



A STUDY ON ANIMAL RIGHTS

Naresh Kumar R, Yudesh Raghavan K
II yr Mechatronics Engineering
SNS College of Technology, Coimbatore -641035

Abstract: The idea of giving rights to animals has long been contentious—but a deeper look into the reasoning behind the philosophy reveals ideas that aren't all that radical. Animal rights advocates attempt to distinguish animals from inanimate objects, as they are so often considered by exploitative industries and the law.

The animal rights movement strives to make the public aware of the fact that animals are more sensitive, emotional, and intelligent than people have previously believed. But first, it's important to understand what the term "animal rights" really means.

Animal rights is the philosophy according to which many or all sentient animals have moral worth that is independent of their utility for humans, and that their most basic interests—such as in avoiding suffering—should be afforded the same consideration as similar interests of human beings. Broadly speaking, and particularly in popular discourse, the term "animal rights" is often used synonymously with "animal protection" or "animal liberation". More narrowly, "animal rights" refers to the idea that many animals have fundamental rights to be treated with respect as individuals—rights to life, liberty, and freedom from torture that may not be overridden by considerations of aggregate welfare.

Keywords: Animal abuse, welfare, Consequences.

I. INTRODUCTION

Animal rights are moral principles grounded in the belief that non-human animals deserve the ability to live as they wish, without being subjected to the desires of human beings. At the core of animal rights is autonomy, which is another way of saying choice. In many countries, human rights are enshrined to protect certain freedoms, such as the right to expression, freedom from torture, and access to democracy. Of course, these choices are constrained depending on social locations like race, class, and gender, but generally speaking, human rights safeguard the basic tenets of what makes human lives worth living. Animal rights aim to do something similar, only for non-human animals.


In his book *Animal Liberation*, Peter Singer states that the basic principle of equality does not require equal or identical treatment; it requires equal consideration. This is an

important distinction when talking about animal rights. People often ask if animals should have rights, and quite simply, the answer is "Yes!" Animals surely deserve to live their lives free from suffering and exploitation. Jeremy Bentham, the founder of the reforming utilitarian school of moral philosophy, stated that when deciding on a being's rights, "The question is not 'Can they reason?' nor 'Can they talk?' but 'Can they suffer?'" In that passage, Bentham points to the capacity for suffering as the vital characteristic that gives a being the right to equal consideration. The capacity for suffering is not just another characteristic like the capacity for language or higher mathematics. All animals have the ability to suffer in the same way and to the same degree that humans do. They feel pain, pleasure, fear, frustration, loneliness, and motherly love. Whenever we consider doing something that would interfere with their needs, we are morally obligated to take them into account.

Animal rights come into direct opposition with animal exploitation, which includes animals used by humans for a variety of reasons, be it for food, as experimental objects, or even pets. Animal rights can also be violated when it comes to human destruction of animal habitats. This negatively impacts the ability of animals to lead full lives of their choosing.

Do Animals Need Rights? Pros And Cons


The idea of giving animals rights tends to be contentious, given how embedded animal products are within societies such as the United States. Some people, including animal activists, believe in an all-or-nothing approach, where animal rights must be legally enshrined and animals totally liberated from all exploitation. On the other end of the spectrum are people whose livelihoods depend upon animal-based industries. Below are some arguments both in favor of and opposing animal rights.



What Are Some Examples Of Animal Rights?

While few laws currently exist in the UK or US that recognize or protect animals’ rights to enjoy lives free from human interference, the following is a list of examples of animal rights that could one day be enacted:

- Animals may not be used for food.
- Animals may not be hunted.
- The habitats of animals must be protected to allow them to live according to their choosing.
- Animals may not be bred
- No use of animals for hard labour
- No selective breeding for any reason other than the benefit of the animal.



What’s The Difference Between Animal Welfare And Animal Rights

Animal rights philosophy is based on the idea that animals should not be used by people for any reason, and that animal rights should protect their interests the way human rights protect people. Animal welfare, on the other hand, is a set of practices designed to govern the treatment of animals who are being dominated by humans, whether for food, research, or entertainment.

Consequences Of Animal Rights

Animal rights teach us that certain things are wrong as a matter of principle, that there are some things that it is morally wrong to do to animals.

Human beings must not do those things, no matter what the cost to humanity of not doing them.

Human beings must not do those things, even if they do them in a humane way.

For example: if animals have a right not to be bred and killed for food then animals must not be bred and killed for food.

It makes no difference if the animals are given 5-star treatment throughout their lives and then killed humanely without any fear or pain - it's just plain wrong in principle, and nothing can make it right.

Arguments In Favor Of Animal Rights

Should the rights of animals be recognized, animal exploitative industries would disappear, as would the host of environmental problems they cause, including water pollution, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and deforestation.

Halting the widespread use of animals would also eliminate the systematic cruelty and denial of choice that animal industries perpetuate. The physical and psychological pain endured by animals in places like factory farms has reached a point many consider to be unacceptable, to say the least. Animals are mutilated by humans in several different ways, including castrations, dehorning, and cutting off various body parts, usually without the use of anesthetic.

“
Many species never see the outdoors except on their way to the slaughterhouse.

The Case Of Animal Rights

The case for animal rights is usually derived from the case for human rights.

The argument (grossly oversimplified) goes like this:

- Human animals have rights
- There is no morally relevant difference between human animals and adult mammals
- Therefore adult mammals must have rights too



Human beings and adult mammals have rights because they are both 'subjects-of-a-life'.

This means that:

- They have similar levels of biological complexity
- They are conscious and aware that they exist
- They know what is happening to them
- They prefer some things and dislike others
- They make conscious choices
- They live in such a way as to give themselves the best quality of life
- They plan their lives to some extent
- The quality and length of their life matters to them

If a being is the subject-of-a-life then it can be said to have 'inherent value'.

All beings with inherent value are equally valuable and entitled to the same rights.

Their inherent value doesn't depend on how useful they are to the world, and it doesn't diminish if they are a burden to others.

Thus adult mammals have rights in just the same way, for the same reasons, and to the same extent that human beings have rights.

The Case Against Animal Rights

A number of arguments are put forward against the idea that animals have rights.

- Animals don't think
- Animals are not really conscious
- Animals were put on earth to serve human beings
- Animals don't have souls
- Animals don't behave morally
- Animals are not members of the 'moral community'
- Animals lack the capacity for free moral judgment
- Animals don't think

II. CONCLUSION

A world in which animals are free from human exploitation still seems far off. But thanks to advocacy campaigns raising awareness of the harmful conditions they experience in places like factory farms, animals may one day experience more fair treatment at the hands of people.

In conclusion, **animal testing should be eliminated because it violates animals' rights**, it causes pain and suffering to the experimental animals, and other means of testing product toxicity are available.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was submitted as a part of assignment for the subject Biology for Mechatronics Engineer.

III. REFERENCE

- [1]. Kumar, Satish (September 2002). You are, therefore I am: A declaration of dependence. ISBN 9781903998182.
- [2]. DeGrazia (2002), ch. 2; Taylor (2009), ch. 1.
- [3]. Taylor (2009), ch. 3.
- [4]. Compare for example similar usage of the term in 1938: The American Biology Teacher. Vol. 53. National Association of Biology Teachers. 1938. P. 211. Retrieved 16 April 2021. The foundation from which these behaviors spring is the ideology known as speciesism. Speciesism is deeply rooted in the widely-held belief that the human species is entitled to certain rights and privileges.
- [5]. 5.Horta (2010).
- [6]. That a central goal of animal rights is to eliminate the property status of animals, see Sunstein (2004), p. 11ff.
- [7]. speciesism and fundamental protections, see Waldau (2011).
- [8]. food, clothing, research subjects or entertainment, see Francione (1995), p. 17.
- [9]. "Animal Law Courses". Animal Legal Defense Fund.
- [10]. For animal-law courses in North America, see "Animal law courses" Archived 2010-06-13 at the Wayback Machine, Animal Legal Defense Fund. Retrieved July 12, 2012.
- [11]. a discussion of animals and personhood, see Wise (2000), pp. 4, 59, 248ff; Wise (2004); Posner (2004); Wise (2007).
- [12]. the arguments and counter-arguments about awarding personhood only to great apes, see Garner (2005), p. 22.
- [13]. Also see Sunstein, Cass R. (February 20, 2000). "The Chimps' Day in Court", The New York Times.
- [14]. Giménez, Emiliano (January 4, 2015). "Argentine orangutan granted unprecedented legal rights". Edition.cnn.com. CNN Espanol. Retrieved April 21, 2015.
- [15]. Cohen, Carl; Regan, Tom (2001). The Animal Rights Debate. Point/Counterpoint: Philosophers Debate Contemporary Issues Series. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. P. 47. ISBN 9780847696628. Retrieved 16 April 2021. Too often overlooked in the animal world, according to Sapontzis, are insects that have interests, and therefore rights.
- [16]. The concept of "bacteria rights" can appear coupled with disdain or irony: Pluhar, Evelyn B. (1995). "Human "superiority" and the argument from marginal cases". Beyond Prejudice: The Moral Significance of Human and Nonhuman Animals. Book collections on Project MUSE. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. P. 9. ISBN 9780822316480. Retrieved 16 April 2021. For



example, in an editorial entitled ‘Animal Rights Nonsense,’ ... in the prestigious science journal Nature, defenders of animal rights are accused of being committed to the absurdity of ‘bacteria rights.’

- [17]. Scruton, Roger (Summer 2000). “Animal Rights”. City Journal. New York: Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.
- [18]. Journal., G.; et al. (2017). “Ethical Issues in the Use of Animal Models for Tissue Engineering: Reflections on Legal Aspects, Moral Theory, 3Rs Strategies, and Harm-Benefit Analysis” (PDF). *Tissue Engineering Part C: Methods*. 23 (12): 850–862. Doi:10.1089/ten.TEC.2017.0189. PMID 28756735.
- [19]. Garner (2005), pp. 11, 16.
- [20]. Also see Frey (1980); and for a review of Frey, see Sprigge (1981).
- [21]. Singer (2000), pp. 151–156.