
Subject: Re: Quite possibly the best political cartoon ever.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 14 Jun 2005 07:43:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Mon, 13 June 2005 17:25 SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 13 June 2005 16:52 warranto wrote on Mon, 13 June 2005 16:18 Missed the point. The comic is dependant on what is defined by "life". If something is still undeveloped as is the egg in the comic, and is not deemed to be human/animal/living/whatever, then it should be fine to eat the egg. If it is not, because the animal will eventually develop into the animal (as the character suggests), then the same wrong can be placed with human embryos as well.

Well, that's what the comic is trying to say, but not what the real issue is. Environmentalists who protect species aren't interested in the moral issues of eating a developing embryo. It's about letting eggs develop to replenish the species. Which is not the issue of abortionists.

Additionally, ACK, how do you know tree hugger pinko commies don't support pro-Life positions? Maybe they're a sect of liberalism that does endorse anti-abortion. Because such a thing does exist. Maybe you're generalizing a bit too much. Because you are.

This has nothing to do with environmentalists. It brings up the idea about "when life begins". Those eggs have the potential to become life (in this case, replenishing a near-extinct species), so the same could be said about any embryos, human or animal, endangered or not.

When I said environmentalists, I meant species protecting people. And the cartoon wants to bring up the idea, but, as mrpirate says it, the two are "incongruous". Species aren't under their endangered list because there are more ethical reasons against eating them rather than other animals. It's so the species can be rehabilitated from Republican hunters killing animals to the point of extinction. It's not an issue of when life begins there.
