

“Because either Frisk or Flowey killed Asgore, meaning she legally inherited the sole right to the throne. If Asgore's still there, either she has to overthrow him (easier said than done; who's going to support overthrowing a very popular ruler for a queen that wants to delay their freedom?), or kill him herself (something she obviously doesn't want to do, and monsters would not take kindly to it). Either way, so long as Asgore's in the picture, any attempt to undo his policy would probably not be seen favorably.

Either you really don't understand Asgore's character, or you've played too much Undertale Yellow.

The answer is, we don't know. We don't know how much time has passed in between humans falling. We don't know how the political landscape before Frisk fell was. We don't know if the previous humans killed monsters, and how many.

It is worth noting that monsters' tolerance for human kills is extremely low. She'll be overthrown if Frisk kills at least 10 monsters (or even less if you kill Papyrus or Undyne). If Frisk kills only in self-defense, they'll kill way more than that. Therefore, it's more likely that the opinion of humans among monsters wouldn't normally be very high after each human falls down, since talking to your attackers isn't the default response most people would go to when someone tries to kill you.”

I explained in my other comment that killing 10 monsters is not small, and killing only in self defense would only result in about 5 kills.

I'd argue that if Frisk can kill some AND the King (everyone thinks Frisk killed Asgore), yet Monsterkind is still willing to accept a new attitude towards humans, Monsterkind's current status quo is not that big of a threat to Toriel's hypothetical new rule.

“When did Toriel ever call Frisk disgusting?”

I meant she called Asgore disgusting and left.

“And by that measure, every single monster in the underground is even more guilty. They all did nothing to stop the humans from marching to their death, when they very well could have tried to stop them. Some of them did worse than nothing.

Papyrus beats Frisk within an inch of their life. Undyne kills Frisk multiple times, tells a child that they would be better off dead (which is straight up just child abuse), Alphys ends up putting said child in danger so she can insert themselves into their story, etc.

Toriel is the only character who even so much as tries. She gave the children the chance to live out their lives in the ruins. That's hardly 'virtually nothing'. Yet for some reason, she's the only one criticized for this?”

Every other monster in the Underground is under an obligation to make an attempt on Frisk's life because of the policy set by Asgore and enabled by Toriel. They have an obligation to do the wrong thing. It doesn't make them justified, just understandable.

Toriel's case is completely different; she had an obligation to do the right thing, and didn't because she was disgusted, then afraid. She is also understandable, but her action/inaction caused a much worse impact than every other monster (except Asgore).

Every monster that tries to kill Frisk is a result of Toriel's inaction. Papyrus beating Frisk to near-death, Undyne skewering them, it's all partly Toriel's fault.

“She didn't 'do nothing'. She did more to stop Asgore than every single monster in the underground combined. Doing nothing would be staying with Asgore. Doing nothing would be moving into a cabin somewhere far away from the ruins and never interacting with a human ever again. Would she be a better person if she did either of those things?”

If she stayed with Asgore and removed the policy against humans (something she is capable of doing and has an obligation to, again, Asgore is a pushover), she'd be a better person. So, yes.

“She did 'do something', as I've already explained. And honestly, if you seriously think that failing to save children is somehow worse than experimenting on your own child, then trying to steal the soul of another child who has been nothing but kind to the people who attacked them for a weapon project, then I genuinely don't know what to tell you. I guess we'll just have to agree to disagree on that one.”

I'll recap my point of view:

Toriel's biggest mistake was leaving her kingdom at a time of crisis. Like how Asgore declared war on humanity in a fit of anger, Toriel left her position in disgust. Both of them acted irrationally due to their emotions. Afterwards, Asgore was forced to continue with his plan because his mistake was already made in anger and the people needed to be given hope. Similarly, Toriel was forced to continue hiding away and doing the little she could against Asgore's plan, because she'd let go of her best opportunity against Asgore's plan when she abandoned him in disgust.

Ceroba faced a moral dilemma and made poor choices, just like Toriel and Asgore. Going by intent, neither Ceroba nor Toriel truly mean bad, so we go by impact. Ceroba caused the near-death of her daughter and attempted to kill a child, while Toriel left a kingdom to rely on genocidal intent for hope and neglected six children, all of which died. I believe the latter is much worse.