
Subject: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [pawky](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 17:46:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How arrogant can these animal rights nuts get?

<http://www.cnn.com/2009/US/01/10/maine.lobster.liberated/index.html>

http://blog.peta.org/archives/2009/01/victory_140-yea.php

So there was this big lobster that's supposed to be 140 years old...then they requested the restaurant owner to release it into the ocean.

Eventually, the restaurant complied cos "it felt like the right thing to do"!

Here's a PETA quote:

Quote:Lobsters don't deserve to be pulled from their ocean home and kept in tiny tanks in their own waste and then boiled alive.

How stupid...why not just release every lobster into the ocean then? Why not WE ALL BECOME vegetarians so these nuts get off everyone's back...

If I were that restaurant owner, that lobster would have been my dinner many nights ago...

100 bucks says that lobster has died by now.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 18:01:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They are stupid. All they are accomplishing is screwing up the food chain. I don't think they realize that we are animals too and are at the top of that food chain..

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [futura83](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 18:14:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PETA is a PITA.

Nuff said.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 19:05:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Penn and Teller did a 'Bullshit' episode on PETA that shines some light on the organization. If you have a half hour to kill, it's fun watchin'.

<http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=DsHUBEfBNMo>

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [u6795](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 20:05:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For once I agree with TANKY completely.

PETA is fucking stupid.

Edit @ Nikki: Oh god, first minute of that video and I'm already laughing.

HIS NAME'S DAVE. NOTHING FUNNY ABOUT THAT.

Edit again: That was awesome.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 20:42:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hear about their sea kitten campaign?

http://www.peta.org/sea_kittens/about.asp People don't seem to like fish. They're slithery and slimy, and they have eyes on either side of their pointy little heads—which is weird, to say the least. Plus, the small ones nibble at your feet when you're swimming, and the big ones—well, the big ones will bite your face off if Jaws is anything to go by.

Of course, if you look at it another way, what all this really means is that fish need to fire their PR guy—stat. Whoever was in charge of creating a positive image for fish needs to go right back to working on the Britney Spears account and leave our scaly little friends alone. You've done enough damage, buddy. We've got it from here. And we're going to start by retiring the old name for good. When your name can also be used as a verb that means driving a hook through your head, it's time for a serious image makeover. And who could possibly want to put a hook through a sea kitten?

Ask the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to stop promoting sea kitten hunting.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 11 Jan 2009 21:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SAVE THE PLECOS

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Wiener](#) on Mon, 12 Jan 2009 09:44:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It seems you totally missed the point in here. Making changes always includes compromises between 2 (mostly extreme) positions. I'm pretty much sure that the "PETA management" is aware of the fact that their actions are mostly over the top.

Do you really believe that anyone would waste a thought on wearing fur coats If PETA just carried signs with "its not good to wear fur" on it?

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 12 Jan 2009 13:14:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ITS TOO BAD THE END DOESNT JUSTIFY THE MEANS.
BOMBING PLACES JUST ISNT RIGHT.
ITS NOT.
K?
K?
K!

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 12 Jan 2009 21:06:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What makes PETA laughable is that it doesn't follow its own "rules." If it did so, I'd be more inclined to take the organization seriously and actually recognize that they have a valid point of view (if somewhat skewed from my perspective). However, they say one thing then do something altogether different. They say they support peaceful change then support groups like ALF. They lobby for bans on furs and then their members show up at rallies wearing leather belts/shoes or some imitation thereof (meanwhile chucking cans of red paint at the dirty meat-eaters). They decry euthanasia as cruel and inhumane then reveal that they've been putting animals down for years because sometimes that's the only way to end their suffering.

That is what makes PETA laughable. Some degree of hypocrisy is a given when dealing with any organization run by human beings, but the level present in PETA shows that they consider themselves above the standards they would hold everyone else to. Extreme action has no

meaning when it is obvious that the people behind it don't have any respect for their own so-called beliefs.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Mon, 12 Jan 2009 21:37:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In addition, PETA's hypocrisy goes right to the top. Mary Beth Sweetland, the vice president of the organization is a diabetic, which means she has to use insulin injections... the pioneering reasearch that gave diabetics a means to live a normal life relied on testing on animals, particularly dogs.

Without animal testing, diabetics like PETA's VP would not enjoy the quality of life they currently have. Painkillers, chemotherapy, cancer research, and multitudes of vaccines needed animal testing in order to come to fruition.

PETA's president said in a speech that "Even if animal research resulted in a cure for AIDS, we would be against it."

Their PR is also beyond taste, by comparing the state of animals today as a 'holocaust' , and even used the disturbing murder on a Greyhound bus in Canada for their own advertising purposes.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 12 Jan 2009 23:42:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tad Focking Nugent.

Good vid.

check this out
http://www.peta.org/sea_kittens/index.asp

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 04:37:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Stefan](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 12:13:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why can't i eat humans when i'm allowed to eat animals?

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 12:21:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because we give ourselves more rights than we do animals?

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Stefan](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 14:03:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Tue, 13 January 2009 06:21Because we give ourselves more rights than we do animals?

I got a gun, i'm hungry and i see a friend of yours (or someone who you really like) walking around, defenceless. I regard myself as higher than him because i got a gun. He's just another animal to me. Can i kill & eat him even though i don't need to?

We might be higher on the food chain, but we don't need to eat animals in order to survive.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 14:35:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uhh, there are VERY few species that resort to cannibalism, and homo sapiens are not one of them.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 14:59:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Stefan wrote on Tue, 13 January 2009 15:03Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Tue, 13 January 2009 06:21Because we give ourselves more rights than we do animals?

I got a gun, i'm hungry and i see a friend of yours (or someone who you really like) walking around, defenceless. I regard myself as higher than him because i got a gun. He's just another animal to me. Can i kill & eat him even though i don't need to?

We might be higher on the food chain, but we don't need to eat animals in order to survive. plants are living beings toom, and you will have to eat something, so whats your point?

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 16:10:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Folks who go pure vegetarian often have difficulty with nutrition and have to take dietary supplements in order to avoid deficiencies. It is possible to live on a pure vegetarian diet without those supplements, but you've got to combine all of the right plants to do it as you need several different proteins and vitamins which can't be found all in the same place. If the crop of X or Y plant goes south for the year, you're up shit creek without a paddle. For that matter, what do you suggest for people who don't have access to all of the right plants and/or dietary supplements? What would PETA suggest they do, slowly starve to death?

Or you could just eat a nice, juicy steak and supplement it with widely available and incredibly cheap fruits and veggies, and not go through all the trouble of constantly worrying about whether or not you're getting enough of (insert nutrient here).

If it is acceptable for a wolf to kill and eat its food, then it is acceptable for a human to do the same. We don't have to be cruel about it, not when we have the resources we have at our disposal, but we also don't have to stop living at the expense of other life because there is nothing inherently wrong with it. We are not violating some higher law by eating meat. We are not angering some elder god by eating meat. We are simply doing what our bodies are designed to do: consume and process nutrients from a wide variety of sources, including plant and animal life. Hence the term "omnivore."

The only reason people get up in arms about animals is because they have features we can identify with- eyes, ears, mouth, etc.- folks tend to forget that everything else we eat is or was also alive. The voice of opposition loses much of its volume as that which is eaten becomes less and less human; have you ever wondered if PETA would so violently oppose the killing and eating of, say, live grubs? We do that in some places, you know. Then again, those animals aren't cute and cuddly.

On the other side of the coin, I really don't feel much sympathy for people who get themselves eaten by animals, either. Hell, when I see animal attacks on those "wildest video" shows, I'm usually rooting for the critter. Just because we're at the top of the food chain doesn't mean our position will always be secure there. Food for thought.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA

Posted by [futura83](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 16:21:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Stefan wrote on Tue, 13 January 2009 14:03
Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Tue, 13 January 2009 06:21
Because we give ourselves more rights than we do animals?

I got a gun, i'm hungry and i see a friend of yours (or someone who you really like) walking around, defenceless. I regard myself as higher than him because i got a gun. He's just another animal to me. Can i kill & eat him even though i don't need to?

We might be higher on the food chain, but we don't need to eat animals in order to survive. I regard the person you see as more intelligent than you and therefore higher than you...

But, think of it what you will, right and wrong is a human invention, it's all about survival of the fittest, and humans are so much better than other animals at survival.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [bisen11](#) on Tue, 13 Jan 2009 17:57:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

TANKY wrote on Sun, 11 January 2009 12:46
Here's a PETA quote:

Quote:Lobsters don't deserve to be pulled from their ocean home and kept in tiny tanks in their own waste and then boiled alive.

How stupid...why not just release every lobster into the ocean then? Why not WE ALL BECOME vegetarians so these nuts get off everyone's back...

If I were that restaurant owner, that lobster would have been my dinner many nights ago...

100 bucks says that lobster has died by now.
If we give in to PETA then PETV (V for vegetables) will be soon to follow.

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Thu, 15 Jan 2009 19:07:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nobody cares about PETA. They have a complete disregard for human life, and their increasingly offensive and wacky PR stunts just continue to prove what everyone already knows. PETA is fucking insane!

Subject: Re: Arrogant PETA
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sat, 17 Jan 2009 08:32:31 GMT

tanky wrote on Sun, 11 January 2009 10:46 How arrogant can these animal rights nuts get?

<http://www.cnn.com/2009/US/01/10/maine.lobster.liberated/index.html>

http://blog.peta.org/archives/2009/01/victory_140-yea.php

So there was this big lobster that's supposed to be 140 years old...then they requested the restaurant owner to release it into the ocean.

Eventually, the restaurant complied cos "it felt like the right thing to do"!

Here's a PETA quote:

Quote:Lobsters don't deserve to be pulled from their ocean home and kept in tiny tanks in their own waste and then boiled alive.

How stupid...why not just release every lobster into the ocean then? Why not WE ALL BECOME vegetarians so these nuts get off everyone's back...

If I were that restaurant owner, that lobster would have been my dinner many nights ago...

100 bucks says that lobster has died by now.

Ah let stupid PETA waist their time with their dumb 140 year old lobster, the younger ones will probably taste better anyways.
