

Humane & Free Range

- Deceiving the public for profit?

Labels of free range/humane are common - they are used to reassure the public that although animals were used in the production of a product, these animals lived good, natural lives, or were slaughtered painlessly and naturally. In essence they are there to provide us with the reassurance that no unnecessary suffering took place.

These labels are deceptive.



Battery

Free Range

While the likes of free range production provide human satisfaction in allowing consumers to buy the animal products 'guilt free', it does little if anything for the animals involved.

As illustrated in the example pictures, free range is marketed as more acceptable as it takes away the cages and cold metal environment. However the chickens still suffer all the same major harms, they are simply kept within one big cage (or shed), or allowed a few inches more space.

It 'looks nicer' at a quick glance, as it looks less like a prison, but free range is just as much of a harm to animals involved. Similar situations exist with cows, pigs, fish, and a variety of others, as 'humane' or 'free range' standards are not there to help animals, they are there to reassure the consumer that the animals are being treated 'well'.

Furthermore, 'Free Range' and 'Humane' standards are solving a problem that doesn't exist. They pretend that the problem with our use of animals is that it isn't nice enough, and so try to make it better. Regardless of the intentions of the groups and companies that partake in this, they completely miss the point.

If unnecessary suffering is wrong, than all of our exploitation of animals is wrong, not just the extreme cases. There is no relevantt moral difference between a hen kept in a cage, or a slightly more spacious shed, or a cow who is allowed to see grass three times a week - they are all exploited throughout their lives, and restricted from the most basic instinctive behaviours before facing a horrendous end on the slaughterhouse floor.

The problem is not that we aren't doing these things in a nice enough way, it is that we are doing these things at all when we don't need to. So increasing welfare standards fights an imaginary problem, and as shown in the first point, it does so with little or no benefit to the animals involved.

Doing what's right and improving things for animals in farms, labs and in the variety of other situations in which they are exploited for human preference is simple.

Veganism, the exclusion of all animal products from diet and lifestyle, recognises these animal products are entirely unnecessary in our lifestyles – and so recognises our use of animals in these horrific ways is also unnecessary. We don't need to buy 'free range' or 'organic', as we don't need to eat or use animal products.

What's more important - your developed yet changeable, taste for animal products, or doing what's right by other sentient individuals? That's up to you to decide, there is no 'half way' compromise from where the animals are standing.

For more information on Veganism, please visit:
veganuk.net vegansociety.com