

Tribhuvan University

Human Morality and Ethical Treatment to Animals in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable*

Lightness of Being

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Central
Department of English in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in English

By

Narendra Lamichhane

Symbol No: 561

T.U. Reg. No. 6-1-325-41-2006

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February 2018

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude and owe a debt to my respected research supervisor, Mr. Mahesh Paudyal, lecturer, the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University (CDE, TU) for his patient guidance and invaluable suggestions at every step of my work. This work would not have been materialized in this form without his intellectual direction.

Similarly, my sincere gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of CDE, TU and all the respected teachers and administrative staffs of CDE, T.U. for their continual support and inspiration.

Finally, I must also thank my friends, colleagues, and family members who have directly or indirectly provided impetus I needed to undertake my research work. The role of my family in my life is seminal.

Narendra Lamichhane

February, 2018

Human Morality and Ethical Treatment to Animals in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*

Abstract

This research paper explores the projection of animal rights in Milan Kundera's novel The Unbearable Lightness of Being. It focuses upon the deep irony presented in the different aspects of life values and fundamental rights in relation to human life. This thesis consisted of a wide review of relevant literature on animal rights resolutions and movements. The research approach adopted in the research paper includes John Berger's Why Look at Animal, Tom Regan's Defending Animals Right and The Case for Animal Rights and M. Coetzee's The Lives of Animal. The findings from this research show that the animals become the first victims in the tussle of human beings, though they claim this as the result of their nationality. The idea that only human beings can be holders of rights is thought to be a conventional wisdom. This commonly held belief has been questioned by animal rights activists several times by filing the lawsuits on behalf of certain captive great animals. These cases showed that the question of the legal status of animals is very alive today and needs careful attention. This research paper recommends that an isolation should never be used as arrogant and disgusting term in modern age because humans must understand that the earth was created for everyone.

Keywords: Animal Right, Ethics, Ecocriticism, Animal right movements.

The Unbearable Lightness of Being is a story of irreconcilable love and infidelities in which Milan Kundera projects the treatment to animals by modern men. First published in 1984, Kundera's masterly novel encompasses the extremes of tragedy and war. This research paper claims that the author uses the animal suffering and vulnerability for deeply analyzing human morals. The lightness of being refers to the playfulness with which the central characters of the novel Tomas, Sabina and Karenin reflects the exploration of human's meaning of love for animals.

The major objective of this research paper is to investigate human relation that establishes the animal rights as basic actsto human society. To concretize this issue, it will analyze Tereza and a dog Karenin's relationship in the narratives. Tereza as a social activist against specism campaigns this injustice. Motherly treatment of Tereza to Karenin justifies the fact that fundamental rights of animals would be entitled as right to life, right to individual freedom, right no to be tortured in the case of the great wars. Hence, Terezas' act validates that animals also have inherent values as as individuals. They hold the attributes as humans.

The legal status of animals requires the legal means of protection of animals' legitimate interests. In this respect this researcher argues that granting animals legal rights is the most effective and necessary way to guarantee the inviolability of animal interests. The beginning of this research provides an overview of the moral status of animals in ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary philosophy. This researcher critically discusses each view on the moral standing of animals and show their main shortcomings. In order to draw the line between the animals that matter morally and the ones that do not, we need to establish a morally significant break. The later research argues that sentience is the best candidate for that. Further, it deals with the question of whether animals are moral agents, moral patients or moral subjects. This

researcher up this chapter by concluding that while some animals can be moral subjects, none of them is a moral agent but all sentient animals qualify as moral patients. This researcher argues that sentience grants animals the interests in avoiding pain and experiencing pleasure. I will also show that animals have an interest in remaining alive

The ensuing emergency in thinking about animals in philosophy prepares a sophisticated background for new analysis of the book. The theme of the animal suffering enters deep into the heart of western intellectuality. So, this research paper will analyze how the animal rights have worked aesthetically in the novel. What are the implications of animals like Karenin and the wounded crow to human relation between Tomas and Tereza? How does this novel pose a problem of animals situation in human world? Thus, this paper will seek to find out convincing answers to these questions.

The Unbearable Lightness of Being is about two women, two men, a dog and their lives in the 1968 Prague spring period of Czechoslovak history. The novel begins with a discussion of Friedrich Nietzsche's idea of eternal return. Nietzsche theorized that everything we experience happens an infinite number of times. But if the opposite is true, argues the narrator of this novel, and if our lives happen only once, they aren't that significant. They are meaningless and carry no weight. The narrator also considers the question of which is better lightness or weight which do we want?

Tomas is a 40 year old doctor who lives in Prague. He is an epic womanizer who is with a new woman every day. He meets, falls in love with, and marries a young woman named Tereza. He feels that sex and love are two different things, and that he is emotionally faithful to his wife. Tereza is entirely dependent on Tomas.

She hates his womanizing but considers herself too weak to leave him. She forms a close relationship with the female dog Tomas buys her, whom she names Karenin after a character in Anna Karenina. They both work for the community farms. Tereza herds cows. The relationship between Tereza and her dog is explored in great depth, with much philosophizing on the soul of an animal, the nature of happiness, and the passing of time. Karenin ends up getting cancer and is eventually put down.

The French-Czech novelist Milan Kundera was born in the Czech Republic and has lived in France since 1975 into exile. He became a naturalised French citizen in 1981. He sees himself as a French writer and insists his work should be studied as French literature and classified as such in book stores.

Kundera's best known work is *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. Prior to the Velvet Revolution of 1989 the communist regime in Czechoslovakia banned his books. He lives virtually in cognito and rarely speaks to the media. A perennial contender for the Nobel Prize in Literature, he is believed to have been nominated on several occasions. He belongs to the generation of young Czechs who had little or no experience of the pre-war democratic Czechoslovak Republic. His ideology was greatly influenced by the experiences of World War II and the German occupation. He studied literature and aesthetics at the faculty of Arts at Charles University in Prague.

This novel is interpreted and commented critically by many critiques. Joseph Mai in his article *Humanity's True Moral Test* argues, "The traditions of metaphysics and ontology have always created a gap between animals and humans" (103). To identify with animals' suffering means to break ranks with the very definition of the human. So, he analyzes the gradual emergence of relationship between animals and human. The narration begins with the Tereza's compassion for animals. The narrator

soundly states: The nature of the human couple, the love of man and woman is a prior inferior to that which can exist in the love between man and dog. It is a completely selfless love. Tereza did not want anything of Karenin. She did not ever ask him to love her back" (289). Karenin always stares deeply in the eyes of Tereza. Tomas and Tereza enter an edenic idyll in which animals especially their dog Karenin, emerges to the center of the fictional world. Karenin waits patiently through most of the narrative, in some corner of a cafe or at the foot of Tomas and Tereza's bed. Thus, most of the novel is focused on the core division between man and animal. Martha Nussbaum has diagnosed the human encounter with animals and their own mutual vulnerability with shame and disgust (Mai 103). Bodily fluids, gross odors, rotting flesh, and other slimy substances keep us from touching animals because we do not want to be reduced to the status of animals.

Mai argues, "It is not surprising that animals have been the first victims of this denial. As we are reminded when the narrator recounts a new story that has struck Tereza's imagination" (105). Just after the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia the government launched campaigns to exterminate pigeons and feral dogs, beginning with propaganda associating the animals with filth and disease. By emphasizing the disgusting in animals the authorities were able to establish a zone of bare life, life of no value. It makes irony that human beings are more animalistic in sense of brutality than animals themselves. Mankind's failure towards the animals is at the root of all human moral failures.

Hana Pichova and Marjorie E. Rhine in their article "Reading Oedipus in Milan Kundera" argue, "Tomas's adaptation of Tereza is just like Polybus's adaptation of Oedipus. Oedipus's killing his own father and begetting children from his own mother is very much presence of animalistic nature in Oedipus" (73). They try to

justify the presence of animality in human beings who call them more rational than other non-human creatures. Similarly, in the novel Tereza's mother was forced to marry the most virile of her suitors only because this one refused to be careful when they made love. So, the absurdist behaviour of primal animals is presented in the narratives of the novel.

One scene gives a glimpse of Tereza extending her solidarity to an animal. One day, walking home with Karenin, she sees a crow, buried up to its neck being tortured by a couple of boys. The cruelty towards animals is being learned at a young age. J.M. Coetzee in his "The Tanner Lectures on Human Values," argues: "Do we have something in common- reason, self - consciousness, a soul with other animals? If we do not, then we are entitled to treat them as we like, imprisoning them, killing them, dishonoring their corpses" (132). Coetzee explains the presence of sympathy; feelings and emotions are both in humans and animals. Thus, if we don't have the sense of feelings then only we can call ourselves too different from animals.

Watching the bird Tereza realizes that Tomas is the only person she has in the world, and that he could easily abandon her. She is like the bird, wounded and alone and does not want to leave it. This shameful brings herself to identify with weak and helpless animals. Mai argues, "For Tereza as explained by the narrator, defecation and voluptuousness were present in Eden, but that they were different, that man "did not look upon shit as something repellent. Humans were shameless animals" (111). Oddly, enough, the rhetorical question produces its own response, one that connects Oedipus to animals. Kundera narrates, "It is much more important to dig half - buried crow out of the ground than to send petitions to president" (220). Tereza's tenderness to animals is about compassion and vulnerability.

Richard A. Posner in his journal "Animals' Rights" argues, "To punish an ox or a cat as if it were a rebelling slave is to accord the animal a considerable dignity. When we remember that the Egyptians worshipped cats and that in Greek mythology Zeus often assumes an animals form to have intercourse with women, it becomes plain that people and animals are one and the same species" (529). They were full of loopholes. They just forbade sadistic, gratuitous, blatant cruelty. Human laws represent the dramatic change from the indifference of the common law to animals welfare. What is important to his argument is that animals or at least some species of them have consciousness that distinguishes them from being unconscious. The main conclusion of this argument is to point that animals were often treated as gods from our ancient period. Our history has always observed animal as something divine than us. This research paper basically concerns over online journals and libraries for theoretical insights concerning the provocation of animal rights. It brings insights from John Berger's "Why Look at Animals" where he argues that suffering of animals is more likely to affect human attitudes if we become intensely aware that our sufferings are shared. He soundly states:

Animals were with man at the centre of his world. Such centrality was of course economic and productive. Whatever the changes in productive means and social organizations, men depended upon animals for food, work, transport, and clothing. Animals first entered the imagination as messengers and promises. (4)

Animals are born, are sentient and are mortal. For example, the domestication of cattle did not begin as a simple prospect of milk and meat. Cattle had magical functions, sometimes oracular, sometimes sacrificial. They resemble human beings as

they born and mortal. But they differ from humans in their habits, time and physical capacities.

Tom Regan in his article “Defending Animal Rights” and “The Case for Animal Rights” explains, “The fundamental wrong is the system that allows us to view animals as our resources, here for us to be eaten, or surgically manipulated or exploited for sport or money” (337). Regan insists that animals have inherent value individually and that animal rights philosophy must have universal basis away from cultures, countries or religions. Once we accept animals as our resources, this is regrettable. Why worry about their loneliness, their pain, their death? Human beings are so selfish that it matters them when it bothers our life also. To correct our mistreatment to animals, it requires making animal rearing methods more humane. It requires total dissolution of commercial animal agriculture. People must change their beliefs before they change their habits.

Views on the moral standing of animals in ancient philosophy were quite mixed. Depending on their own belief systems and available knowledge philosophers would come up with differing ideas about the treatment of animals. For example, one of the earliest Greek philosophers Pythagoras who believed in metempsychosis (the supposed transmigration at death of the soul of a human being or animal into a new body of the same or a different species) and animism (the attribution of a soul to plants, inanimate objects, and natural phenomena) argued that eating animals is as wrong as eating humans since all animate beings are the same kind with respect to the soul. It is also believed that he advocated vegetarianism and abstaining from animal food.

People who are elected to public office must believe in change before we will have laws that protect the rights of animals. This process of change is very

complicated, very demanding, very exhausting. It calls the efforts of many hands in education, publicity, political organization and activity, down to the liking of envelopes and stamps. Narrator argues, " Pain is pain wherever it occurs. If your neighbor's causing you pain is wrong because of the pain that is caused we cannot rationally ignore or dismiss the moral relevance of the pain that your dog feels" (338). To expose the vulnerability of a animals lives, Aysel Dogan's, "A Defense of Animal Rights" is incited in this research paper. Animals have rights in the sense of having valid claims. As society advances and new scientific technological developments, our alternatives are invented for the work without using animals. Dogan claims, "Animals have right to life, to liberty in the sense of freedom of movement and communication, to subsistence, to relief from suffering and to security against attacks on their physical existence" (10). Animals interest in living, freedom, subsistence and security are of vital importance to them. They do not belong to us. They are not the things we have already possessed by virtue of our own nature. Interests of animals do morally matter. Many people think that inflicting unnecessary suffering on animals is wrong. Everyday millions of animals are slaughtered for food, sport, and fashion. Animals are generally kept in terrible conditions. They are caged in solitary narrow spaces and they are transported along distances in crowded containers.

Kundera's provocation is entirely with his investigation of human life in the trap through the unsympathetic behaviour of humans towards animals and natural habitation. Animal right has a very specific meaning as one of the possible approaches to the projection of animals. The harsh treatment to animal not only has adverse effects on the environment but it surfaces our own animality. They deserve our moral consideration and ethical treatment. Animals should not be used as commodities. The major implication of this research paper is to advocate active public involvement in

the animal right management. So, this paper suggests possible means to reduce the violation of animal rights. Hence, to establish humanly relationship, the approaches to minimize animal's physical and psychological discomfort will be investigated.

Tereza's act in the novel justifies them as the best companion to share the human pain and loneliness. Her treatment to Karenin and the wounded crow abolishes the animal exploitation based on material gain, convenience, habit and domination. She defies speceism and as a social activist has more humanistic vision.

Animals came from over the horizon. An animals blood flowed like human blood, but its species was undying. They were subjected and worshipped, bred and sacrificed. If the first metaphor was animal, it was because the essential relation between man and animal was metaphoric. The narrator in the novel argues:

The very beginning of Genesis tells us that God created man in order to give him dominion over fish and fowl and all creatures. Of course, Genesis was written by a man, not a horse. There is no certainly that God actually didgrant man dominion over other creature. (277)

The narrator justifies the human made law where human beings have kept themselves far superior to other earthly terrestrials. Humans have utilized the advantage of their brain power. So, during the evolution, they came as the most powerful creature of the earth. Regan emphasizes " Non- human mammals over a year of age have mental capacities for memory, a sense of future, emotion and self- awareness to a certain extent"(330). On the ground of their having such mental capacities, he concludes that mammals are subjects of life and have equal inherent value.

Medieval philosophy was greatly influenced by the theological and Aristotelian thought. This was reflected on St. Thomas Aquinas' views on animals. Like Aristotle, he argued that animals exist for human purposes and that they have

only instrumental value. He regarded animals as irrational beings and given his belief in the order of the things where imperfect were for the perfect he justified the use of animals for the benefit of humans. However, Aquinas maintained that humans have indirect duties to avoid animal cruelty for the reason that the cruelty towards animals may lead to the cruelty towards humans.

The collective farm had four large cow sheds as well as a small stable of forty heifers. Tereza was charged with looking after them and taking them out to pasture twice a day. Karenin, their dog always gives company to Tereza. The care and love, they give to their dog emphasizes the value of animal rights and love. One day, they took a walk with Karenin up the slope behind their cottage. Tereza states, " I don't like the way his running. He is limping on a hind legs" (276). Tomas bends down and carefully feels all along it. Near the hock, he finds a small bump. The narrator argues: "The next day he sat in the front seat of the pick - up and drove, during his rounds to the neighbouring village, where the local veterinarian lived. A week lived. A week later he paid himanother visit. He came home with the news that Karenin had cancer" (276).

The narrator establishes the more moral and physical value to animals. Before the progress in development of several INGOs and NGOs working in the field of animal rights, the animals were regarded as non -living things. Neither our use nor our treatment of animals mattered morally or legally. Animals should not be treated as property.

Gary Francione argues, "There were some who like French philosopher Rene Descartes, claimed that animals were nothing more than machines created by God" (6). Descartes denied that animals were sentient. However, it was accepted that animals were sentient and were the sorts of beings who had interests. Karenin, the dog

in the novel loves Tereza which he justifies through his states and hospitality. The narrator argues, "Walking along with her heifers, driving them in front of her, Tereza was constantly obliged to use discipline, because young cows are frisky. Karenin kept her company" (278). He had been going along daily to the pasture with her for two years.

Posner in his article "Animal Rights" argues, "Placing animals on a plane of equality with human beings may make the life of a pig more valuable than the life of a severely retarded human being" (534). We should undertake to shrink the human population to give more scope for happy - seeming animals. A world population just large enough to support an enormous animal population might be the utilization optimum. Tereza tries to develop a strong solidarity with the animals and her desire to make others as animal lover also seems clear. The narrator states: "Tereza understand and had spent enough time in the country to realize that if the local inhabitants loved every rabbit as she love Karenin they should beunable to kill any of them" (279).

The narrator justifies that punishing and killing animal is a reflection of immoral human character. Animals should never be used as slaves. Animals should not be reared for the outcome of food only. Posner argues, "To punish an ox or a rat as if it were a rebelling slave is to accord the animal a considerable dignity" (529). Animals also should have the same constitutional rights. The rights to life, to bodily integrity, to subsistence and to some kind of freedom. We cannot permit invasive or dangerous medical experimentation on animals, no matter how great the benefits for human health.

Tereza finds cows and heifers quite interesting in their sheds. Tereza enjoys their company. For Tereza, there was nothing more touching than the cows at play. Tereza took pleasures in their antics and could not help thinking. It is the idea that she

can never forget The narrator claims, "Man is as much a parasite on the cow as the tapeworm is on man. We have sucked their udders like leeches" (279). It is the major premise that presents the immediate difficulty with the question of animal rights.

Animals also have the rights not to be killed by other animals. We must create and maintain the healthy environment for their residences. Dogan argues, "Since animals are sentient creatures and thus have capacity to suffer, we, should give equal consideration to their suffering as human suffering" (26). Hence, as moral persons we ought to avoid inflicting pain on animals for wearing fur and leather clothes, using animals' bones as ornaments and so on.

The narrator argues that even though Genesis says that God gave man dominion over all animals. We can also construe it to mean that he merely entrusted them to man's care. Tereza's ideas distance her from the rest of the mankind. Man was not the planets master, merely its administrator. The narrator different to his ideas, brings contrasting ideas from Descartes and states: "Man is master and proprietor, says Descartes, whereas the best is merely an automaton, an animated machine, a *machina animata*. Thus, we have no reason to grieve for a dog being carved up alive in the laboratory" (280).

Taking animals as simply machine, Descartes ideas are quite opposite to the novelists. That's why, he brings the character of Tereza to establish the beautiful relation of humans and the animals. Tereza sits on a stump with Karenin while the heifers grazed, Karenin's head rests in her lap. This position maintains the animal life depends upon the human life. Therefore, cruel treatment towards animals should be imposed as criminal activity.

One of the most influential views on animals in modern philosophy belongs to Rene Descartes who regarded animals as natural automata or moving machines. In

order to distinguish between humans and animals Descartes employed two criteria that is – the capacity to think and the capacity to use language. He believed that animals lacked both capacities which made him think that animals were not conscious beings. The moral implication of Descartes' view on animals is that as long as animals are mere automata they do not have welfare and interests whatsoever, therefore humans do not have any direct moral concern towards them. Descartes argues that animals lack the capacity to conceptualize intellectually like us. They differ in quality to contemplate like great artists and human. He considers animals just as machine assembled to functions certain specific deed only. Thus, he sympathizes with animals who could just be taken as poor machine without having full control over themselves. Finally he attempts to put the vulnerability and unethical treatment to animals.

The narrator describes about the Russian and German invasion over Czechoslovakia. During this Second World War, people were filled with the fanatical nationalism. Their anger was rising. They were becoming more cruel and animalistic than they ever had been. Then they had to focus, cultivate, and maintain those people's aggressiveness, give them a temporary substitute to practice on. The substitute they lit upon was animals. The narrator argues:

The papers started coming out with cycles of features and organized letters - to the editor campaigns demanding the extermination of all pigeons within city limits. And the pigeons would be exterminated. But the major drive was directed against dogs. (280)

People were still fearful over the catastrophe of the occupation. Radio, television and the press went on and on about dogs. It was argued in the novel about dogs that they are soiling the streets and parks. People fear about endangering their children's health.

Soldiers spread such that the crazed mob would do harm to Karenin. But later on, such people started being removed from their jobs arrested, put on trial. At last the animals could breathe freely.

Voltaire criticized Descartes' view on animals by appealing to the learning skills of animals. He pointed out that a hunting dog knows more after the training for some time than he knew before the training. This, according to Voltaire, should mean that animals are not mere machines. He also argued that since animals have the same organs of feeling as humans do it would be absurd to believe that nature arranged all the means of feeling in animals in order for them not to (be able to) feel.

We could have obligations that concerned animals. We've obligation not to damage our neighbour's cow. My neighbor might have an obligation not to impose gratuitous suffering on her cow because that might make her more inclined to treat others in an unkind fashion. Bentham and Mill argue, "The requirement of impartial consideration entailed ignoring the species of being just as it required ignoring the race or sex of humans" (3). They argued that even if animals were not rational, self-aware, or otherwise did not have minds that were similar to those of humans, these cognitive differences were irrelevant to the moral significance of animal suffering.

One of the heifers had made friends with Tereza. The heifer would stop and stare at her with her big brown eyes. Tereza knew her. She called her Marketa. Tereza shows that animals also have souls. So, it is argued, "She would have been happy to give all her heifers name. And if having a name is a sign of having a soul, I can say that they had souls" (282). But then the villagers were turned into a large collective factory. Cows began spending all their lives in the five square feet set aside for them in their cow sheds.

Unlike Descartes, David Hume believed that no truth was more evident than the fact that animals are endowed with thought and reason as well as humans. He argued by analogy that since internal and external actions of animals closely resemble internal and external actions of humans then the causes from which these actions are derived should also resemble. Moreover, he also maintained that a capacity for sympathy and emotions like “pride and humility are not merely human passions, but extend themselves over the whole animal creation.” Immanuel Kant infamously argued that as animals are not rational, autonomous, and self-conscious beings we, humans, do not have any direct duties towards them. Though we have indirect duties to treat them humanely and the only reason for that is the worry that the cruelty to animals may lead or encourage the cruelty to humans, therefore animals should be treated humanely, but after all they are only a means to an end and this end is the human being. Therefore they can be used for the benefit of human purposes.

According to Mill, "A being of higher faculties requires more to make him happy is capable probably of more acute suffering, and is certainly accessible to it at more points, than one of an inferior type" (Francione 6). Man can never really wish to sink into what he feels to be a lower grade of existence. Animals lack, a sense of dignity, which all human beings possess in one form or other. Moreover, humans have a more developed intelligence. It gives a wider range to the whole of their sentiments whether self- regarding or sympathetic. As a result animal rights become dissatisfactory.

Industrialists and utilitarians are responsible for the emergence of the animal welfare movement because they created the bad environment for them. We consider animal interests when assessing the consequences of actions. Francione argues that

animals do have an interest in continuing to live and their interests to treat them as property and to use and to kill them humanely. The narrator with love explains.

Karenin followed him with his eyes, which seemed to show a glimmer of interest, but he did not pick himself up. Tomas brought his face right up to his muzzle. Without moving his body, the dog took the end of the roll sticking out of Tomas mouth into his own then Tomas let go of his end so that Karenin could eat it all. (283)

An animal may struggle against a threat to its life even it cannot grasp. It has a life in the sense that requires an understanding of what it is to exist over a period of time. It is not easy to explain why the loss to the animal killed is not made good by the creation of a new animal who will lead an equally pleasant life. Bentham argues, "Animals do not know what if they lose when we kill them; death is not harm for them" (Francione 7). Bentham tries to justify the notion that animals care about suffering while they live. As long as we take seriously the interests of animals is not suffering, our use of them may be ethically wrong.

If it is the infliction of suffering that we are concerned about, rather than killing then people should not use plants as vegan products because their products are through the sufferings of animals. Human and nonhuman interests in not suffering ought to be treated in a similar fashion as required by the principle of impartiality. Singer claims, "Because humans have superior mental powers, they will in some cases suffer more than animals and in some cases suffer less but making interspecies comparisons is difficult and perhaps even impossible" (Francione 8). He maintains that we have moral justification for treating animals not as the means for humans.

It is narrated in the novel, "Standing there watching him, they thought once more that he was smiling and that as long as he kept smiling he had a motive to keep

living despite his death sentence" (284). The dog's purpose for living is made clearer. Though the dog is simply an animal, his major motive is to an animal, his major motive is to struggle and live despite the unbearable pain. Regan argues that in a situation in which we are in a lifeboat and must choose whether to save a dog or a human, we should not hesitate to choose to save the life of the dog over the human because death is equally harmful for the animal also.

Transported mentally into the future, a future without Karenin, Tereza feel abandoned. The narrator points out, "Karenin has been an important part of our life. Silence was the only way of not thinking about Karenin in the past tense" (285). To some extent humans and non - humans have different sorts of minds. Those differences may be relevant for some purposes, just as differences between and among humans may be relevant for some purposes. Our dogs very much like to sit with us when we watch movies but we do not consider their likes and dislikes in movies when we go to the video store. We assume that they do not have any interests in what films we choose. They seem equally happy to sit with us irrespective of what we are watching.

Tereza accepted Karenin for what he was. She did not try to make him over in her image. She agreed from the outset with his dogs life, did not wish to deprive him of it. She did not envy his secret intrigues. The reason she trained him was not to transform him but to provide him with the elementary language that enabled there to communicate and live together.

Francione argues that animal is cognitively more similar to humans because they are relevant to determining their interests. But with respects to the animal interest in her life and the harm to her of death, or her interest is not being made to experience pain and suffering "(11). We should be clear here about the meaning of right. A right

is a way of protecting an interest. The interest is protected even if the general welfare would be increased. For example, to say that I have a right to my life is to say that my interest in continuing to remain alive is protected even if using me in a painful biomedical experiment that resulted in my death might lead to a cure for cancer.

No one forced Tereza to love Karenin. Love for dogs is voluntary. So, the narrator argues: "But most of all no one can give anyone else the gift of the idyll. Only animal can do so because only they were not expelled from Paradise. The love between dog and man is idyllic" (290).

Such relationship knows no conflicts, no hair-raising scenes. It knows no development Karenin surrounded Tereza and Tomas with a life based on repetition. He expected the same from them.

If Karenin had been a person instead of a dog, he would surely have long since said to Tereza, "Look, I'm sick and tired of carrying that roll in my mouth every day" (290). And therein lies the whole of man's plight. Human time does not turn in a circle. It runs ahead in a straight line. That is why man cannot be happy. Happiness is the longing for repetition. Francione argues that if animals matter morally, then we must apply the principle of equal consideration. We should answer the question that is there a justification for using animals in ways in which we would regard it as inappropriate to use any humans.

The answer is clear. There is no rational justification for our continuing to deny this one. As long as animals are property, they can never be members of the moral community. The interests of animals will count for less than the interests of animal owners. We can fall back on religious superstition and claim that animal use is justified because animals do not have souls, we can accuse them of not created in Gods image or of inferior spiritually. Alternatively, we can claim that our use of

animals is acceptable because we are human and they are not. It is like saying we are white and they are black. We are men they are women. We are straight, they are gay.

The narrator argues, "Dogs do not have many advantages over people, but one of them is extremely important: euthanasia is not forbidden by law in their case; animals have the right to a merciful death" (291). Karenin walked on three legs and spent more and more of his time lying in a corner. Both husband and wife agreed that they had no business letting him suffer need lessly. They still had to face the anguish of determining the time when his suffering was in fact need less, the point at which life was no longer worth living. If only Tomas hadn't been a doctor, then they would have been able to hide behind a third party. They would have been able to go back to the vet and ask him to put the dog to sleep with injection.

Everything in the village, its rhythms, its people's actions, its spaces is organized by the relation to animals. Most importantly, Karenin finally is allowed to emerge from the corner to the center of the narrative, she becomes the keeper of the clock' who helps Tereza lead the herd out to the fields to grace twice a day. But though a harmonious coexistence Between Tereza Tomas, and Karenin could provide many narrative opportunities, Karenin's move to the outer of the narrative world is again marked by vulnerability. Since the beginning of the narrative, Karenin has been a sort of ultimate, non - human, foundling. One of the first acts of the couple had been to adopt this unwanted of St. Bernard / German shepherd puppy from one of Tomas's colleagues, thus saving her from death.

When Karenin starts limping, and Tomas diagnoses a cancer, her death becomes their central occupation. Thus, the narrator proliferates, "Assuming the role of death is a terrifying thing. But then he realized that he could grant Karenin a privilege forbidden to humans. Death would come for him in the guise of his loved

ones"(291). There is no irony here that associates Karenin's life and death with that of Tomas and Tereza. For Sabina, Tomas lover had received a letter from Tomas's son many pages earlier informing her that they had died. And yet instead it is Karenin whom we find flying with the time. Her dying is recounted step by step, covering several days. It has created more pathos than the human dead. Indeed, we have seen more solemnity than the death of Jackoff or Sabina's lover Franz.

Karenin's death leads Tereza to rethink the human/ animal relation. For Berger, animals are similar to human in that they" are born, are sentient and are mortal" (259). But they are dissimilar as well, and he believes that one regrettable result of the disappearance of animals is that humans no longer feel their gaze upon is same time a sign of a deep, abyssal distance. When looked at by another human, we can overcome this distance at least through language and sociability. Tereza continually interprets Karenin's behavior as though she were reading a book. She show signs of wanting to play and emits a weak grunt of pleasure.

Though Tereza and Tomas refer to this in badly anthropomorphic terms as Karenin's smile. It is only a smile in the sense that she still takes pleasure in life and has a will to live. This low- level translatability does not erase an ethical distance. Since her adoption, Karenin has been entirely dependent on Tereza. Tereza can neither help Karenin nor explain her. When she feels Karenin's gaze fall upon her just before death she interprets it as a reminder of her great power. She is over whelmed by this gaze and its absolute confidence, "It was a look of awful, unbearable trust" (300).

Francione argues, "The animal rights position does not mean releasing domesticated non- humans to run wild in the street" (13). If we take animals seriously and recognize our obligation not to treat them and facilitating the production of

domestic animals altogether we will care for the ones whom we have here now, we will stop breeding more for human consumption. We will leave non- domesticated animals alone. We will stop eating, wearing or using animal products and would regard veganism as a clear and an equivocal moral baseline.

The capacity to receive the gaze of an animal stands in vivid contrast to the modes of viewing. Both Tomas and Tereza had been called to observe and visually analyze other people. Tomas as a surgeon and a lover and Tereza as a photographer. But each character recognizes that there had been something wrong with their manner of looking. For Tereza the break comes with the photographs of nudists that she is shown in Swiss exile. She had photographed Tomas's lover Sabina nude and even posed nude for Sabina herself. Instead, it is the mechanical depiction of the vulnerable bodies that turns her away from these photographs. Her own willingness to submit to the camera for Sabina shows that she is willing to take the risk of baring vulnerability.

This vulnerable gaze helps Tereza deepen a perspective from which human pretensions to the moral good can be judged. For Tereza, Karenin's trustful eyes recall those of the crow, which seemed to reproach Tereza for what her co- species had done. Tereza also feels the gaze of her heifers, one of which, named Marguerite, approaches to look her in the face. From there she also constructs of her external gazes, some of which overturn the human/animal hierarchy. The narrator argues, 'she concludes that mankind should consider apologizing to the cows' (305). She imagines a zoologist should define mankind as a parasite of the cow.

Even though Charles Darwin himself was not a philosopher his influence on the philosophical thinking in relation to animals is immense. Darwin's revolutionary ideas about the origin of species completely changed the way humans regarded themselves and their relationship with other animals. Darwin proposed the theory of

evolution according to which humans were not the creations of god but rather they were the result of evolutionary process and had evolved from an ape-like ancestor. These ideas, for the most part, broke the old stereotypes and challenged the traditional beliefs that proclaimed a human as a unique and all-dominant supreme creature. Darwin argued that human beings are very similar to animals in many ways and that there is no fundamental difference between their mental faculties. Though, he did point out that intellectually humans are superior. But he noted that:

Nevertheless the difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind. We have seen that the senses and intuitions, the various emotions and faculties, such as love, memory, attention, curiosity, imitation, reason, etc., of which man boasts, may be found in an incipient, or even sometimes in a well developed condition, in the lower animals.

(Jalagania 8)

In the 20th century another utilitarian and very influential contemporary philosopher Peter Singer, similar to Bentham, considers sentience or the capacity for suffering as a vital characteristic for moral consideration. He argues that the ability to feel pleasure and pain is a prerequisite for having interests at all and as most animals are sentient beings they are worthy of our moral concern. Moreover, Singer holds that if we accept the principle of equality then we should accept the equal consideration of interests too. Considering that all sentient animals have interests at least in avoiding pain and suffering then we need to extend the principle of equal consideration of interests to animals as well. Singer describes that principle as follows: “The essence of the *Principle of Equal Consideration of Interests* is that we give equal weight in our moral deliberations to the like interests of all those affected by our actions” (Jalagania

12). Violating this principle and giving more weight to the interests of humans over the same interests of animals will qualify as speciesism—an attitude of bias against a being because of the species to which it belongs. Singer maintains that the fact that animals do not belong to the human species shouldn't be the reason for discounting the like interests of animals – suffering should be counted equally with the like suffering. The moral implication of Singer's view is that as most of the animals are sentient and fully conscious beings they should be granted the interests respective to their capacities, particularly an interest in avoiding pain and suffering and humans are morally required not to violate these interests. This will mean abolition of most of the practices that involve animal exploitation where animal interests are constantly ignored and violated, and where human interests are not such as to justify such violation. It is also worthy to mention that according to Singer's view some animals who are merely conscious (sentient, but not self-conscious) do not have an interest in continued existence and can be considered as replaceable. In that respect, from the utilitarian standpoint, killing a merely sentient (non-self-conscious) animal painlessly and without suffering can be morally permissible, if and only if, the animal will be replaced by another one leading an equally pleasant life, at least all other things being equal; for example, unless killing the animal makes other animals suffer.

Kundera's narrator broadens her critique to include the massive transformation of animals into raw material in the meat industry. It is cleared by the fact that she cannot name all of her heifers is itself an indication of the massive size of the exploitation she works for. The narrator declares, "The village itself had become a factory and that the world has declared Descartes correct" (289). We have to watch the attitudes of people towards that vulnerability. For Berger, "animals are both here in our world and on the other side of a horizon in a place we no longer try to access.

But if we look they can also form a link between man and his origins" (261). For Tereza, as explained by the narrator. "The only logical response the narrator can find is that defecation and voluptuousness were present in the Eden. At that time man didn't care those as disgusting" (247). Thus, humans are shameless creatures from their origins.

After Karenin's death, she is only happy to find the first urine pad of her. Karenin's urine pad gave her sense of presence of Karenin to Tereza. She also thinks of how little disgust she felt when Karenin was in heat and had to wear Tereza's old underwear. She wonders why she can feel tenderness towards Karenin's bodily fluids. The narrator explains, "Animals know nothing about the duality of body and soul and have no concept of disgust" (297). She concludes that animals have never fallen and have never taken the wrong turn of having been expelled from paradise.

The first problem with the property status of animals is that property status regards animals as property, which is not only immoral but also a category mistake. Moreover, as a result of this the law not only regards animals as property but also treats them as mere objects and reduces them to commodities. Hence, the property status diminishes the inherent value of the animals and objectifies them. Given the biological fact that most animals are sentient and fully conscious beings capable of experiencing pain and pleasure, various kinds of positive and negative emotions, one may ask-does the property status of animals, allowing them to be a subject to cruel treatment, really correspond to their true nature? Animals obtained the legal status of property hundreds of years ago. Since then the majority of countries haven't even bothered to reconsider the compatibility of property status with the capacities of animals.

Tereza presents the counter utopia of animality. Thus, there is reasoned justification offered for this ethical morality. The novel can find real justification for Tereza's indulgence for suffering animals. Thus, through pathetic irony, the novel is an obliteration of a certain portrait of mankind. Karenin the dog lies as well in a fallen idyll. *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* opens a perspective in which human life is reduced to the meat. But in meat and feces it issues an unjustified moral appeal concerning both human and animal suffering. Thus, the novel integrates all aspects including character, narrator, style and narrative. It opens a wide and deep perspective on the problem of animality and animal suffering.

Works Cited

- Bedient, Calvin. "On Milan Kundera." *Salmagundi*, Skidmore College, no.73, 1987, pp. 93- 108.
- Berger, John. "Why Look at Animals." *Jstor*, Brill, vol. 9, no. 2, 2005, pp. 203-18.
- - - "Francis Bacon and Walt Disney." *Selected Essays*, ed. Geoff Dyer, vintage International 2001, pp. 315-19.
- Coetzee, J.M. *The Lives of Animals* ed. Amy Gutman. Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Dogan, Aysel. "A Defense of Animal Rights." *Springer*, Kocaeli University, 2010.
- Francione, Gary L. "Animal Welfare and the Moral Value of Nonhuman Animals." *Law, Culture and Humanities*, Sage, vol. 6, no. 1, 2009, pp. 1-13.
- Jalagania, Beka. "Moral and Legal Status of Animals: Why Animals Should Have Legal Rights." *Estoian Development Corporation*, University of Tartu, 20016, pp. 1-47.
- Kundera, Milan. *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. Translated by Michael Henry Heim. Harper and Row publishers, 1984.
- Mai, Joseph. "Humanity's true moral test: Shame, idyll, and animal vulnerability in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*." *Studies in the novel*, The John Hopkins University, vol. 46, no. 1, Spring 2014, pp. 100-16.
- Nussbaum, Martha. *Upheavals of thought : The intelligence of Emotion*. Cambridge University press, 2001.
- Pichova, Hana and Marjorie E. Rhine. "Reading Oedipus in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*." *Comparative Literary Studies*, State University Press, vol. 34, no. 1, 1997, pp. 71-83.

- Pichova, Hana. "The Narrator in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*." *The Slavic and East European journal*, American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European languages, vol. 36, no. 2, Summer 1992, pp. 217-26.
- Posner, Richard. "Animal Rights." *The Yale Law journal*, The Yale Law Journal Company, vol. 110, no. 3, Dec. 2000, pp. 527-41.
- Regan, Tom. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Blackwell publishers, 1985, pp. 13-26.
- Scarpetta, Guy and Anzalone John. "Kundera's Quartet." *Salmagundi*, Skidmore College, no. 73, Winter 1987, pp. 109-18.