

The Case for Using Philosophers as a Food Source

by [Armando Simón](#) (March 2024)



Corpse of Man, by Hyman Bloom, 1944

Recently, I became aware of one Peter Singer, an Australian philosopher who, I get the impression, wants to kill everyone. At least, he has specifically made the case for killing handicapped newborns and unborn babies. He is also an advocate for the rights of animals.

His specialty is ethics.

After reading about him and his desire to kill others, my first thought was, "OK, let's start with him!" Then, upon contemplation I asked myself, "Why stop there? Why not kill all philosophers?"

Now, this may sound like an extreme position to take, but hear me out. You will see that there is a lot of merit to this proposal.

First of all, philosophy and philosophers are an anachronism, the intellectual dodo that should have died out long ago.

Let's be honest: of what use are they?

Centuries ago, when knowledge was highly limited and there were few specialties, philosophers were jack-of-all-trades. They could think, talk and argue about anything because there were no boundaries, and knowledge—that is, firm, unequivocal facts—were few and far between. As recently as the early 1800s, geology, medicine, biology, and chemistry were in the toddler stages, while astronomy was in its infancy. Physics began in the 1600s while mathematics had made steady progress since Ancient Greece. But, by now, all fields of knowledge are clearly demarcated and specialized (actually, overspecialized) to the point that Lynn Margulis accurately described the situation as academic apartheid.

So, what do philosophers do these days to earn a buck?

Well, mostly, they sit around and try to impress undergraduates—and each other—with word games. Like, if a tree falls in the forest and no one is around to hear it, has it made a sound? They also argue among themselves over the same topics that they have argued *for centuries*, using the same arguments they used *for centuries* while pretending that they came up with those arguments on their own because they are so brilliant. Like, is there free will?

Some of the philosophers hope that someday they will come up with a new, original, word game and their name will be enshrined, down the centuries to come for other philosophers to waste time on.

But, anyway, nowadays no one ever really pays attention to them anymore.

And philosophers get angry because of that.

On top of that, they take up office space in universities that should rightfully be allocated to staff that actually produce knowledge. And they eat, of course. A lot. And they earn salaries. Too much (though they think otherwise). And do I have to bring up their flatulence?

But, again, really, no one ever pays attention to them.

So now that we have established that philosophers are not only useless but take up space and valuable resources, and they expel gases, what do we do with them?

I say we eat them.

After all, recently, our enlightened overlords at Davos and elsewhere have begun a movement away from eating beef in favor of crickets and cockroaches because cows eat grass and expel methane which they say causes global warming. Well, everyone who has had dealings with philosophers will attest to the fact that they are full of hot air, and they eat too much anyway

(has anyone ever seen a philosopher without a potbelly?). There is too much overall noise pollution in society as it is, so their elimination would eliminate their particular gibberish. And hopefully global warming.

This would be Ethical Cannibalism. It would free up valuable resources which could then be allocated towards professions which have consistently proven themselves to benefit mankind (like psychologists). After all, cannibalism is nothing new in the history of the world. Even some animals do so. Some eat their young. I confess that I myself have been tempted in the past to eat my teenage children when they were insolent and if I had done so, it would have freed up resources that I needed, not to mention it would have lowered my stress. Lord knows that they have cost me a lot of money over the years. They themselves have practically eaten me alive with their demands. But that's another story. One worthy to explore (another one is using ex-wives as a food source; now, *that one* would be very popular if put into practice).

So, yes, let's use philosophers as a food source. We are told that due to global warming food supply will plummet in the years to come.

But why wait?

(Days after I sent off this to the editor of NER, I became aware of an article in [New Scientist](#) (of all places!) that, without saying so outright, seems to advocate cannibalism. Of anyone, not just philosophers or ex-wives. So, I disapprove of the article's message. I think cannibalism should be more restrictive in the choice of food. That article came out on February 14, Valentine's Day, so perhaps in the not too distant future one could take a date out to a restaurant that specializes in cannibal cuisine. Or perhaps dispense with going out altogether for persons whose budget is limited and

the housewife or girlfriend could cook a nice leg of man to her lover. Food for thought.}

[Table of Contents](#)

Armando Simón is a retired psychologist who, as a naive undergraduate, actually thought philosophy was cool until he came to his senses. He is the author of [When Evolution Stops](#) and *This [That](#) and the Other*.

Follow NER on Twitter [@NERIconoclast](#)