

All animals are equal



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

RESPONSE TO ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL In his article on the existence and philosophy behind discrimination based on species, Peter Singer argues that there are three way in which humans violate any principle of equality for animals. These instances are in experimenting on animals, in eating animals, and in giving them a lower philosophical status. It seems that he sees these as a violation of human philosophy concerning the invalidity of discrimination. The error in Singer's argument is that he groups all animals into one category of " non-human" and states that they need to be protected from human discrimination, which neglects to address the issue of animals violating the hypothetical quality and rights of one another. Human equality protects blacks no only from discrimination from whites, but also from discrimination from other blacks. What then, is to be done when a bear decides to maul a dog when there is no evidence of a real threat from the canine? Is the bear to be punished? Singer's implications of the need for equality among species would call for exclusive enforcement of moral ideals by humans, with no animal contribution. In a business sense, this would call for great complications in developing new laws to regulate commerce that involves animals, and would designate them not as property and livestock but as something more akin to a citizen. This would dissolve human economic rights and change markets, making meat a contested commodity and would cause a collapse in several sectors. It would incur a massive cost due to need for regulation and need for alternative sources of food as well as methods of testing products. On the whole, it would entirely change the free market and give animals a stake by prohibiting them from being bought, sold, and harvested, a poor and devastating policy.