

The meat eaters article review example

[Environment](#), [Animals](#)



In his article, “ The Meat Eaters,” Jeff McMahan discusses the concept of animals suffering at the hands of other animals, and whether or not this should be tolerated. He explores the reasons why animals should not be made to suffer any more than humans, and possible ways in which to eradicate their suffering. Overall, he believes that by allowing all carnivorous animals to become extinct and then introducing new herbivorous species, suffering could be eliminated.

McMahan contends that as humans tend to avoid allowing any other human being to suffer, perhaps we should be extending this responsibility to avoiding the suffering of other species of animals. Speaking primarily of animals in the wild and natural environments, he talks about how animals are savagely killed and eaten by predator animals and are often subjected to a slow and painful death.

He touches on ‘ The Problem of Evil’ and the fact that animals are perceived to have no free will to choose either good or evil and, therefore, should not be subject to any kind of suffering or evil. Furthermore, as animals are assumed in the bible to have no mortal soul, they will have no chance of being compensated after death by living in heaven. Staying with this theory, if it were true, there is no justification for omniscient, benevolent god who allows animals to suffer.

McMahan argues that if he had the opportunity to create a world and all of nature, he would design it in such a way that no living creature needed to kill another creature in order to survive. He suggests a possible solution to the problem of animals suffering in the wild: to allow all carnivorous animals to go extinct and then replace the numbers with new herbivorous animal

species. He argues that this would largely eradicate suffering among animals in the wild.

He acknowledges that there are potential downfalls with his theory. For example, if nature has evolved rather than been created, the balance of animal species which have survived have done so for a reason. The ecosystem is working as it is, save for the damage done by human beings, and therefore should not be tampered with. After all, there may be disastrous consequences if such an intervention occurred, including possible consequences that we haven't even considered possible. For example, if there were many more herbivorous animals than there currently are in the world, it is feasible that they would run out of foliage to eat. This, in turn, could lead to large numbers of animals starving and having a long and unpleasant death. McMahan lists several risks, similar to this one, and quotes other scientists in the process.

Once considering all the arguments and counterarguments for allowing carnivorous animals to become extinct and introducing new herbivorous animals to take their place, he concludes that he is in favour of the notion. Of course, the argument is purely hypothetical. There is little chance that this will ever be allowed to happen and, if left to nature, it would not happen on its own accord. In an ideal world, no creature would suffer. However, even if animal suffering in the wild was eliminated, there is a high chance that human beings would continue to cause suffering to animals anyway.

Works Cited

McMahan, Jeff. "The meat Eaters." The New York Times. 19 Sept 2010. Web. 25 Jan 2012.

<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/19/the-meat-eaters/>