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| --- | --- |
| **Class/Subject: Philosophy** | **Lesson 26- “Animal Rights”** |
|  |  |
| **Objective(s):**  **SWBAT evaluate what constitutes ethics in regards to animals and apply their beliefs to related animal rights topics.** | **Unit- “ETHICS”** |
|  |  |
| **Philosophical Quote of the Day:**  *“The assumption that animals are without rights and the illusion that our treatment of them has no moral significance is a positively outrageous example of Western crudity and barbarity. Universal compassion is the only guarantee of morality.” ―*[*Arthur Schopenhauer*](http://www.goodreads.com/author/show/11682.Arthur_Schopenhauer)*,*[*The Basis of Morality*](http://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/113207) | **Philosophical Song of the Day:**  **“Kitties are So Nice” by: Bubbles** [**https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UvXw4aIdl7I**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UvXw4aIdl7I) |
|  |  |
|  | |
| **Key Points of the Day:**   * Philosophical thinking on the[moral standing of animals](http://www.iep.utm.edu/ap-ethic/#SH4b)is diverse and can be generally grouped into three general categories: Indirect theories, direct but unequal theories, and moral equality theories. * Indirect theories deny animals’ moral status or equal consideration with humans due to a lack of consciousness, reason, or autonomy.  Ultimately denying moral status to animals, these theories may still require not harming animals, but only because doing so causes harm to a human being's morality.  Arguments in this category have been formulated by philosophers such as[Immanuel Kant](http://www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/),[René Descartes](http://www.iep.utm.edu/descarte/),[Thomas Aquinas](http://www.iep.utm.edu/aquinas/), Peter Carruthers, and various religious theories. | * Direct but unequal theories accord some moral consideration to animals, but deny them a fuller moral status due to their inability to respect another agent's rights or display moral reciprocity within a community of equal agents. Arguments in this category consider the sentience of the animal as sufficient reason not to cause direct harm to animals.  However, where the interests of animals and humans conflict, the special properties of being human such as rationality, autonomy, and self-consciousness accord higher consideration to the interests of human beings. * Moral equality theories extend equal consideration and moral status to animals by refuting the supposed moral relevance of the aforementioned special properties of human beings.  Arguing by analogy, moral equality theories often extend the concept of rights to animals on the grounds that they have similar physiological and mental capacities as infants or disabled human beings.  Arguments in this category have been formulated by philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Journal Entry:**  **“What rights do animals have? What constitutes ethical treatment toward them? What policies should be in place regarding animal rights?”**  *.* | **Featured philosopher and**  **supplemental Reading: *“Animal Liberation” by: Peter Singer:***    *Peter Albert David Singer, AC is an Australian moral philosopher. He is known in particular for his book,*[*Animal Liberation*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal_Liberation_(book))*(1975), a canonical text in*[*animal rights*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal_rights)*/liberation theory.* |