

Tom regan's animal rights, human wrongs

[Environment](#), [Animals](#)



Animal rights, or the establishment and the idea of them being official, have become an increasingly interesting controversy for quite some time. The topic seems to question the common morality and ethics of man, while simultaneously questioning practices that target humanity's safety, luxury, and in some cases, survival. In such a debate, three articles come to mind.

The debating articles: " Cow VS Animal Rights", " Animal Rights, Human Wrongs", and " Proud to be a Speciesist" all deliver a very strong argument to the topic, yet making it quite difficult to ignite a solid solution around the topic, being that each article is elaborate and thorough in arguing their point. In " Animal Rights, Human Wrongs", the idea of animal rights is directly and thoroughly supported.

Written by Tom Regan, the article presents a several cases of animal cruelty in a seemingly attempt to put the reader in a parallel perspective of each animal in attempt to cause the reader to feel sorry or some form of sympathy for each victim. Regan challenges the methods of hunting, industrial farming, and scientific practices on animals, and, using his pity-the-victim strategy, urges the realization of the rights of animals as a group that stands side by side with the humans in matters pertaining legal rights.

In Stephen Rose's article " Proud to be a Speciesist", this thought is contradicted directly. Stephen Rose gives an entirely different perspective and idea on the matter of animal rights. In the article, Rose proposes a situation in which the rights, if any exist at all, of mosquitoes and other pests are violated once they're exterminated by human choice. This situation provides a just argument, being that such pests are killed all the time, yet, if

they were ever to attain such rights, concerns questioning their existence would arise and put a complicated spin on the basics of life itself.

In "Cow VS Animal Rights Activist", written by Linda Hasselstrom, a different view is exploited. The article retains a neutral perspective, being that the writer explains the uses of animals (primarily cows) but does not refrain from informing the reader of all the cow endures while under human use. Even so, Regan uses pathos while illustrating each animal's demise to convince the reader to share the same view, or "ideal", in the matters concerning animal rights.

In each situation, he gives a victim, portraying each one as innocent and helpless, and then he gives the description of their death. He paints incredibly vivid pictures of the situation by elaborating on what would presumably be the last moments each animal experienced before their death. Rose, on the other hand, uses a weak form of egos in his writing. Arguing solely from his position as a researcher, Rose has dim credibility and most of his arguments are biased from the perspective of a researcher.

This is made obvious when he tries to justify animal research by claiming that it has resulted in many cures for diseases human encounter today. Hasselstrom's form of logos contributes to her argument in a seemingly complementary fashion. From her perspective, she simply states the pros and cons of ranching and hunting, as well uncover the hardships faced by ranchers that many activists seem to overlook. With all of these arguments at point, the matters of animal rights will remain a controversy as long as the morals and ethics of the common man play a part in its decision.