
Comparison Of Orwell And Singer's Animal Philosophy

What makes racism and sexism immoral is that you cannot treat someone different because of their race, religion, or sex. The fact false empirical beliefs are held by racists and sexists; it is undeniable that the two vices will always give rise to all forms of prejudice that may be harmful to society. Besides, the evidence they provide is not sufficient or even misleading and may hardly meet the standards as Singer observes. When the evaluation is done on the position taken by racists and sexists, it is difficult to believe their propositions. For instances, it does not matter the kind of defense given by racists bearing in mind that they are the very cohort that executed human slavery and the slave trade. They were never mindful of the welfare of Africans. Sexists also behave in an inhuman manner and therefore immoral.

According to Singer, we put ourselves in a vulnerable position when embracing both racism and sexism. In other words, Singer attempts to equate speciesism with racism and sexism. The ills committed by sexists and racists are nowhere different from the practice of speciesism. The latter is a straightforward discriminatory attitude that leads to human suffering. Moreover, speciesism does not give any regard to ethical consideration. The interests and welfare of beings are not significant factors when speciesism is elevated in society. For example, the right to take part in a voting process cannot be denied by a speciesist. On the same note, a sexist is not mandated to rebuff men abortion right. When different beings are handled differently, it does not necessarily amount to speciesism especially if the right procedures are followed. Singer also argues that 'animals should get equal moral consideration with humans.' That is a position for 'extending the principle of equality beyond our species.' It appears so simple in the sense that concerns for others should be among our priority areas. Better still, caring for others should never depend on their nature. Therefore, consideration of interests should be uniform across the board. Animals also have an equal right as humans.

Singer bases his ethical arguments on the theory of utilitarian. Utilitarianism which we learned early on, depends or relies on outcomes. Consequences are essential in the theory of utilitarianism. One action is chosen over the other and does not settle or rely on one's interest. Being a normative ethical theory, the author uses it as he gives reference to the importance of handling every being with respect. For example, since human life is made up of both painful and happy moments, it is crucial to recognize the fundamental role played by the utilitarianism theory on ethics. Singer also uses the theory to approve or disprove specific actions that may amount to either pain or pleasure.

Orwell and Singer's philosophy on animals differ. The story is about an elephant that broke away from his owner, ravages the village, causes damage to property, and kills a man. Orwell orders his gun from one of his assistants for protection against the elephant. However, as over 2000 Burmans standing behind him they expected him to bring down the elephant. They wanted the meat and the elephant dead for causing the destruction. Once Orwell shot the elephant it did not die, it suffered. He had to shoot him multiple time and it still took the elephant 30 minutes after being shot to die. Whereas the story is symbolic, it is evident that Orwell would not have applied the philosophy of Singer regarding equal rights for both animals and human beings. Orwell justifies shooting the animal to save further destruction, self-humiliation, and to please the people. Singer would not have killed the elephant because animals should be treated

the same as a human.