

Analysis of proud to be speciesist essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The use of animals for human benefits has always been a controversial topic. It is still unanswered whether the use of animals for human advantages is valid. Animal activists think that using animals for human advantages can never be good, whereas few researchers and scientists think that animals are necessary for human welfare. “ Proud to be Speciesist” by Stephen Rose, talk about the issue of animal rights but present a totally contrasting viewpoints toward use of animals. The authors talk about using animals for human benefits in different approach.

Rose’s essay looks at a specific, personal view on the topic. Rose contradicts saying that human welfare and survival is more important than animal rights and argues that using animals for research is acceptable. Rose talks about the importance of animals in research for human survival. He cites an example of Alzheimer’s disease from his personal experience to explain the importance of animals in research to find a treatment to it. Rose’s arguments about importance of animals in research are incontestable as his arguments are totally scientific and logical.

Since Rose is a professor of biology and a researcher himself, his arguments are valid and credible. He says, “ The first statement is plain wrong; the second, the claim that animal have “ rights”, is sheer cant”. In addition, he talks about “ speciesism” and says that animal activists are also speciesists because they prefer animals to humans. Though Rose’s arguments are strong, his credibility weakens as his reasons and examples are solely from science. Moreover there can be a hint of him being biased about the topic since he is a researcher himself.

Though use of animals in research is necessary, his arguments are weak due to the limited scope of his research. Rose explains how researchers have been able to find cure for diseases like diabetes, Epilepsy, Parkinsonism, and he also talks about how pivotal were animals in these researches. He says, “ How far the concept of right can be extended—to not swatting a mosquito that is sucking your blood? To prevent your cat from hunting and killing a rat? Does an ant have as many rights as a gorilla? “.

Rose further states that some species of animals are privileged over other species just for the reason that former one is more important. He talks about animal rights being a relative term, which means that animals in greater proximity with human have more rights and vice versa. He had shown that animal activist are Speciesist themselves, so he thinks it is not wrong if anti-activists are also speciesist. He says, “ Just because we are humans, any discussion of rights must begin with human rights. Rose is proud to be Speciesist in favor of human because he thinks that we should privilege human over animals since we are a human. Rose’s arguments and examples are factual and convincing, but they are weakened with a doubt that about its limitation. Rose’s Logics and reasoning can be flawed by appropriate arguments from other fields rather than science. Hence, Rose’s idea gives a room for a doubt though his facts, reasoning and ideas about research are very watertight.

Rose, on the other hand, says that no other rights should be privileged over human rights. His idea of human rights being more important than any other animal rights appeals the conscience of readers. He mentions that animal activists are, in a way, speciesist themselves, so we, human, too can be

speciesist in favor of human. Rose says that animal activists would not refuse to take, for example, insulin for diabetes, L-dopa for Parkinsonism and such though they know that those medicines and treatment procedures were experimented on animals before.

Rose's reasons are impeccable, but it cannot be forgotten that it is a typical human behavior to take medicine in illness. Any living creature would do anything for survival, so Rose's argument can be faulted in this case. In same section, Rose talks about " Declaration of Animals in Medical Research" signed only by doctors, not by people from other fields. That's why, though Rose's arguments about " speciesism" in favor of human are logical and convincing, his ideas has been weaken by the limitation of his scope and with a possible doubt of his biasness.