“Your Comments About Eating Animals Are Unintelligent and Illogical”

I read your response to the question “Why Did God Allow Animals to be Eaten and Sacrificed?” and found it to be one of the most unintelligent arguments on any subject that I have ever read. Your “logic” draws conclusions in very convoluted ways. Recognizing an animal’s right to life does not drag man down to the level of a beast. If ALL life is valued then human life is valued more. There would be no “‘open season’ on man to cure overpopulation problems…” as you suggest. There is no ultimate NEED for humans to get their diet from animals. Even Daniel recognized that he could be as healthy as [email ends here]

Thanks for writing. Jimmy isn’t able to respond to your email, so I’ll take a shot at it.

I’m really surprised you found this “the most unintelligent arguments on any subject [you] have ever read.” You should read some of the letters we get!

Upon what do you base an animal’s right to life? The answer to that will depend in a significant way upon your worldview. We are Christians, so our authority is the Bible where we learn about the places of humankind and other living beings in God’s order.

Because we’re to be good stewards of God’s creation, we are not to destroy life willy nilly. As Jimmy wrote in his article, there is a hierarchy. I think you’d probably agree that we needn’t shed tears over pulling up plants when they

are being a problem. Killing animals should be for good reasons, not just for killing's sake. You said we don't need to eat animals. Maybe not, but I don't see why we need to eat animals in order to do so. If God gave us that freedom, we can engage in it (Gen. 9:1-3).

Jimmy's concern about man being pulled down has historical precedent. The loss of a belief in the sacredness of human life has given us abortion and euthanasia. Can you imagine a hundred years ago having to pass a law to prevent doctors from sticking sharp objects into the skulls of partially-delivered babies to suck their brains out and kill them? That would have been unthinkable. But people think they should be able to do that. What does that say about the value of human life? And if Darwinism is correct, then there is no qualitative difference between humans and animals, just a difference of degree.

Yes, Daniel and his friends did well on a vegetarian diet. But there's no hint in the text that he did that because he thought it wrong to eat meat. The Babylonians' meat could very well have been obtained as a part of idol worship.

The bottom line is that we have been given permission to eat any living (non-human) thing. Animals don't have the same "rights" we have. To make a case that animals shouldn't be used for food because they have a right not to, requires a reason for such a right. On what do you base such a right?

Rick Wade

© 2008 Probe Ministries

“Vegetarianism is a More Biblical Diet!”

I, as a vegetarian and a Christian, thought it important to point out that being a vegetarian is the more “natural” form of diet considering the Garden of Eden. In Genesis 1:29 we see that God gives the the fruits and seeds, vegetables etc…”as meat,” causing one to consider then obviously He (God) made a distinction between the meat of animals and the meat for humans to eat. I personally try to eat as close to Gen 1:29 as possible….this is not saying that meat is wrong—Jesus ate meat—yet Hinduism is simply ripping off God’s original plan and adding a twist of spirituality to what God intended to be natural and common sense. I am also not making a blanket statement that meat is unclean…not calling unclean what was made (or possibly created to be?) clean…considering the mass production of cattle in the U.S. and horrible sanitation we have adopted as common practice in the meat industry largely as a whole…we owe it to ourselves to consider these points that:

1. **God created man for a plant based diet**
2. **That changed when sin entered the picture**
3. **We are God’s temple, BODY, soul and spirit**
4. **Animals being killed and eaten was symbolic also of Jesus’ sacrifice and our remembrance of Him in communion (a bit of foreshadowing). Also possibly why when meat consumption is documented it is only in special occasions—e.g.: symbolic feasts, sacrifice of the priests, celebrations of significance—but not frivolously. One would soon run out of cattle if you were eating them all the time. You wouldn’t sin too much either if you had to sacrifice cattle all the time.**
5. **We are never commanded to eat meat.**
6. **The meat back then and the meat now are almost two**

> **completely different things (as far as healthy content and environment are concerned.**

Anyhow, I thank you for you time and on a final note…nothing in this world is the Devil's original idea…it is simply a twist of God's original idea…this goes for religions as well as health practices. The religions of the world have truth to them but those truths belong to Christianity and have been twisted and blown way out of proportion. May God bless you richly. Grace and Peace.

I agree with much of what you wrote but I would not go so far as to say that vegetarianism is more natural from a Biblical perspective. Clearly that was God's initial intent, but the Fall changed many things as you indicated. Sin was not natural to our being before the Fall but is quite natural after. So it is quite possible that most of our bodies are going to struggle on a purely vegetarian diet as a result of changes wrought by the Fall. In fact, the care and knowledge needed to follow a strictly vegetarian diet and remain healthy, may indicate that in our fallen state, a diet that includes meat may be more natural. Just a thought.

Also we are clearly told that we can eat meat in Genesis 9:3, "Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you, as I gave the green plant." It is the same language and tense as in Genesis 1:29. Neither statement is strictly a command but God's intent is made quite clear.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Help Me Understand Eating Clean and Unclean Meats”

I am a freshman college student. A New Testament class professor said that Paul, James and Peter disagreed with the eating of clean and unclean meats. Now I know of the vision with Peter, which he says some scholars say is only for the fact that they should preach to Gentiles as well as Greeks. Now, is there anywhere else that says they may have not been disagreeing or that one case won out over the other or if one had more information from God? Should we be wary of this subject as Christians? Because that would mean we were eating “wrong” all this time (for those of us who do eat pork and other things like that). Does this have any relevance to our spirituality as Christians? Am I just thinking too hard?

Thanks for writing. The dietary laws set forth in passages such as Leviticus 11:1-47 and Deuteronomy 14:1-21 were temporary laws given by God only to Israel. These laws are not applicable to Christians today under the terms of the New Covenant. This is not only made clear in Peter’s vision, recorded in Acts 10:9-16, but it is stated explicitly by Christ Himself in Mark 7:14-23. Notice in particular what Jesus says in vv. 18-19. In part, this text reads, “Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him; because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?” Then notice the parenthetical statement which concludes this verse: “Thus He declared all foods clean.” In other words, the dietary restrictions given by God to Israel have been nullified. Christians today are not bound by such laws. Today, the Old Covenant under which Israel operated is obsolete (Hebrews 8:13).

Hope this helps!

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn
Probe Ministries