Vegans are LOSING Their Minds After Watching THIS Jubilee Debate! Transcript

(Transcripts are generated by AI and may contain errors)

Intro to the Jubilee vegan debate

Hi everyone, I'm with Sarah and Shabnam and today we're going to be watching an epic debate on Jubilee, which vegans are losing their minds over. >> think we should reduce the amount of pain that plants are experiencing?

>> Yes, we should. Plants matter. #plantsmatter. You're not addressing my points. You are not addressing my points. You are deflecting because I literally backed you into a corner.

>> You can have sex and it was unethical, non-consensual, but it was great, or you can have the consensual sex and it's not quite as good. Which one do you pick?

Probably a cheeseburger. Okay, it's pretty explosive. You've probably seen Jubilee before and this episode of Jubilee doesn't disappoint. >> Is eating meat unethical, or has the conversation around veganism and ethical dieting become too [music] rigid and moralized? And from Jubilee Media, this is Surrounded, where one brave soul faces a room full of disagree-ers.

Today, we're [music] diving headfirst into veganism, factory farming, and what it means to eat ethically. [music] I'm here in the center with our featured guest, Dr. Jack Symes. Welcome to the show. Hey, thanks for having me. Are you ready to debate the circle? Sure am. I'm looking forward to hearing what reasons they've brought for their unethical lifestyles. Are you all ready to bring your best arguments?

All right, let's get into it. First up, let's see what Matthew Nagra has to say. They claim everyone should aim to be vegan. You happy with it? No, and here's why. So, I am a third-year med student and I will actually come out and say that the vegan diet tends to be healthier, absolutely. Right. I don't think there's much dispute over that. You can look at the evidence. It is It is healthier.

Health, supplements, and protein arguments

However, the biggest thing with the vegan diet from a physician perspective you have to think about is, and it's been mentioned a couple times, is the micronutrient deficiencies that you can have.

>> B12. B12 is one of them. First off, kudos to him for at least acknowledging that vegans tend to have better health outcomes than meat-eaters, but I do take issue with framing micronutrient deficiencies as an issue with a vegan diet specifically. All dietary patterns have some gaps. Those gaps just change.

For example, vegans may need to ensure they're getting enough of certain nutrients like vitamin B12, but then meat-eaters need to focus more on getting enough of things like magnesium and folate. And this can be taken care of by making sure you're including certain food groups or supplements depending on the nutrient. Why would you take the supplement?

>> Why would I take supplements when I could just have lean meats like chicken and fish and turkey and things that There's a study by Junie Wang in 2019 where she found the fortified and the supplements were more easily absorbed by the body cuz they're already taken away from the fibers.

>> [music] >> So, that's why you take >> So, I actually disagree with that because so for instance, omega-3s, fish have omega-3s. This was very odd. Dr. Jack Symes cited this study in which consuming cereal fortified with vitamin B12, which is similar to taking a supplement, resulted in higher B12 levels in the body compared to consuming meat with the same amount of B12. And that's without the cardiovascular risks of regularly consuming meat. And the reason likely is that the vitamin B12 in a fortified food or supplement isn't bound to protein like it is in meat. So, its absorption doesn't rely as much on the health of the gut to be able to break the B12 apart from the protein. And after that, presumably without ever having actually read the study, the med student just disagreed because fish

have omega-3s. I'm really not sure what the relevance of that is to whether or not nutrients from supplements are absorbed as well or better than nutrients from foods. Nevertheless, to indulge his concerns over vegans not getting the long-chain omega-3s, EPA and DHA from fish, the importance of which is debated, I'll mention that algae-based supplements exist. They contain the same omega-3s and have been shown to be similarly bioavailable to fish oil.

Second, let's go to Cheap Lazy Vegan who also is very opinionated about this debate and some of the things Dr. Jack Symes had to put up with. This is so dumb. Do they have the right to exist? Well, because here's the deal. If you're saying that we should not harvest them, then those animals are never going to exist. So, I guarantee if they had consciousness and you put them down and you said, "Here are the scenarios. You can either exist and you can have one bad day and you can serve a purpose and you can have a beautiful life. You can make a positive contribution to the environment." So, essentially, he is defending the right for animals to be bred into existence simply to be killed for our consumption. And what kills me, no pun intended, is somehow he is twisting this to try to make it seem as though this is a benevolent practice. Like we are doing you a favor by allowing you to exist so that we could kill you. So that we could use your body.

You know? And do they have a right to exist? What the hell is a right to exist? If you don't exist, you don't exist. How does something that does not exist have a right to exist? What about the right to live once you exist? Okay? What about once a living sentient being exists, they deserve a right to be free and to live their own lives and to not be killed. How about that right? And also if animals have a right to exist, then that right shouldn't be predicated on the fact that you want to eat their body. If they have a right to exist, then we should be bringing them into existence regardless of what we can or cannot do with their bodies. Because they have a right to exist, right? This is what's so fascinating to me. Humans will do the most evil things and turn around and act like they are God's gift on Earth.

Okay. Humans will breed animals into existence, sentient living beings into existence, feed them for a few years, and then slit their throat and act like that they are doing them a favor. Okay, so let's go to Dr. Minel Patel who was also astounded by clip in this GB debate a little bit later on. Well, my experience and the research I've done Yeah. Oh, he's done research. This guy has done research. Uh finally, they've got someone who's done the research. Amazing. Let's hear what he has to say.

>> You need at least some animal product to survive cuz like Oh, no. A lot of the vegan diet is good. A lot of it's good, the fruits and veggies and everything.

But What makes you think that though? What makes me think that vegan meat is good? Because >> No, what makes you think that you need to eat meat to survive and thrive? Because I found out recently, I've been doing a lot more of a health getting better shape, and I found that the more protein I eat from meat, chicken, steak, it gets me more bulk.

Ethics of animal existence and rights

An hour and 24 minutes in, and finally we have someone using the protein [music] argument. I was wondering when we'd hear that. There are plenty of high-protein vegan foods, and you would hope a chef >> [music] >> would know that. Tofu, tempeh, textured vegetable proteins, seitan, soy milk, soy beans, [music] black beans, kidney beans, all the freaking beans, lentils, bean and lentil-based pastas, whole grains like quinoa.

>> [music] >> Not to mention plant-based protein powders. It is easy to get enough protein on a vegan diet. And if your goal is bodybuilding or athletic performance, then you only really need about 1.6 g per kilogram body weight of protein per [music] day.

For a 70-kg person, that's about 112 g, and that is not difficult provided you're eating varied sources throughout the day. When it comes to muscle gains, when protein is matched, there is no difference between vegans and omnivores.

[music] So, stop making excuses, and if you're going to, please leave protein out of it. >> Perfectly said. But what Very impossible to become full vegan. There is nothing There is nothing really in this >> impossible to be What are

you wearing by chance? Are you wearing Doc Martens by chance? Yeah. Aren't those Aren't those vegan? Yeah. Are you sure about that?

>> Yeah, they're made of rubber. And rubber is made of? Rubber's not made of animals. But there's a lot of vegan product There's a lot of animal products in things that you don't >> wearing leather Turn up to one vegan versus 20 meat eaters wearing leather shoes. Maybe. You think You think I'm I mean, a lot of people don't know a lot of stuff's in there. Oh my days, man.

She did Yeah. Yeah, it crossed my mind, too. It crossed my mind, too. Thank you. He crossed his mind, too. I rest my case, and my time is up. Great to meet you. >> Pick up some vegan Doc Martens.

Thank you. So, I would say veganism is not good for the world. And my number one point is burgers. Have you ever had a burger? Yeah, with cheese on it? Yeah.

Have you had a burger and what do you think? Uh I think that people aren't the experts they think about their own mind. Giovanni Savani did a study in 2023 where he looked at 175 people and gave them blind taste tests and informed taste tests. The majority couldn't figure out which one was the beef burger and the plant-based burger and when on the informed taste test, they all preferred the plant-based burger over the beef burger. So, no, I don't buy it.

When we look at what people will do when they're not in this debate setting, it's not clear that they prefer it. Well, I would say that I prefer Yeah, of course you would. like cheeseburgers, like real cheeseburgers and I could tell the difference. I have like really good taste buds.

>> Yeah. So, I really like when it's not like fake cheeseburgers. >> Yeah, go for it. I prefer like they taste like But you understand there's going to be limits to this, right? You like doing lots of things. I assume you like having sex as well, but you certainly you certainly want to I imagine that you want to get it in an ethical way. Yeah, obviously. But I I think I can get I mean, if I just go to like the store and buy a a burger, that's pretty ethical to me. Let me give you this question. You can have sex and it was unethical, non-consensual, but it was great or you can have the consensual sex and it's not quite as good. Which one do you pick? Probably a cheeseburger. I think uh Which one do you pick out of the two of them?

>> Well, you said that >> do you pick out of the two of them? Just pick one. The ethical The ethical >> pick the non-ethical Well, the ethical one, but I would choose a cheeseburger over sex any day. So, the analogy was Okay, and there's another interesting clip from Dr. Mati Nagra. Let's go to that. Recent studies have shown that you you're way less likely to develop heart disease by having the ultra-processed vegan burger over the beef burger. I'm not surprised by this either. The ultra-processed vegan burger is better?

Protein, burgers, and taste tests

The Beyond Meat one is significantly Contrary to popular belief, plant-based meats do appear to provide some health benefits compared to animal-based meats on average. For example, in the SWAP-ME randomized crossover trial, Beyond Meat products resulted in lower LDL cholesterol levels and a little bit of weight loss compared to organic and grass-fed meats without any clear downsides. And these findings are consistent across the literature as I highlighted in my review that was published in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology and which was reinforced by a recent meta-analysis. Now, it may be a stretch to say you're way less likely to develop heart disease since we don't actually have those long-term studies looking at actual heart attack rates, but all else held equal, a lower LDL cholesterol level and a little bit of weight loss would be expected to translate to a lower heart disease risk. Posy, you've been voted out by the majority. Please return to your seat. It's always a pleasure. It calcium is very important for um bone density. Yeah. About 30% um if your vegan diet's exclusively, you are 30% likely to have um a fracture. I couldn't find any studies with the 30% statistic specifically, but what most people cite is the EPIC Oxford study in which vegans had a 43% higher risk of fracture, largely driven by hip fracture. And that translates to about 19 more fractures per thousand people per 10 years. However, I do take issue with using these data to suggest that vegans are inherently at higher risk. For starters, the risk was only statistically significant in postmenopausal women, not men or premenopausal women, as well as in inactive and people with a BMI below

22.5. That last point is important because there were far more vegans below a BMI of 20 than there were meat eaters. And they did not adequately account for differences in BMI among people who would be classified as underweight. In essence, they could very well have been comparing some vegans who were very underweight to meat eaters who barely classified as underweight. And this is critical because fracture risk increases substantially once BMI gets below that level. They also didn't adjust for vitamin D intake or status at all and didn't do adequately so for calcium. with the Adventist Health Study 2, which was published just months later. They too found that the vegan women had a higher risk of hip fracture than the meat-eating women, but once they only included participants who supplemented vitamin D and calcium, that difference in risk was abolished. These studies just highlight the importance of eating enough to maintain a healthy weight and ensuring adequate vitamin D and calcium from supplements or fortified foods. Fortunately, many plant-based milks today are fortified and contain as much or more calcium and vitamin D than their dairy counterpart. Should children be vegan? Yeah. Why? Doesn't that feel like a bit of a risk? I'd I'd say the biggest risks on health outcomes We're talking overall health outcomes. Like child obesity in this country, right? Huge problem. They can have lower BMI if they're vegan. And they can get all the nutrients that they need. Yes, kids can be healthily raised vegan as long as some care is taken to ensure they're getting adequate nutrition, just like any other diet. And like Dr. Jack Norris highlighted, there may be some benefits.

For example, vegan kids tend to have a lower BMI and lower LDL cholesterol levels. And if you're wondering why that even matters at that age, well, cardiovascular disease begins to develop in childhood or even earlier. So yes, attention needs to be paid to certain nutrients like iron and vitamin B12. But let's not write off the potential benefits of feeding kids at the very least a plant-predominant diet. >> two here? These are opposable thumbs. We evolved these in order to hunt better. These two pair of legs, bipedal. We are bipedal to become better hunters. Even communicating with each other, we've evolved to become better hunters. Our entire existence as a as human species has been around eating meats. And for you to just say all of a sudden with to be like, "Oh, you shouldn't do that anymore." is kind of asinine.

Health claims about vegan diets

We evolved these traits like opposable thumbs, bipedalism, and speech for reasons that extend well beyond just hunting. So suggesting that hunting is the reason is asinine. That said, even if we had developed these traits primarily to make us better hunters, that wouldn't make engaging in that behavior ethical.

Similar arguments can be presented around our evolutionary impulse to mate. The fact that that impulse exists doesn't make it ethical to mate without consent. In fact, one of the things that makes humans unique is our capacity for abstract moral reasoning. So we can actually ask whether following our biological drive is morally justified. And finally, adaptations that may help us survive in the short term, like procuring calorie-dense animal foods during times of scarcity, can often be detrimental in the long term. This is something known as antagonistic pleiotropy. For example, genetic variants that cause sickle cell anemia can help people survive long enough to reproduce in areas where malaria is endemic. That's because the sickle cell trait protects against malaria, but then it can go on to cause cardiovascular issues later in life. Similarly, Huntington's disease can increase fertility, but then cause death within 20 years of symptoms arising. These traits either increase the likelihood of living long enough to reproduce or they improve fertility, so they're more likely to pass their genes on, yet lead to long-term issues. So, adaptations to meat consumption may have actually been beneficial in the short term when food was scarce. But our ancestors didn't typically live long enough to deal with things like cardiovascular disease or colorectal cancer, which usually appear at old age. And those are some of the health reasons to limit red meat consumption today.

>> 80% of all of soy is given to non-human animals. Oh, I'm going to stop you right there. I'm going to stop you right there. The soy is grown for the oil. The soy is grown for the oil. It is literally extracted. The leftover product is then fed to cattle. That is a manipulated statistic. He's just plain wrong here. According to data from the Food Climate Research Network, University of Oxford, and USDA database, 76% of global soy production is for animal feed. Only 13% is for oils meant for human consumption and 4% for industry use in the form of things like biodiesel. It is literally the byproduct. They grow the soy for the oil. Even if it wasn't being fed to the animals, they would still grow the soy. >> That is true. That is true. That is true. That is true. That is true. That is true. That is true. That is true.

That is No, it's not true. We can most generously call it a co-product or consider the oil to be the byproduct. The

demand for soybeans is tied to global meat consumption. If we didn't produce so much soy to feed to animals, which can also be used to produce oils, we would just shift to producing other oils, which could actually save money and resources. That's because soybeans actually have a lower oil yield than rapeseed, sunflower, and palm oil. So, he's got it completely backwards. >> Okay, so let's go back to cheap lazy vegan she cuz she's got something else to say.

>> We think the dog fighting is bad, don't we? Yes, we do. So, what happens when we kill the dog? We eat its flesh and then we fight. Is that wrong as well? What do you mean we? I don't speak French. I've never done that. So, I've never seen anybody that knows that you can eat a chicken, a A a cow, a chicken. But, you saying that in such a negative light. What's the difference? The difference is one we raise as a companion and the other one we raise as food.

>> And that makes a moral difference why? It makes a moral difference because I need to feed my kids. You can't feed your kids a plant-based diet? I love that he asked, "And that makes a moral difference why?" Because we arbitrarily raise animals for food and we arbitrarily assign animals as companions. This is all very cultural and literally we just make it up. Okay, we make it up. There is no moral difference between these animals, dogs and cows for example. They both feel pain, they both have enough intelligence to know what's going on, they're sentient beings, they can suffer. They have connections to each other, they have connections to other animals, they have connections to humans.

Evolution, soy, and factory farming

There's really no moral difference between these two animals, yet we assign arbitrarily the roles that they are to play in our lives and in the world because we think we are human, we can play God, we can do whatever we want. Just because we raise an animal to be our food doesn't mean we should. We've done a lot of things in the past, a lot of systems have been in place in the past that we now recognize as immoral and unethical. There is a great movie that I always reference, it's called Never Let Me Go. It's set in this school and it looks like just a very normal kind of private school, it looks like regular children, regular normal kids, but we very soon find out that these kids are actually clones of other humans. So, they are humans genetically, everything about them is human except for they are just, you know, made in a lab I guess, but they can feel pain, they can suffer, they can love, they can uh experience everything a human being can experience and they are human by every definition of the word. Now, why were they cloned? We find out that they were cloned in order to become involuntary organ donors. From a young age, as soon as they're like fully developed, they start having surgeries to remove their organs so that those healthy young organs can be donated to sick people. And this is all done without them deciding for themselves that that's what they want to do. This is just the role that they were assigned by other people. They get their organs removed one by one until they basically die because they can't survive without their vital organs. They were cloned into existence so that humans could use their bodies as organ donors, okay? Does that make it okay? Does it make it okay for humans to be killing these other humans so that we could use their bodies when they did not decide that for themselves? Does it make it okay? Really? I don't think so.

>> So, I will not defend factory farming. Um there's Every time Every time in these videos, they all say, "I don't defend factory farming. I'm against factory farming." Yet, they do not acknowledge that 99% of animal products purchased and consumed in the United States and probably we can extrapolate that number to many other countries in the world, they are all produced in factory farms. Majority of animal products consumed are produced by factory farms. Why? Because in order to feed this gigantic population of billions of people, as many animal products as we consume today, we need factory farms. Okay? That is the truth that you do not want to admit. These meat eaters do not want to admit that factory farms are a necessary thing if you want to have it so that there aren't that many vegans, for example. Because if we got rid of all factory farms, which apparently all these people are against, apparently none of these people buy meat from the grocery store, and none of these people go to restaurants and just just eat steak without asking if it's a locally sourced or grass-fed or whatever.

Apparently, all of them only purchase goods from non-factory farmed places. Really? I don't think so. Statistically, no, you are not doing that. All of you are purchasing goods from factory farms. I can almost guarantee it. Doesn't mean every single thing that you eat is from a factory farm, but I can guarantee that they do not avoid factory farmed meat. If you're going to be so against veganism, but you're also saying you're against factory farming, I

think that is very ironic. Okay? Because vegans are actively not participating in factory farming. Of course, they're also not participating in other forms of animal agriculture, but they are the very few people that are actually actively not consuming factory farmed meat. Because again, chances are, even if you say you're against factory farming, chances are you still consume factory farmed meat. The only people that aren't doing that, guaranteed, are the vegans. And let's go back to Dr. Minoo Patel, who found another interesting moment in the Jubilee debate. >> Yeah, I get the minerals I need.

>> Yeah. What are you going to do about the calories? Because, you know, you get rid of the mineral the meats. Yeah. And you you cut out that calorie, but you also cut out a lot of the the calories that you need to survive. Because if we become too malnutritioned and neurodivergent, we will die.

Did you say malnutritioned and neurodivergent? He says you need calories. Excellent. [music] You know what contains calories? Food. Potatoes, pasta, rice, oats.

Regenerative agriculture and animal testing

Those are your sources of carbohydrates, which contain plenty of calories. You want to get some healthy fats in as well? Great. Nuts, [music] seeds, avocado, olive oil, or even one of my favorites, peanut butter. If only we had some examples of absolutely huge vegans. Oh, wait, we do. >> [music] >> You've got Jordan Drain, you've got Joe VJ, you've got Nimai Delgado, Patrik Baboumian, Brian Cranall, Jon Thomas, aka the bodybuilding vegan. Nick Squires, aka Meaty McSorley, and that's just a few off the top of my head. There are many, many more. These guys aren't out here making excuses about the fact that they can't get enough calories on a vegan diet. They're lifting hard, they're eating enough, and they're getting absolutely freaking huge in the process. You don't need to eat meat. You need to train and eat enough calories and protein. It's that simple.

>> As a factory farming big for the raising cattle. I'm not defending factory farming. You don't need to Are you against regenerative agriculture? Are you against chickens, turkeys?

agriculture? >> Yes. Are you against regenerative agriculture? Yes. Because it destroys the wildlife. Because it destroys the climate. So, this guy's really big on regenerative agriculture. He says regenerative agriculture is better for the environment. Remember the claim being argued is about suffering. [music] But, is his claim even correct? No. A report by the International Research Collaboration, led by the Food Climate Research Network, found that grass-fed livestock are not a climate solution. [music] Raising livestock are net contributors to the climate problem.

As are all livestock. Rising animal production and consumption, [music] whatever the farming system and the animal type, is causing damaging greenhouse gas release >> [music] >> and contributing to changes in land use. In fact, you need 150% more land and grazing cattle would [music] produce 43% more emissions. Plant-based sources of protein use far less land, far less water, create far less greenhouse gas emissions, and cause far less water pollution as well. Remember what he said, he didn't want to jump around, but it seems like that's all he did all debate, and didn't address any of [music] Jack's original claim. Perfectly summarized. So, animal testing. Oh, boy.

Yeah. For all of the devices, immunizations, they need to, per the FDA, do animal testing first. >> So, in 2022, the FDA Modernization Act 2.0 was signed into law. This allows for alternatives to animal testing in the preclinical phase of drug development, in part because there's such a low translation of results from animal studies to human studies. More on that.

86% of all of the experiments done on non-human animals transfer. Where's the research? It I'm giving it to you now. No, no, no. I want to know the who wrote the paper. Oh, Harry Harlow, the editor of the Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology. >> Really? And you think that's enough to prove your point? This is well understood. It's like she's never actually looked into the topic, yet wants to debate it. Here's another recent review, separate to what Jack is citing, stating that on average, the translation rate of animal research to humans is about 5%. He looks at 2,500 articles and he said, "Quote, most of the observations most of the data is not worth publishing and not most of the experiments not worth doing." Wait, so you're He's He's strictly No, no, no, no, hold on. So, you're basing what you just said on one person's opinion. >> No, I just told you 6% of all the research. >> opinion on what a whole bunch of other people >> of the experts in the area, yeah. And I also said that the

biochemical engineer at Cornell said the same. That was just cringey. She asked who wrote the paper or where she could find the research, but I think it's pretty clear she doesn't actually care. No matter which researchers were involved or where it was published, she was probably just going to respond with, "Oh, that's all you've got?" accompanied by a fake laugh, of course. And I'd be curious to know if she's even aware of the FDA Modernization Act that I mentioned earlier replacing the old requirement for animal testing from 1938. That aside, we currently live in a world where medications have historically been tested on animals. However, moving forward because of the poor translation of the animal research to humans and advancing technology like AI, I could see a transition, albeit a slow transition, away from animal testing being the standard.

>> is Nicole Ashley. >> Nice to meet you, Nicole Ashley. Jack, how you doing? I'm great. I think plants killing plants is murder, though. Oh, come on, you're joking. You're trolling. >> ripping it from the ground. You're ripping it from its mother. It's murder. Poor Jack here even asks if she's trolling. There are actually people that believe this. Yes, plants are living.

However, they do not have a nervous system. They don't have a brain. They don't have pain receptors or nociceptors. >> [music] >> So, they cannot actually perceive noxious stimuli or perceive pain. There's no plausible reason to believe that they have consciousness or that they can experience pain [music] and suffering the way humans and animals can. What plants can do is respond to physical stimuli [music] such as light, uh changes in chemicals, and even touch.

Famous are the Venus flytrap or the sensitive plant, also known as the touch-me-not. [music] They're both capable of something called rapid plant movement in response to a physical stimulus.

Plants, land use, and vegan ethics

Now, this type of plant biology is absolutely fascinating. So, if you want to learn more about it, then check out this article. But, responding to stimuli is something even machines do like our [music] phones or computers. However, you and I would both agree that our phones and computers are not sentient beings. They cannot experience what it is [music] to be living. Do you think we should reduce the amount of pain that plants are experiencing? >> Yes, we should. Plants matter.

#plantsmatter. Okay. So, according to Hannah Ritchie 2022, you get a 75% reduction in all of the land that you need for farming. So, if given the fact you're getting 40 to 1 in your calories and 30 to 1 in your protein from plants to animals then slaughtered, you get a 75% decrease in the plants that you're going to kill >> This is how we reduce it.

>> So, Jack plays along [music] and asks if he wants to reduce plant pain and suffering. Let's grant the premise that plants feel pain and that they can suffer. If you want to reduce [music] that, then moving towards a plant-based diet is one of the number one ways to do that. 50% of all habitable land at the moment is currently used for farming. 77% of that is used to [music] grow crops and graze animals that are then used for food. This only provides 18% of global calories [music] and 37% of global protein. If everyone moved to a plant-based diet, we could free up 75% of all land. We could rewild it. We could have much more room for plants. We would kill a lot less plants in the process. So, if you're a plant rights [music] activist, you should be vegan. I did actually think that that person was trolling. I thought it was somebody going on there pretending to say the stuff that anti-vegan trolls say, but she was deadly serious. She was completely serious about it.

>> I think she knew she was trolling, but she represents a viewpoint that many, many people believe. That's the point. >> my job at Plant Based News is to respond to comments, and we get that all the time where it's like, "Don't you care about plants as well?" So, I always respond with the same thing, which is, "You know that the majority of the world's crops are being grown to be fed to animals who are then slaughtered, so you're not only eating the animal, but you're also eating all of those crops. If you actually cared about plant suffering, like Dr. Patel said, then you would actually be vegan, too." But nobody wants to hear that. >> when we just take a look at the global food system, right? Animal agriculture uses 77% of all farmland and produces 57% of all emissions. To me, that just doesn't seem like a great return on investment if it's only producing 37% of the world's protein.

>> I enjoy the trivial pleasure of doing what the lions, with the hyenas, with the tigers have done for history. >> Okay, we're back with crazy plant life matter lady. She's talking about what lions, hyenas, and tigers do in the wild. So, she's saying that human beings should be able to do the same as these carnivorous animals. So, another quick biology lesson. Humans are not carnivores, despite what your favorite social media influencer has been telling you. We are opportunistic omnivores, which means we can eat both animal-based foods and plant-based foods. The animals she mentioned are obligate carnivores. They have to hunt and eat animals. Biologically, there is no reason that we have to eat meat. Also, this is an ethical debate. We should not be basing our morality on what wild animals do. But, what about the caveman times? The caveman times that caveman lived, they lived off of eating meat. So, what is the big deal? So, again, we're arguing from tradition here and habit. Just because we've done something for so many years does not make it morally right. Human beings have waged war, killed one another, enslaved one another for centuries. Does [music] that then make it correct because we've been doing it for so long? No. We often hear that our ancestors ate meat, but what did they actually eat? As I said before, human beings are opportunistic omnivores. We will eat anything [music] we can get our hands on.

We're capable of eating both animal and plant-based foods. Historical research shows that human beings mostly ate a plant-based diet and occasionally would scavenge meat that was brought down by live predators.

With the advent of stone tools, our appetite for meat increased >> [music] >> as we began to hunt. It still did not make up the majority of our diet. The other issue is basing your food choices on what our ancestors ate seems pretty ridiculous when you consider that our ancestors had a life expectancy of around 30 years. I don't know about you, but I intend to live a lot longer than that. And actually, we now know that eating a plant-based diet and actually reducing the amount of meat is associated with longevity and reduction risk of chronic disease. So, it makes no sense to say that we should be eating meat just because cavemen did. The protein argument, the land use argument, the emissions argument, the plants have feelings argument, they're all just divesting from an actionable plan that could take place. Can we talk about Dr. Jack Shames very quickly? So, what amazing guy, what amazing communicative for animal rights. I never knew about him until about sort of 3-4 weeks ago, but such an amazing advocate for this movement. He handles himself so well. Yeah, I think he's also been on the Joe Rogan podcast and a number of other big podcasts because he is just so good at advocating and debating in clearly quite challenging situations. Thank you everybody for watching another episode of Plant Based News. Please like, comment, and subscribe and we'll see you very soon.

>> [music] [music]