believe slavery was ended or at least that it is the work of particular evil people in the grimmest places on earth, a consequence of the wickedness of a tiny minority. The truth is that it is a consequence of the indifference of the majority who allows it to happen.

Many humans enjoy a high level of living largely because of modern slaves who make many of the products they buy and use every day. Slavery is prevalent in different stages of the supply chains from the production of raw materials like cacao, cotton, coffee, iron, rubber, wood, cobalt, wheat and sugar to only name a few, to manufacturing every-day goods such as mobile phones or cloths made in [sweatshops](#).

Still most humans don't bother themselves too much with the production process of the goods they enjoy.

The same as they don't when it comes to animal derived products.

If anything, that is the relevant analogy to take from slavery.

The hopes of the animal liberation movement are laid on an institution that exists for about 15,000 years, was never ended nor reduced but was actually broadened in terms of the number of slaves, the enslavement methods, the slaves' age, the ethnical diversity, and the geographical spread. Slavery has never ended but evolved with time and it is now much more extensive and less visible, and that is the surest recipe to assure its continuance.

Slavery is almost everywhere, almost in everything. The fact slavery kept growing in size regardless of the fact that it is illegal now in every country in the world, shouldn't be inspiring but alarming.

But not only the inspiration is false, the comparison itself is false and it is so for several reasons.

Here are the main 10:

Different Functions

One of the main rationales of the comparison is that both slaves and animals were objectified and treated as if they are property. First of all, the fact that two exploited groups are considered property doesn't mean they were treated the same. And secondly, most animals are not considered property but merely raw material.

Enslaved humans were never milked, experimented on, skinned to be worn or eaten by their enslavers, and most exploited animals don't do humans' labor for them but are raised by them so humans can fiercely take what they desire from them, mainly their own bodies after they were murdered in the age and size humans wished for.

Some exploitations might seem similar to slavery (circuses, zoos, donkeys and horses exploitation and maybe even some animals in laboratories), but the food industry is a whole different story. Of course Genocide is a well-known phenomenon in human history, but intentionally systematically artificially creating populations to kill them is animal exclusive.

Black people were treated as sub-humans who are destined to serve white people, animals are a disposable bundle of meat that happen to be alive and sentient.

Different Scopes

Overall, the estimations of the slave trade are of about 30 to 40 million humans during a period of about 400 years. Based on the common estimation of 150 billion victims in the food industries each year, that number is suppressed after 2 hours.

When the gaps are so enormous and the victims are artificially "produced" in their billions every year, it is not a quantitative difference. In the peak of slavery in the United States there were about 4 million enslaved humans. Every 13 minutes, 4 million animals are murdered in the food industry, most after they have suffered their whole lives.

Different Depth of Control and Manipulation

Cruel family separations were common during the slave trade, but not separating all the parents from all the young, all the time. In institutional animal exploitation the separation between the parents' population and the offspring population is systematic.

Absolute control over the reproduction of an entire breed was never recorded in the history of human exploitation. Slaves were chosen by their body size and teeth condition but their body features weren't modified according to the masters' desires, as happens with every factory farmed animal today.

Creating an entire breed that is designed by artificial selection for specific profitable body parts is an animal exclusive atrocity and one of the most dramatic differences between the two.

One of the greatest causes of suffering of animals is not the external prison they live in but the inner confinement. Animals are born to suffer from their own body deformities caused by genetic manipulations. Regardless of their living conditions, at some point of their lives they suffer simply from being alive. As opposed to slaves which their living conditions in many ways are ruled by their human "masters", in the case of animals at least from this aspect they are all ruled by the mastery of their own deformed bodies.

Clearly slavery is slavery regardless of the masters' treatment. Taking others' freedom is sufficient to consider slavery as one of the worst things humans ever did to each other. But not all the slaves suffered every single moment of their lives. Billions of animals can't find even one painless position they can stand, sit or lie in. Billions of animals have no single moment of relief during their entire lives.

Different Value

A very dramatic difference is the value of the victim. When the function of the enslavement is the labor of the enslaved there is an incentive to protect the slaves. Not out of consideration for humans but out of a cynical protection over the "property". That is as opposed to the case in which the function of the enslavement is certain organs that happen to be part of the body of a sentient being.

When it comes to slaves, the longer they live and the better their physical condition is, the better it is for the enslaver who paid a lot of money to buy them. When it comes to animals the fastest they reach the "target weight" the better.

Slaves are good and profitable as long as they live, animals - when they die. That's why there is at least some sort of a built-in extremely cynical economic incentive that the slaves would be healthy and live long, and that animals grow the desirable limbs as fast as possible (on the expense of the rest of their body).

Obviously the very fact that a price tag was attached to a human is appalling, but given that this price was high, provided an incentive for the enslavers to protect the enslaved. When it comes to animals it is never the case, not even when it comes to expensive animals like some of the exploited animals in [laboratories](#), some of the exploited animals in [circuses](#), horses in the [horseracing industry](#) and [cows in the dairy industry](#). And it is definitely not the case with 99% of the systematically exploited animals which are so cheap and the gap between keeping them alive and the profits made of them is so marginal, that millions of individuals are left to die in any case of a problem. In some cases a death toll of more than 10% of a population is just business as usual.

It is not by chance that much of the comparison is made using mammals and in industries in which they are worth more when they are alive. Fishes and Chickens are almost not mentioned since their lives are so cheap and short that it is absolutely incomparable with slavery.

Slaves are identified by names and documents. [Cows](#) and [Pigs](#) are identified by numbers. [Chickens](#) don't even have identifying numbers. But they are counted in whole numbers. Fishes are not even counted in

whole numbers. Individual fishes are not even considered as separate items - they are [counted in kilograms and tones](#).

Different Scope of Demands

To actually abolish nonhumans' exploitation, a much more radical change than a formal legal prohibition of selling animal based food, is required.

The enslavement of several million humans in a very specific and defined system, which is pretty clear where it begins and how it can end, is incomparable with the exploitation of trillions of nonhumans which the scope and definition of their exploitation is obscure and undefined, let alone when some forms of it are arguable even among the Animal Liberation community.

Human slavery is compared to institutionalized exploitation, mostly factory farms, but hundreds of thousands of humans privately imprison hundreds of millions of animals (mostly in their backyards) for several exploitive functions - from feeding themselves with their flesh, worming themselves with their skin, do their labor, carry their belongings, carry them from place to place, guard their yards, amuse them in their houses, amuse them in public places, bet on them, use them to kill other animals and etc.

These few examples don't begin to cover the list of wrongs done to animals on a regular basis which happen outside of factory farms.

In addition, although human slavery is mostly compared to factory farms, animal liberation means that animals should be liberated from human tyranny. When it comes to animals everything is much more complex, every road dividing habitats, every artificial lighting operated at night, every ship invading the ocean with tremendous noise, with trembling, pollution and collisions, every flying object who does the same in the air, every industrial factory polluting materials which animals are always the first to get hurt by. The abolitionists' goal was to convince their own people not to force humans from a different culture (who they considered a different race) to work so hard for so little. In theory all that it required was to hire more or less the same people to work on more or less the same farms but as free humans with rights, decent working conditions and a salary.

On the other hand if we take animal liberation seriously, we must vision a world which nothing in it is similar to the one we know today. Veganism is only the first step and we have so far made less than about 1% of it. Morally we mustn't compromise on less than a truly free world and that is never going to happen.

Different Settings

Even in the peak of slavery in the United States in the middle of the 19th century, the public opinion was at least bipartite if not in favor of slavery abolishment, since the North which was against slavery (for self-serving [political and ironically racist reasons](#)), was more populated than the South.

So if to analogize, the movement's "North" is speciesist vegans and the South is the rest of the world. On the eve of the civil war there were about 22 million people in the North and about 9 million in the South, that's almost double and a half. Vegans are less than 1% of the world population...

And what makes things even worse is that despite that nowadays slavery is not bipartite but the vast majority of humans are against it, still [there are more slaves than ever before](#). So what are the chances of animal liberation when the vast majority of humans are actively supporting their exploitation?

Different Justifications

Another important difference is the set of justifications to enslave Africans. Besides the de-humanization and savageness that was attributed to Africans, which was used to excuse the supremacy and exploitation, many whites identified themselves as the Africans' saviors. Many have convinced themselves that black people came from Africa to receive Christianity and if they have, they would gain a place in the next life which is anyway more important than this one. Whether some wholeheartedly believed in such a

paternalistic view, or was it a convenient cynical way to justify what they were doing, is less relevant, the point is that salvation was never used as a justification for animals' exploitation. The fact that "salvation" was brought up, even merely as an excuse, proves that Africans were seen as humans, not animals. Inferior to white humans in their eyes of course, but still humans, and even ones who can get a place in the afterlife.

Different Representation

A very dramatic difference between the two struggles is the self-representation factor. Slaves could and have represented their case by themselves, animals can't. Fredrick Douglas' autobiography was a best seller and he traveled the North telling people his story and what slavery is like from first hand in his own voice. That was much more effective than William Lloyd Garrison's journals, and it is definitely more effective than human activists trying to mediate animals' suffering.

It's not just about authentic voices that are identifiable for the wide public. The lack of self-representation regards every aspect of the struggle – [its aims](#), [its means](#), its priorities. You can be sure that if animals could represent themselves everything would have been totally different. Even the very definition of what is oppression and [what is not](#).

Different Legitimacy

While the civil war wasn't really about slavery, violence did play a part in the struggle against slavery. William Lloyd Garrison was famously non-violent but Nat Turner, David Walker and John Brown for example weren't. Despite that fact, they are studied in history classes. They are unquestionably considered as part of the anti-slavery struggle.

Even though they faced a much smaller atrocity compared with the one we are dealing with, the use of violence got much more support which some of it came in real time. That shows how vast the gaps are between the status of animals compared with what was the status of slaves and how legitimate animal exploitation is compared with humans exploitation.

John Brown is forever a hero for raiding an army arsenal because he wanted to initiate a slaves rebel, and when AR activists throw paint on a fur coat they are violent aggressors.

And don't get it wrong, it is not a historical perspective matter, the hang of John Brown was a public event, he became a martyr a minute after he was judged, not retrospectively, years after slavery was abolished. We in the Animal Liberation movement can only dream of such [legitimacy for violence use](#).

Different Narratives

Even if, despite of all the causes, reasons and evidences specified in the [post regarding the 13th amendment](#), there are ones who insist on arguing that the abolition movement had a crucial factor in ending slavery in the United States, even in this most flattering scenario, it can be said that they had something to do with the fact that a war broke out. Somehow activists tend to ignore that part in their version of events - that a war, let alone a civil war, was a major factor in the events held before, what is mistakenly considered to be, the ending of slavery in the United States.

It is one thing to insist that the war was about slavery, but it is a totally different story to ignore the fact that one existed. We understand that activists need to believe that it was an ideological dispute, despite all the evidences. However, even in that fairytale version, in the end what eventually turned things around was a war. So if to ignore history and focus on the logic behind the comparison only, if it took a civil war, which lasted 4 years and had more than 700,000 casualties, to free the about 4 million slaves in one country only, do activists really believe that freeing billions of animals all over the world would be gained peacefully? Or is it global war that they offer?

Who in their right mind can even imagine a war between vegans and non-vegans? And even if there are some who do, currently ethical vegans are less than 1% of the human population and probably most of this

tiny minority would pass on the war against 99% of the world's human population.

We don't see how the abolitionists' (admirable as they are and inspirational as they are on a personal level) marginal influence is even debatable considering the events before and after the war. The North, generally speaking, was extremely racist before, during and after the war. Colonization programs were considered before, during and after the war (including by Lincoln himself). Several northern states maintained their slaves before, during and after the war. And of course, the war didn't end slavery which [continued in the South for about another century](#).

If one really wants to believe in that story, still, the allegedly social "change" [happened by using coercion and violence](#). So if there is a historical lesson then it is that if you want to abolish a major exploitative system, start to acquire arms.

Conclusion

The comparison between slavery and institutional exploitation of animals is commonly criticized for supposedly belittling human atrocities, but as broadly detailed, it actually does the exact opposite.

As horrible as slavery was and still is, when it comes to the number of aspects of life the enslavers are invading, the depth of their invasion, the exploitation functions, the circumferential systems and facilities of the exploitation, the knowledge and research involved and mainly the extent of the exploitation throughout history, it is incomparable.

How is it possible to make a comparison between an oppressive system that suppresses the other oppressive system in several parameters, mainly considering that its extent is suppressed in 2 hours only?

While the world is getting [farther and farther from being slavery-free](#), as hard as it is to realistically think this institution is abolishable, it is at least imaginable. A world without animals' exploitation is unimaginable.

The few similarities that we do find are mostly the ones regarding the mindset of the enslavers, not in the status and value of the enslaved. Focusing on the enslavers instead of the enslaved is done because the mindset of activists is focused on how to change the views of victimizers and not how to free the victims. We have thoroughly addressed this issue in a [blog post](#) and in its [follow-up](#). Please take the time and read them.

And even if after this long list of arguments you still insist the comparison is valid, you should definitely agree with our meta-argument - if the urge is to take advantage of a given situation and that is truly what stands behind all exploitations, then why insisting on changing humanity and not destroying it? If when humans observe weakness in someone, no matter who, from which ethnical origin, color or species, and no matter at which period in history, they take advantage of that, then why not draw the relevant conclusions that if we wish to truly abolish exploitation, we must abolish the exploiters?

Nothing can be compared with humans' tyranny over animals. Not even the cruelest, most oppressive tyranny of humans over each other. Slavery was and still is an atrocity that we think is in itself a reason why there is [only one solution](#). And the fact that such a dreadful atrocity isn't the worst thing happening in the world but can't even be compared with the worst one, doesn't leave room for doubt that this world is to be destroyed.

9. The Human Race Perspective On Itself And On The World Has Changed Through Time And Will Keep On Changing, All We Need Is To Be Patient

Humans' perspective was, still is and will always be extremely anthropocentric.

Humans see themselves as the center of the universe, even after what is regarded as the three big revolutions of Copernicus, Darwin and Freud.

Copernicus discovered that planet earth is not the center of the universe. The sun and the other planets are not circling the earth. Humans know today that earth is just another planet, not particularly big or special, in a not particularly big or special solar system.

Darwin has taught humans that not only are they not the center of the universe, they are not even the center of Earth. All the species have the same origin. Humans are just another animal as all the other species - nothing special about them on earth too.

Over the years there have been major discoveries in genetics, and accumulated knowledge in paleontology, embryology, comparative anatomy and physiology, molecular biology, and etc. all showing the amazing similarities between humans and nonhuman animals. Yet none of them are enough for humans to understand. Anthropocentric attitudes are still extremely far from being vanished.

One of the most important beliefs, which makes animal abuse possible, is the idea that humans and other animals are in some way separated by an unbridgeable gap.

But humans, as you know, are great apes, not gods. Genetically, humans are much more closely related to other great apes than these apes are to other monkeys. Humans and chimpanzees have about 98.4% of their genes in common, whereas monkeys have only about 93% of the same genes as apes.

The amazing similarity is supposed to fundamentally weaken anthropocentric concepts that unfortunately most humans hold.

But when half of Americans still reject the theory of evolution, superannuating anthropocentrism is far from reality.

When it comes to their perception of their place in the universe, nothing fundamental has changed.

One thing that cannot be taken from humans, is their amazing talent for rationalization.

Some are even using the genetic similarities to further strengthen their alleged superiority, arguing that humans are so superior exactly because they have done so well with so little. The fact that they are in their godlike position despite that they are so genetically close to other apes, is what makes them so special.

Freud generated the third revolution that was supposed to further shatter the anthropocentric view. He said that not only are humans not the center of the universe, and the animal kingdom... they are not even the center of themselves. Humans are not really in complete control of what they are. They are motivated by unaware impulses and by systems and mechanisms in the unconsciousness.

Freud taught us how critical and influential experiences are in the first few years of life, and how complicated it is to alter their tremendous shaping effect retroactively (in addition to the many inborn mental characteristics).

We are not even really the masters of our own domain.

Obviously many of Freud's ideas are debatable. But the basic concept behind at least the psychological cornerstones relevant in our context, are still valid. Humans can no longer see themselves as utterly rationalistic beings driven solely by rational factors, and in absolute control over their personalities, behavior, thoughts and desires.

Conceptually, these theories are almost meaningless in the everyday life of most humans. The anti-anthropocentric aspect of these ideas is pretty simple, however most humans don't really internalize their conceptual meaning in terms of their place in the universe.

The reasons for the gap between the revolution these ideas were supposed to create, and the everyday reality, in which humans are still convinced and act as if they are the center of the universe, are coming from a motivation to keep humans' superior status in the world. A status that was supposed to die out a long time ago.

The sad reality is, that at a certain notorious historical era, these ideas did take hold and had a social-political influence, but it didn't lead to humbly respecting other sentient beings. Instead, it led to what is remembered as the worst crimes (conducted on humans) in the 20th century. Distortion of Darwin's theory was readapted into social and political theories which later evolved to Fascism and Nazism. Even the temporary extensive effect the theory had, didn't affect the way humans see nonhumans, and poorly affected the way they see themselves and each other.

The fact that most humans still believe in the existence of a god in the 21st century, after so many discoveries refute its existence, is not an indication of ignorance (in many cases it is, but that is not the case we are talking about now), or that the alternative theories are not of satisfactory. It is an indication of the psychological motivations humans have to believe in a god, and that they are the center of its creation. The sense that an omnipotent entity is watching over them specifically is very comforting. It fills their lives with meaning and control. The need for an existential order in such a chaotic world is highly essential for humans, and part of this "heavenly" order is their special position and role in this world.

There is nothing rational in the belief that the human race is superior and the center of the universe. There is nothing rational in discrimination based on skin color, gender, class, ethnic origin or species. There are motivations to hold these perceptions and they are much stronger than the little rational thinking humans are capable of.

The fact is that most humans believe in a god, most humans believe that they are superior to other animals and most humans are racists, chauvinists and of course speciesists.

One of the strongest indications of how hopeless the chances are to create a moral change in society based on humans' compassion, is the way [humans treat members of their own species](#). Please take the time and read our articles and posts about how humans systematically [exploit the poorest of their own kind](#), how they treat [half of their own species](#) and their own [posterity](#), as well as the answer in this [FAQ](#) to the question about [the possibility of social revolutions](#), and particularity about [the possibility of a vegan world](#). These examples and arguments, as well as many [others](#), prove that if any, the human race's perspective on itself and on the world has in many aspects, changed for the worse.

And finally, the request for patience which is being asked on nonhumans' expense, is speciesist. Given that more than 150 billion animals per year are suffering from birth to death under mankind tyranny, asking them to hold on until about 7 billion humans are convinced, is not only speciesist, it's cruel.

A non-speciesist perspective, a point of view that doesn't count the interests of one species over another, necessarily leads to the conclusion that this world has to be ended.

10. The Problem Is That People Don't Know What Is Going On...

It's true that most people aren't exposed to what the animals go through in factory farms, but they are aware of the basic facts. Humans don't have to know that factory farms are the cruelest exploitation systems ever in history, it is enough to know that they exist to be morally accountable. And even more basically, they know that meat is animals' flesh. They know that animals are born to die. [They know meat is murder](#). Knowingly participating in hurting nonhumans is sufficient. Humans consume animal products because they want to, not because they don't know better.

The problem is not ignorance, but apathy.

"Animal liberation" by peter singer was written more than 40 years ago, "Animals machines" by Ruth Harrison was written more than 50 years ago, and since these two, hundreds more were published, and there

are hundreds of websites and social-media platforms with thousands of videos and tens of thousands of photos documenting animals' systematic exploitation by humans. People have many ways to get the information if they want to, they just don't.

Obviously, people are trying to avoid the acknowledgment that it is not moral to exploit animals, arbitrarily drawing their personal line at any place that fits their day-to-day routine. From minding themselves only, to family and friends, same country, same religion, same species, "free" range eggs only, no veal only, no tested cosmetic products only and etc.

Unfortunately, you are avoiding the acknowledgment about how they're avoiding the acknowledgment.

Worldwide, many humans are still regularly exposed to the everyday sights of animal exploitation, the same as humans have been not long ago all over the world. Does it matter to them? Did it ever?

Even though not all humans have been exposed to evidences from the inside of factory farms, hundreds of millions have been. The information reaches them through leaflets, social media, mainstream media, best seller books, demos, stands, so on. Also many have witnessed animal transportation, on the road, right before their very own eyes. Did this visual information matter?

The animal rights arguments are so simple and right. They are based on solid facts and evidences. Nobody can confront them rationally. Why then is it so hard to convince someone to go vegan?

The reason is that rationality is not enough in this world. It has proved itself as an insufficient element in order to change people's habits. Rationality can't beat motivation. For a more extensive view on that matter please read [Even the most selfish argument is not working](#) in our article section.

Take vegetarians for example, not only that they are aware of the harms inflicted in factory farms, they are even actively resisting parts of it. The problem is that they do it while supporting other parts of it including the meat industry which they seemingly act against. The [milk industry](#) and the meat industry are inseparably bound together, given that a mother is inseparably bound together with her babies. The [leather](#) industry is even more strongly bound with the meat industry, and the [egg industry](#) shares with the meat industry all its violent elements and even for a longer period of time for each victim.

And yet, despite these facts, or any logical consistency and ethical coherency, vegetarians artificially separate the industries as if you can resist one and support the other. Not because they are unaware of the harms in the egg industry or the inseparable connection between the milk and meat industry, but only because this is where they have decided to draw the line.

And not only that the infirm concept of vegetarianism didn't gradually merge with veganism, there are many more vegetarians than the ethically firmer, coherent, factually based and logically consistent vegans. Of course there are many problems with veganism as you can see [here](#), however they are much more complex than the ones with vegetarianism, which scream out of the dairy farms and battery cages.

A few decades ago vegetarians could have honestly argued that they are not aware of the harms in the eggs and milk industries. But in the last couples of decades, when every vegetarian knows what veganism is, they can no longer honestly argue for lack of awareness.

The fact that there are much more vegetarians than vegans in the world, indicates how small is the part information plays in humans' moral decisions. If all the vegetarians know what goes on and most still decide to stay vegetarians, it is most likely that non vegetarians need more than to be informed for them to stop being flesh eaters.

If you examine the arguments that are raised in conversations about animal rights and about veganism, you won't find even one rational argument against animal rights or veganism.

You'll never stop hearing the same stupid old responses:

“What about how other animals kill and eat each other?”

“Human beings are a part of the food chain, and eating meat is natural. So then, how can it be wrong?”

“But didn't our ancestors eat meat?”

“If God did not want us to eat meat, then why did he place animals on the Earth?”

“How do you know that plants can not feel pain too?”

“What about insects?”

“Where would I get my protein from?”

“Would you rather save your child or your dog?”

“Shouldn't we focus on solving human problems before worrying about animals?”

“If everyone become vegetarian, then what will we do with all the farm animals?”

“If we didn't raise animals for food, then they would never have had the chance to be born and experience life at all.”

“Don't you have something better to do?”

“[Bacon!](#)”

...and you will give the same answers.

For how long will you participate in this game?

Lack of information is not the problem. The problem is that people that do know what is going on are not doing anything about it, and the few that do something, are aiming at the wrong direction.

The vast majority of people's awareness of what's going on is sufficient enough for them to decide not to participate in the abuse. But besides that, on a deeper level, behind the argument that “the problem is that they don't know”, lies the speciesist assumption that humans should be presented with all the available information, all the reasons and rationales for stopping their systematic abuse, first, and then they will decide whether to stop or not.

[A non-speciesist claim](#) on the other hand would be that nonhumans should be free from their exploitation first and regardless of humans' decision or opinion.

It shouldn't be about what humans know or don't know, or willing or not willing to do - as it's not about them. It's about stopping the suffering of their victims. It must not be about humans and their journey of gaining knowledge, and self-improvement and redemption.

Choosing to inform humans about their daily torture is accepting and reinforcing the concept that it is humans' decision whether or not to change the way they treat nonhuman animals. It is declaring that it is their minds that count. Humans' power and control shouldn't be an obvious given.

The fact that the animal rights activists' natural tendency and the first and last plan of action, is to inform humans about their daily torturing of the weaker for their own minor benefits, habits and pleasures, is [in itself wrong, violent and speciesist](#).

Our job is not to convince humans to stop abusing, our job is to stop the abuse.

The problem is not that humans don't know what's going on, the problem is that the most caring people in the world are wasting their so precious time on informing the rest of humanity about the greatest exploitation system ever in history, hoping that some of them will be kind enough to stop some of it, instead of looking for ways to annihilate them all so none of it will ever exist.

11. In Your Website You Write About Human Suffering, How Can You Compare Human Suffering To Animals' Suffering?

We don't. We are trying to include every suffering element in the world with no difference in scope, shape, gender, race or species.

Suffering is suffering. All the suffering should be addressed, and all suffering should be eliminated.

If you go over all our material as we hope you would, you will find that out of our [43 articles](#), 8 regard humans as victims and all the rest regard nonhuman animals as victims. And out of about 50 [videos](#) overall, 7 regard humans as victims and all the rest regard nonhuman animals.

In addition, some of the human oppressions are vaster than some of the nonhuman ones. For example each year there are more victims of [Female Genital Mutilation](#) than bulls during the [St. George Festival](#), in Chieti, Italy. We don't argue that their lives are much worse than the bulls' and we don't say otherwise, it just doesn't matter. Same as it doesn't matter whether [chickens in battery cages](#) suffer more than [sheepes in the wool industry](#) or vice versa.

When we were activists in the conventional movement this depressing question mattered because we wanted to help those who needed us the most, so we had to compare and decide somehow. Now as we are aiming at [stopping it all](#), it doesn't matter.

12. I Agree That The Human Race Is The World's Biggest Problem And The Cause Of Most Of The Suffering But I Am Against Extinction

Indeed, we think that the human race is the world's biggest problem and the cause of most of the suffering, but humans are far from being the world's only problem. There are many other suffering factors on this horrible planet. The total extinction of all species and the end of all suffering on this planet is our moral aspiration. Please check the article [Non-Anthropogenic Suffering](#), the answer to the question [Why Nonhuman Animals Too](#) and the post [The Violence Even Activists Are Disregarding](#).

We disagree with the rather common notion that extinction is in itself morally wrong. We think it is a false argument based on an ethical misconception.

A species is a notion, a concept, not a sentient being. It can't feel. It doesn't experience. It can't suffer. A species has no intrinsic value, no worth in itself irrespective of the individual members constructing it. A species is not itself a being with the ability to experience suffering or to have any kind of preference. Therefore a species is not a moral entity.

Individual sentient beings who are members of a species however, do feel and do experience and therefore are moral entities.

Morally, viewing individuals in species terms is false since experiences take place at the level of the individual only, not the group.

The wrongness of hurting someone is not rooted in the belonging of that someone to a specific species. For the individual, it hurts just as much if s/he belongs to an endangered species or not.

Furthermore, as broadly explained in the article [The Anthropocentric View of the Environmentalists](#) viewing abstract terms such as eco-system, nature and in this case - species, as moral entities, is eco-fascism.

Not only that this view turns abstract terms, including of course the term species itself, into moral entities, it perceives these made-up entities as morally superior over actual moral entities. It almost makes them the only thing that matters. These abstract terms are the basic moral units, instead of actual living, sentient individual. Individuals are completely expendable.

According to this view the "quantity" of animals and the variety of the species on the planet is what matters, not the quality of their lives. It is as if maintaining populations is the goal, not their living conditions and certainly not how each member feels.

Like in fascist ideologies, the continuity of the group is much more important than the well-being of its members. The system is much more important than the individuals forced into it.

However, it is the suffering of every sentient being that is meaningful and so "actions against the species" are meaningful because they cause suffering for its individual members, not because it hurts the species.

The only ethical relevancy of a species extinction is its impact on the individuals who gradually die out and individuals from other species who are affected by the extinction of that species.

As opposed to humans' actual enormous ecological influence, the human race theoretical ecological "role" is supposed to be very minor (considering its original place in the food chain and what was supposed to be its impact on the environment, the human race should have been a marginal species in biosphere terms.

Humans' nutrition is not based on a specific species and vice versa, there is no other species that its nutrition is based on humans so ecologically speaking, the human race is not supposed to be important). Given that, and considering that its role in global suffering is probably greater than all the other species combined, there should be no moral dilemma about human extinction if you think that extinction is morally relevant in itself.

In principle the argument against extinction is philosophically false. In practice the argument against human extinction specifically, is inconsistent and speciesist.

If you have a problem with extinction then it is actually supposed to be another reason to annihilate the human race, because it is the human race who is responsible for dozens of species extinction per day. In fact, this period is referred to as an extinction wave, named the Holocene extinction, or the Sixth Extinction, starting from about 12,000 years ago, and attributed to the human race activity.

If you are theoretically against the extinction of the human race, you are practically in favor of the extinction of at least 1,000 and up to about 50,000 species per year.

This rate is between 1,000 to 10,000 times the natural extinction rate, estimated (using the fossil record) at between 1 and 5 species per year.

The species you refuse to annihilate is the one causing all of these extinctions.

And the annual extinction rate is increasing still further. By 2100, according to current trends, about half of all species will go extinct.

One in 4 amphibians is an endangered species, so is one in 4 mammals, one in 8 birds, one in two crustaceans, one of every 5 fish species and one of every 5 reptiles - all are endangered species.

And that is not all:

More than 50% of the world's wetlands have been drained.

According to the UN since 1950 half of the world's forests were destroyed.

Each year, a further 15 billion trees are cut down.

Since 1950 humans have managed to wipe out more than 90% of all large fishes, leading to the widely known estimation that by [2048 the oceans will be empty](#).

Roughly one-third of the world's coral reef systems have been destroyed or highly degraded. And all of the world's reefs are predicted to be lost by 2050 due to destructive, human-related activities.

In only a few decades, more than one-third of the planet's arable land has been lost due to erosion or pollution.

It's not just animal based agriculture that is liable- the most common plant agriculture practices such as tilling, plowing, mono-culture, use of pesticides and fertilizers are major contributors too.

Also, other human activities such as urbanization, road paving, deforestation and global warming contribute to the arable land loss.

Opposing the extinction of the human species despite its responsibility for the extinction of so many nonhuman species, is specieist.

It is the same logic as in the case of animal consumption. Giving the abusers unlimited opportunity to change while they keep their abusive routine is considering them as more important than all of their victims. And given the average animal consumption figures of each human, each is worth thousands of animals.

Average American meat eaters are responsible for the life of suffering of about 55,000 animals within their lifetime, including about 10,000 crustaceans, 1,860 [chickens](#), 950 [fishes](#), 55 [turkeys](#), 30 [pigs](#) and [sheeps](#), 8 [cows](#), and between 35,000 and 50,000 of non-directly consumed fishes and crustaceans who are either "by-catch" or animals captured and killed to feed the [directly consumed animals](#). And of course that is without counting the chickens suffering in the egg industry and cows in the milk industry. Morally opposing to stopping humans, [by all means necessary](#), including killing them, means they are worth more than the pain

and suffering of all of these nonhumans.

Animal extinction was not one of [our reasons to start the E.A.S movement](#).

We don't argue that the human race should be eradicated because it causes the extinction of other species, as we don't think species are moral entities. We argue that the human race must be eradicated because it systematically hurts the species' individuals.

But if you are against extinction, the best thing you can do about it is annihilate the human race.

Annihilation of the human race is the only solution from that point of view too.

13. It Seems That Annihilating The Human Race Is More Realistic Than Ending All The Suffering, Shouldn't We Focus On That?

We think that activists' goal must be an overall solution, which should be forsaken only if a broad and thorough examination brings about the tragic conclusion that such an option is unrealistic. As we stressed in other FAQ's, neither you nor us can make a determination about the feasibility of the project to abolish all the suffering on this planet. The only way to find out is by conducting an extensive research.

Forsaking the overall solution and focusing on annihilating the human race, is forsaking [all the suffering that is not caused by humans](#) - suffering which otherwise would [never be addressed](#). That's why we are insisting on an option which is far less realistic but far more moral. That's the only way to [stop all the suffering](#).

Therefore we [call activists](#) to first make the most of the research of how to end all the suffering.

Having said that, humans are causing so much suffering, and the option of their annihilation is much more realistic and perceptible, that we can't say that if we had a substantial option of eliminating them, we wouldn't go for it.

A world with no [battery cages](#), [trawl nets](#), [TD](#), [slaughterhouses](#), [mastitis](#), [gestation crates](#), [mulesing](#), herbicides, pesticides, air pollution, water pollution, land clearing and [so many other atrocities](#) which will cease to exist and will never come back once humans are gone, is a world so less horrible than our current one, that we can't see ourselves refusing to implement the option to wipe out the human race if we had the chance of doing it.

Our call is for activists to do everything they can to stop all the suffering in the world. We realize that many believe it is an unrealistic goal. But we fail to understand how that can be a valid reason not to do everything they can to end all the suffering humans are causing or will ever cause.

For more about the feasibility issue please read our FAQ's [What Can I Do](#) and [I Agree with the Ethical Imperative to Stop This World, But I Think It is Way Too Complicated](#).

14. How Come You Use Death Figures As A Bad Thing?

The death figures are used as a bad thing in several of our materials since they reflect the scope of the exploitation industries we discuss, and since they represent the end of lives full of suffering. The use of "death figures" fits our main conceptual perceptions since the mentioned victims die as a result of the same mechanism that made their lives so miserable. So we don't exactly use death figures as a bad thing but more of a reflection of bad things which death is their final outcome. Furthermore in most of the [cases](#) that death figures are mentioned, death is not only a reflection of life full of suffering, but also in itself involved a lot of suffering.

15. What If There Is Suffering In Other Planets Too? If We Annihilate Ourselves We Won't Be Able To Help The Other Planets?

For some of you it may sound like a strange question, however we feel obligated to address every question we have been asked.

Obviously we can't deny the possibility that there are sentient beings suffering somewhere on other planets. But regardless of the chances, this cannot be a serious argument for the exploitation on this planet to go on. All the current suffering on planet earth, and all the future suffering that would be condemned to continue by not destroying this planet, can't be balanced with a chance that there are other life forms, and that these other life forms are sentient, and that they live on reachable planets, and that we would be able to somehow help them. It is statistically so unlikely that it seems more like an excuse. A way to feel morally o.k. with a very cruel decision - to leave this world as it is.

It is very ironic that activists, who are involved with relatively small scale campaigns in their local area alone, are raising the entire universe as a counter argument for putting an end to all the suffering on this planet.

And don't get this the wrong way, it is not that charity begins at home, but that charity didn't even really begin. So far, here on earth [every year more animals endure more suffering](#). So seriously arguing that activists who can't convince their own kind, who speak their language and share their social and cultural traits, to change their habits because it causes inconceivable suffering to sentient beings, would be able to do it with extraterrestrials?!

It took humanity more than 200 thousand years to reach the point where less than 2% of it is vegan, and even veganism, the far better option, [is a very cruel one](#). So how many more victims on this planet are required before humans would figure out how to detect, reach and help the exploited extraterrestrials?

Even if we go with this hypothetical scenario, it is very unlikely that activists are the first to be able to reach other planets and more likely it will happen only after humans have settled down there. In that case it is pretty obvious that humans would suck and squeeze everything they can out of those planets just as they do [on this one](#).

If they are doing it to what is, as far as they know, their only possible home and their only possible children's home, what reason is there to think that they won't do [the same on other planets](#) if they got the chance?

They will do the same as they always did, still do and will never stop doing as long as we don't stop them, they will destroy everything and everyone to serve their own interests, negligible and insignificant as they may be compared with the price others must pay for it.

Throughout history humans have exploited [blacks](#), [whites](#), [women](#), [children](#), [horses](#), [donkeys](#), [elephants](#), [bears](#), [pigs](#), [sheeps](#), [cows](#), [fishes](#), [chickens](#), [everyone on this planet](#).

All of the above share genes with humans, as well as other significant features. A species that mass tortures and mass murders its relatively alike and its own kind, won't save but exploit beings from another planet. It is far more likely that humans will experiment on the new beings or lock the "exotic creatures" in a zoo, or use them as living machines after finding the "best" way to "extract" the most out of each. And of course, occupy their planet and use its potential resources to satisfy more of their desires.

If there are sentient beings on other planets that humans could reach in the future, then humans will be their nightmare not their saviors.

So those who feel it's a realistic option that humans would reach other planets which are inhabited with sentient beings, should be more motivated to end this world before humans could reach them too...

16. What About The Animals Who Are In Captivity Now?

This question assumes that the End All Suffering refers to humans only. However, we consider it as a much broader solution to a much broader problem, which humans are the absolute worst symptom of. We view suffering as the problem, and sentient life is its root cause (see [Why Nonhumans Too](#) in the [FAQ](#), [Non-Anthropogenic Suffering](#) in the [article section](#) and [The Violence Even Activists Are Disregarding](#) in the [Blog](#)).

But even if “only” the human race is annihilated (if for example one of the research groups would find such an option feasible in the immediate range and decides to execute it), there isn’t much doubt that the fate of the captive animals will be much better anyway. In that scenario unfortunately they probably would die from dehydration or hunger, but as horrible as it is, it is still much better than their current lives. Even the last phase in their miserable lives - the aggressive and traumatic snatching from the shed, loading into the truck, transportation, violently forced into the slaughterhouse and the slaughter itself, probably cause more suffering than the suffering caused by death of dehydration or hunger. Not to mention whole lives of suffering in every single moment.

If the End All Suffering idea isn’t carried out, the caged animals would stay in the cages anyway and continue to suffer from density, suffocation, beating, humiliation, dehorning, number burning, dehydration, starvation, rape, ear clipping, force feeding, castration, boredom, diseases, transportation and slaughter. Nothing is worse than factory farming.

Do you really doubt that a death from hunger is less horrible than a year in a [battery cage](#)? Than six years in a [cow shed](#)? Than ten years in a [circus](#)? Than 20 years in the [premarin](#) industry? And in most of these exploitation industries the exploited animals are suffering from hunger and dehydration anyway.

Even if you insist that many animals will endure more suffering in the cages after the human race is gone than while humans used and abused them, this question regards the captive animals who are alive after the annihilation only. Every year the animal exploitation system breeds 150 billion more animals to suffer from birth to death. So after a few months only, the suffering that is prevented by the annihilation will be much greater than the suffering of the captive animals living after it.

The annihilation idea is for good. The above argument is relevant to one generation only and as we explained, even for that one generation it is better.

What about the future generations?

Things are only getting worse. The global animal consumption is growing rapidly and persistently. Every year more animals are being exploited. And it is not only a quantitative matter, every year the industries make the exploitation more efficient on the expense of the animals’ broken bodies. The genetic invasion is getting more harmful and violent every year. Farm animals are already [genetic freaks](#) - born to be cripples. The next generation will suffer more than the present and less than the one after it. In the future, many more animals will suffer much more.

We hope that the process causes as little suffering as possible.

But remember that no matter what the method is, it will cause suffering for one generation only (in the case of captive animals) and then the suffering (at least the human caused one) will be stopped. So even if your annihilation idea has a potential of causing a lot of suffering, there is no doubt that it is still worth it because nothing can be compared to the suffering that a decision not to do it will cause. Otherwise the suffering will never end. Generation after generation will be born to this cruel world as the new sufferers, only to become a [steak](#), [omelet](#), [shoes](#), [coat](#), [sweater](#), [pillow filling](#), [decoration](#), [an entertainment object](#), [or the food of humans’ food](#).

If you are thinking that it is wrong to “sacrifice” a generation (and as we wrote, we don’t see it as sacrifice, especially for the animals who are living at the time of the annihilation, since the lives of most of them is suffering from birth to death) for the sake of all the sentient beings that will ever suffer on this planet, we

ask you, don't you think it is wrong to "sacrifice" **all** the sentient beings who will ever be born into a life of suffering from birth to death?

When you decide not to "sacrifice" one generation, of which billions are suffering every single moment as it is, you condemn uncountable number of sentient beings to a life of suffering from birth to death.

17. O.k. I Agree, But Don't You Think It Will Take A Lot Of Time And The Chances Are Very Small To Succeed? So Don't You Think I Better Act Within The Conventional Movement?


We don't know how long it will take and what the chances to succeed are and neither do you. You will never know until you drop your current conventional activism and [start an advanced research](#). What both you and we do know, and is demonstrated all over this website, is that if activists continue to work within the conventional movement, the chances to free the animals from human exploitation are practically zero. And the chances to end the suffering are even theoretically zero. That is all that activists need to know to start their research team. It is extremely complicated, highly demanding, very risky and small chance, but it is also the only option for the suffering to end. And the more activists choose this option the bigger the chances to succeed.

Obviously we realize why our suggestion draws such a skeptical reaction (uncommon and different ideas get much more scrutinized), but we ask you to turn the very same question to the conventional animal right movement that is taken for granted.

Even if you are specifically very talented activists, think how many of those are out there (not in proportions to the importance and urgency of the problem of course) compared with activists who are considering taking such a challenge upon themselves. Think how many conventional activists were along the movement's history and how little they achieved? Think how much suffering you can reduce if you continue with conventional local activism, compared with a global action to end it entirely.

Nothing can be compared with even the tiniest option for stopping all the suffering. As tiny as the chances are, the movement's chances of stopping all the suffering are not tiny, they are zero. It's very difficult to make someone acknowledge that the movement s/he is part of, all the effort that was put in, the life work of so many, is failing. It's painful to admit that activists rely on small achievements missing the bigger picture and fail to recognize the mechanism. Many honestly believe the state of animals has improved since the movement was formed. It is frightening to think how much animal suffering increased since *Animal Liberation* was first published. The global [pigs flesh](#) production increased 3 times, [egg production](#) 4 times and [chickens flesh](#) production by more than 5 times.


Since 1975 new exploitation practices have been formed, joining the ones that already existed and constantly expand. Many countries have added exploitations of species who were subjected to commercial exploitation in other countries, and further intensify their exploitation all the time. The prices got cheaper and cheaper and a greater variety of available products was introduced to the market.



Animal consumption is growing rapidly and persistently. The meat consumption per capita has increased in all countries in the world. The world's total meat supply was 71 million tons in 1961. 50 years later in 2011, it was 294.7 million tons and it is expected to reach about 400 million tons by 2030 and 455 million tons by 2050. And maybe the scariest thing about these terrifying estimations is that they don't include [fishes](#), an industry that is very often ignored and would more than double the consumption figures.

In the lower-income countries, the meat consumption rose twice as fast, doubling in the last 20 years. The per capita demand in Asia has almost quadrupled since 1975 (with China's meat per capita consumption quintupling). The "Middle Income" countries have tripled their per capita meat consumption since 1975 and it's now standing on about 50kg per year on average. These countries also hold the highest population growth rate.

In Asia the most populated continent in the world (about 60% of all humans), the consumption of grains as a staple food has declined over the past three decades, especially in the rapidly growing economies of Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam and China, while consumption of [meat](#) (including [fishes](#) of course), [eggs](#), and [dairy products](#) has increased dramatically.



People in lower-income countries currently consume on average one-third the meat and one-quarter of the milk products per capita compared to the richer countries, but this is changing rapidly. More people everywhere are eating more animal products as soon as their incomes rise above poverty level. The animal rights movement can't deal with the current enormous amounts of exploited animals around the world, and it will only get worse. In the future many more animals will suffer much more.

The total animal products consumption has almost tripled since *Animal Liberation* was written. It's the human population, urbanization, increase in the Gross Domestic Product, global trade agreements, corporations' interests, the price of commodities and diseases like Avian Influenza and Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) that determine the number of exploited animals, not ethics. No point in dreaming of a vegan world when the global course is on the exact opposite.

The world is changing first and foremost because of economic reasons and political interests, not because of moral ideals. Exploitive industries such as [Fur](#), [Bears' Bile](#) and [Foie Gras](#), [Cockfights](#), and [Dogfights](#) all still exist and are very popular in spite of the campaigns that the animal rights organizations run against them for decades, and even though most of the public is against them.

And if this is not enough for little and publicly unaccepted industries such as these, when will the [chicken industry](#), which is about 55 billion suffering animals per year industry, ever stop?

When will [the last fish be suffocated in the extremely dense fish farms or pulled out of the water](#)? Currently even among the animal liberation movement, fishes aren't often portrayed as individual victims of human consumption, and you can often hear from activists about [the ocean "depletion" problem](#).

Every year tens of millions more sentient beings are born into a life of suffering. Every day is worse than the one before. Our website is full of [facts and figures](#) about suffering in the world, but the worst ones are the mentioned acute per capita increase, and that every second 5 more human babies are born. This world is so

horrible that one of the greatest suffering factors is the human birth rate.

It's time to open your eyes and admit that human society is [irrevocably speciesist](#). So far there [is every reason](#) to believe that even within the human race, selfishness and discrimination will never be overcome. [Anthropologists have never discovered a human society free of violence](#), and [social psychology findings](#) indicate that elements such as [group patriotism](#), selfishness, [obedience](#), conformism, tendency to discriminate, as well as biases, irrational and irrelevant factors when it comes to moral thinking, are all innate to a great extent.

Conventional advocacy, or, asking the torturers if they are willing to stop torturing, [is basically and principally speciesist in itself](#).

Despite that theoretically activists absolutely oppose humans' dominance, they practically accept it by asking humans to change their violent ways. They all know what happens every time they fail to convince them.

The partisans didn't organize an advocacy information stand in the forests to stop the massacre (among themselves activist point out that the animal holocaust is much worse than any human holocaust in history, so how come the norm in the movement is to do so much less than the partisan, and never adopt their tactics?).

The fact that the animal rights activists' natural tendency and the first and last plan of action, is to explain to humans that their daily torturing of the weaker for their own minor benefits, habits and pleasures is wrong, only shows how deep speciesism runs. The natural tendency should be to [stop the suffering in the most deep rooted and fastest way](#).

Even if many would consider going vegan, and even if all would go vegan, the absolutely delusional option of a vegan world can reverse at some point in the future. And even if it won't, it is still [a very violent one](#). The chances that the animal liberation movement would stop all the suffering are zero, not only because of the current consumption trends and the extremely depressing forecasts of the future, but because there are so [many suffering factors that the movement doesn't address](#), and so many suffering factors that the movement can't even theoretically address. One of the main blind spots is the problems inherent to the solution.

The solution the AR movement is offering - veganism, the one that even in the more progressive parts of the world many activists believe it's strategically unwise to ask for, is actually a systematic global oppression operation, abusing countless numbers of animals.

The main reason activists hardly ever address this massive black hole is because everything pales next to factory farming, and also because most automatically go on the defensive when meat eaters cynically make this point.

But we are not meat eaters, [we are vegans too](#). We are vegans because it is the least horrible option. But more than we are vegans, we are activists, and as such we are looking for a truly moral solution. [Veganism isn't](#).

The long list of vegan options you gladly offer those you're trying to convince to consider stopping their personal part of the torture, is substituting extremely horrible things with much less horrible things. But they are not at all cruelty free options. Plant based diet is cruel. The fact that there are diets that are much crueler doesn't make it moral.

Apart from the agricultural stage, the manufacture of products that are considered basic vegan food such as soy milk, flour, tofu, bread, oil, tea and etc can include dozens of harmful sub-processes like: Cleaning and removing unwanted parts such as the outer layers, for example separating the beans from the pod, extracting the interior such as seeds, mixing and macerating as in preserved fruits and vegetables, liquefaction and pressing as in fruit juices and soy milk production, fermentation like in soy sauces and tempeh, baking, boiling, broiling, frying, steaming, shipping of a number of ingredients from different distances, wrapping, labeling, packing, transportation of waste and of course the transportation to the stores. All are comfortably invisible as the finished product lies on the shelf.

And don't get this criticism wrong, it is not about activists' diets, it is about activists' activism. We are not criticizing activists for being hypocrite because they cause suffering. We know it is inevitable and that's the

whole point. Even the most caring and compassionate, non-speciesist humans on this planet are [bound to participate in a violent system](#), systematically hurting creatures they wholeheartedly believe they mustn't. [There is no nonviolent option in this world.](#)

Naturally some might raise the gatherer primitivism life, but we are not interested in personal solutions but global ones, and it is theoretically impossible even for a much smaller human population. And even if it was, remember that for it to be a solution, everyone else must do it as well. Everyone, as in people who eat whatever they want whenever they want, people who don't consider any ethical issues in their consumption choices, people who drive their SUVs on the way to the gourmet restaurant, all must adopt this lifestyle as well. Do you see foie gras consumers do it? Or even compromise on only local, seasonal, non-wrapped, naturally pollinated fruits? Can you see them even forsake their steaks? Currently we can't even make humans give up just meat for just one day of the week while telling them it is [for their health and their own children's future!](#)

Most humans haven't even made much more basic ethical decisions. There is no magic formula to educate most humans to solve conflicts without violence, to not objectifying each other, to not discriminate each other on the basis of race, gender, ethnical orientation, class, weight, height, looks and etc, it's even hard to get them to recycle, so what are the odds of convincing them all to become vegans?

Humans prove again and again that their profits, taste preference, convenience, entertainment etc, are much more important to them than morality. Most of them are not even willing to hear the facts and listen to the arguments, not to mention stop financing animal abuse.

The animal rights arguments are so simple and right. They are based on solid facts and evidences. Nobody can confront them rationally. The fact that the arguments are so strong and so well-based but still fail again and again, is the exact thing that should wake you all. Animal rights activists shouldn't draw strength from their strong arguments but the other way around. When arguments that are so strong and so obvious don't work there is something wrong with the addressees.

Even when the animal rights movement gives up on the idea of developing care towards nonhuman animals, and turns to anthropocentric and egoistic advocacy such as trying to appeal to humans' selfish concerns like care for their children's future, by using "the environmental argument" or care for their own kind using "the hunger argument" or caring for themselves - the hopelessness summit, using "the health argument", or when they consider humans' self-centered character and their ethical frailty promoting initiatives such as Meatless Mondays or Veganuary, corporate outreach, and further development of various flesh "alternatives" (all indications of how activists gave up on humans' care for animals), it doesn't really change humans as they are too egoistic and self-centered, even for the most anthropocentric and self-involved arguments. Even when the animal rights movement reaches [the lowest point](#) it is not enough.

Not only that a vegan world is not possible, even if it was, as unimaginably wonderful as it would be, it is far from a sufferingless world.

Vegan diet is not cruelty free, and it is not because of a specific way a specific product is being produced. It is all the ways that all of the products are produced which is harmful. The list of harms in the plant based diet is endless. Harming is inevitable. For a more complete picture please read [Vegan Suffering](#).

An even bigger blind spot is all the [suffering that occurs in what most humans call "nature"](#), and surprisingly for most activists it represents perfection, an ideal we should aspire to, or something spiritual that we should worship, something that ought to be preserved and never criticized.

But the truth is that nature is where trillions of sentient beings suffer from hunger, thirst, diseases, parasites, injuries, extreme weathers, rape, infanticide, violent dominance fights, the constant fear of being attacked, actually being attacked, and only rarely from caducity.

Every single second somewhere in the world, defenseless and frightened babies are left alone because their mother has to leave them alone searching for food, a turtle is burned alive as she can't out run the flames of a fire, a bird's feet are frozen to a branch since he couldn't find shelter from the harsh weather, a baboon

monkey is in ongoing stress as a higher ranking female takes food out of her mouth and eats it herself, a nestling is thrown off the nest by the other siblings so they can get more food, a coyote is experiencing severe hunger as the rabbit he chased managed to escape instead of being torn apart, a female dolphin is being raped after she couldn't outswim a male or even a few of them who gang rape her, a badger drags his rotten legs with infectious wounds resulting from constant fights, a zebra is dehydrated but can't approach the ponds as the lionesses might be on the prowl, a lizard is being slowly devoured by a fungus that spread through the organs, a weak robin chick starves to death because his parents don't feed him, as it makes more sense energetically to invest in his stronger siblings.

We mustn't accept suffering just because it happens in what we call nature, and to nonhuman animals by other nonhuman animals. For the sufferers, the suffering is bad when it is considered natural just as much as when it is considered artificial. Our moral obligation to prevent suffering is driven from the fact that suffering is intrinsically bad for those who experience it.

Activists should be [obligated to preventing suffering no matter to whom, by whom and where it happens](#).

When watching suffering of wild animals on the screen, most humans and certainly every animal activist, are dramatically emotionally moved by these horrific scenes. Some rationalize their way out of it by calling it natural and others by claiming it is inevitable, failing to infer the moral conclusion out of the situation - when something that horrible is such a natural and inevitable part of life, life is horrible. Activists mustn't rationalize their ways out of horrible situations but act to change them.

Please take the time and read our article about suffering in nature called [Non-Anthropogenic Suffering](#). Even and especially if you disagree with this argument.

If you would act to change the world the maximum you can theoretically achieve is some more vegans in this world. But if you act to destroy it the maximum you can achieve is a sufferingless world. Isn't that goal worth devoting your lives for? Can you think of anything better to do with the one life that you have than trying to do everything you can so that if you succeed no one will ever suffer again?

We are not delusional activists. We are well aware of how little the chances to stop all the suffering are. However morally that's what we aspire for and what we think every activist should aspire for. As long as there is a theoretical chance to stop all the suffering we mustn't compromise. We must search for ways to do it as hard and complicated as it is, and as long as it takes. Especially since the conventional movement's chances are not even theoretically optional.

The more activists join this ambitious effort, the greater the chances of the suffering to end.

18. I Agree With The Ethical Imperative To Stop This World, But I Think It Is Way Too Complicated

Out of all the questions in this FAQ and all the 'arguments' we've heard along the years, the only one we find really challenging is this one. The rest are mainly excuses for activists to keep doing what they are already used to. To those who internalized the moral imperative of stopping this world but are genuinely deterred by the extreme complexity of the mission, we wish to say that we totally understand why you find it hard to start.

As complicated, difficult and extremely imperceptible as it may be, you must constantly remind yourself that there is nothing more important than thoroughly examining the possibility of stopping the suffering for good. It is definitely worth the time it would take to at least make a more educated decision regarding the only option that truly faces global suffering, instead of hastily dismiss the option as way too complicated.

Obviously we are aware of the fact that it is extremely complicated, however nobody knows that it is way too complicated. None of you does and therefore you are morally obligated to try and figure that out. The difference between way too complicated and extremely complicated is exactly why we created this movement. This is the gap between [merely wishing for the world to be destroyed](#), as many activists do (stating it's the best thing that can ever happen!), and acting to make it so.

It is important to approach the suffering abolition project while taking a break from your regular activism. That is despite that from our personal experience in many cases activism is exactly what brings activists to consider the annihilation option. Profound despair of the chances to ever change society, made many think that it is pointless to try and change humanity, and that the only way to change things for the better is to get rid of it.

We wish it wouldn't be despair, hate or revenge that would inspire activists to look for ways to stop the suffering, but the vision of a suffering-less world. But in any case while you are examining the possibility of that, it is recommended not to do it while continuing with your conventional activism, as it is easy to be sucked back into your routine especially if the other mission is as demanding as this one.

The start would be very hard. It is very frustrating to learn about the outcome of [past pandemics](#), historical climatic events and the record of [asteroid and comets hits](#), but remember, none of the past events was engineered intentionally. The outcome of a well- designed plan could be entirely different.

Claiming humanity can overcome any threat is too Hollywoodian and very little reality based. If you read our short review of humanity's reaction to past pandemics and even the reaction to the AIDS outbreak (which obviously is not relevant in our case but we can learn a lot about humanity from it) you'll realize that humans tend to look out for themselves first and sometimes only (a recent case for that matter is [humanity's response to climate change](#), those in power don't really care that other fellow humans are hurt and die because of the life style they lead and are perfectly willing to keep their luxurious life style on their expense).

However if you do think that humans can overcome a threat like a pandemic than it means causing a global pandemic is not enough on its own, and what is required is a combined effort made of several different routes.

Maybe what is needed is an army of activists spreading one [pathogen](#) while others are spreading a different one (for the case of a natural immunity of some humans for example), both followed by a simulations attack on the world's institutions who are most likely to confront the pandemics (WHO, CDC and etc.). And all that can mostly be a cover up or a starting point creating the opportune moment for the efforts to make the entire planet gradually uninhabitable by releasing the [Methane Hydrate](#) trapped in it, or darkening the earth's surface to decrease the [Albedo Effect](#) or whatever combined global project you can think of. These are just examples, the point is that if it was a disbelief in the chances of one of the suggested routes, then there is a need to think of a combination of them, not to give up the only option to stop the suffering.

We know this scenario sounds absolutely far-fetched but consider that several decades ago it would have sounded absolutely ridiculous. With the rate of advance of technologies and possibilities, in a few decades from now it would seem less and less fanciful than it may seem to you now. And more importantly, it would forever remain far-fetched if all the activists keep focusing on the few more humans they can convert to veganism, instead of focusing on a realistic operating plan to end global suffering.

In a self-defeating cycle, the more activists excusing themselves from trying because the idea is unrealistic, the more unrealistic the idea seems to activists who continue to excuse themselves from trying because the idea is unrealistic.

Our goal is that the annihilation option becomes an acknowledged activism option. Our hope is that it would become activists' first option. In fact it must. Stopping all the suffering is what should be our goal and thinking how we can do that is where we must start, not from advocacy which is an extreme compromise on the animals' expense. You start from the best option and only after it turns out to be irrelevant should you turn to such an extreme compromise as a world with as many vegans as possible. And even a totally vegan world (which is totally unrealistic) is a horrible world as we explain in the article [Vegan Suffering](#) and in the article [occupied territory](#).

Examining all the options and more importantly all the suffering sources in the world and how to confront

them, necessarily leads to the conclusion that this world must be destroyed. Only after all the possible ways to achieve this goal were investigated and failed, you can argue that the solution we suggest is impractical. We doubt that any of the activists who argue that the annihilation idea is impractical claim so after seriously examining the option. As long as we don't know that the only solution to the world suffering is impossible, we all must try.

The vision, that groups of activists with a diverse set of implementations may someday work, is not more imaginary than that the whole world would someday [decides to go vegan](#), that veganism would someday become truly [cruelty free](#) and that someday all the animals would decide that since they can't survive without [hurting other animals](#) they would stop breeding.

While the first is theoretically possible, but practically extremely unlikely, the other two are not even theoretically possible.

The goal of our movement is to convince activists to waive the chance to stop some of the suffering that few of the humans they encounter during their lifetime are causing, and focus on stopping all the suffering that will ever be caused.

We know that most activists won't join the suffering abolition project. Let them focus on making veganism more accessible to a few more humans and let yourself focus on making suffering a history.

Nothing can be compared with even the tiniest option of stopping all the suffering.

Don't focus on the small chances of such a plan to succeed, but on the chances that it can, but won't, because no one tried it.

The only thing worse than talented and dedicated activists devoting their lives to stopping all the suffering project that had failed, is activists missing the option to stop all the suffering because they thought it would fail.

19. What Can I Do?

In order to reach significant breakthroughs we shouldn't think of what has been done so far, or what we think is possible, we must constantly think how to change reality into what we believe it should be.

In our site and [blog](#) we have broadly discussed the irrelevancy of the animal liberation movement in terms of achieving its own formal goals, not to mention the goal that every activist should aspire to, which is obviously a suffering-less world. Please read our [Manifesto](#) for further elaboration.

However, the conventional animal liberation movement formed highly dedicated, motivated and experienced activists who are now able to subdue their fixated notions about the [effectiveness of social movements](#), about [veganism as a moral solution](#) and the concept of [nonviolent approach](#), and join the effort to stop all the suffering in the world.

The process is likely to be a long and a difficult one, we are aware of that. But we find the level of effort and the time it may take irrelevant. Only one fact is relevant – the only way to stop the suffering is annihilation.

You might refer to this idea (which you most probably didn't hear of for the first time from the E.A.S movement) as a fantasy or as a too complicated project, but you can't tell or even make any rough estimation since you haven't started conducting any research yet. Please read our FAQ [I agree with the ethical imperative to stop this world, but I think it is way too complicated](#).

For now, two things are certain - the first is that no one knows what is the feasibility of the mission before conducting research, and the second is a simple statistic fact - the more of us trying, the greater the chances of success. On the other hand, as long as nobody tries, it would never happen and the suffering will continue.

Clearly we knew from day one that the mission is extremely complicated. That is why, instead of starting by launching our own research, we formed the End All Suffering movement with the explicit goal of encouraging other activists to form research teams.

We are promoting an ambitious idea but we are not pretentious people, so our first decision as a group was to create more of us. It can be a good idea for some of you too. Spread the word. Talk to the right people. You know who they are.

And if you don't personally know any potential supporters (or ones that you can trust), you can create your own website, social media page or a blog, supporting and advocating the idea.

Think of other creative ways to multiply the number of people who will devote their lives to ending the suffering.

Remember to act cautiously. Talk about it only with people you trust. Use secure communication like PGP, Proxy, Cybercafés and etc and prefer personal meetings over emails, chats, and of course cell phones.

Imagine that in a matter of only a few years 5% of the most committed activists of the animal liberation movement, which up until now have dedicated themselves to organize demonstrations and conventional campaigns, are taking their devotion, talent and motivation and focus only on finding a way to stop the suffering. Dozens of cells, individuals and groups, spread worldwide, distributing the annihilation idea, forming varied research teams, each with its own unique perspectives and resources, finding ways of sharing knowledge and experience with one another (cautiously) - all exploring leads and routes for the sake of stopping all the suffering.

As part of an act to expand the E.A.S movement, you can devote your entire activity concentrating completely on the conventional animal liberation movement, challenging its views, means and vision. Influencing the conceptions within the movement would be setting the foundations necessary for E.A.S cells to rise. Make sure more and more activists are in the radical mindset that will not compromise on any oppression system, and committedly act against it by delivering the messages of a world which is truly cruelty free, or heading to research themselves. The more the idea circulates among more and more activists - the more it becomes a legitimate option and the number of activists considering it will multiply.

Those of you who won't choose to focus on movement establishment, should start conducting research, investigate and learn more about the potential possibilities. We believe (and hope) you know more activists that care enough and who are obligated enough to the mission. Associate with them and start a research cell.

To our knowledge a few groups have already started in different places in the world. Openly presenting detailed practical data is of course out of the question, however some information (naturally more of a background info) can be discussed more freely. It's up to every cell's judgment at each stage of course, but we urge you to use communication as carefully as possible.

If we exchange information, the chances would significantly rise. Through meetings, discussions and global brainstorming, ideas will come and ways will be found.

By 'only' ruling out false methods for other groups, we can significantly promote the End All Suffering idea. One cell's failure would fertile the ground from which other cells draw their ideas.

Ideas worth further research can come up even from rather basic sources. As you know entire courses and textbooks are available online nowadays, and even going through varied scientific websites, books and journals can be a good start. The list of useful sources is practically endless. We would like you to share any material you believe may hold important information. Please do so by using private messages in our forum or by mail (using PGP) and we'll upload it to the website.

Here are some leads that seem to hold potential. These 6 are mere examples and we're detailing them here not so you fix your mind on them, but to trigger your creativity so you can get started.

- [Pathogens and biotechnology](#)
- [Pandemics and the way you should examine them](#)
- [Carbon sinks](#)

- [Albedo](#)
- [Methane hydrates](#)
- [Volcanic global affects](#)

Before you begin, almost needless to say - drop every other type of activism.

Think about all the time you have wasted on the efforts to convince such a small number of people. Can you really hand out another leaflet knowing that at the same time you could start forming a cell aimed at no less than a global solution?

We realize this is a 180 degrees turn, from promoting veganism and animal rights on a small scale while daydreaming of an event that would wipe out humanity, to taking steps to make it a reality. We know that time is needed to internalize this radical shift. We have been there. We realize it may also be hard to feel part of a movement while all of its members are anonymous, working in underground cells. Keep in mind that at dozens of other locations there are people as committed as you are, feeling more or less the same, taking their first step in making suffering history, turning their theoretical wishes into a practical agenda.

Please don't automatically dismiss the idea as an unrealistic fantasy and get back to your cozy familiar position in your organization. Even if you have doubts whether it's possible - at least try. At least take the time and effort of researching. At least speak with relevant people, to you it may sound totally hopeless but to another person, with different background and knowledge it may appear as entirely feasible and will be the push they have been waiting for all their activist lives.

If you agree this horrible world must be stopped, if you wish for suffering to cease, then you must try. Initial thoughts about the likelihood of success are irrelevant because you don't know what the chances are and because as extensively explained all along the website, [conventional activism can't stop the suffering](#).

If you would act to change the world the maximum you can theoretically achieve is some more vegans in this world. But if you act to destroy it the maximum you can achieve is a sufferingless world. Isn't that goal worth devoting your life for? Can you think of anything better to do with the one life that you have than trying to do everything you can so that if you succeed no one will ever suffer again?

The image of a world with no battery cages, no slaughterhouses, restraining devices or genetic manipulations is the strongest motivation of all.

The more the E.A.S message is passed, the greater are the chances of success. The more research cells formed worldwide the better the chances are of bringing the day that no one suffers.

Our power lies in our devotion, commitment, diversity and number. Each single cell may stand a small chance of success, but this is not the case of dozens of cells with hundreds of different varied points of view, approaches, ideas, abilities, resources and methods. The cell with the right means and the right resources and resourcefulness is bound to come along. All it takes is for one group to succeed, and the suffering will be stopped forever.