

Bryan McGrath  
English 110 - G  
4/5/19

### Consider This

The definition of considerate is stated as “thoughtful of the rights and feelings of others”. When looking back on the claims of David Foster Wallace concerning the underlying thoughts and position of the life of the lobster and their inevitable fate, it is naive to not question the consideration of these animals. After taking a closer look at articles including “What the Crows Know”, by Ross Andersen and Hal Herzog’s “Animals Like Us”, the idea of consideration in the process of the American food industry regarding the lives and “feelings” of these animals is tainted. It is evident in these three articles that these animals have the awareness and recognition of what is going on but as a culture across the nation it is not seen and prioritized by the mass population. This shows the overall and underlying point that as a society people in general tend to prioritize their feelings in a way that they either turn a blind eye or do not care as long as it benefits them to an extent. Consideration applies to the mass of the knowing, from these articles it shown that these animals do indeed know which shows the lack of consideration and superiority that at least in America society feels over the natural human beings.

In David Foster Wallace’s article, “Consider the Lobster”, he talks about the Maine Lobster Festival and the impact of the copious amounts of lobster that is killed and eaten at this event annually. In this article he dives into the different tasks and ways in which the lobsters, living breathing animals, are killed for the mass enjoyment of all the people who attend this event. Wallace talks about the boiling alive of these

**Commented [JM1]:** Really good hook here, be sure to include where you got this information from.

**Commented [2]:** This is a nice start to your introduction but try to include the text you are referencing from David Foster Wallace. While our class would understand what story you are bringing into your argument, someone else might get confused if you just include the author and not the text you will be referencing.

**Commented [JM3]:**

**Commented [JM4R3]:** You did a really good job here of connecting the three article together and ensuring all of their viewpoint are recognized.

**Commented [JM5]:** Be sure to include a clear thesis here, there is a little confusion on what you are trying to have your thesis be.

**Commented [6]:** Interesting thesis. I like the idea of bringing in the people who turn a blind eye to an aware problem as well as saying that those who consider are looking into this situation, but what those who didn't know this situation like Foer in "Against the Meat" where he didn't know chicken was chicken?

**Commented [7]:** Right here, I feel you could include what makes the lobster seem to be living in our eyes as human beings. I would try to include how the lobster "thrashes around" on page 6 paragraph 3 to provide an idea of how the lobster is "living."

creatures and the torture that these lobsters are put through in their last living moments. This calls into question the consideration of the chef and the mass population in general when it comes down to the killing of animals for personal enjoyment. From this article reveals a speculation that the process in which this event is held and the process in which the killing of these creatures is not taken into consideration at all. The pain and suffering of what the lobsters endure is not something that is given any sympathy towards them. This shows that as a society, especially in the food industry shown in this article, is a scenario in which we as people do what is best for us without the consideration of the animals present who do indeed know more than the society perceives when it comes to their surroundings. It is expected since these creatures know what is going on they simply do not prefer to be boiled alive but society turns a blind eye to this because it would hinder their personal gain in the effectiveness of killing them for food. In David Foster Wallace's article concerning the livelihood and the traumatic way in which these creatures are murdered, and in the case of the Maine Lobster Festival mass murdered, it reveals the way in which society especially today turns the blind eye without much consideration of these living breathing creatures that do indeed realize and understand what they do go through even though they may not feel all of the pain in the process.

In Ross Andersen's article, "What the Crow Knows", he talks about the consciousness of the animals and the involvement of how these animals know what is going on in their surroundings and their ability to understand what is happening. Andersen specifically talks about different bird species experiences, "A grey parrot once amassed a 900-word vocabulary, and in India, a few have been trained to recite the

**Commented [JM8]:**

**Commented [JM9R8]:** Here you could consider including a direct quote from the article that gives the lobster more of a meaningful attachment as a living creature who feels pain.

**Commented [10]:** While I like how you are summarizing "Consider the Lobster," I feel that you can include a text-on-text moment by including what Wallace says in the article about this suffering of the lobster and what you think about this idea whether you agree, disagree, or undecided. On page 6 paragraph 3 there is a part where they describe the lobster "coming to life in boiling water" that you could include or bring up the "cerebral cortex" on page 5 paragraph 4.

**Commented [JM11]:** Although I really enjoy this piece of your essay, I believe you could reword it differently, it is almost a little repetitive at some moments. Maybe adding a quotation then elaborate what you believe it demonstrates could be used here.

**Commented [12]:** While I like the idea of what your going for in this paragraph, your own voice seems to be missing on this topic. Once you include a quote, try to describe what you think of this idea of consideration and why people look away from this situation.

**Commented [JM13]:** I do think that introducing the article is very important, maybe considering putting this into your intro so you can more solely focus on your elaboration of your thesis instead.

Vedic mantras. But birds have only rarely assembled verbal symbols into their own, original proto-sentences". This quotation shows the overwhelming development of how these birds have evolved and their level of comprehension and consciousness. This research and findings from Anderson in this article show that since the birds and animals in general are shown to be understanding what is going on around them the consideration that us as a society project onto these animals is relatively non-existent. This takes into question the thought of what as a society are we willing to turn a blind eye towards. In "Animals like Us", Herzog presents the example of one woman explaining that she is a vegetarian but only eats fish is a complicated twist and red flag in the thought process of the society towards animals and the use of them for food. By saying one is a vegetarian but only eats fish is not only a contradiction but also questions why she is able to turn the blind eye to fish who still do indeed know and understand their surroundings and still try to hold onto the values of not killing animals instead. To be considerate is to know and understand the ones who surround you rather it be an animal or a human or even a fish and mammals in general. Andersen helps explain the research and science that is brought into the discussion about what animals in general can understand and explains even more that society as a whole continues to turn a blind eye towards it for the benefit of themselves.

When one talks about the rights of another human being it is the freedom of unlawful torture, imprisonment and execution. In the case for animal rights it is the act of fair and humane treatment which is to say that are marked as sympathetic, compassionate and considerate towards those animals. In Andersen's article, "What the Crow Knows", about the science behind what animals actually know helps pave the way

**Commented [14]:** e

**Commented [JM15]:** Really good support of evidence here.

**Commented [16]:** While I like that it connects back to your thesis, try to include how this relates with Wallace's idea of consideration. What are the similarities between each text you are referencing?

**Commented [JM17]:** Maybe divide these two sections into two paragraphs just because the paragraph is long.

**Commented [18]:** I would make this its own separate paragraph due to bringing in someone else's conversation. This should help with the flow of your paper when bringing in another person's perspective.

**Commented [19]:** Instead of woman say Judith Black

**Commented [20]:** I like where you are going with this idea but I think you should include text of when Judith Black and her husband were arguing and how she began to change her mind (to show how she became considerate) as they continued to argue for 3 years.

**Commented [JM21]:** Consider adding in a quote here to really strengthen your point.

**Commented [JM22]:** Good comparison, maybe see if you can then connect it to the thesis.

for the retrospective violation that David Foster Wallace presents about boiling alive the lobster that society as a whole is willing to turn the blind eye towards. The question is, are we personally alright with the violation of these animals not being given humane rights if it concludes with personal benefit? In Herzog's article, "Animals Like Us", he describes numerous variations of examples of people trying to rectify or to the best of their ability help out this problem that they see. Although he describes example of numerous people switching on and off the vegetarian or peccatarian lifestyle, it is no benefit to the issue as a whole and even has its own underlying problems as well. The major concept is that as a society we still deep down perceive to reveal this survival of the fittest mentality that does not take in consideration the human rights of animals if it prevents an individual from their desired dinner. As people we are animals too, survival of the fittest is and will always be ingrained in our blood. The question is, will this thought process of restricting human rights towards animals evolve into one that strips the human being from human rights. That's the next step. Is society creating a scenario in which we will eventually take that step?

\*

\*\*Dear Bryan,

Overall, I found this is an excellent start to your paper. I would consider just double checking your grammar, and be sure to be consistent with the spelling of Andersen's name. I think that all of your points are very strong and think with a little more elaboration of your descriptions the paper can really be strengthened. Also, be sure to include some more textual evidence, direct quotes used correctly can really bring in the readers attention to others views, outside of your own statements in the paper. I think I can see where you want this paper to go, and with just a little more time you will get it straight.

**Commented [23]:** I like this question that you present to the reader because this is not an easy answer for the reader. Continue to do this done the line when writing your paper and conclusion.

**Commented [JM24]:** This is a really good point, consider bringing in more evidence from the text itself to explain the claim even further.

**Commented [25]:** Dear Bryan,  
Overall I found your paper is in a good place right now. You are able to go in-depth with the articles abstract ideas while saying question the promote the reader to think about the moral dilemma that is presented. Where I feel you are lacking in is the inclusion of text evidence to enhance your points that you are making. Due to the lack of quote, I feel you don't have as many text-on-text moments that you could have. Beside that, you have a couple grammar errors and flow issues. Once you fix those issues you should be good to go.  
-Alex Smyth