

Argument Analysis

The article begins with an argument as to why we should eat animals. This is followed by a counter-argument as to why we shouldn't eat animals. State both main arguments in standard form (numbered premises, line underneath, and conclusion) and systematically evaluate them according to the three criteria (i.e., the acceptability and relevance of the individual premises and the adequacy of the premise set). If either main argument contains one or more sub-arguments, you should state each such sub-argument separately, in standard form, when evaluating the acceptability of the premise of the main argument that the sub-argument is intended to defend. (I find this neater than trying to combine sub-arguments with the main argument in one big standard form presentation.) The author obviously feels that his counter-argument is stronger than the first argument; on the basis of your evaluation of both arguments, which argument do you think is stronger? You should also feel free to add further considerations of your own to support one side or the other on this issue. I would prefer that your paper be word-processed, and it should be in the range of 1000 words long. The paper will be due at the beginning of class on July 25.

Don't Eat Animals; Delicious, Delicious Animals

Brady Ehler, OP Opinions

I love animals, especially with barbeque sauce. And they aren't just delicious, they are also healthy; they contain a ton of protein. It's easy to stay healthy if you eat animals. Besides, it's so convenient to eat meat; 90% of the menu items in 90% of restaurants contain the flesh of at least one tasty critter.

Despite all these fantastic reasons to kill animals and put them in our stomachs, there are actually some good reasons to avoid stuffing your craw with the species of the day.

The most obvious reason to give up meat is that it's not moral to kill things and eat them if you don't have to. True, it can be argued that it's not moral to eat plants, because they have feelings too (see "The Secret Life of Plants," by Peter Tompkins), but so what? Plants don't have a neocortex, let alone a cerebellum. Hell, they don't even have eyes. Besides, we have to eat something, and I for one have a simple rule about that; the closer the organism resembles me, the less acceptable it is to eat it. For example, it's fine to eat water chestnuts; they have no moving parts, they have no nervous system, and they won't scream when you eat them raw. Conversely, it's really bad to eat human beings, because they break all the rules that make it okay to eat water chestnuts.

I understand that some people view animals as nothing more than a food source and that's okay, I get it, I was an uncompromising omnivore for most of my life. However, I think we all care about the global environment, or at least human beings, both of which are effected greatly by the mass consumption of animal meat. Every year, in the US alone, over 41 million cattle are transformed into TV dinners and beef stew (wow, that's enough beef to make nearly 78 trillion McDonald's hamburgers). It takes a lot of land to raise that

many cows, grazing on land that has to be cleared by slashing forests.

Sure, there isn't all that much slashing in the US anymore, but as of the 90's, the Amazon was being chopped down at a rate of 7,000 square miles per year. That land is being cleared for agriculture and livestock. Agriculture isn't such a bad idea (providing it's for corn and not cocaine), but you have to feed livestock a lot of vegetation. It takes somewhere between 7 to 40 times more land to grow a pound of meat than a pound of produce. If all the land on Earth that is devoted to raising livestock were converted to agricultural land, we could end world hunger without breaking a sweat. Not only that, but we could save the Amazon Rainforest.

I'm sure a lot of you are still not convinced it's better not to eat meat. Perhaps you think it isn't possible to be healthy subsisting on a diet devoid of meat protein, and that human beings are meant to eat meat, so why resist it? Well, it is perfectly healthy to survive without meat. Almost everything has protein in it; grains, legumes, vegetables, dairy products, eggs, nuts, seeds. Basically, as long as you're not trying to survive on lemonade, then you are getting protein. The trick is getting all of the proteins, and this can be solved easily by eating a wide variety of different foods.

Animals are delicious, there is no arguing against that to a meat-eater, but is it really necessary to eat meat? Maybe it was 100 years ago, but now, we have alternatives, supplements, and wide variety of different foodstuffs available to us. So no, it's not necessary to eat meat, especially with an ever-increasing global population, and growing environmental concerns.

