

Animals and the NAP

The Facebook page “V is for Voluntary” asked the question, “Do you extend the NAP to animals? Why or why not?” And I responded,

Personally, in a way, yes. I don't think we should go around half-killing animals and then letting them suffer toward either health or death. If there's a more humane way to kill your food, you should use that way as a matter of personal choice. I'm certainly not saying that animals have rights; consider it an appeal to personal integrity.

And Zachary Silva responded,

I think a pretty good standard for animals would be a MAP (minimal aggression principle), if it's living, treat it well, if you're going to eat it, kill it humanely.

I like that, the Minimal-Aggression Principle. And why not? Why should you not adhere to the MAP? Unless you're a really deranged person, why not treat animals as humanely as possible? Can't really think of a good reason myself. And as I asked in “Voluntaryism Transcends Anarchism,”

For anyone concerned about improving themselves, becoming a better person, a better friend, a better neighbor, how will using force [or in this case, abusing animals], even when justified, affect my own spiritual development?

What would treating animals inhumanely do to me? Transform me into? Interesting questions.

Skyler.