

STATEMENT OF INTENTION

Recently, there have been discussions in the media of the ethics and impacts of animal agriculture after vegan activists blocked the streets of Melbourne by protesting for animal rights and liberation. It's my intention in this speech to argue that viewers who were against the protest should have supported the vegan activist as the exploitation of animals is intolerable and gratuitous. My target audience is parents who are concerned about their children's health, environmentalists who seek to find a solution to climate change and those who were opposed to the vegan activists protesting. Since my target audience is more likely to be moved by emotional appeals - and will be influenced to show empathy towards the exploited animals - I'll employ disapproval, disgusted and critical tone in the way I present my piece.

My speech contains three key arguments which I think are most likely to appeal to my target audience:

- The practices in the animal agriculture industry are vicious and unethical.
- The production of these animals is the leading cause of environmental damage.
- The consumption of animal products is destroying our health.

To initiate my oral presentation, I included a hook, which mirrored the exact words that the vegan activists were chanting during the protest, stating "What do we want? Animal liberation! When do we want it? Now!" This sets the setting and tone of my oral presentation, indicating the issue that my oral is set around. Furthermore, I have listed names that vegan activists were labelled as by the media, such as "vegan vigilantes", "radicalised extremists", "militants" "self-indulgent nutters" and "shameful, unaustralian, green-collared, criminals" to elicit sympathy from those against the vegan protesters, encouraging them to be open-minded about the issue of veganism.

In my first argument, I have discussed the unethical practices that animal agriculture takes part in. This argument is most likely to be aimed towards those who are passionate about animal rights, as they can feel empathetic towards the animals who have received unjust treatment. While discussing about the egg industry and what happens to male chicks who are labelled as waste products, I have included the repetition of "you," stating that "According to the industry, if you can't produce eggs or you can't be turned into meat, you don't provide money. So you deserve to be minced and blended to death, alternatively, imprisoned in a chamber where you are poisoned by carbon dioxide gas, all because you are deemed useless." Such repetition allows my target audience to imagine themselves in the position of a male chick, as a result of a detailed explanation of the journey of a male chick in the industry, hence they are encouraged not to support the egg industry.

Moreover, in my second argument, I examined the negative effects that animal agriculture poses to the environment. Unlike my first argument, this argument is targetted towards environmentalists. I have included the irony that "the efforts that we make to ban fossil fuels for transport is rather insignificant in comparison to the substantial impact that animal agriculture has on climate change", after mentioning a shocking statistic, which informed the reader that the

“animal agriculture is responsible for a staggering 51% of greenhouse gas emissions, which is more than the combined emissions from all transportation, which only accounts for 13%.” The irony and statistical evidence elicit shock to the reader as they may have been misinformed previously, being told the the burning of fossil fuels is the biggest contributor to climate change. As a result, my target audience is encouraged to limit their consumption of animal products and support the vegan activists who are voiceful about the environmental impact that the industry has towards it.

Lastly, my third argument scrutinises the negative impacts animal products has on our health. I have included a negative connotation with the word “cancer”, stating that the “World Health Organisation has classified processed meats such as bacon, salami, hot dogs and sausages, a class 1 carcinogen ... signifying that there has been an extensive amount of research showing the development of cancer in exposed humans.” This elicits fear to readers, however, a tonal shift occurs, from a critical tone to a positive tone. I have included a list of influencers who are partaking in a plant-based diet, which includes the “Williams sisters, Lewis Hamilton, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Beyonce, Peter Dinklage, Patrik Baboumian, who holds Germany’s strongest man record, Rich Roll, who has won several Ultraman World Championships and Morgan Mitchell, an Australian Olympian.” By using influential people, the audience is invigorated to attempt a plant-based diet as some people look up and are inspired by these celebrities athletes.

As a whole, this speech encourages consumers of animal products to be more conscious of their diet choices, and to some, attempt a plant-based diet.