

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
2018/19 1st semester
UGEC2858 Animals and Society: A Philosophical Approach
Course Outline

Instructor: Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson & Dr. Wong Kim Fan
Time: Lecture-Tuesday 16:30-18:15; Tutorial- TBA
Venue: Lecture-UCC C2; Tutorial- TBA

Course overview:

This course examines the social issues of animal from the philosophical perspectives. What are the key differences between humans and other animals? Is it ethical to raise and slaughter animals for food, conduct tests on, and buying or keeping animals as pets? How ought one to respond to unethical laws on animals? What are the social impacts of these actions? Students will develop an interdisciplinary perspective in the fields of human animal studies, sociology, ethical theory and environmental philosophy by understanding how ancient and contemporary philosophers, sociologist, environmental scientists, ecologists, activists, and journalists have responded to key ethical questions concerning animal and its social implication. Topics to be discussed include: animal-machines, ethical meat eating, radical vegetarianism, and the evolution of pets.

本課程旨在從哲學角度探究有關動物的社會議題。人類與動物的根本差別是甚麼？飼養與殺害動物食用、以動物做實驗、買賣與養寵物等行為是否合乎道德？我們應該如何回應對動物的惡法？這些行動對社會有何影響？本課程會探討古代與當代哲學家、社會學家、環境科學家、生態學家、激進主義分子、記者如何回應動物權益的道德議題及其社會影響，並從動物研究、社會學、倫理學、與環境哲學等跨學科的角度去分析各種動物議題。討論的焦點包括：動物機器說、肉食道德說、極端素食主義、寵物進化論等。

Learning outcomes:

Upon completion of the course, students will be able to:

- cite the major arguments in the current philosophical debates over the social and moral status of nonhuman animals, and understand the strengths and weakness of each;
- recount the historical, scientific, social and cultural contexts of the debate;
- discuss the broad range of animal exploitation and the moral issues that each form of it raises;
- form a conclusion about the ethics of using animals and defend it with a strong, logical argument.

Learning activities and workload:

- 1. Lecture:** 2 hours each week.
- 2. Interactive tutorial:** one 2-hour session every two weeks. Students are required to discuss and present reading material assigned.

Assessment:

Task nature	Description	Weight
Tutorial	Discussion and Presentation	30%
Mid-term Assignment	Take home Reflective Journal	30%
Final Paper	Term Paper (2800-3800 words)	40%

Details of course website:

Lecture notes and information on assignments will be posted on the Blackboard Learn website.

Topics and Course schedule:

Week	Date	Topic	Remarks
1	Sept 4	Introduction: Why Animals matter?	
2	Sept 11	The Animal-Human Borders & Domestication of Animals	
3	Sept 18	The Social Representation of Animals	1 st Tutorial The Domestication of Animals
4	Sept 25	Public Holiday	
5	Oct 2	The Moral Status of Animals: Utilitarian, Kant and Right-based Approach	2 nd Tutorial The Animal-Human Borders
6	Oct 9	The Moral Status of Animals: Capabilities, Virtue Ethics and Difference Thesis Approach	
7	Oct 16	Animals as Food: Meat industry, Meat Culture and Vegetarianism as a Social Movement	3 rd Tutorial The Moral Status of Animals
8	Oct 23	Animals as Food: The ethics of meat eating	Mid-term Assignment Deadline
9	Oct 30	Animals as Tool: Zoos and Entertainment	4 th Tutorial Ethics of meat eating
10	Nov 6	Animals as Tool: Animal Experiment and Animal-Assisted Activities	
11	Nov 13	Animals as family member: Commodification and keeping pets	5 th Tutorial Ethics of Animal Experiment and Animal-Assisted Activities
12	Nov 20	Animals as family member: <i>Pet-o-phia</i> and The Death of pets	
13	Nov 27	Conclusion: Peaceful Co-existence? Animals as Citizen?	6 th Tutorial Ethics of keeping pets

Reference:

Baggini, Julian. *The virtue of table: How to Eat and Think*. Granta Books, 2014.

Bekoff, Marc and Pierce, Jessica. *Wild Justice-The Moral Lives of Animals*. The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Caras, Roger A. *A Perfect Harmony: The Intertwining Lives of Animals and Humans Throughout History*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.

Carruthers, Peter. *Animal Issue. Moral Theory in Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Chignell, Andrew, Terrence Cuneo & Matthew C. Halteman. eds. *Philosophy Comes to Dinner: Arguments About the Ethics of Eating*. New York: Routledge, 2016

Cohen, Carl & Regan, Tom. *The Animal Rights Debate*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001.

Damron, W. Stephen. *Introduction to Animal Science: Global, Biological, Social, and Industry Perspective*. 5th Edition. Boston: Pearson, 2013.

DeMello, Margo. *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Department of Defense. ed. *U.S. Military Working Dog Training Handbook*. USA: Morris Book, 2013.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008

Diamond, Jared M. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies (1st edition)*, W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Flynn, Clifton P. Ed. *Social Creatures: A Human and Animal Studies Reader*. New York: Lantern Books, 2008.

Franklin, Adrian. *Animals and modern culture*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage 1999

Foer, Jonathan Safran. *Eating Animals*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009.

Grimm, David. *Citizen Canine. Our Evolving Relationship with Cats and Dogs*. USA: PublicAffairs, 2014.

Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Empathy. An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. USA: Lantern Books, 2015.

Harari, Yuval Noah. *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. New York: HarperCollins, 2015.

Herzog, Hal. *Some We Love, Some We Hate, Some We Eat*. USA: HarperCollins, 2010.

Hursthouse, Rosalind. *Ethics, Humans and Other Animals*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Kagan, Shelly. "What's Wrong with Speciesism"? *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 33:1, 2016, pp. 1-21.

Mappes, Thomas A. and Zembaty, Jane S. *Social Ethics: Morality and Social Policy*, 7th edition. McGraw Hill Higher Education, 2006

McCance, Dawne, *Critical Animal Studies: An Introduction*. State University of New York Press, Albany, 2013.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, and Species Membership*. USA: First Harvard University Press, 2007.

Pierce, Jessica. *Run, Spot, Run: The Ethics of Keeping Pets*. Chicago: Chicago Press, 2016.

Pinker, Steven. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. Penguin Books. 2012.

Pollan, Michael. *The Omnivore's Dilemma*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2011.

Regan, Tom. *The Case for Animals Rights*. USA: University of California Press, 1992.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. New York: HaperCollins, 2009.

Singer, Peter. "Why Speciesism is Wrong: A Response to Kagan". *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 33:1, 2016, pp. 31-35

Singer, Peter & Jim Mason. *The Ethics of What We Eat*. USA: Holtzbrinck, 2006.

Taylor, Nik. *Humans, Animals, and Society, An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies.* New York: Lantern Books, 2013

Waldau, Paul. *Animal Studies: An Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Williams, Erin E. & Demello, Margo. *Why animals matter: the case for animal protection.* New York: Prometheus Books, 2007.

Zaraska, Marta. *Meathooked: the History and Science of Our 2.5-million-year Obsession with Meat.* New York: Basic Books, 2016.

哈拉瑞著，林俊宏譯，《人類大歷史：從野獸到扮演上帝》。台灣：天下文化，2014年。

史蒂芬·平克著，顏涵銳、徐立妍譯，《人性中的良善天使：暴力如何從我們的世界中逐漸消失》。台北：遠流出版社，2016年。

法蘭斯·德瓦爾著，楊仕音、林雅玲、顧曉哲譯，《你不知道我們有多聰明：動物思考的時候，人類能學到什麼？》。台北：馬可孛羅文化，2017年。

哈爾·賀札格著，李奧森譯，《為什麼狗是寵物豬是食物：人類與動物之間的道德難題》。台北：遠足文化，2016年。

大衛·葛林姆著，周怡伶譯，《貓狗的逆襲：荊棘滿途的公民之路》。台北：新樂園，2016年。

索妮亞·法樂頂著，范堯寬、曹嫵恆譯，《傷心農場 — 從印尼到墨西哥，一段直擊動物生活實況的震撼之旅》。台北：商務印書館，2016年。

羅伯特·馬吉歐里著，楊智清譯，《哲學家與動物》。南京：社會科學文獻出版社，2017年。

潔西卡·皮爾斯著，祁毓里、李宜勳譯，《學會愛你的寵物伴侶》。台北：商周出版社，2016年。

唐克龍，《中國現當代文學動物敘事研究》。天津：南開大學出版社，2010年。

黃宗潔，《牠鄉何處？——城市·動物與文學》。臺北：新學林，2017年。

陳燕遐、潘淑華編，《「牠」者再定義：人與動物關係的轉變》。香港：三聯書店有限公司，2018年。

Feedback for evaluation:

1. Students are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the course via email or meetings with lecturer.
2. Students evaluate the course through a survey and written comments at the end of the term as well as via regular feedback between teacher and students.

Academic honesty and plagiarism:

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed **declaration** that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. For group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students' uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the receipt will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.

Contact:

Lecturer	
Name:	Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson
Office Location:	KHB 414
Consultation Hours	Tue 14:30-16:00
Telephone:	3943-1519
Email:	samsonkpn@cuhk.edu.hk
Name:	Dr. Wong Kim Fan
Email:	kimfan@netvigator.com
Tutor	
Name:	Kwan Ho Chuen
Office Location:	KHB 411
Consultation Hours	Mon 10:30-13:30
Email:	chuen726@hotmail.com

Grade Descriptors for Tutorial Performance

Attendance: Note that marks cannot be given for mere attendance, but marks may be deducted for absences.

[Excellent] A (85-92) Or [Very Good] A- (80-84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You concisely explain the relevant material in a way that clarifies how the various pieces are meant to fit together. - You raise and clearly explain your own insightful questions of interpretation about the material. - You raise and clearly explain your own challenging yet fair objections to the material. - You construct charitable replies on the author's behalf to your points, and provide your own rejoinders. - You carefully discuss the significant of your points and their theoretical or practical implications. - In discussion, you demonstrate a willingness to share newly formed ideas, and you effectively begin to develop ideas on the spot through constructive yet critical interaction with others.
[Good] B+ (76-79), B (72-75) or B-(68-71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of material contains minor errors, or is correct but adds little or nothing. - Questions/objections are relevant, but obvious. - Author's reply is absent or oversimplified. - Implications are not discussed or are only briefly explained. - Good effort at discussion, but hesitant to take risks and has difficulty developing ideas on the spot.
[Fair] C+ (64-67) C (60-63) or C-(56-59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of material contains significant errors and oversights. - Questions/objections are often confused or unclear. - Author's reply is absent or mistaken. - Implications are not discussed or are confused or unclear. - Little or no effort at discussion.
[Pass] D+ (53-55) D (50-52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You attend and show a reasonable interest in the discussion and a willingness to participate minimally if called upon.

Grade Description for Essays

	Argument	Theory Analysis	Writing Style
[Excellent] A (85-92) Or [Very Good] A- (80-84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You provide a detailed and specific thesis statement that clearly describes the main claim(s) you will be arguing for and indicates how and what you plan to say adds something to the discussion, rather than mostly repeating the material we have read. - You defend your claims in a well-developed way by giving and explaining your reasons for your position. - You identify likely objections, present them charitably and respond to them effectively. - You carefully explain the theoretical and/or practical implications of your argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You provide an accurate account of the relevant parts of the theory. - You illuminate the relationship between the theory's conclusion(s) and its arguments. - You quote relevant key passages with proper citations. - You define key terms, and explain their role and how they relate to each other. - You discuss what the thinker would probably have said about an issue by drawing on what he/she did say about other related matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You choose your words carefully. The language is precise rather than vague, natural rather than awkward, straightforward rather than ostentations. - Each piece of the essay is presented in a way that makes it clear to the reader how it is relevant to your thesis - Where appropriate, you use real or hypothetical examples to help illustrate abstract points.
[Good] B+ (76-79), B (72-75) or B-(68-71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious. - The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defense are merely asserted. - Some key objections are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief. - Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are minor inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some small points are overlooked. - The theory's arguments for its conclusion(s) are described, but the relationship between them is not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. - Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. - Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity. - The relevance of small parts of the essay is not made clear. - Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.
[Fair] C+ (64-67) C (60-63) or C-(56-59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused. - The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defense are merely asserted. - Objections are not considered, or they are only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective. - Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. - The argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked. - The theory's conclusion(s) are described without reference to its argument. - Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations. - Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is often unclear, due to being vague or awkward or ostentatious. - The relevance of significant parts of the essay is not made clear. - Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all.
[Pass] D+ (53-55) D (50-52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The student demonstrates an awareness of what an argument is, and tries to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The student grasps at least the main features of some of the theory's most important points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is intelligible more often than not.