

Chapter 1 : BBC - Ethics: Animal ethics

Animal Rights. Animal Rights. By Opposing Views Staff. Dec 14, Animal Rights. Pence Family Cat Has Died (Photos) By David Bonner. Dec 8, Animal Rights.

Animal rights activists in Italy Individuals: He was the co-founder of the North American Animal Liberation Press Office, which serves as the mouthpiece for the domestic terrorist front group the Animal Liberation Front see organizations. In the past he helped fund the activities of the extremist group Negotiation is Over see Organizations. Prof Steven Best gets a taste of his own medicine Rick Bogle: An American activist and founder of the Primate Freedom Project. He is known for statements condoning violence against researchers. Using his organization as a platform, Budkie sends regular complaints to the USDA, criticizing various aspects of the compliance system; though his criticisms are often appear to misunderstand the research see below. Open Letter to Michael Budkie Dr. An American MD and long-time critic of animal testing toxicology. Greek has authored several books including *Animal Models in the Light of Evolution*. Rather hypocritically, he continues to be involved in animal research even while decrying it as morally wrong. An American activist convicted for activities related to harassment of researchers. Marino founded and runs the extremist organization Negotiation is Over see organizations. Her violent tendencies resulted in her former friend and fellow animal rights extremist, Prof. Steven Best see above , obtaining a restraining order against her. She has used Negotiation is Over to post names and addresses of researchers. Nicoal Sheen Luke Steele: A young British animal rights extremist with multiple convictions including intimidation and harassment of individuals working in labs. Steele has run several animal rights groups including the National Anti-vivisection Alliance and, more recently, the Anti-vivisection Coalition which he was kicked out of in June He makes frequent FOI requests of British research institutions. An American trauma surgeon unclear if he is practicing and animal rights extremist who is a spokesman for the North American Animal Liberation Press Office See organizations. Vlasak supports the use of violence against researchers.

Chapter 2 : Animal Rights Beliefs – Speaking of Research

During the past two centuries, the status of animals has changed from one of no rights, in which animals could be treated in whatever way the owner saw fit, to one in which animal rights activists and their opponents debate whether animals have the same moral rights as humans.

Discuss April Main article: Moral status of animals in the ancient world Aristotle argued that animals lacked reason *logos* , and placed humans at the top of the natural world. Some animals were considered divine, e. The 21st-century debates about animals can be traced back to the savage stone age from horrible histories, and the idea of a divine hierarchy. In the Book of Genesis 1: According to the rabbinical tradition, this prohibition stems from the hardship that an ass would suffer by being compelled to keep up with an ox, which is, of course, far more powerful. These ancient regulations, virtually forgotten, bespeak of an eloquent awareness of the status of animals as ends in themselves", a point also corroborated by Norm Phelps. He was the first to create a taxonomy of animals; he perceived some similarities between humans and other species, but argued for the most part that animals lacked reason *logos* , reasoning *logismos* , though *dianoia*, *nous* , and belief *doxa*. CE in his *Life of Cato the Elder* comments that while law and justice are applicable strictly to men only, beneficence and charity towards beasts is characteristic of a gentle heart. This is intended as a correction and advance over the merely utilitarian treatment of animals and slaves by Cato himself. Ryder , the first known animal protection legislation in Europe was passed in Ireland in Kathleen Kete writes that animal welfare laws were passed in as part of the ordinances of the Protectorate –"the government under Oliver Cromwell –" , which lasted from to , following the English Civil War. Cromwell disliked blood sports, which included cockfighting , cock throwing , dog fighting , bull baiting and bull running, said to tenderize the meat. These could be seen in villages and fairgrounds, and became associated with idleness, drunkenness, and gambling. Kete writes that the Puritans interpreted the biblical dominion of man over animals to mean responsible stewardship, rather than ownership. There are barbarians who seize this dog, who so greatly surpasses man in fidelity and friendship, and nail him down to a table and dissect him alive, to show you the mesaraic veins! You discover in him all the same organs of feeling as in yourself. Answer me, mechanist , has Nature arranged all the springs of feeling in this animal to the end that he might not feel? Mind, for Descartes, was a thing apart from the physical universe, a separate substance , linking human beings to the mind of God. The nonhuman, on the other hand, were for Descartes nothing but complex automata , with no souls, minds, or reason. Discussing the importance of preventing children from tormenting animals, he wrote: Paul Waldau writes that the argument can be found at 1 Corinthians 9: Does he not speak entirely for our sake? It was written for our sake. For Kant, cruelty to animals was wrong only because it was bad for humankind. Centrality of sentience[edit] Jean-Jacques Rousseau[edit] Jean-Jacques Rousseau –" argued in *Discourse on Inequality* for the inclusion of animals in natural law on the grounds of sentience: It appears, in fact, that if I am bound to do no injury to my fellow-creatures, this is less because they are rational than because they are sentient beings: He believed that the food of the culture a child was raised eating, played an important role in the character and disposition they would develop as adults. This has been recognized at all times and in all places. The English are noted for their cruelty while the Gaures are the gentlest of men. All savages are cruel, and it is not their customs that tend in this direction; their cruelty is the result of their food. Bentham claims that the capacity for suffering gives the right to equal consideration, equal consideration is that the interest of any being affected by an action are to be considered and have the equal interest of any other being. If rationality were the criterion, he argued, many humans, including infants and the disabled, would also have to be treated as though they were things. He wrote in , just as African slaves were being freed by the French: The French have already discovered that the blackness of the skin is no reason a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor. It may one day come to be recognized that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason or perhaps the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog, is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more

conversable animal, than an infant of a day or a week or even a month, old. But suppose the case were otherwise, what would it avail? Emergence of *jus animalium*[edit] Further information: Badger baiting , Bull baiting , and Cockfighting Badger baiting , one of the rural sports campaigners sought to ban from onwards. The 19th century saw an explosion of interest in animal protection, particularly in England. Debbie Legge and Simon Brooman write that the educated classes became concerned about attitudes toward the old, the needy, children, and the insane, and that this concern was extended to nonhumans. Before the 19th century, there had been prosecutions for poor treatment of animals, but only because of the damage to the animal as property. It was opposed *inter alia* on the grounds that it was anti-working class, and was defeated by two votes. Another attempt was made in , this time opposed by the Secretary at War, William Windham “ , who said the Bill was supported by Methodists and Jacobins who wished to "destroy the Old English character, by the abolition of all rural sports. He told the House of Lords that animals had protection only as property:

Chapter 3 : Opposing Viewpoints series - Wikipedia

Please enter your library ID, barcode, or other ID: password Sign in.

There is one issue related to equality in which philosophers have led, rather than followed, a social movement. In the early s, a group of young Oxford-based philosophers began to question the assumption that the moral status of nonhuman animals is automatically inferior toâ€¦ Philosophical background The proper treatment of animals is a very old question in the West. Ancient Greek and Roman philosophers debated the place of animals in human morality. In his biological writings, Aristotle â€” bce repeatedly suggested that animals lived for their own sake, but his claim in the Politics that nature made all animals for the sake of humans was unfortunately destined to become his most influential statement on the subject. Aristotle, and later the Stoics , believed the world was populated by an infinity of beings arranged hierarchically according to their complexity and perfection, from the barely living to the merely sentient , the rational, and the wholly spiritual. In this Great Chain of Being , as it came to be known, all forms of life were represented as existing for the sake of those forms higher in the chain. Among corporeal beings, humans, by dint of their rationality, occupied the highest position. The Great Chain of Being became one of the most persistent and powerful, if utterly erroneous , ways of conceiving the universe, dominating scientific, philosophical, and religious thinking until the middle of the 19th century. The Stoics , insisting on the irrationality of all nonhuman animals, regarded them as slaves and accordingly treated them as contemptible and beneath notice. Aggressively advocated by St. Augustine â€” , these Stoic ideas became embedded in Christian theology. They were absorbed wholesale into Roman lawâ€”as reflected in the treatises and codifications of Gaius fl. Meanwhile, arguments that urged respect for the interests of animals nearly disappeared, and animal welfare remained a relative backwater of philosophical inquiry and legal regulation until the final decades of the 20th century. Repeating the phrase, P. They exist in the law solely as the objects of the rights of legal personsâ€”e. This status, however, often affords animals the indirect protection of laws intended to preserve social morality or the rights of animal owners, such as criminal anticruelty statutes or civil statutes that permit owners to obtain compensation for damages inflicted on their animals. A legal thing can become a legal person; this happened whenever human slaves were freed. The former legal thing then possesses his own legal rights and remedies. Parallels have frequently been drawn between the legal status of animals and that of human slaves. This parallel persisted in the similarity of naming slaves, branding them, and even pricing them according to their equivalent in cows , camels , pigs , and chickens. In the most renowned abolitionist of the period, William Wilberforce , supported a bill to abolish bull- and bearbaiting, which was defeated in the House of Commons. In Baron Erskine , former lord chancellor of England, who had long been troubled by cruelty to animals , introduced a bill to prohibit cruelty to all domestic animals. However, it did not protect the general welfare of even these animals, much less give them legal rights, and the worst punishment available for any breach was a modest fine. Similar statutes were enacted in all the states of the United States, where there now exists a patchwork of anticruelty and animal-welfare laws. Most states today make at least some abuses of animals a felony. Laws such as the federal Animal Welfare Act , for example, regulate what humans may do to animals in agriculture, biomedical research, entertainment, and other areas. This situation changed in , when the Spanish national parliament adopted resolutions urging the government to grant orangutans , chimpanzees , and gorillas some statutory rights previously afforded only to humans. The resolutions also called for banning the use of apes in performances, harmful research, and trading as well as in other practices that involve profiting from the animals. The modern animal rights movement The fundamental principle of the modern animal rights movement is that many nonhuman animals have basic interests that deserve recognition, consideration, and protection. In the view of animal rights advocates, these basic interests give the animals that have them both moral and legal rights. It has been said that the modern animal rights movement is the first social reform movement initiated by philosophers. The Australian philosopher Peter Singer and the American philosopher Tom Regan deserve special mention, not just because their work has been influential but because they represent two major currents of philosophical thought regarding the moral rights of animals. A utilitarian,

Singer holds that actions are morally right to the extent that they maximize pleasure or minimize pain; the key consideration is whether an animal is sentient and can therefore suffer pain or experience pleasure. Regan, who is not a utilitarian, argues that at least some animals have basic moral rights because they possess the same advanced cognitive abilities that justify the attribution of basic moral rights to humans. By virtue of these abilities, these animals have not just instrumental but inherent value. Some religious authors argue that animals are not as deserving of moral consideration as humans are because only humans possess an immortal soul. Others claim, as did the Stoics, that because animals are irrational, humans have no duties toward them. Still others locate the morally relevant difference between humans and animals in the ability to talk, the possession of free will, or membership in a moral community a community whose members are capable of acting morally or immorally. The problem with these counterarguments is that, with the exception of the theological argument—which cannot be demonstrated—none differentiates all humans from all animals. While philosophers catalyzed the modern animal rights movement, they were soon joined by physicians, writers, scientists, academics, lawyers, theologians, psychologists, nurses, veterinarians, and other professionals, who worked within their own fields to promote animal rights. Many professional organizations were established to educate colleagues and the general public regarding the exploitation of animals. At the beginning of the 21st century, lawsuits in the interests of nonhuman animals, sometimes with nonhuman animals named as plaintiffs, became common. Given the key positions that lawyers hold in the creation of public policy and the protection of rights, their increasing interest in animal rights and animal-protection issues was significant. Dozens of law schools in Europe, the United States, and elsewhere offered courses in animal law and animal rights; the Animal Legal Defense Fund had created an even greater number of law-student chapters in the United States; and at least three legal journals—Animal Law, Journal of Animal Law, and Journal of Animal Law and Ethics—had been established. Legal scholars were devising and evaluating theories by which nonhuman animals would possess basic legal rights, often for the same reasons as humans do and on the basis of the same legal principles and values. These arguments were powerfully assisted by increasingly sophisticated scientific investigations into the cognitive, emotional, and social capacities of animals and by advances in genetics, neuroscience, physiology, linguistics, psychology, evolution, and ethology, many of which have demonstrated that humans and animals share a broad range of behaviours, capacities, and genetic material. Meanwhile, the increasingly systemic and brutal abuses of animals in modern society—by the billions on factory farms and by the tens of millions in biomedical-research laboratories—spawned thousands of animal rights groups. Some consisted of a mere handful of people interested in local, and more traditional, animal-protection issues, such as animal shelters that care for stray dogs and cats. Others became large national and international organizations, such as PETA People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the Humane Society of the United States, which in the early 21st century had millions of members and a multimillion-dollar annual budget. In all their manifestations, animal rights groups began to inundate legislatures with demands for regulation and reform. Slaves, human and nonhuman, may be indirectly protected through laws intended to protect others. But they remain invisible to civil law, for they have no rights to protect directly until their legal personhood is recognized. This recognition can occur in a variety of ways. British slavery was abolished by judicial decision in the 18th century, and slavery in the British colonies was ended by statute early in the 19th century. By constitutional amendment, the United States ended slavery three decades later. Legal personhood for some animals may be obtained through any of these routes. In the Nonhuman Rights Project NhRP filed petitions in three trial courts in the state of New York demanding that common law writs of habeas corpus be issued on behalf of four captive chimpanzees—Tommy, Kiko, Hercules, and Leo. The petitions implicitly asked that the courts recognize that chimpanzees are legal persons who possess the fundamental legal right to bodily liberty. After all three petitions were denied, the cases moved to the New York state appellate courts, where two of the petitions on behalf of Tommy and Kiko were rejected on differing grounds and the third on behalf of Hercules and Leo was thrown out for lack of the right to appeal. Meanwhile, the organization prepared to file additional lawsuits on behalf of other chimpanzees and elephants.

Chapter 4 : Gale - Product Login

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Science and Society Talking Points Animal rights, human wrongs? The balance between the rights of animals and their use in biomedical research is a delicate issue with huge societal implications. The debate over whether and how scientists should use animal models has been inflammatory, and the opposing viewpoints are difficult to reconcile. Many animal-rights activists call for nothing less than the total abolition of all research involving animals. Conversely, many scientists insist that some experiments require the use of animals and want to minimize regulation, arguing that it would impede their research. Most scientists, however, try to defend the well-established and generally beneficial practice of selective experimentation on animals, but struggle to do so on an intellectual basis. Somehow, society must find the middle ground—avoiding the cruel and unnecessary abuse of animals in research while accepting and allowing their use if it benefits society. In any debate, one should first know the facts and arguments from each side before making an educated judgement. Rather than simply demanding adequate regulations to ensure animals are well treated and do not suffer unnecessary and avoidable pain, Rollin questions the assumption that humans have an automatic right to make decisions for other animals. In his expansive and stimulating article, he concludes that there is no logical basis for the way in which we treat animals in research; in fact, we would not tolerate such treatment if the animals were *Homo sapiens*; therefore, we cannot tolerate such treatment for other sentient creatures that, like us, are able to experience and suffer pain. With a particular focus on the UK, they highlight how public opinion and legislation have worked together to control invasive research on animals within a legal and ethical framework, despite objections from the scientific community to the additional bureaucracy and costs that such laws engender. It is ironic then, that the UK is also where militant opponents of animal research have committed the most attacks against scientists and research institutes. Turning to the wider picture, the European Commission is now rewriting its Directive on the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes. The Commission intends to reiterate its emphasis on the 3Rs—replacement, reduction and refinement—as a way to reduce the number of animals used in biomedical research Matthiessen et al, According to the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, the implementation of REACH will involve the killing of up to 45 million laboratory animals over the next 15 years to satisfy the required safety tests Hofer et al, Although optimists might think that cell-based tests and methods could replace many of the standard safety and toxicity tests for chemicals or medicines, regulatory bodies—such as the US Food and Drug Administration, the US Environmental Protection Agency and the European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products—are not in a rush to accept them. After all, their task is to protect society from the devastating side effects of new drugs and other compounds, so any replacement test must be at least as reliable and safe as existing animal-based tests. There are also good scientific reasons to retain the use of animal-based tests. Most scientists who work with cell lines know that they are full of chromosomal anomalies; even cells from the same line in two laboratories are not necessarily biologically identical. Cell-based tests also have other limitations: Even if cell-based tests could replace animal-based tests, there are still no alternative methods available to test for teratogenicity or endocrine-disrupting activity, which require animal-based tests over several generations. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that cell and tissue cultures can sufficiently replace animals in the short term. In the absence of safe alternatives to replace the animals used in research, the emphasis shifts toward reduction and refinement. However, this implicitly accepts the need to use animals in the first place, which is the point that Rollin challenges. Following his arguments, it is easy to see how anti-vivisectionists question whether humans have the right to decide how to use animals in what is generally thought to be the common interest. Similarly, it is easy to understand why researchers and society pass over these difficult questions, believing that the end justifies the means. In my view, the most important point in this debate is the cost–benefit analysis used to justify certain types of research while prohibiting

others. Society at large already relies on this: This is a pragmatic distinction based on weighing the benefits to society—such as drug safety—against the costs to animals: In some cases, the benefits seem to outweigh the costs. If a cure for cancer was found, or a vaccine against malaria developed, the treatments would have to be tested on animals—for toxicity, unexpected side effects and efficacy—before being administered to millions of people. Here, the benefit to society might be obvious, and the use of animals morally justifiable. In other cases, the costs seem too high to justify the benefits. Such unnecessary use of laboratory animals was widespread in the s and s, but thankfully is no longer officially tolerated. Between these extremes, however, is a huge area in which the balance of costs and benefits is more difficult to achieve. Understanding ourselves and the world in which we live is not merely an intellectual exercise—it defines us as humans. To gain this knowledge relies on experiments, some of which require the use of animals—for example, generating transgenic mice to understand the function of a gene. These might reveal crucial information for tackling a disease, but in general it is hard to justify every such experiment with potential benefits for human health. Consequently, it is not possible to determine a priori whether an experiment is morally justified if its outcome merely advances understanding rather than producing a cure. In my view, we should adopt a pragmatic attitude. An experiment that uses animals would be justifiable if it is done in such a way that causes minimal pain to the animals involved and if all possible alternative methods have been explored. When scientists take the lives of animals into their hands, they have a particular duty to avoid unnecessarily cruel treatment—not only during experiments but also in the way the animals are kept and handled. In this regard, a legally binding regulatory framework that reflects ethical considerations is not necessarily an undue intrusion on the freedom of research: If it strikes the right balance, such a framework might do more to reduce the number of animals used in research than any attacks on scientists and scientific institutions. To guide lawmakers in drafting regulations that both address valid criticism and enable valuable research, scientists and society must continue this debate to define what is needed and what is necessary.

Chapter 5 : Animal rights | calendrierdelascience.com

Animals opens with a discussion of man as the "King of the Beasts" and continues with pieces on animals as natural resources, farming practices that support the meat demands of today's population, cosmetic and pharmaceutical testing, pets, sports such as polo and bull fights, hunting, endangered animals, zoos, and protesters.

Chapter 6 : BBC - Ethics - Animal ethics: Animal rights

Animal rights. There is much disagreement as to whether non-human animals have rights, and what is meant by animal rights. There is much less disagreement about the consequences of accepting that.

Chapter 7 : Animal rights - Wikipedia

AVMA cannot endorse the philosophical views and personal values of animal rights advocates when they are incompatible with the responsible use of animals for human purposes, such as food and fiber, and for research conducted to benefit both humans and animals.

Chapter 8 : Animal Rights: Opposing Viewpoints

In summary, defenders of animal experimentation argue that humans have higher moral status than animals and fundamental rights that animals lack. Accordingly, potential animal rights violations are outweighed by the greater human benefits of animal research.

Chapter 9 : Animal Rights Activists and Organizations – Speaking of Research

DOWNLOAD PDF RIGHTS FOR ANIMALS? (VIEWPOINTS)

Animal Welfare Facts and Resources. Use these resources to learn important facts about animal welfare, laws, issues, and activism focusing on the treatment and mistreatment of animals worldwide.