

**PHIL 296 Animals and Society**  
**Winter 2019**

**Course Time:** Mondays 10:00-11:30; Wednesdays 8:30-10:00

**Course Location:** Kinesiology 101

**Instructor:** Agnes Tam

Office: Watson 337

Email: [13nyt@queensu.ca](mailto:13nyt@queensu.ca)

Office Hours: Wed 10:15-11:45

**Teaching Assistant:** Ryan Wilcox

Office: Watson 321

Email: [16rw15@queensu.ca](mailto:16rw15@queensu.ca)

Office Hours: By Email Appointment

**Course Description**

While the scientific understanding of animal cognition, emotion, and sociability has evolved significantly over the past decades, our social institutions and practices in relation to animals remain more or less exploitative. We continue to raise and kill animals for human purposes, destroy their habitat, and drive species into extinction. As a part of the burgeoning and interdisciplinary field of animal studies, this course examines human-animal interactions in our social practices, urban spaces, capitalist economies, liberal-democratic politics, and legal systems. As a philosophical inquiry, this course introduces a wide range of normative frameworks to critically evaluate these human-animal interactions and identify ways to improve them.

Our philosophical inquiry is a five-part journey. In Part I, we begin the journey by diagnosing the status quo. We ask whether there is anything wrong to domesticate animals as pets, breed and kill animals for their meat, disenfranchise animals in the political processes or treat animals as properties in the law, given that animals are thinking, feeling and social beings. In Part II, we look at moral theories (e.g. utilitarianism, deontology) that answer these questions in terms of the *intrinsic moral status* of animals. In Part III, we look at moral theories (e.g. deep ecology, care ethics) that answer the questions in terms of the *relations* humans have with animals. In Part IV, we take a political turn of animal ethics and examine theories that answer the questions with distinctively *political categories* (e.g. dignity, citizenship, exploitation). In Part V, moving from theory to practice, we explore both obstacles and opportunities to enable progress for animals. Drawing on social epistemology, psychology, and history, we examine how cognitive bias, power, and social norms obstruct our ability to recognize animal subjectivity and revise judgments about our obligations to animals. We look at how interspecies community building and collective action can possibly challenge power and destabilize norms.

**Class Format**

The course will be conducted through a mix of lectures and group activities. There are no tutorials. For each part of the philosophical inquiry (except for Part I), we begin with lectures to learn philosophical theories and end with a student-led group activity (e.g. presentation, debate) to apply theories to solve a selected practical problem (e.g. Is meat-eating morally wrong? Should we police nature?). To do well in this course, students must read the essential readings in advance and be prepared to critically discuss the material in class.

## **Learning Outcomes**

1. *Identify* key thinkers, concepts, and theoretical positions in philosophy that evaluate the appropriateness, meaning, and value of human-animal interactions in society.
2. *Explain* key concepts and theories covered in the course, including their central features, strengths and shortcomings, and the ways in which they complement or contrast one another.
3. *Critically assess* the role of animals in current social institutions and practices through application of theories.
4. *Understand* real-world obstacles and opportunities to implement moral progress for animals.
5. Develop *independent* reasoning skills – to form, revise, express and defend one’s own views in written assignments by engaging with course materials.
6. Develop *collaborative* reasoning skills – to exchange ideas, share perspectives, and respond to peers’ questions, suggestions, comments and criticisms by partaking group activities.

## **Assessment**

Students’ final grade will be calculated on the basis of three pieces of assessed work, weighted as follows:

	Assessment	Weight	Date
1.	Group Activities	25% (+5% bonus)	See Course Schedule
2.	Short-Question Mid-Term	35%	Feb 25 <sup>th</sup>
3.	Final Take Home Theory Essay	40%	Apr 17th

### **1. In-Class Group Activities**

Each student will be assigned to a group of five to eight once the add/drop period ends. Each group will be assigned a particular topic. The exact nature of each activity varies. Details of each activity can be found in the course outline. Generally speaking, each activity is related to a real-world problem. Groups are expected to apply relevant theories or concepts learned in lectures to either articulate the problem, or solve the problem, or both. With the help of the TA, members of each group are expected to meet, discuss, exchange reasons and evidence, formulate arguments together and present their group consensus to the whole class. Each member is expected to contribute equally to the process, although it is up to the group to divide their cognitive labor. The non-presenting groups are expected to raise questions, comments and suggestions, to which presenting groups are expected to respond. The objectives of the group activities are to provide students chance to be active in learning, to collaborate, and to appreciate the relevance of theories in the real world.

Each group activity is assessed on a pass/fail basis. If the group passes, all group members receive 25%. If the group fails, all group members receive 0%. A bonus 5% will be accredited to groups with exceptional performances. Exceptional performances involve the demonstration of organizational skills, coherence and clarity in argumentation, and engagement of the audience. In case of free-rider complaints, each member of the group is required to complete and submit a peer-assessment form

(see Appendix II) for herself and each of her peers. The peer assessment will be the evidential basis upon which the course instructor and the TA adjust the grade to fairly reflect individual contribution.

## 2. Short-Answer Mid-Term Exam

The mid-term assignment will be a one and a half hour exam. The objective of the assignment is to test students' basic understanding of key concepts and theories covered in Week 1 to 7. All course materials covered in lectures, group activities and essential readings are examinable. The questions will be straightforward, requiring short answers only. For example, "Define speciesism." For another example, "Identify two reasons why environmental ethics can be said in conflict with animal rights."

## 3. Take-home Final Essay

Students are expected to write a critical essay independently. Each essay comprises two components: interpretative and evaluative. The objective of the assignment is to test students' understanding of a key concept or aspect of a theory and ability to critique. Good essays will critically engage with the course materials and develop a line of argument, reaching a clear conclusion. Research is not required but further readings provided in the syllabus may help students develop their own original arguments. See Appendix I for a rough grading rubric.

Three default essay topics will be announced in due course. Alternatively, students may come up with their own question which draws upon the themes and ideas covered in weeks 6 to 12 of the course. The question must be philosophical in character, but may draw from a variety of disciplines. Students who wish to do this must seek approval from the course instructor **at least 10 days** in advance of the essay due-date. Only essays answering questions which have been approved by the course instructor may be submitted.

Essays should be between 2500-3000 words, excluding bibliographies. Essays longer than 3200 words will lose 10%. Essays longer than 3500 words will lose 20%. Essays longer than 4000 words will not be marked and will receive a grade of 0%.

The essay is due at 23:59 on April 17<sup>th</sup>. It must be submitted to the appropriate dropbox on OnQ. If the submission is late, the essay will receive a late penalty (-5% per day). However, no late assignment will be accepted after three days (72 hours). In case of extenuating circumstances, students should inform the course instructor as soon as possible **and** apply for extension via <http://www.queensu.ca/studentwellness/home/forms/extenuating-circumstances>.

## **Classroom Expectations**

Our philosophical inquiry is essentially a joint one, among the course instructor, the TA, and each individual student. Yet, we are an ideologically and culturally diverse group of people. Some of the topics explored in class are controversial. Disagreement is to be expected and not avoided. Disagreement, if taken up appropriately, is an opportunity to explore new perspectives and challenge one's own views. To foster a space for constructive, respectful, and inclusive joint inquiry, please meet the following expectations:

1. Be attentive. Attend all lectures and group activities. Read all essential readings prior to class.

2. Be charitable. Interpret a speaker's statement in the most rational way possible. In case of disagreement, consider the best, strongest possible interpretation.
3. Be helpful. Raise questions, suggestions and comments about course materials to advance shared understanding.

### **Academic Integrity**

Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery, and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen's. Plagiarism on any part of any assignment can result in automatic failure. I may use turnitin.com to analyze your assignments for evidence of plagiarism. Knowing what academic integrity is and what counts as plagiarism is your responsibility as a member of Queen's academic community. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar (see Academic Regulation 1 <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-1>), on the Arts and Science website (see <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academics/undergraduate/academic-integrity>), and from the instructor of this course.

### **Accessibility and accommodations**

Queen's University is committed to achieving full accessibility for persons with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all of their academic activities. If you are a student with a disability and think you may need accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact Student Wellness Services (SWS) and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the Student Wellness website at: <http://www.queensu.ca/studentwellness/accessibility-services>

### **Academic Considerations for Students in Extenuating Circumstances**

The Senate Policy on Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances (<http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.uslclwww/files/files/policies/senateandtrustees/Academic%20Considerations%20for%20Extenuating%20Circumstances%20Policy%20Final.pdf>) was approved in April, 2017. Queen's University is committed to providing academic consideration to students experiencing extenuating circumstances that are beyond their control and which have a direct and substantial impact on their ability to meet essential academic requirements. Each Faculty has developed a protocol to provide a consistent and equitable approach in dealing with requests for academic consideration for students facing extenuating circumstances. Arts and Science undergraduate students can find the Faculty of Arts and Science protocol and the portal where they submit a request at: <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/accommodations>. Students in other Faculties and Schools should refer to the protocol for their home Faculty.

## Course Schedule

WK	DATE	TOPIC	Note
1	Jan 7	Lecture 1: Who Are Animals? A View from Science	
	Jan 9	Lecture 2: Who Are Animals? A View from Societies	
2	Jan 14	Lecture 3: Utilitarianism – Injury of Welfare?	
	Jan 16	Lecture 4: Deontology – Violation of Rights?	
3	Jan 21	Lecture 5: Is Abolition the Solution?	
	Jan 23	Group Activity 1: Is Meat-Eating Morally Wrong?	Gp 1 &2
4	Jan 28	Lecture 6: Environmental Ethics: Thinking from Biological Communities	
	Jan 30	Lecture 7: Feminist Ethics: Thinking from Relations of Care	
5	Feb 4	Lecture 8: Capabilities: Denial of Flourishing and Dignity?	
	Feb 6	Group Activity 2: Should We Police Nature?	Gp 3 &4
6	Feb 11	Lecture 9: Zoopolis: Denial of Citizenship?	
	Feb 13	Lecture 10: Zoopolis: Denial of Denizenship and Sovereignty?	
7	<i>Reading Week</i>		
8	Feb 25	Mid Term Exam	
	Feb 27	Lecture 11: Democracy: Denial of Political Agency?	
9	Mar 4	Lecture 12: Power: War and Domination?	
	Mar 6	Group Activity 3: Keeping cat as pet is morally wrong.	Gp 5 &6
10	Mar 11	Lecture 13: Obstacles to Change: Power and Bias	
	Mar 13	Lecture 14: Obstacles to Change: Social Norm and Conformity	
11	Mar 18	Group Activity 4: a) Bias and Animals; and b) What is it to be a Liminal Animal in Kingston?	Gp 7 Gp 8
	Mar 20	Lecture 15: Multiculturalism (Guest lecture)	
12	Mar 25	Lecture 16: Social Change via Community Building? (Guest lecture)	
	Mar 27	Lecture 17: Social Change via Civil Disobedience	
13	Apr 1	Group Activity 5: Animal Work as a Site for Enacting Interspecies Membership?	Gp 9&10
	Apr 3	Review for Take-Home Exam	

## Course Outline and Readings

### Part I: Diagnosing the Status Quo

---

#### Lecture 1: Who Are Animals? A View from Contemporary Science

##### Essential Reading:

- Course syllabus

##### Further Reading:

- The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness, available at <http://fcmconference.org/img/CambridgeDeclarationOnConsciousness.pdf>
- DeMello, Margo. "Animal-Human Borders." In *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*, pp. 32-41. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Safina, Carl. *Beyond Words: What Animals Think and Feel*. New York: Picador, 2016.
- Andrews, Kristin, and Jacob Beck. *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Animal Minds*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2018.

##### Suggested Films:

- Carl Safina's Ted Talk on What Are Animals Thinking and Feeling, available at [https://www.ted.com/talks/carl\\_safina\\_what\\_are\\_animals\\_thinking\\_and\\_feeling#t-766947](https://www.ted.com/talks/carl_safina_what_are_animals_thinking_and_feeling#t-766947)
- Inside the Animal Mind (Streaming available on Summon)

#### Lecture 2: Who Are Animals? A View from Contemporary Societies

##### Essential Reading:

- DeMello, Margo. "Human-Animal Studies." In *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*, pp. 3-28. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

##### Further Reading:

- DeMello, Margo. "The Social Construction of Animals." In *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*, pp. 44-56. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Peggs, Kay. *Animals and Sociology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

## Part II: Thinking from Intrinsic Moral Status

---

### Lecture 3: Utilitarianism – Injury of Welfare?

#### Essential Reading:

- Singer, Peter. “All Animals are Equal.” *Philosophic Exchange* 5, no. 1 (1974): 103-16.

#### Further Reading:

- Matheny, Gaverick. “Utilitarianism and Animals.” In *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer, pp. 13-25. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.
- Singer, Peter. “Killing Humans, Killing Animals.” *Inquiry* 22 (1979): 145-156.
- Kagan, Shelly. “Singer on Killing Animals.” In *The Ethics of Killing Animals*, edited by Robert Garner and Tatyana Visak, pp. 136-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Williams, Bernard. “The Human Prejudice.” In *Peter Singer Under Fire*, edited by Jeffrey A. Schaler, pp. 77-96. Chicago, IL: Open Court, 2009. Available at: <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/gmoran/WILLIAMS.pdf>

### Lecture 4: Deontology - Violation of Rights?

#### Essential Reading:

- Tom Regan, The Case for Animal Rights, in *The Animal Ethics Reader* (Susan J. Armstrong and Richard G. Botzler eds. 2017) pp. 15-22

#### Further Reading:

- Korsgaard, Christine M. “A Kantian Case for Animal Rights.” In *The Ethics of Killing Animals*, edited by Tatjana Visak & Robert Garner, pp. 154-178. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. “Universal Basic Rights for Animals.” In *The Animal Ethics Reader*, edited by Susan J. Armstrong and Richard G. Botzler, pp. 53-65. Oxford: Routledge, 2016.
- Edmundson, William A. “Do Animals Need Rights?” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23, no. 3 (2015): 345-360.
- Scruton, Roger. “The Moral Status of Animals.” In *Animal Rights and Wrongs*, pp. 59-85. London: Metro Press/Demos, 2000.

### Lecture 5: Is Abolition the Solution?

#### Essential Reading:

- Francione, Gary. “Animals – Property or Persons?” In *Animals as Persons: Essays on the Abolition of Animal Exploitation*, pp. 25-66. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Cochrane, Alasdair. “Ownership and Justice for Animals.” *Utilitas* 21, no. 4 (2009): 424-442.

#### Further Reading:

- Francione, Gary and Robert Garner. *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Waldau, Paul. "How Do Moral Rights Differ from Legal Rights?" In *Animal Rights: What Everyone Needs to Know*, pp. 57-61. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Deckha, Maneesha. "Critical Animal Studies and Animal Law" *Animal Law* 18, no. 2 (2012): 207- 223.

### Group Activity 1: Is Meat-Eating Morally Wrong?

**Group Task:** Group 1 and 2 lead the class discussion on whether meat-eating is morally wrong.

Group 1 opens the class by presenting a case for the thesis that meat-eating is morally wrong. Build the case by using the strongest argument from the intrinsic moral status of animals as discussed in lectures 3 and 4. The recommended reading will prove resourceful, although students need not necessarily adopt the authors' arguments. Possible lines of argument include a. being a subject-of-a-life is sufficient for the right to life; and b. morality is about maximization of aggregate welfare, and given the fact of factory farming, meat-eating fails to maximize the aggregate welfare and frustrate our moral goal. There are many more. Choose one and no more than two. Group 1 should speak for roughly 20 minutes and spend 10 minutes to respond to questions from the audience. Since this is not a debate, Group 1 is not expected to respond to Group 2's arguments.

#### Recommended reading:

- DeGrazia, David. "Moral Vegetarianism from a Very Broad Basis." *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 6 (2009): 143-165.
- Rachels, James. "The Basic Argument for Vegetarianism." in Sapontzis (ed.) 2004: 70–80

**Group 2** then presents a case against the thesis that meat-eating is morally wrong. Build the case by showing how the arguments from intrinsic moral status of animals do not support the thesis. Our discussions in lectures 3 and 4 and the recommended reading below will prove resourceful. Possible lines of argument include a. going vegetarian does not, in fact, maximize welfare even if welfare maximization is the moral goal; b. going vegetarian may maximize welfare, but maximizing aggregate welfare is not a proper moral goal; and c. meat-eating is not *always* wrong because...Again, choose one argument and no more than two. Group 2 should speak for roughly 20 minutes and spend 10 minutes to respond to questions from the audience. Since this is not a debate, Group 2 is not expected to respond to Group 1's arguments.

#### Recommended reading:

- Lamey, Andy. "Food fight! Davis versus Regan on the Ethics of Eating Beef." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38, no. 2 (2007): 331-48.
- Pollan, Michael. "The Ethics of Eating Animals." In *The Omnivore's Dilemma*, pp. 304-333. New York: Penguin Press, 2006.



## Part III: From Intrinsic Moral Status to Relations

---

### Lecture 6: Environmental Ethics – Thinking from the Biological Community?

#### Essential Reading:

- Callicott, J. Baird. “Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair.” In *The Animal Rights/Environmental Ethics Debate: The Environmental Perspective*, edited by Eugene C. Hargrove, pp. 37-70. New York: SUNY Press, 1992.

#### Further Reading:

- Smith, Mick. “Deep Ecology: What is Said and (to be) Done?” *The Trumpeter* 30, no. 2 (2014): 141-156.
- Jamieson, Dale. “Animal Liberation is an Environmental Ethic.” *Environmental Values* 7, no. 1 (1998): 41-57.
- Taylor, Paul W. 1981. “The Ethics of Respect for Nature.” *Environmental Ethics* 3, no. 3 (1981): 197-218.

### Lecture 7: Feminist Ethics – Thinking from Relations of Care?

#### Essential Reading

- Donovan, Josephine. “Feminism and the Treatment of Animals: From Care to Dialogue.” *Signs* 40, no. 1 (2006): 305-329.

#### Further Reading

- Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. New York: Lantern Books, 2015.
- Adams, Carol J. “The War on Compassion.” In *The Feminist Care Tradition in Animal Ethics*, edited by Josephine Donovan and Carol J. Adams, pp. 21-36. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Kasperbauer, T. J. “Rejecting Empathy for Animal Ethics.” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 18, no. 4 (2015): 817-833.
- Regan, Tom. “Obligations to Animals are Based on Rights.” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 8, no. 2 (1995):171-180.

## PART IV: From Relations to Political Categories

---

### Lecture 8: Denial of Flourishing and Dignity?

#### Essential Reading

- Nussbaum, Martha. “Beyond “Compassion and Humanity”: Justice for Nonhuman Animals.” In *Frontiers of justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*, pp. 325-407. London & Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press: 2007.

#### Further Reading

- Hailwood, Simon. “Bewildering Nussbaum: Capability Justice and Predation.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 20, no. 3 (2011): 293-313.
- Ilea, Ramona. “Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach and Nonhuman Animals: Theory and Public Policy.” *Journal of Social Philosophy* 39, no. 4 (2008): 547-563.
- Zuolo, Federico. “Dignity and Animals. Does it Make Sense to Apply the Concept of Dignity to All Sentient Beings?” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 19, no. 5 (2016): 1117-30.

### Group Activity 2: Should We Police Nature?

**Group Task:** Consider the following controversial proposal from moral philosopher Jeff McMahan in his New York Times piece, available at: <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/19/the-meat-eaters/>.

*“Suppose that we could arrange the gradual extinction of carnivorous species, replacing them with new herbivorous ones. Or suppose that we could intervene genetically, so that currently carnivorous species would gradually evolve into herbivorous ones, thereby fulfilling Isaiah’s prophecy. If we could bring about the end of predation by one or the other of these means at little cost to ourselves, ought we to do it?”*

This proposal is no longer just a mere fantasy. A new technology CRISPR – Cas9 gene-editing tool, also called “gene drive”, makes it a real possibility. For a video illustration of how it works, see: <https://wyss.harvard.edu/media-post/crispr-cas9-gene-drives/>. Scientists have had some success in the lab using the technology to interfere with the fertility of mosquitos and change the coat color of mice. Should we use the technology to manipulate the predatory behavior of carnivorous species?

**Group 3:** Assuming that you are an advocate of environmental ethics, what answer would you give? Your answer can be for or against or indeterminate. Draw on our discussions in Lecture 6. Consult the recommended reading below. Speak for 20 minutes, and respond to questions from the audience for 10 minutes.

#### Recommended Reading:

- Plumwood, Val. “Tasteless: Towards a Food-Based Approach to Death.” *Environmental Values* 17, no. 3 (2008): 323-30.

- Sagoff, Mark. "Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 22, no. 2 (1984): 297-307.

**Group 4:** Assuming that you are an advocate of care ethics, what answer would you give? Your answer can be for or against or indeterminate. Draw on our discussions in Lecture 7. Consult the recommended reading below. Speak for 20 minutes, and respond to questions from the audience for 10 minutes.

**Recommended Reading:**

- Swart, Jac A. A. "Care for the Wild: An Integrative View on Wild and Domesticated Animals." *Environmental Values* 14, no. 2 (2005): 251-63.
- Clement, Grace. "The Ethic of Care and the Problem of Wild Animals." *Between the Species* 13, no. 3 (2003): 1-12.

## Lecture 9: Denial of Citizenship?

**Essential Reading**

- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. Chapter 3 – "Extending Animal Rights via Citizenship Theory," pp. 50-72; and Chapter 5 – "Domesticated Animal Citizens," pp. 101- 155. Both in *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

**Further Reading**

- Hinchcliffe, Christopher. "Animals and the Limits of Citizenship: *Zoopolis* and the Concept of Citizenship." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23, no. 3 (2015): 302–320.
- Valentini, Laura. "Canine Justice: An Associative Account." *Political Studies* 62, no. 1 (2014): 37-52.
- Wyckoff, Jason. Toward justice for animals. *Journal of Social Philosophy* 45, no. 4 (2014): 539-53.

## Lecture 10: Denial of Denizenship and Sovereignty?

**Essential Reading**

- Luther, Erin. "Tales of Cruelty and Belonging: In Search of an Ethic for Urban Human-Wildlife Relations." *Animal Studies Journal* 2, no. 1 (2013): 35-54

**Further Reading**

- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. Chap. 7 – "Liminal Animal Denizens." In *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*, pp. 210-251. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cochrane, Alasdair. "Cosmozoopolis: The Case Against Group-Differentiated Animal Rights." *Law, Ethics and Philosophy* 1, no. 1 (2013): 127-41.
- Ladwig, Bernd. "Against Wild Animal Sovereignty: An Interest-Based Critique of *Zoopolis*." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 23, no. 3 (2015): 282-301.

**Mid-Term Exam - Good Luck!!**

## Lecture 11: Democracy: Denial of Political Agency?

### Essential Reading

- Hooley, Dan. "Political Agency, Citizenship, and Non-human Animals." *Res Publica* 24 (2018): 509–530.
- Smith, Kimberly. "Representation." In *Governing Animals*, pp. 99-125. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

### Further Reading

- Cochrane, Alasdair. "Do Animals Have an Interest in Liberty?" *Political Studies* 57 (2009): 660-679.
- Hinchcliffe, Christopher. "Animals and the Limits of Citizenship: Zoopolis and the Concept of Citizenship." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23, no. 3 (2015): 302–320.
- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. "Interspecies Politics: Reply to Hinchcliffe and Ladwig." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 23, no. 3 (2015): 321-344.

## Lecture 12: Power: A Problem of War and Domination?

### Essential Reading

- Wadiwel, Dinesh. Chapter 8 – "The Violence of Stupidity," pp 273-96; and Conclusion – "True," pp. 297-302. Both in *The War Against Animals*. Leiden, MA: Brill, 2015

### Further Reading

- Wadiwel, Dinesh. "Zoopolis: Challenging our Conceptualization of Political Sovereignty Through Animal Sovereignities." *Dialogue* 52 (2013): 749-58
- Murray, Mary. "The Underdog in History: Serfdom, Slavery and Species in the Creation and Development of Capitalism." In *Theorizing Animals: Re-Thinking Humanimal Relations*, edited by Nik Taylor and Tania Signal, pp. 87-107. Leiden, MA: Brill, 2011.
- Painter, Corinne. "Non-Human Animals within Contemporary Capitalism: A Marxist Account of Non-Human Animal Liberation." *Capital & Class* 40, no. 2 (2016): 327–345.

## Group Activity 3: "Keeping cat as pet is morally wrong." Debate.

**Group Task:** Group 5 plays the **Affirmative** Team; and Group 6 plays the **Negative** Team.

Some philosophers (e.g. Francione) hold the abolitionist view that domestication in general is morally wrong. Humans have no moral right to own, breed, or render animals dependent on them. On this view, keeping pet, regardless of its species, is morally wrong. Some hold a more nuanced view. For example, Donaldson and Kymlicka (2011) argue that some forms of domestication are morally permissible, desirable even, if regulated by just terms of citizenship. However, even Donaldson and Kymlicka are unsure if cats as a species is suitable for domestication. For one thing, cats are obligate carnivores. Most are also skilled and enthusiastic predators. These facts about cats make them problematic citizens. It is difficult for cats to respect co-citizens' rights and for co-citizens to respect their rights in turn. If cats cannot be "flourishing members of a mixed society", it seems morally wrong to keep them? Group 5 plays the affirmative team arguing that keeping cat as pet is

morally wrong. Group 6 plays the negative. Group 5 should draw on our discussions in Lecture 9 and the recommended reading below. Group 6 should draw on our discussions in Lecture 9 and the recommended reading below.

For the purpose of our learning, the debate focuses on the substances of the arguments rather than rhetoric or sophistries. Nor are we testing quick thinking. As such, both teams are encouraged to exchange their arguments in advance so that speakers can better prepare their rebuttals and stage a genuine dialogue.

**Format:**

- First Affirmative Speaker: Four minutes to introduce the topic
- First Negative Speaker: Four minutes to restate the opponent's viewpoint:
- Second Affirmative Speaker: Three minutes to rebut first negative speaker; may substantiate arguments introduced by 1<sup>st</sup> affirmative speaker
- Second Negative Speaker: Three minutes to counter second affirmative; may substantive arguments introduced by 1<sup>st</sup> negative speaker
- Open to the floor: 10 minutes
- Preparation for summary: Two minutes
- Negative Summary: Three minutes to conclude with your thesis
- Affirmative Summary: Three minutes to conclude with your thesis

**Recommended reading for the Affirmative team:**

- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. 2011. Chapter 5 – “Domesticated Animal Citizens,” in *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

**Recommended reading for the Negative team:**

- Palmer, Clare. “Companion Cats as Co-Citizens? Comments on Sue Donaldson's and Will Kymlicka's *Zoopolis*.” *Dialogue* 52, no. 4 (2013): 759-67.
- Cochrane, Alasdair. “Born in Chains? The Ethics of Animal Domestication.” In *The Ethics of Captivity*, edited by Lori Gruen, pp. 166-73. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

## PART V: From Political Categories to Social Change

---

### Lecture 13: Epistemic Obstacles: Power and Bias?

#### Essential Reading

- Anderson, Elizabeth. "The Social Epistemology of Morality: Learning from the Forgotten History of the Abolition of Slavery." In *The Epistemic Life of Groups*, edited by Michael Brady and Miranda Fricker, pp. 75-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Sevillano, Verónica, and Susan T. Fiske. "Warmth and Competence in Animals." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 46, no. 5 (2016): 276-93.

#### Further Reading

- Valentini, Laura. "Ideal vs. Non-Ideal Theory: A Conceptual Map." *Philosophy Compass* 7, no. 9 (2012): 654-664.
- Bastian, B. and Loughnan, S. "Resolving the Meat-Paradox: A Motivational Account of Morally Troublesome Behavior and its Maintenance." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 21, no. 3 (2016):278-299
- Kasperbauer, T.J. "Dehumanizing Animals." In *Subhuman: The Moral Psychology of Human Attitudes to Animals*, pp. 39-62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

### Lecture 14: Social Obstacles: Social Norms and Conformity

#### Essential Reading

- Tam, Agnes. Forthcoming. "Why Moral Reasoning is Insufficient for Moral Progress." *Journal of Political Philosophy*.
- Delon, Nicolas. "Social norms and farm animal protection." *Palgrave Communications* (2018) 4:1-6.

#### Further Reading

- Freiman, Christopher. "Why Be Immoral?" *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 13, no. 2 (2010): 191-205.
- Bicchieri, Cristina. "Norms, Convention, and the Power of Expectation." In *Philosophy of Social Science: A New Introduction*, edited by Nancy Cartwright and Eleonora Montuschi, pp. 208-232. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

### Group Activity 4: Scanning Bias and What is it like to be a Liminal Animal in Kingston?

#### Group task:

**Group 7** is tasked with bias scan. First, identify biased perception, memory, imagination, reasoning or representation of animals in the media (including news, movies, documentaries), legal codes, textbooks or fictions. Present notable positive/negative bias scanned to class. Second, given what we have learned in Lecture 13, speculate the cause(s) of such positive and/or negative bias. In what

ways and to what extent does the nature of social relation humans have with animals cause and shape the biases? Do you think humans suffer “speciesist bias” in general? If they are not speciesist bias, what are they? The group should prepare to speak for 20-30 minutes.

**Recommended Reading:** See further reading for Lecture 13.

**Group 8** is tasked with demonstrating what it is like to be a liminal animal in Kingston. Identify one particular group of liminal animals (e.g. raccoons, coyotes, squirrels, rats, bats, geese, ducks) for your case study. Observe them with the following questions in mind: *How is the group being treated in our urban space? Where do they live? What do they eat? Are they flourishing or suffering, and in what ways?* Imagine a member of the Urban Planning Council comes to you for advice for improving the design of the city. Present your policy recommendations to the class. Back up your recommendations with normative theories or concepts learned in lecture 10. Consult the recommended reading below. The group should prepare to speak or 20-30 minutes.

**Recommended Reading:**

- Palmer, Clare. 2003. “Colonization, Urbanization, and Animals.” *Philosophy & Geography* 6, no. 1 (2003): 47-58.
- Acampora, Ralph. “Oikos and Domus: On Constructive Co-Habitation with Other Creatures.” *Philosophy & Geography* 7, no. 2 (2004): 219-36.

## Lecture 15: Cultural Obstacles: Multicultural Conflicts (Guest Lecture by Andrew Lopez)

**Essential Reading**

- Deckha, Maneesha. “Animal Justice, Cultural Justice: A Posthumanist Response to Cultural Rights in Animals.” *Journal of Animal Law & Ethics* 2 (2007): 189-229.

**Further Reading**

- Kymlicka, Will and Sue Donaldson. “Animal Rights and Aboriginal Rights.” In *Canadian Perspectives on Animals and the Law*, edited by Peter Sankoff, Vaughan Black and Katie Sykes, pp. 159-186. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2015.
- Kim, Claire Jean. “Multiculturalism Goes Imperial: Immigrants, Animals, and the Suppression of Moral Dialogue.” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 4, no. 1 (2007): 233-49.
- Cordeiro-Rodrigues, Luis and Les Mitchell, eds. *Animals, Race, and Multiculturalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

## Lecture 16: Interspecies Community-Building

**Essential Reading:**

- Kymlicka, Will. “Social membership: Animal Law Beyond the Property/Personhood Impasse.” *Dalhousie Law Journal* 40, no. 1 (2017): 123-155.

**Further Reading:**

- Chang, Darren. (2017). *Organize and resist with farmed animals: Prefiguring anti-Speciesist/anti-anthropocentric cities*. (M.A. Paper, Department of Political Studies, Queen's University, Kingston).
- Emmerman, Karen S. "Sanctuary, not Remedy: The Problem of Captivity and the Need for Moral Repair." In *The Ethics of Captivity*, edited by Lori Gruen, pp. 213-230. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Essen, Erica, and Michael P. Allen. "Solidarity between Human and Non-Human Animals: Representing Animal Voices in Policy Deliberations." *Environmental Communication* 11, no. 5 (2017): 641-53.

## Lecture 17: Civil Disobedience

### Essential Reading

- Milligan, Tony. "Animal Rescue as Civil Disobedience." *Res Publica* 23 (2017) 281-298.

### Further Reading

- Welchman, Jennifer. "Is Ecosabotage Civil Disobedience?" *Philosophy & Geography* 40 (2001): 97-107.
- McCausland, Clare, Siobhan O'Sullivan and Scott Brenton. "Trespass, Animals and Democratic Engagement." *Res Publica* 19 (2013): 205-221.
- O'Sullivan, Sioban, Clare McCausland and Scott Brenton. "Animal Activists, Civil Disobedience and Global Responses to Transnational Injustice." *Res Publica* 23 (2017): 1-20.
- Delmas, Candice. "Civil Disobedience." *Philosophy Compass* 11, no. 11 (2016): 681-691.

## Group Activity 5: Is Animal Work a Promising Site for Enacting Interspecies Membership?

### Group Task:

One of the constraints to moral progress regarding animals is the human failure to recognize animals' subjectivity (which is sometimes called "dignity" or "sovereignty"), that is, an individual with her own needs, interests, and claims on us. One solution, perhaps, is to engage democratic moral inquiry with animals, such that animals could demonstrate their moral worth and demands to us. We've explored the conceptual and practical difficulties of democratic moral inquiry between humans and animals. Another solution, perhaps, is to enable humans to recognize animals as "one of us" or members of our community. If we can recognize animals as members, we may be able to bypass the obstacles to the recognition of animal subjectivity and respect their claims on us. But under what conditions do we recognize animals as co-members? Under what conditions do animals transform from "Others" to "One-of-us"? As discussed in Lecture 16, Kymlicka (2017) suggests that some workplaces are promising sites for enacting interspecies membership. The core example he gives is military dogs, whom are being recognized as "co-workers". Can we scale this up? We invite Groups 9 and 10 to explore this suggestion.

**Group 9** is tasked to explore the *cognitive* condition(s) of interspecies membership in the animal work context. Explore either a) or b). Speak for 20-30 minutes.



- a) Requirement of Collective Intentionality: "Seeing" or "recognizing" others as one of us in the human case typically and minimally requires collective intentionality. Is collective intentionality conceptually possible between humans and animals in general, and in interspecies workplaces in particular? Can you identify any real-world examples beyond military/police dogs?
- **Recommended readings:**
  - Robert Wilson. "Collective Intentionality in Non-human Animals." In *Routledge Handbook on Collective Intentionality*, edited by Marija Jankovic and Kirk Ludwig, pp. 420-432. New York: Routledge, 2017.
  - Coulter, Kendra. "Beyond Human to Humane: A Multispecies Analysis of Care Work, Its Repression, and Its Potential." *Studies in Social Justice* 10, no. 2 (2016): 199-219.
- b) Requirement of Norms Sharing: For a social group to be a cohesive "We" in the human case, it typically requires the social group to share social norms. As discussed, social norms, on Gilbert's joint commitment account, have "We" constituting power. But can animals conform to social norms in general, and more specifically, in interspecies workplaces context? Can they partake in the shaping and enforcement of social norms? Can you identify any real-world examples?
- **Recommended Reading:**
  - Sarah Vincent, Rebecca Ring, and Kristin Andrews, Forthcoming "Normative Practices of Other Animals" in *The Routledge Handbook of Moral Epistemology*, ed Aaron Zimmerman, Karen Jones, and Mark Timmons
  - Coulter, Kendra. "Beyond Human to Humane: A Multispecies Analysis of Care Work, Its Repression, and Its Potential." *Studies in Social Justice* 10, no. 2 (2016): 199-219.

**Group 10** is tasked to explore the *sociological* condition(s) of interspecies membership. Kymlicka writes, "social recognition of others as co-workers is easier when we interact with them on an everyday basis, in a setting of trust, cooperation, and sociability, where we greet others at the start of a work day, socialize, and then embark on working together... The sociological conditions that make it possible to see others as co-workers in a shared workplace are simply not present in most modern farms or labs." (2017, 151) We certainly have a clear idea what kinds of workplace (e.g. exploitative workplaces) are unfavorable for enacting interspecies membership. But it is less clear what kinds of workplace are favorable. Should they be protected by labor rights? Should they be governed by norms of justice? Should there be minimal or mitigated conflicts of interests? Should they be governed by norms of trust and solidarity? Can Group 10 identify some promising sites and explain why they are so? If not, identify the conditions under which workplaces should be designed to make it favorable. Speak for 20-30 minutes.

**Recommended Reading:**

- Coulter, Kendra. "Beyond Human to Humane: A Multispecies Analysis of Care Work, Its Repression, and Its Potential." *Studies in Social Justice* 10, no. 2 (2016): 199-219.
- Cochrane, Alasdair. "Labour Rights for Animals." In *The Political Turn in Animal Ethics*, edited by Robert Garner and Siobhan O'Sullivan, pp. 15-33. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
- Weisberg, Zipporah. "Animal Assisted Intervention and Citizenship Theory." In *Pets and People*, edited by Christine Overall, pp. 218-233. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

**Apr 3<sup>rd</sup>: Review for Take-Home Exam**

**Rubric for Essay Grading**(Adapted from <http://melissajacquart.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Phil-1020-Paper-Rubric.pdf>)

<b>Writing (20%)</b> Does the author provide a clear, organized plan for the paper at the outset and Does s/he follow that plan? Does the author have a clear command of writing mechanics?	Needs Improvement (0-11) The writing suffers from several of the following problems: Most of the writing is unclear, unnecessarily wordy, or convoluted. The purpose of sentences, paragraphs, or the paper as a whole is not clear. The paper is disorganized.	Good (12-15) The language is generally clear and precise. Most of the writing is somewhat clear, succinct, and direct, but improvement is needed. There are some unclearities in the purpose of sentences, paragraphs, and the paper as a whole may be somewhat unclear. The paper is generally well-organized, but may need some improvement. There may be a number of grammatical and/or spelling errors.	Excellent (16-20) The writing is generally clear, succinct, and direct. The purpose of sentences, paragraphs, and the paper as a whole is almost always clear. The paper is well-organized. The grammatical and spelling are near perfect.
<b>Exegesis (20%)</b> How well does the author present, understand, and make appropriate use of the material relevant to the paper? How well does the author understand the complexity of the issues involved?	Needs Improvement (0-11) There is no relevant exegesis. The paper may be purely argumentative, suffers from major inaccuracies, or is mostly irrelevant, unclear, or uncharitable.	Good (12-15) The exegesis is mostly accurate, relevant, clear, and charitable, but there is much room for improvement.	Excellent (16-20) The exegesis is almost entirely accurate, relevant, clear, and charitable.
<b>Application (20%)</b> How well does the student apply the course material to proposed situation?	Needs Improvement (0-11) The application is incorrect, and/or, inaccurately represents the view. Student has not demonstrated understanding of the course material.	Good (12-15) The application is somewhat sensible, but may be inaccurate in parts. Student has demonstrated some understanding of the course material.	Excellent (16-20) The application is accurate and appropriate to the theory/author/concepts. Student has demonstrated sufficient understanding of the course material.
<b>Argument (30%)</b> Does the author use well-reasoned arguments to support his or her position? Do the claims made in different parts of the paper follow from one another and are they consistent?	Needs Improvement (0-17) There is no argument. The paper may be purely expository or merely assert its thesis without argument or reasoning.	Good (18-24) The considerations provided somewhat support the thesis and are stated fairly clearly, though they may be inadequately developed or unsupported, or their relevance to the thesis may be somewhat unclear.	Excellent (24-30) The considerations provided clearly support the thesis and are stated clearly and succinctly.
<b>Opposition (10%)</b> Does the author consider and respond to arguments against the thesis of the paper?	Needs Improvement (0-5) The paper fails to consider obvious objections to the arguments or considers irrelevant objections.	Good (6-7) Some objections to the paper's arguments are considered, though some may be irrelevant, unnecessary, or poorly responded to.	Excellent (8-10) Objections to the paper's arguments are considered and adequately responded to.

Peer Assessment Form

Rater's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment of: \_\_\_\_\_

Rating		Comments, Examples, Explanations, etc.
<p><b>Group Participation</b> Attends meetings regularly and on time.</p>		
<p><b>Time Management &amp; Responsibility</b> Accepts fair share of work and reliably completes it by the required time.</p>		
<p><b>Adaptability</b> Displays or tries to develop a wide range of skills in service of the project, readily accepts changed approach or constructive criticism.</p>		
<p><b>Creativity/Originality</b> Problem-solves when faced with impasses or challenges, originates new ideas, initiates team decisions.</p>		
<p><b>Communication Skills</b> Effective in discussions, good listener, capable presenter, proficient at diagramming, representing, and documenting work.</p>		
<p><b>General Team Skills</b> Positive attitude, encourages and motivates team, supports team decisions, helps team reach consensus, helps resolve conflicts in the group.</p>		
<p><b>Technical Skills</b> Ability to create and develop materials on own initiative, provides technical solutions to problems.</p>		
<p><b>Scoring</b> For each category, award yourself and each member of your team a score using this scale.</p>		<p><b>3</b> – Better than most of the group in this respect  <b>2</b> – About average for the group in this respect  <b>1</b> – Not as good as most of the group in this respect  <b>0</b> – No help at all to the group in this respect</p>

(adapted from Goldfinch, 1994; Lejk & Wyvill, 2001)

## Grading Method

## Appendix III

All components of this course will receive letter grades which, for purposes of calculating your course average, will be translated into numerical equivalents using the Faculty of Arts and Science approved scale (see below). Your course average will then be converted to a final letter grade according to Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale (see below).

*Arts & Science Letter Grade Input Scheme Scale*

Assignment mark	Numerical value for calculation of final mark
A+	93
A	87
A-	82
B+	78
B	75
B-	72
C+	68
C	65
C-	62
D+	58
D	55
D-	52
F48 (F+)	48
F24 (F)	24
F0 (0)	0

*Queen's Official Grade Conversion*

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

Your course average will then be converted to a final letter grade according to Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale:

*Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale*

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below