I. Ethical Extensionism

I. Peter Singer Animal Liberation

A. Liberation refers to movements that historically have

enlarged the moral sphere

B. Leopold in "The Land Ethic" gives the example of Odysseus hanging slave girls whom he suspected of misbehaving

1. slaves had no moral standing

2. slaves were property

3. rights of slave owner guaranteed in Article 4

sec 2 and the 5th Amendment

4. expanded the moral community to include all persons

5. Leopold argues that it is time to expand the moral

community to define our relationship to the land and to

the animal and plants that grow upon it.

C.. According to Singer, exclusion of animals on a par with exclusion of women and blacks -- Speciesism-- similar to racism and sexism

1. these were acceptable practices, almost natural, now we veiw them morally and legally as intolerable

2. took movements of liberation to extend the boundaries

of our moral community against both resistance and ridicule to all people

a. Marry Wollstonecroft Vindication of the Rights of

of Women 1792

b. ridiculed by most and refuted in a satire by

a distinguished Oxford philosopher Thomas Taylor

"Vindication of the Rights of Brutes"

E. Singer wants to enlarge the moral sphere to include animals

1. Singer is a bioethicist and his thought is shaped

by utilitarian thinking

2. his starting point is trying to illuminate the basis by

which we ascribe moral standing to some beings and not

others

3. if we accept his argument then we are morally obligated to cease certain practices individually and

as a society

D. Singer's argument

1. He accepts the utilitarian assumptions

a. that the scientific method can be applied to

questions of right and wrong to determine

whether actions or policies are good or bad

b. he accepts psychological hedonism and the

inference that good and bad and right and wrong

really refer to pleasure and the avoidance of pain

2. He says then that we ascribe moral standing on the basis of whether a being is sentient

a. not whether it has a soul

b. not reason and not having a language

i. children

ii. mentally retarded, can we eat, perform

experiments, take their organs

c. not race or sex

d. not just human, then would have to find common

capacity that all humans possess that animals

don't

d. but can it feel, seek pleasure and avoid pain

e. if a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into

consideration

3. he accepts the principle of equal consideration

a. all those whose interests are effected by an

act or policy should have those interests receive

equal consideration for determing the morality of

the action or policy

b. interests refers to whether the act or policy

will enhance their pleasure or cause them pain

c. any being with moral standing counts for one and

not more than one

4. the capacity to enjoy or suffer is a sufficient basis

for moral standing

5. because all beings that can suffer have at the very

least an interest in not suffering

6. the principle of utility: "that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to hve to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question."

7. The only real question according to Singer is do

animals suffer

8. if we determine that an animal is suffering there exists no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideratiosn, and to count it equally with like suffering

9. We can infer from their behavior that they do indeed suffer

a. lobster

b. animals in zoo, zoochosis, pacing, walking and

playing in own feces, premature death, inability to

reproduce

c. animals in radiation tests tear at their own

bodies

9. not having a language is not sufficient not to allow them moral standing,

a. neither do children, and frequently mentally ill, or physically ill cannot communicate verbally.

10. how far down the chain; stops at oysters and insects (not me, SPiders)

11.. Therefore all sentient beings have moral standing,

12. therefore they have a right to their interestssuffering and pleasure being considered in all actions and policies

13. morality equals the consequences of actions or policies on those beings whose interests are being effected

14. an action or policy is good if it

E. Consequences

1. eating non-humans cannot be justified

2. factory farming cannot be justified

3. animal testing and animal experimentation

4. zoos, sea worlds, circuses, rodeos cannot be justified

a. a sanctuary for endangered species

i.. less than one third are endangered

ii. two thirds for display and entertainment

b. education

i. artificial environments

ii. little information on the natural habits

polar bear plunge, Gorillas, 15 miles, 500

sqare feet,

iii. rainforests without insects

c. breeding and reintroduction

i. breeding is failure need to keep capturing

free animals

ii. reintroduction is failure

E. Do we need to experiment on animals for at least medical purposes? If we treated food animals humanely is there anything wrong with eating "pieces of slaughtered non-humans?

II. Tom Regan and Animal Rights

A. Regan's argument for the moral standing of animals is rights based on Kantian moral theory

1. beings with moral standing have rights

a. life, liberty, and security

b. because moral beings are ends in themselves

i. dignity and respect

ii. equality and freedom

2. they also have duties and obligations in relation

to other moral beings

3. beings with moral standing are moral agents, moral

subjects, or subjects of a life

4. the basis for moral attribution is reason

B. Regan argues that some animals qualify should be included in the moral community, moral standing

1. if so these animals have rights

2. and these rights define the obligations and responsiblities towards them

2. it is a question of principle if animals have moral standing must be treated as ends in themselves

a. some practices towards animals are wrong in principle

b. practices treat them as means, as resources.

c. no more right to eat animal than to eat human child

E. Regan's argument

1. Some animals have 'inherent value' value in and of

themselves, separate from their use value, not merely means to some other end.

2. Regan starts by making a distinction between moral agents and moral patients.

a. Adult human beings are moral agents, moral actors, those whom we ascribe moral standing

b. human beings who are not moral actors, mentally ill, children, comatose have moral standing

c. we can't simply treat them as means

d. refers to them as moral patients

i. even though they are not conscious

ii. not rational

iii. still have moral standing

3. do some animals have something essential in

common

a. can't be just life, he says, "more than being alive, and more than being conscious

b. it is that they are "subjects of a life.'

4. What does it mean to be a subject of a life?

a. they have desires, preferences

b capacity to initiate action towards achieving

their desires and preferences

c. can act in terms of own welfare

d. emotional life together

5. Being an experiencing subject of a life is sufficient to extend moral standing

6. Many animals can be observed to act on desires,

act in terms of their own welfare, and have an

emotional life together

5. All animals, human and non-human that are subjects of a life have equal inherent value**.**

6. Justice demands that:

"We are to treat those individuals who have inherent value in ways that respect their inherent value.

7. must not treat individual with moral standing as a

means, receptical. Kant's "Kingdom of ends should include

animals"

8. As John Lennon says, "Let it be" that would reduce the most suffering

9. The whole creation groans under the weight of the

evil we humans visit upon these mute, powerless,

creatures.

10. the abolition

a. of th use of animals in science

b. the total dissolution of commercial animal

agriculture

c. the total elimination of commercial sport

hunting and trapping