

# Argument-sparky essay examples

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



This paper is going to give an argument concerning the fact that Sparky should not be put in a microwave. Different scenarios backing this argument are given. However, in this paper, the argument will revolve around two of these scenarios which are considered to be the best. It is also important to note that the chosen two scenarios comply with the moral reasons as well as emotional and logical reasons as outlined in the literature.

The first scenario is that torturing a puppy that is defenseless for personal amusement is unethical. Animal, like human beings have a life to live. At the same time, human beings have power over the small defenseless animals. Human beings can decide whatever they want to do with these defenseless animals. Whatever the decision, the animals cannot stop them from executing their plans. The animals just live in the mercy of the human beings. Since they cannot communicate, they only wish that human beings who torture them could just understand that they do feel the pain. Therefore, putting Sparky in a microwave is morally unethical. Sparky is innocent and powerless. Sparky can also not communicate with the torturer, at least so that the torturer can feel what the animal is going through. In this earth, human beings have dominion over all the living creatures. Human beings are morally responsible for the welfare of the different creatures. Jane Goodall argues that " If only we can overcome cruelty, to human and animal, with love and compassion we shall stand at the threshold of a new era in human moral and spiritual evolution - and realize, at last, our most unique quality: humanity." (Leffingwell 79).

In the book of Taking sides: Moral values, Kant makes a categorical imperative that Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the

same time will that it should become a universal law (Satris 202). In this argument, he argues that while doing something, a person has to always consider the maxim of his actions. The consideration will involve testing the particular maxim to see if it is universal. Consequently, the person has to ask himself if he would be happy to see everyone acting on that maxim. At the same time, this person has to put himself or herself in shoes of the animal being tortured. Through role reversal, the person can now be in the position of making moral judgment. If the moral judgment passes, then his or her act is morally permissible. If it fails, it is morally wrong.

Being morally responsible in taking care of the animal welfare is beneficial to human beings since there are different gains that animals provide. Sparky for instance can bring protection and security in the homes. Because of this, life on earth becomes more sensible. However, when human beings begin to torture the innocent and helpless creatures, their actions will translate into fellow human beings. Philosophers argue that caring and having compassion for the animals indicate a good character. Arthur Schopenhauer, a German Philosopher argues that, " Cruelty on the other hand indicates that the torture cannot be a good man even to fellow human beings. " Compassion for animals is intimately connected with goodness of character and it may be confidently asserted that he who is cruel to animals cannot be a good man." (Leffingwell 87).

Secondly, human beings are strong and hence the obligation they have is that of defending the lesser creatures that are defenseless and weak. If human beings demonstrate that they can defend the helpless creatures, they also demonstrate their ability to defend their fellow human beings who

are weak in different aspects in life. However, if they torture the defenseless and weak puppies, the next creatures for them to torture will be the fellow human beings. Therefore, if society allows for such people to continue with their brutal acts, logically, it is like they are setting a ticking bomb that would come and destroy the entire society. Pythagoras argues that " For as long as men massacre animals, they will kill each other. Indeed, he who sows the seed of murder and pain cannot reap joy and love." (Leffingwell 67).

### **Works Cited:**

Leffingwell, Alber. An Ethical Problem. New York, NY: Plain Label Books. 2006. Print.

Satris, Stephen. Taking Sides: Moral Issues. New York, NY: MacGraw-Hill, 9th Ed., 2003. Print.