

Consider The Lobster

1. *The opening paragraphs are there to introduce the reader to Maine and its industries, as well as give an overview of the Monstrosity that is the Maine Lobster Festival. It also contrasts the touristy Lobster to the opulent town of Camden.*
2. *The second section takes us to a long pamphlet like piece of writing all about the different methods of preparing lobster. How much does lobster cost? What season is it best in? Is a hard shell or a soft shell lobster better? All of these questions are answered in lead up to the the authors argument about the ethics of eating lobster.*
3. *The author portrays the authors only as tourists mongering to get a piece of that tasty lobster. The author describes the lines as “Disneyland-grade”, talks about how people are rude, reserving tables, bringing in coolers that block the aisles. Also what is talked about is the food that isn't lobster; the styrofoam cups filled with warm flat soda and cool convenience-store coffee all topped off with not enough napkins to clean up the spills from the masses of young children who send more food flying that they do into their mouths. All in all there is a very negative attitude toward the patrons in the main food tent.*
4. *In footnote 6 the sort of puts down the upper class atmosphere that exists in Camden saying that everybody needs to be a real tourist every once and a while, “It is good for the soul”. But to him, going to the Maine Lobster Festival made him feel like an “alien”. His footnotes often feel like a slight concession to the side he is arguing against. In this case saying “Hey...sometimes it is alright to be a tourist and do real touristy things.*
5. *He is arguing that it is unethical and immoral to point at the living thing that you are about to eat for dinner. I disagree, Food is food, we kill cows everyday what does it change that we are picking the one that looks most delicious to us. Through natural selection we were pushed to the top of the food chain. There is no evolutionary reason for us to discriminate against what we eat just because we look it in the eye before we eat it. As a fisherman I do the same thing every summer, after reeling in a fish I must measure it to make sure that it is to legal size. As I unsheath my tape I am staring the fish in the eye just hoping that he will be big enough to cut up right there. Humans have been doing this since the beginning of time. Now it is just more efficient, instead of having to go catch a lobster out in the bay not it is possible to do it right in your own supermarket. It allows anybody to feel the same thrill that an angler or a hunter does.*
6. *This section takes a dive into the ethics of the lobster. Should we be killing these animals by drowning them in a cramped tank of boiling water? Do lobsters feel pain? The author seemed offended by the kinds of people and their inability to see past the tasty, juicy, fleshy, and delectable Lobster meat. If Wallace is going to question whether or not eating lobsters is ethical, why not dive right into the giant slaughterhouses made for more mass-market meat.*

The amount of lobsters killed at the Maine lobster fest is paltry compared to the Billions of other animals killed each year. If I was a reading of true Gourmet magazine I would be offended as I would most likely delve deeply into many exotic eating experiences, many which involve processes much less ethical than dropping a lobster into a boiling pot of water.

- 7. In what I believe is section 7 is when Wallace begins to talk about the uncomfortableness that comes with cooking a lobster. Claiming that the creatures attempt to push their way out of the pot after being placed in the warm water. He also mentions that popping and hissing sound that they make while in the pot all in an attempt to sway the reader into feeling bad for the crustaceans. He wants the reader to be on his side before he goes and talks about what the popping sound actually is as well as the lack of brain in the lobsters.*

- 8. He asks the readers to question “what ethical convictions have you worked out that permit you not just to eat but to savor and enjoy flesh-based viands” He is telling his readership that they must’ve already thought about and debated with themselves as whether or not to enjoy fleshy foods. He then asks if they really think about where the food comes from or if they just ignore it and enjoy. He used this strategy to ensure the reader that they indeed are higher functioning humans but asking them if they indeed made the right decision and is asking them to rethink that decision.*