

Wyatt Blackstone  
Project 3 Lobster Pot  
Jesse Miller  
April 3<sup>th</sup> 2019

What qualifies us to make the decisions whether it is just or not to kill an animal for food, or even put them through scientific experiments to advance human knowledge? Our perception of events and morals lead us to decide whether our actions are right or wrong, but everyone is influenced by different events in their life and no one's morals are all the same. These theological topics are discussed in Hal Herzog's article, "Animals Like Us" where he discusses several stories of people's experiences with animals that ultimately left them pondering why we treat our animal counterparts. In one of these stories it discusses one of Herzog's graduate school friends, Ron Neibor. Ron was studying how the brain reorganizes itself after injury. This required Ron to surgically destroy specific parts in the cat's brains, let the cats heal, then go through a fairly gruesome process of decapitation and chipping away the skull to examine the brains. Throughout the experiment Ron had no issues until the end when he was required to kill the cats in order to examine the brains. At this point Ron had become very attached to the cats, coming in often to play with the kittens, and had several personality changes after having to kill all the cats. He displayed several signs of "moral injury" such as changes in personality, outgoingness, and even sleeping and eating habits. As stated by Herzog, "It took Ron several weeks to perfuse", kill, "all the cats. His personality changed. A naturally cheerful and warmhearted person, he became tense, withdrawn, shaky." This shows how badly this experience affected Ron. Other people had the morals to allow them to say and think that it was ok to kill several cats in order to advance the knowledge of brain injury for the human race, however, Ron could not think this way. Because of this several health consequences manifested as a result. Not everyone has the same moral standards or has the ability to break down their morals for the "greater good", whatever that may be.

Our morals are not the only thing to consider when we talk about killing and using animals, and other living organisms, for food and experiments. When must also ask what gives us the innate right to play God and determine what deserves to die and for what reasons? Just because we have the power to kill the cow for our dinner doesn't necessarily mean we should. In a more exaggerated and drastic example of this is the nation's governments and their nuclear warfare capabilities. Just because we can end millions of lives doesn't mean we should, even over oil or political disputes. However, this still happens in the context of war. We still send in thousands of troops to invade other countries, or in modern-day warfare send them in to keep the peace or help overthrow governments that we see as bad. What makes them bad and us good? These questions are not a matter of right and wrong, fact and fiction, good or evil (in most cases of course). It is all determined by our perception of our world based on our past experience and how we biologically interpret the stimulus we receive. Every bad guy is the good guy in his own perspective, we only have our social norms, religion, and cultural practices that guide us to what is right or wrong.