

Name:

Professor:

Course:

Date:

Why Vegan?

There are three main parts in Michael Pollan's book *The Omnivore's Dilemma*. Pollan begins with a short introduction of industrial farming culture in the United States, where the author claims that the majority of food contains grain (sweetening substances). Massive consumption of those chemicals is unhealthy for people. Following this, the author describes the effects of organic farming which benefits animals, consumers and environment. Pollan finishes his book by sharing his experience of food preparation with the ingredients which he has hunted, collected or grown by himself. In the chapter "Ethics of Eating Animals", Pollan pointed a controversial question that referred to ethical food. Some people in the society believe that it is unethical to kill other animals for interest, while others think that it is acceptable. The author offers three main reasons to support his argument that veganism is an inefficient form of a diet. However, in my opinion, Pollan's point of view involves logical mistakes, and I believe that veganism is still the best choice for human diet.

At the beginning of the book, Pollan mentions that animals are most beneficial to a person's health. "Our metabolism demands certain chemical compounds which, in the nature, can be received only from plants (as Vitamin C) and others which can be received only from animals (as Vitamin B-12) (Pollan). It is more than simply spice of human life, a variety for us, apparently can be a biological requirement. Based on my researches, there is actually "no proof that the person has to eat a flesh of animals or any products of animals to be healthy, nevertheless there is an overwhelming proof that it really is the best not to ("Vegan Wolf")." Moreover, veganism is considered to be more healthy than any other form of diets. The vegan

is effectively prevented from hormones and antibiotics used in lifting of animals and animal such illness as mad cow disease. As the only food which contains cholesterol is products of the animal origin, vegetarian diet can easily decrease cholesterol level in a body.

In the second part, Pollan thinks that it is stereotypic for people to think that animals suffer in slaughterhouses. "There are neo-Cartesian scientists and thinkers who claim that animals are incapable of suffering, because they lack language. Human pain differs from the pain of animals. Pollan believes that "suffering in this representation causes not simply big pain, but also the pain strengthened by clearly human emotions, such as regret, pity to oneself, shame, insult and fear (Pollan)." In my opinion, it is a good example for a hasty error of generalization. There are researches who prove that animals really have emotions and it is considered that animals are able to express the range of emotions, such as happiness, grief, sympathy, anger, curiosity, concern and fear (Toothman). Though there is a federal law which demands that mammals were stunned before slaughter animals still suffer. The animal can suffer one or two brought stuns ("Actions Are Needed"). As being reported to Washington Post, "Hogs, unlike cattle, dip in tanks of hot water after they are stunned. As a result, spoiled slaughter condemns some hogs to be scalded and drowned. Confidential video from the Iowa pork plant shows squeal of hogs and a kick as they go down in to water (Warrick)". I personally watched some of these "confidential video movies" online. I really see those cruelty proofs in a slaughterhouse. In some cases, animals are killed only by stunning; animals shout plaintively to run away from death; the pigs are repeatedly kicked in the head and so on. Therefore, I really believe that the statement that "Animals don't suffer very much in the slaughter house" is simply senseless rhetoric propaganda.

The third and the most improbable argument that Pollan made is that veganism is less sociable. It is more time-consuming to prepare a vegetarian dinner. Pollan claims that "the creation of a satisfying vegetarian dinner takes much more thought and works (splitting work

in particular). It also is more sociable, at least in a society where vegetarians still represent a rather tiny minority". He also specified that *Time* magazine estimated recently that there are 10 million vegetarians in the United States. Pollan claims that his dietary restrictions give up a big breakthrough into the main relations of the host and a guest. "If I forget to say to my host in advance that I do not eat meat, he/she feels badly, and if I really tell it, he/she will make something special for me when I will feel badly. Concerning this matter, I am inclined to agree with a Frenchman who looked at any personal dietary prohibition as on impoliteness" (Pollan). Pollan made a mistake of analogy here. Comparison is carried out between veganism and a diet of an omnivorous from the point of view of sociability. Nevertheless, I do not see the relations between veganism and sociability. There are many factors which define "success" in society, and being a vegetarian does not play an important role here.

All of the above evidence indicates that Pollan's argument on veganism is refutable. In addition, it is proved that veganism is better than omnivorism from the point of view of human health and ethics. In addition to the benefit of veganism as being ecologically friendlier, it also promotes stability of society as a whole.

A plant based diet considerably reduces our carbonaceous trace and benefits very much to environment. According to food of conservation and dietary section, the vegetarian food only for 28% as is burdensome on a planet, as traditional SAAD (a standard Australian-American diet) (Green, Costello, and Dare). To put it in the numerical way and if the person makes the decision to become a vegetarian, it could benefit Earth effectively, saving 1.5 tons of carbon dioxide annually. Veganism also helps with the reduction of water consumption. Statistical data showed that "500 liters are used for 1 kilogram of potatoes; 900 it is used for 1 kilogram of wheat. 2000 liters of water are required to make kilogram of edible beans of soy and 16800 liters to lift kilogram of the Australian beef." It is considered that in the year 2025,

two thirds of the world population will live under the "deficiency of water". Therefore, it is important to reduce the unnecessary use of water.

The vegetarian diet is definitely more viable than a diet of the omnivore. With the same quantity of resources, it invests the capital in animal husbandry more effectively and can be reached the larger scale of plant based agriculture.

In conclusion, vegetarian diet is not as bad as how Pollan described in his book *The Omnivore's Dilemma*. There are many advantages of veganism: it is better for the health, the environment, and, most importantly, it is morally a correct thing to make.

Works Cited

"Actions Are Needed to Strengthen Enforcement." n. page. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

<<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-203>>.

Pollan, Michael. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin, 2006. Print.

Toothman, Jessika . "Do animals have emotions?." *Animals Facts*. n. page. Web. 11 Apr.

2013. <<http://animal.discovery.com/animal-facts/animals-have-emotions.htm>>.

Green, L., Costello, L, and Dare, J. "Veganism, Health Expectancy, and the Communication of Sustainability." *Australian Journal of Communication* 37.3 (2010): 51-

72. *ProQuest*. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

Warrick, Joby. "'They Die Piece by Piece'; In Overtaxed Plants, Humane Treatment of Cattle

Is Often a Battle Lost ." *Washington Post*. (2001): n. page. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

<<http://tucovegs.blogspot.com/2007/03/from-washington-post-in-2001.html>>.

"10 Main Reasons for going VEGAN." *Vegan Wolf*. n. page. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

<http://www.veganwolf.com/reasons_to_be_vegan.htm>.