Doyle Proto

Professor Eric Drown

ENG122

9/16/18

Domestication is one of the many processes that Humanity have used to fuel its rise to the top food chain. This multi-generational process of selective breeding yields an organism used to produce or accomplish something useful to the breeder. Humans began this process about 10,000 years ago with a variety of plant, animal, and, fungal species to the point where you be hard pressed to find something on your plate that didn’t from a domesticated organism..

Entire species have been molded to humanities whims and desires. In fact, there was an entire breed of dog once made to power turnspits called the “Turnespete”. These short stock dogs when extinct after people found better ways to power their turnspits. The example of the “Turnesete “ highlights the relationship between humanity and it’s domesticated species as one to extract value and labor. But then again just look at cows. There one of the most numerous animals on the planet. They are so widespread and diversified that extinction for them is kind of unimaginable. A lot of these animals stand to gain quite a lot from human domestication.

 But, as of recently the relationship between humans and its domesticated has been animals called into question by many different groups of humans including a philosopher name Peter Singer. This is a lead to a very large argument about the nature of these relationships in what they are. f Singersay it's akin to slavery or genocide and other say that it’s part of the natural order or necessary part of life. Within this grand, and endless, debate enter Michael Pollan a journalist for the New York Times. The man who wrote an article called Animal’s Place in 2002. In this article he explores the afar mentioned grand debate attempting to understand the position of Singer and his book Animal Liberation. Pollan own position is ever so gently hinted at the begin of article “The first time I opened Peter Singer’s “Animal Liberation,” I was dining alone at the Palm, trying to enjoy a rib-eye steak cooked medium-rare.” (Pollan 1) Pollan immediately establish what side of the argument he is on. It's very short sentence but it really does help show the reader where he's coming from. Pollan goes on to describe Singer’s position in a very similar matter. “Singer and the swelling ranks of his followers ask us to imagine a future in which people will look back on my meal, and this steakhouse, as relics of an equally backward age.” (Pollan 1)To Singer he sees the treatment of animals in our societyas an issue of speciesism . Speciesism ,according to singer, something on par with racism and that we should strive for the elimination of speciesist sentiments in our society.

Personally, I find this idea up a bit ridiculous as comfortable extended rights to set Dolphins , higher primates, members of crows, certain octopods, member of elephants , and, certain domesticated animals, but not bug or worm, not anything with the shell pretty much. Despite the initial attitude that Pollan shows towards this idea he does do an in-depth on it. The next part of the essay is a series of questions by Pollan and the response is he found in Singer’s book. One consistent idea in the section is that Defining our relationship with animals and how it helps define our relationship with other humans. This relates to an idea that Pollan and brings up about the philosopher Jeremy Bentham. “Bentham here is playing a powerful card philosopher call the “argument from marginal cases.” It goes like this: there are humans – infants, the severely retarded, the demented – whose mental function cannot match that of a chimpanzee”. (Pollan 4) This argument is meant to make us think about the ideas we hold about animals because if we define our relationship with animals we've also defined our relationship with disabled people within our society. Course have not, but it sets a moral standard. Then again Jeremy Bentham Just went out another crucial thing about our relationship with animals.

One thing I do have to say is that this article has changed the way I look at this issue. I'm not going to stop eating meat that's just part of my diet, but it has given me a new defense which is its part of the deal. Also, the way that this whole speciesism idea works is that we're supposed to treat animals differently because We can treat them differently. Even though if put in a room with a hungry grizzly bear, lion, or insert random predator here it would gladly eat things and I think it's thought about it, but the moment I eat something let’s shark it's speciesist act. Paradoxically the idea of speciesism is speciesist. It’s kind of fries the brain in a way. This is the problem I have with comparing animals to humans is that. A lot of animals are not driven by intelligence are driven by instinct. Given there are highly intelligent and are you capable of incredible things, but saying the chickens are like Auschwitz inmates is a bit too far for me.

Both Pollan and Singer bring up the raising of animal to if not widen they’re protectives, but to fortify there ideas. Singer bring the horror show that is modern factory farm
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