

Good essay on
comparing tom
regan's kantian
account of animal
rights with the uti...

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



Curse:

This essay seeks to present a comparison of Tom Reagan's "Kantian account of animal rights" and the "utilitarian view of animal rights". Tom Reagan and utilitarian concern is the welfare of animals. The argument presented by both philosophical schools of thought is the preservation of animal life by human beings (Rollin, 1992). Both schools recognize the need for protection and preservation of animal life. However, there are some differences in relation as to what each school deems is the way to accomplish the preservation of animal life. Some of the differences include and is not limited to;

Reagan's approach to preservation of animals' "lives" is based on the idea of rights. Reagan argues that there must be a set of rules that lay down the rights of animals in order to command their respect in addition to elevating them at the same level with human beings to facilitate their protection. Reagan's reasoning relies on the reasoning that human animals do have feelings and should not be subjected to pain and should be allowed to enjoy the pleasure. Reagan thus prohibits the use of animals as meat products or experimental purposes. Utilitarian "view of animal rights" on the other hand is based on "moral ideology" that concerns itself on goals and not rights.

Utilitarianism scholars argue that animals' feelings should be awarded ultimate respect. However, they disregard the animal rights reasoning as being useless. The useless nature of "animal rights" is based on the fact that it is impossible to implement the rights as well as "abolition" of animal exploitation as suggested by Reagan (Waller, 2004).

Moreover, we find that utilitarian theory of morality is intertwined with the well-being of the "society at large" when dealing with animal rights. The intertwining is linked to animals being part of peoples' property. Animals therefore can be used for the benefit of the society if "mechanisms" are put in place to reduce their suffering for instance during killing to obtain meat and in experimental researches. Additionally, utilitarian acknowledges that a reduction in animal species will benefit the remaining animals (Waller, 2004). The foregoing statement is based on the fact that there will be an increase in resources due to reduction in animal numbers thus resulting to a better life for the remaining animals. On the other hand, Reagan Kantian approach denies this view and argues that if the reduction of pain is allowed in order to use animals for the benefit of human beings, there is a likely hood of abuse occurring thus denying animals their rights.

Reagan approach further acknowledges that animals should be treated equally by humans. Reagan advocates for equality because he regards animals as having "moral status" that should be subject to respect despite the fact that they cannot speak or air out their views. Reagan thus prohibits the use of animals for gain by human beings because he deems it as cruelty to "animals" (Reagan, 2004). On the other hand, utilitarian theory of "animal rights" suggest that the rights of humans and animals should be put into consideration when dealing with animals. Utilitarian theory acknowledges that animal morality should be awarded respect but argues that animals do not have an interest in the future and thus their deaths are not harmful compared to that of human beings.

In conclusion, it is important to note that Reagan's and utilitarian

``ideologies of''animal rights deal with preservation of animal lives. However, they differ in regard to what constitutes ``animal moral consideration'' and its implementation.

Reference

Reagan, T. (2004). *The Case For Animal Rights*. USA. University of California Press.

Rollin, B. (1992). *Animal Rights and Human Morality*. New York. Buffalo.

Waller, B. (2004). *Consider Ethics: Theory, Readings, And Contemporary Issues*. UK. Pearson Education, Limited.