

Animal rights and 'talent in understanding pain and suffering ': Critical review of Peter Singer

Alireza Aleboyeh¹, Naser jafari poor²

Submitted: 2021/11/29
Accepted: 2022/3/2

Keywords: Pain and suffering, Animal interests, Animals ethics, Human and Animal, Peter Singer.

Abstract: One of the most important reasons for animal rights advocates and the need to change their inappropriate behavior is the "ability to understand pain and suffering in animals." Peter Singer is one of the main defenders of this argument and by emphasizing the need to pay equal attention to animals and humans, he challenges any use of animals, including eating meat, laboratory research, and industrial animal husbandry. Denying the superiority of man over the animal, he considers animal exploitation to be morally incorrect, and by criticizing the view of religions in this regard, introduces it as a precondition for violation against animal rights. This article, reviewing and criticizing this argument and emphasizing the need to respect the privacy of animals and human responsibility towards them, states that due to the special place of man in the universe and his existential differences with animals, his purposeful and responsible use of animals is morally permissible, which is also confirmed by a look at the teachings of religions. Considering the relationship between suffering and science and consciousness, the value of human beings, the same criterion of fetus and animal, and contradictory claims are among the criticisms that can be leveled at Singer.

DOI: 10.30470/phm.2021.531191.2002

Homepage: phm.znu.ac.ir

1. Assistant Professor, Islamic Sciences and Culture Academy, aleboyeh@isca.ac.ir.

2. Phd student of Islamic Ethics , Baqerul Uloom University (**Corresponding author**), Njafari133@gmail.com.

Introduction: Peter Singer forbids any use of animals by imposing a ban on inflicting any suffering on animals and emphasizes on paying equal attention to the interests of animals and human beings. He has given reasons for his claim that "the ability to understand the pain and suffering of the animal" is one of the most important things. (Singer, 1996: 101) Given the importance of Singer in the discussion of animal rights and his influence on it, and the importance of the argument for the ability to understand the suffering and pleasure of animals based on the equality of animals with human beings, this article examines and critiques this argument.

Methodology: With the argument of "the ability to understand the pain and suffering of the animal", can the animal be considered equal to man and any use of it be prohibited? In this

research, Singer's argument is reviewed via the application of library and theoretical methods.

Findings: The Relationship of pain and animal suffering with science and its knowledge: It is possible to measure and compare the amount of the suffering in different types of animals with the human species because the understanding of pain and suffering by creatures is directly related to their knowledge and awareness.

Painless killing: Pain and suffering in themselves contrast the nature of any living thing, but sometimes the introduction of some amount of suffering to provide higher benefits is necessary for the material world and so one can escape it.

Equal criteria of fetus and animal: What is Singer's reason for placing a person as a criterion for moral value? Does Singer have to say that

prescribing murder is something impersonal? Does Singer accept that anything that is impersonal can be killed? Whether it is a newborn baby or people with disabilities or some animals.

The value of human beings : Singer, neglecting the immaterial realm of man, and with a one-sided view and degrading his existential rank as an animal, has considered sensitivity and the ability to feel as the only criteria for equality between man and animal, while the intellectual and social structure of animals are much simpler than that of human beings. And because of this existential superiority and value, to benefit (of course, value-oriented and responsible) is morally defensible for the superior being (human).

Contradiction in Singer's claims : Singer's view on defending the need to pay equal attention to animal and human being and to strive to protect animal rights along

with stopping inflicting suffering on animals while he defends doing the most heinous and ugly things about animals awakens the conscience and intuition of every fair man and bring to the fore its ugliness

Religious teachings and pain and animal suffering : The teachings of the divine religions, while prescribing human use of animals, have also emphasized many aspects of respect for animal privacy. Further, the shortcomings of animal rights advocates root in today's human extremism in permissible use of all nature and animals.

Discussion and Conclusion:

By accepting the different level of cognition in animals from humans, it must be accepted that the level of animal benefits from benefits is also different from humans and has its own limits. And man is allowed to use animals according to his special position and special

privileges of existence, but this permission does not mean that he uses the animal as a tool to achieve his goals.

References:

quran

Nahj al-Balaghah

- Eslami, Seyyed Hassan. (1392 SH)"Environmental Ethics of Backgrounds, Perspectives and Futures", Revelation Ethics , No. 4, Qom, Esra Institute. 7-35.
- Barqi, Abu Ja'far, Ahmad ibn Muhammad .(1371 SH). Al-Mahasin, Ch II, Qom, Islamic Library.
- Al-Hurr al-Amili (1414 AH), Wasa'il al-Shi'ah, Ch II, Qom, Al-Albayt.
- al-Juba'i al'Amili, Zayn al-Din (1413 AH), *Masalik al-afham ila tanqih shara'i' al-Islam*, Vol. I, Qom, maaref Islamic institution
- Jamshidi, Fatemeh. Alireza Albooyeh (1397 SH), \" Review and Criticism of Singer' view on morality of abortion \" , Philosophical Meditations, Vol. 21. Zanjan, Zanjan University, 229- 254.
- Khorasani, Hossein vahid. (1428 AH), *Towzih al-Masael*, ninth, Qom, Publications of Imam Baqir Al-Uloom School. (as)
- Khomeini, Ruhollah .(1424 AH) *Towzih al-Masael* (Mahshi), Ch. 8, Qom, Society of Seminary Teachers of Qom.
- Sobhani, Ja'far (1429 AH), *Towzih al-Masael*. Ch. III, Qom, Imam Sadegh (as) Institute.
- Singer, Peter (1396 SH), Animal Liberation, translated by Behnam Khodapanah, Vol. I, Tehran, Qoqnoos Publishing.
- Tusi. abu jafar mohammad. (١٣٨٧ SH). *Al-Mabsut fi fiqh al-Imamiyya*. Tehran. maktab'iihya' asar jaeafrayh. Ch III.
- Reagan, Tom (1397 SH), The animal right of human error, translated by Behnam Khodapanah, Vol. I, Tehran. kargadanpub
- Rollin, Bernard (1394 SH), Science and Ethics, translated by Saeed Adalatjoo, elmifarhangipub.
- al-Kulayni, Muhammad ibn Ya'qub. (1363 SH), *AL- Kafi*, Ch 5, Tehran, Islamic Library.
- Majlesi , Mohammad-Baqer, (1404 AH) *Bihar Al-Anwar*, Ch II, Beirut, Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi
- Motahhari, Morteza (1385 SH), *Majmoe asar*, digital. Sadra.
- Mousavi, Mahmoud, Nafiseh Samoei .(1392 SH). Elhad dar negab takamolgrayi, *Qabasat*, No. 69, 135-157.