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Introduction

The philosophy of Peter Singer (Australia) is centered on the notion that human beings and animals are of equal value. The philosopher accepts as true that man has no superiority over animals; once that religion is obliterated, man go forward to superior rationality, self consciousness and communication. Singer also emphasized that disabled humans are of less capacities than a healthy animals. Disabled infants / men with Alzheimer’s disease do not have any significance in our population.

These men were supposed to be exterminated than to live. In the paper, the philosopher stresses how killing disabled infants / men with Alzheimer’s disease are acceptable and tolerable.  Man must opt to produce efficient man than a defected man. Men have better options to abscond healthier animals over deflective humans seeing as animals have better opportunities to have better life. Singer believes that man intend to create happiness within men and maximize opportunities to men (excluding aspects of man causing unhappiness).

(Analyses of the text)

Racism

The author / philosopher lay emphasis on the subject matter on white racist being a populace believing in religion, morality, and equality within human. The subject matter focuses not in religion, morality or even equality within humans but, directs to white racist / Americans. The verity of the philosopher’s statement regarding racism is partly true except that not only white racist accept the thought as true. Other democratic populace also implements laws regarding human rights. The student assumed that the philosopher not only reflects ideas on equality of man and animals but also show aggression (directly assault) to white racist. The philosopher in this issue revealed subjective-ness in presenting ideas.

Religious Acquittal

The philosopher insists getting rid of religion in order to possessed greater capacities for rationality, self consciousness and communication. In most of the religious populace, this thought would presage wickedness among men who believed in God. Man decides to what man opted to believe in. Each of the populace has its own opinion and no other man is able to conquer / insist one’s idea.

Religious acquittal doesn’t necessarily means achieving greater capacities of rationality, self consciousness and communication. What is the basis of Singer in eradicating the foundations of one’s belief (religion)? Religious people in return, build a peace society and also advanced the society’s culture. Perhaps, religious populace would achieve greater capacities of rationality, self consciousness and communication.

Utilitarianism

Generally, men opt to attain maximum happiness and minimize pain; exterminate grievances and diseases. In the context of Singer’s philosophy, legality of infanticide and euthanasia is tolerable. Men are obliged to eliminate causes of nausea and disorientation.

The student recognized the concept in maximizing happiness and minimizing pain but confused in the thought that the causes of nausea and disorientation were obliged to be eliminated. In moral context, killing defective infants are against the law of the society. Although man reduces the populace with nausea, the society dictates that man must treat man equal. Other species than man subsist. The student accepts as true that eliminating deflective infants would craft man efficiently and operative, but, killing is immoral and unacceptable to the society.

Killing a deflective infant is logically incomparable to killing a person. Both situations are not allowed in the society. Both situations have equivalent criminal case and resentment. Apart from the ideas of Singer, killing an infant doesn’t convey / create better happiness. Killing a defective man doesn’t maximize pleasure / create effective and efficient man. The lost of a happy life of a killed defected infant is not outweighed by the gain of a happier life of the healthy infant.

Conclusion

Utilitarianism in the context of Peter Singer does have its own advantages / gains and disadvantages / weakness such that confer a student’s affirmation / disagreement. A large part of Singer’s philosophy is not acceptable by the society. Although Singer purports ideas that contribute to man’s societal scheme, utilitarianism in the larger context disallow life and liberty.

Upheaval would always materialize since people would direct in exterminating weak and feeble people. The society would not only treat man as equal as other (man) but also treat animals as equal to man. In return, man’s intelligence would shrink as man give equal consideration to animals. Loss of man’s life will be as common as loss of animal’s life.

Experimentation on human would be allowed even it is against the society’s customs. Human rights shrivel as man becomes inferior to other species. Increasing man’s capacities towards rationality, self consciousness and communication would never be real.

The student recognized the consequences of Singer’s brutal utilitarianism. Utilitarianism will only bring discomfort and disorientation to populace. Man can achieve maximum happiness, but not in the form of utilitarianism.
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