

1: Bill of Rights for Animals

Through the Animal Bill of Rights, the Animal Legal Defense Fund is working to show Congress a groundswell of support for legislation that protects animals and recognizes that, like all sentient beings, animals are entitled to basic legal rights in our society.

Fully 71 percent supported some kind of legal protection for animals, and 25 percent said that animals should have the same rights as people. As a life-long animal lover, I am deeply sympathetic to arguments that we should treat animals humanely. But the moral issue of how we should treat animals is a different and much wider matter than the issue of what legal obligations there should be for protecting animals. For instance, it is normally immoral to lie to your friend, but that does not imply any legal rights or protections. Similarly, it is immoral to nail a cat to a wall, but that does not ground a legal obligation to refrain from such monstrous behavior. I suspect that the percent support for granting animals some kind of legal protection is based on just this confusion between concern about the welfare of animals and a proper ground for rights. This article will simply describe that theory and then employ it to rebut arguments that claim an extension of rights to animals is morally required. In *Defense of Animal Rights* The two main types of argument put forward for animal rights come primarily from two philosophers: Peter Singer and Tom Regan. Therefore, this article will focus on the essential ideas of their arguments. Singer is a controversial, even infamous, Australian philosopher who is currently a professor at Princeton. He is the intellectual inspiration for many animal-rights groups as well as environmentalist groups and is the author of several books and articles on animal rights, including his *Animal Liberation*. He is also well known for his work on other issues in ethics, including euthanasia, famine, and abortion. And his appointment at Princeton sparked tremendous protest because of his views defending the killing of certain kinds of severely disabled newborns. Regan is also the author of several widely used textbooks on moral and social thought, as well as countless articles on animal rights and related issues. His argument is extensively laid out in his *The Case for Animal Rights*. Both Regan and Singer argue for the same ultimate conclusion: Nonetheless, they get to this conclusion in different ways. Utilitarianism is a moral theory that defines the good as that which maximizes the overall happiness or pleasure in the world and minimizes the overall unhappiness and pain. What is bad, then, is that which fails to increase happiness or that which increases overall unhappiness. Utilitarians have historically been reticent or unable to offer a defense of individual rights. After all, rights—“as principles that protect certain kinds of actions”—are likely to interfere with the maximization of overall happiness and minimization of overall pain. For instance, the outlawing of dangerous drugs like ecstasy or methamphetamine might be seen as best under utilitarianism because it decreases the amount of pain and suffering caused by the use of these drugs. However, such a ban conflicts with individual rights to liberty and property. Utilitarianism therefore jettisons the notion of rights in order to focus on maximizing overall happiness. As a utilitarian, then, Singer is not interested in presenting a theory of rights as such but is primarily concerned about the proper treatment of animals. He refers to his position as "animal liberation" as opposed to "animal rights. The Marginal-Humans Argument Like almost every other defender of animal rights, Regan and Singer depend on the so-called marginal-humans argument, which begins with the following observation: There are normal paradigmatic humans; they have the features and capacities that we think of when we think of humans: Then there are those outside of that paradigm--marginal humans--that lack some or all of these capacities. These include infants, young children, the severely mentally retarded, the permanently comatose, and probably the senile. The argument goes something like this: If normal, adult humans have rights by virtue of being rational beings, then, according to the marginal-humans argument, infants and severely retarded humans cannot have rights on this basis because they are not capable of being rational. So, either rationality is not the sole basis for rights, or these marginal humans do not have rights. This seems to put the defender of rights in a precarious position. He can either reject the idea that marginal humans have rights and thus should be given legal protection against harm and abuse; or he must modify the basis for rights to include marginal humans—and along with them, it seems, at least some higher-order animals. We can see this problem in the following dilemma from Singer: McGraw Hill, , p. We

either accept some consideration—like rationality or intelligence—as the criterion for rights and accept that infants and the severely retarded might be treated as we treat monkeys or pigs, or we accept that rights are not limited to humans and that rights-holders will include, at least, some animals. One may be willing to bite the bullet on the treatment of marginal humans and accept that they can be treated as we treat non-human animals. However, most people are not willing to say that and will likely see such a conclusion as a sign that something is wrong in the theory of rights being presented. If the theory allows for infanticide or something similar, it seems wiser to reject or revise the theory of rights than to accept this outcome. In short, the purpose of the argument regarding the position of marginal humans is to show that traditional theories of rights fail to establish that all humans, including marginal and borderline cases, have rights. This, then, makes room for the new theories presented by Regan and Singer—and these new theories will include rights and protections for at least some animals.

Regan and Inherent Value Regan starts with the claim that each person, as an individual, has some distinctive and unique value, which he calls "inherent value. Lastly, inherent value is equal among all who have it. One cannot have more inherent value than another; William Shakespeare and Osama bin Laden would have the same inherent value. University of California Press, , p. We believe it is wrong to enslave humans or to treat babies as food sources, and Regan argues that "inherent value" is the best explanation for these beliefs. Thus, inherent value is essentially an idea that is required in order to explain why we have certain other beliefs. This is similar to the way an astronomer might justify the claim that a planet is circling a faraway star. The astronomer might not be able to detect the planet directly, but he can rationally postulate it because such a mass is required to explain certain other known features about the star and the star system. Inherent value, Regan argues, is similarly required to explain our considered moral beliefs. So, like paradigmatic humans, marginal humans have inherent value and thus rights. In addition, Regan claims, there is no rational basis for denying that some animals also have inherent value, and thus no basis for denying that animals have rights. How do we know whether or not something has inherent value? Regan does not offer straightforward conditions that would need to be met to show inherent value. But he does offer one condition that demonstrates inherent value exists in some beings. He calls it "being a subject-of-a-life. First, one is an organism such that events make a real difference to oneself as an individual. Secondly, one is an organism such that continuing to live matters to oneself. Thirdly, one is an organism for whom what happens in life has some meaning for oneself. These are the sorts of characteristics that ensure things will matter to an individual and make a difference to that individual. Regan claims that being a subject-of-a-life means one has inherent value. However, a creature might not be a subject-of-a-life and still have inherent value. He claims that the permanently comatose are not subjects-of-a-life, but that they do have inherent value. Regan even ponders at one point whether natural objects like trees can have inherent value even though they clearly are not subjects-of-a-life. So, the subject-of-a-life condition is not an explanation or definition of inherent value, only a useful tool to spot inherent value in some cases. Furthermore, he argues that most higher-order animals are as well and that, as subjects-of-a-life, they also have inherent value. His case for rights—animal or human—therefore, rests on this idea of inherent value. To anyone who has spent time at a zoo or had pets, it should not be a stretch to accept that higher-order animals—apes, dogs, cats, and so forth—experience pain and pleasure, have desires and goals, initiate actions to meet their needs and desires, have some sense of their own personal future, and even experience, in some sense, life as good or ill for themselves. Furthermore, it does not strike me that attributing these capacities to them is wild speculation or anthropomorphism. Regan is right that some higher-order mammals possess these capacities. In fact, this is probably one of the things that makes such creatures compelling as pets; it may even provide a moral basis for treating animals with a certain amount of sensitivity and care. This is primarily because inherent value is an invalid concept. It has no basis in reality—it is arbitrary and inconsistent with a proper understanding of value. As Ayn Rand argued, value depends on the existence of a being that faces the alternative of continued existence or the end of existence—and a being that must act to continue in existence. Therefore, a value is always a value for some reason it is required for life and to some organism the being acting in the face of the alternative of life or death. Moral values are the values pursued by an organism with the capacity to choose and reason. Volitional rationality gives rise to the need for a system to guide choices and actions. Humans are the only organisms that

are capable of volitional rationality and, as such, are the only organisms capable of morality. And while animals certainly face the alternative of life or death and thus pursue value, they do not react to this alternative by choosing what actions to take and what values to pursue to maintain their lives. They do not and cannot pursue moral values. It matters not what a person does or who the person is—so long as he has this inherent value, he should be treated like any other person. It is in this way that inherent value divorces value from its conceptual roots and is thus invalid. Regan is concerned that theories that include marginal cases of human beings but exclude animals are doing so on an arbitrary basis. For instance, a theory might attempt to extend rights to marginal cases just because they are all members of *Homo sapiens*. Regan, as well as Singer, argues that such a theory of rights is arbitrary because biological membership is morally irrelevant. We are not given any reason, other than our "reflected intuitions," to believe that paradigmatic humans or marginal humans or animals have inherent value. Regan argues that we need inherent value to explain our moral beliefs about how to treat others, including animals. However, this claim is quite wrong since we can explain why we value treating others with respect and dignity, as well as seeing that needlessly mistreating animals is likely wrong, without appealing to the dubious notion of inherent value. For a treatment of why treating others well is a value, see David Kelley, *Unrugged Individualism: The Objectivist Center*, *Singer and Equal Consideration*. Singer places the principle of equality or equal consideration at the center of his moral view. Each person, in his view, is entitled to equal consideration and respect. Utilitarianism is then seen as the best moral theory to satisfy this principle of equality. Singer quotes the famous English utilitarian Jeremy Bentham: Nor can they talk? But, can they suffer?

2: Animal rights - Wikipedia

The Animal Bill of Rights encourages representatives to pass legislation that protects animals and gives them the rights they deserve: The Right of animals to be free from exploitation, cruelty.

What is the Bill of Rights? Strictly speaking, the Bill of Rights is the name given to the first ten amendments to the US Constitution. A bill of rights was originally proposed by James Madison in the first Congress in 1789. It contained twelve proposed amendments, the first article of the original bill has never been ratified and it is unlikely that it ever will be. The second article was finally ratified in as the 27th amendment. Articles three through twelve were ratified in as ten separate amendments into what is now collectively called the Bill of Rights. Below is the original text of the bill of rights. Note that only articles three through twelve are what is commonly called the Bill of Rights. The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added. Article the first [Not Ratified] After the first enumeration required by the first article of the Constitution, there shall be one Representative for every thirty thousand, until the number shall amount to one hundred, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress, that there shall be not less than one hundred Representatives, nor less than one Representative for every forty thousand persons, until the number of Representatives shall amount to two hundred; after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress, that there shall not be less than two hundred Representatives, nor more than one Representative for every fifty thousand persons. Article the second [Amendment XXVII - Ratified] No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened. Article the third [Amendment I] Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Article the fourth [Amendment II] A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed. Article the fifth [Amendment III] No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law. Article the sixth [Amendment IV] The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. Article the seventh [Amendment V] No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation. Article the eighth [Amendment VI] In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence. Article the ninth [Amendment VII] In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law. Article the tenth [Amendment VIII] Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Article the eleventh [Amendment IX] The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. Article the twelfth [Amendment X] The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. The

ANIMAL BILL OF RIGHTS pdf

Bill of Rights was the first ten amendments to the Constitution; ratified in 1791. The Bill of Rights was also a section of the Constitution specifically guaranteeing individual rights. Why do you have the Bill of Rights? Due to this, the US has survived more than 200 years. Share to: A set of rules that defines people's rights. Share to:

3: Should Animals Have Rights? - The Dodo

The Animal Bill of Rights needs to be expanded and shared more vastly so people can start gaining a better understanding of the cruelty happening to animals, and what they can do to give animals a.

Home Environment List of 8 Key Pros and Cons of Animal Rights List of 8 Key Pros and Cons of Animal Rights Environment Aug 11, The concept of animal rights is based on the idea that some or all non-human animals have a right to live their own lives and to be viewed as persons rather than property. This effectively makes the use of animals as research subjects, for entertainment, clothing, food, and as beasts of burden prohibited. In the United States, there are plenty of organizations that uphold animal rights and where volunteers can join in to offer support. It is the only federal law that regulates the treatment of animals in research, transport, exhibition, and by dealers. Laws to protect animals, however, already exist in Europe as early as the 1800s. But opponents of animal rights claim that treatment of animals is just because they lack reason and are nothing more than complex automata. Should animals be treated like humans, then? List of Pros of Animal Rights 1. Save animal lives Testing and experiments done on animals are not always reliable in certain situations. After all, humans and certain species are extremely different, resulting in tests that are inconclusive. So, there really is no need to use animals for testing or hurt them in the process. Unfortunately, a lot of products have to be tested on animals before they are approved for human consumption. Dead animals are no use for humans If an animal dies during an experiment or test, no results will be gathered. This would only lead to more animals dying before anything conclusive is achieved. What is even worse is that when an animal dies, the ecosystem will be damaged and human beings will pay for the price. Nature has a very delicate system that will cause a chain reaction if disturbed. When this happens no human will be safe. So why mess with the works of Mother Nature? Saves money Performing animal tests are expensive. Good enough if the test results will come out conclusive. Otherwise, all efforts, money and time are wasted, more so if an animal requires special treatment to obtain long-term results. Because of how expensive animal testing is some companies even go as far as to breed animals specifically for testing so they can sell them for a high price. Therefore, if no testing will be done on animals, the overall cost will be saved and used for something else. It can fund other types of organizations that will help improve the world or resolve certain economic or social issues. List of Cons of Animal Rights 1. Prevents safety testing Is it enough to save animal lives when the cost is a human life placed in danger or lost? New products and medications that could save people but are considered harmful until tested on certain subjects will never be used if animal testing is no longer allowed. It would be even more immoral if test subjects used are humans themselves. This may have been going on with clinical trials, but the only difference is that medications used in these trials have already been tested on animals and are considered safe. Stunt research development Animal testing opens doors in research of new products and medication that will significantly speed up the development in the medicine field. Drugs used to prevent and treat cancer, HIV, diabetes, and other serious conditions have all been tested on animals first. Animal rights put a stop on such research, risking the lives of humans in the process. Reduce risk on human lives Because products and medications are first tested on animals, no human lives will be put in danger or lost. Exposure of humans to risky substances or possibly hazardous materials will also be cut down, preventing diseases and other side effects. Therefore, animal testing ultimately saves humans, even if this is at the expense of non-human animals. Pose problems with food consumption Animal meat provides a different source of protein, vitamins and minerals, something that opponents of animal rights claim that will not be found on any vegetable or fruit. Simply put, animal rights take away some human rights. Blur the lines between human and animal rights If animals are viewed as humans, distinction between the two species will be blurred. Most opponents believe that animals do not have the same rights as humans, which means they will never be equal. Proponents, however, would say that animals should be free from human exploitation and cruelty, even if they are below humans in the natural world chain. But here is a problem: Human health would not be improved without animals as test subjects. Animals play a role in the supply of food, is it acceptable for humans to starve and be malnourished because animals are off the menu? There is no difference there between

a cat or a man.

4: What is the animal Bill of Rights

Bill of Rights Comparison Animal farm is an allegoric novel which has a very interesting story to it. The story is about animals in a farm and the owner "Mr. Jones".

Bill of Rights for Animals 1. All animals are born with an equal claim on life and the same rights to existence. All animals are entitled to respect. Humanity as an animal species shall not arrogate to itself the right to exterminate or exploit other species. All animals have the right to the attention, care, and protection of humanity. No animals shall be ill-treated or be subject to cruel acts. All wild animals have the right to liberty in their natural environment, whether land, air, or water, and should be allowed to procreate. Deprivation of freedom, even for educational purposes, is an infringement of this right. Animals of species living traditionally in a human environment have the right to live and grow at the rhythm and under the conditions of life and freedom peculiar to their species. Any interference by humanity with this rhythm or these conditions for purposes of gain is an infringement of this right. All companion animals have the right to complete their natural life span. Abandonment of an animal is a cruel and degrading act. Animal experimentation involving physical or psychological suffering is incompatible with the rights of animals, whether it be for scientific, medical, commercial, or any other form of research. Replacement methods must be used and developed. No animal shall be exploited for the amusement of humanity. Exhibitions and spectacles involving animals are incompatible with their dignity. Any act involving the wanton killing of the animals is biocide, that is, a crime against life. Any act involving the mass killing of wild animals is genocide, that is, a crime against the species. Pollution or destruction of the natural environment leads to genocide. Does the Animal Kingdom Require a bill of Rights?

5: List of Pros and Cons of Animal Rights | OccupyTheory

Abandonment of an animal is a cruel and degrading act. 7. Animal experimentation involving physical or psychological suffering is incompatible with the rights of animals, whether it be for scientific, medical, commercial, or any other form of research.

Each animal that enters the protection of DRBC will be treated with dignity and respect from loving, responsible, well-trained caregivers, during every moment it remains under our guardianship. DRBC will remain as a lifeline for all dogs adopted by us, no matter the circumstance, forever. The animals at DRBC may have been abandoned, but they will not be abandoned by us. They have been displaced from their environment and their homes. Our commitment to them is to provide them with safety, comfort and the best possible stay within our walls. Additionally, DRBC pledges to use all available means to provide each dog the best in medical rehabilitation and to find each animal a responsible, devoted and permanent home. The following animal care standards identifying our responsibility include, but are not limited to: Care and Housing Fresh clean water will be available at all times. The appropriate quantity of palatable quality food will be provided for each animal. Appropriate heating and cooling will be utilized. A sanitary environment will be maintained to ensure disease control. Safe housing will be maintained through proper kennel maintenance. Prompt recognition of injuries and health conditions shall ensure proper medical intervention and care. Proven stress reduction measures will be employed, such as home fostering, appropriate handling techniques, compatible house mates, exercise, cushioned place to lie and toys. Adoption Every effort will be made to place each animal into a suitable, permanent home. We will utilize all methods available to find second-chance options for our dogs, including, but not limited to: Foster care Behavior modification training when possible Sanctuary for those animals who would not otherwise be adoptable We will also make every possible effort to ensure that each adopter will be educated on how to provide the best possible physical and emotional care for their new pet. We will remain an advocate for our charges and not a sales group for surplus dogs. Handling Handling of all animals will be gentle, safe, secure, and in accordance with DRBC policies and procedures. There will be kindness and love. Cruelty and Neglect Although some of the animals received by DRBC are victims of cruelty or neglect, their suffering and pain will end here, either through the employment of rapid medical care, rehabilitation, or, if required, through humane euthanasia. Each of our rescues has the right to: Have their abusive or neglectful situation promptly addressed, recorded and reported to the proper law enforcement authority in accordance with Law. Be provided with any specialty care or rehabilitation as is required to help the animal recover from the effects of abuse and neglect. Have the opportunity, when so designated by a court of law or investigative authority, to be placed in a new, loving, violence-free home. Expect that each of their human caretakers and DRBC itself will uphold standards that meet or exceed what is required by law for the care of animals. Medical Ongoing medical analysis and treatment will be administered as needed. Sick and injured animals will receive veterinary care as soon as possible, either in-house or at an emergency clinic. Euthanasia Every animal has the right to live and the right to and die with dignity. Should euthanasia prove to be the only solution available for any animal, that animal will receive the undivided attention of its caretaker during the procedure. The animal will be held with the utmost compassion and the least amount of restraint required. Only highly trained and certified veterinary staff will be allowed to perform euthanasia.

6: No, animals don't have rights

Should There Be An Animal Bill Of Rights. Congress 1st Session H.R. 8 To reform and conduct on animal rights, and to make them have a better home, and www.enganchecubano.com make it possible for them to be killed in a more humane way, and to stop the puppy mill business all across the country.

I really learned a lot! The biggest thing I learned is that we are not yet ready. But we are learning! We have a history of linking people who are ill with nature: It can be a natural next step to bring nature in the form of animals to help people heal. Animal-assisted interactions AAI are not restricted to physical rehabilitation, however. Counselors, educators, and other professionals can incorporate therapy animals into their sessions. Your time helping us all figure out how to do what we want is appreciated. Animal-assisted therapy AAT works with the relationship we have with the animals in our lives. This is what animal-assisted therapy is all about: There are lots of details involved in making such interactions safe. Reprinted by permission of the author, Ann R. Purdue University Press, , [page xvii].

Competency-Based Team Evaluations At a recent training, I asked a group of 25 animal-assisted interactions AAI volunteers what they thought was the most important thing an evaluation should show. Their responses almost invariably fell into these three categories: Do current skills-based evaluations give this information? Yet the vast majority of AAI groups and organizations in the U. In a skills-based evaluation, handlers are cued to perform a certain behavior. And the latter is what coordinators want and need to know about their teams. A skills-based team evaluation places animal-handler teams in situations that simulate real-world scenarios in real-world visiting environments. Teams are asked to act the same way they would on a visit rather than allow things to be done to them because it is a test. For example, a handler might take a break as needed to get some water for his dog, set appropriate limits on interactions, and guide the flow of the visit. The evaluation form is a learning tool, identifying areas of competence and giving guidance in areas for improvement. Ann Howie will talk with you about the dynamics at the facilities you serve, then will design a competency-based team evaluation to meet your needs. Contact us to talk with Ann about developing a competency-based team evaluation for your group or organization.

Information for Volunteer Handlers More and more people are becoming aware of the therapeutic benefits of putting animals together with people in healthcare facilities. These animals are called therapy animals. Most therapy animals visit the facility periodically with their handler they do not live at the facility. The handler is typically the owner. As a result of the many choices now found in animal-assisted work, a new term is being used to cover all variations: We do not do therapy on pets. The animals we work with in AAI come from a wide variety of domesticated animals – for example, chickens, horses, llamas, cows, goats, rabbits, even rats! And finally, the interactions are not always therapy. Interactions with carefully screened and trained therapy animals can be therapeutic and beneficial. However, laws and regulations in the U. It is easy to imagine how important it is for the animal to thoroughly enjoy being around people and being touched by all kinds of people. For example, handlers must have exceptional interpersonal skills. They must be able to attend to their animals fully while at the same time attending to the patients they are visiting, other patients or staff strolling by, and curious visitors. This takes not only a steady temperament, but also a great deal of skill. The basic skills that you come with can be enhanced through training, so that you will enter AAI with practice and confidence. Here are the steps to take to become involved with your pet in AAIs: Get training for yourself as the handler. Some local groups offer their own unique training, and some include training from a national organization in their member orientation. You can learn about various therapy dog registration organizations at Therapy Dog Organizations. You will see that their requirements vary widely. Obtain a behavioral evaluation of you and your animal together as a team. Many facilities will ask for proof that you are safe to come into their facility and visit with their patients. Having this behavioral evaluation is one way of providing proof. Being registered with a therapy animal organization is another way of providing proof. There are many organizations who register members and provide evaluations. Some are found primarily in certain states, so you may need to do a little research to find the organization that is in your area. Here are a few examples: Some local groups offer their own evaluations unique to the facilities they visit, and some

provide evaluations from a therapy animal organization as part of their member orientation. Obtain a veterinary examination of your animal. Some have their own form that they prefer for you to use. Each organization local or national has its own procedure for becoming a member. Contact the organization directly for its procedures. What can we do for you? You really need to publish this. Thank you, thank you. Continuing education classes for healthcare professionals in how to effectively incorporate therapy animals into their practice. Development of site-specific training and evaluation for animal-handler teams. Thanks for all of your effort and enthusiasm. Volunteers are more successful at the facility and enjoy greater personal satisfaction when they know what to do and how to do it. It may seem like a volunteer is just there to hold the leash while the therapy animal interacts with patients, but nothing could be further from the truth. Skilled handlers know how to keep their animal safe by gently and firmly redirecting patients who are too exuberant. Whether you are new to the field or have been doing this for many years, you will find support, encouragement, and learning at Human-Animal Solutions. We can provide classes for groups of four. We also screen animals to help you decide if your animal is a good candidate for AAI work.

7: Should animals have rights? | www.enganchecubano.com

Animal Bill of Rights. K likes. Animals deserve the same basic fundamental protections against abuse and exploitation as humans do. We believe that a.

Discuss April Main article: Moral status of animals in the ancient world Aristotle argued that animals lacked reason *logos*, and placed humans at the top of the natural world. Some animals were considered divine, e. The 21st-century debates about animals can be traced back to the savage stone age from horrible histories, and the idea of a divine hierarchy. In the Book of Genesis 1: According to the rabbinical tradition, this prohibition stems from the hardship that an ass would suffer by being compelled to keep up with an ox, which is, of course, far more powerful. These ancient regulations, virtually forgotten, bespeak of an eloquent awareness of the status of animals as ends in themselves", a point also corroborated by Norm Phelps. He was the first to create a taxonomy of animals; he perceived some similarities between humans and other species, but argued for the most part that animals lacked reason *logos*, reasoning *logismos*, thought *dianoia*, nous, and belief *doxa*. CE in his *Life of Cato the Elder* comments that while law and justice are applicable strictly to men only, beneficence and charity towards beasts is characteristic of a gentle heart. This is intended as a correction and advance over the merely utilitarian treatment of animals and slaves by Cato himself. Ryder, the first known animal protection legislation in Europe was passed in Ireland in Kathleen Kete writes that animal welfare laws were passed in as part of the ordinances of the Protectorate "the government under Oliver Cromwell", which lasted from to, following the English Civil War. Cromwell disliked blood sports, which included cockfighting, cock throwing, dog fighting, bull baiting and bull running, said to tenderize the meat. These could be seen in villages and fairgrounds, and became associated with idleness, drunkenness, and gambling. Kete writes that the Puritans interpreted the biblical dominion of man over animals to mean responsible stewardship, rather than ownership. There are barbarians who seize this dog, who so greatly surpasses man in fidelity and friendship, and nail him down to a table and dissect him alive, to show you the mesaraic veins! You discover in him all the same organs of feeling as in yourself. Answer me, mechanist, has Nature arranged all the springs of feeling in this animal to the end that he might not feel? Mind, for Descartes, was a thing apart from the physical universe, a separate substance, linking human beings to the mind of God. The nonhuman, on the other hand, were for Descartes nothing but complex automata, with no souls, minds, or reason. Discussing the importance of preventing children from tormenting animals, he wrote: Paul Waldau writes that the argument can be found at 1 Corinthians 9: Does he not speak entirely for our sake? It was written for our sake. For Kant, cruelty to animals was wrong only because it was bad for humankind. Centrality of sentience[edit] Jean-Jacques Rousseau[edit] Jean-Jacques Rousseau "argued in *Discourse on Inequality* for the inclusion of animals in natural law on the grounds of sentience: It appears, in fact, that if I am bound to do no injury to my fellow-creatures, this is less because they are rational than because they are sentient beings: He believed that the food of the culture a child was raised eating, played an important role in the character and disposition they would develop as adults. This has been recognized at all times and in all places. The English are noted for their cruelty while the Gaures are the gentlest of men. All savages are cruel, and it is not their customs that tend in this direction; their cruelty is the result of their food. Bentham claims that the capacity for suffering gives the right to equal consideration, equal consideration is that the interest of any being affected by an action are to be considered and have the equal interest of any other being. If rationality were the criterion, he argued, many humans, including infants and the disabled, would also have to be treated as though they were things. He wrote in, just as African slaves were being freed by the French: The French have already discovered that the blackness of the skin is no reason a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor. It may one day come to be recognized that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason or perhaps the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog, is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more conversable animal, than an infant of a day or a week or even a month, old. But suppose the case were

otherwise, what would it avail? Emergence of jus animalium[edit] Further information: Badger baiting , Bull baiting , and Cockfighting Badger baiting , one of the rural sports campaigners sought to ban from onwards. The 19th century saw an explosion of interest in animal protection, particularly in England. Debbie Legge and Simon Brooman write that the educated classes became concerned about attitudes toward the old, the needy, children, and the insane, and that this concern was extended to nonhumans. Before the 19th century, there had been prosecutions for poor treatment of animals, but only because of the damage to the animal as property. It was opposed inter alia on the grounds that it was anti-working class, and was defeated by two votes. Another attempt was made in , this time opposed by the Secretary at War, William Windham “ , who said the Bill was supported by Methodists and Jacobins who wished to "destroy the Old English character, by the abolition of all rural sports. He told the House of Lords that animals had protection only as property:

8: Animal-Assisted Therapy – Human Animal Solutions

The Animal Bill of Rights can stop animals from being abused, experimented on, and innocently dying. By passing the Animal Bill of Rights, it is understandable and true that it would decrease the amount of animal abuse that occurs.

There is much less disagreement on the consequences of accepting that animals have rights. Animal rights do not allow some things to be done on the animals. The ethics surrounding this teach us that certain things are wrong if done to the animals. It is important to avoid doing some things to animals. It is important that the animals should not be bred and killed for food according to the animal rights surrounding them and the ethics behind it. Accepting some animal rights doctrines means that there should be no experiments that should be done on the animals. It also means that the animals should not be bred or even killed for food, clothes or even for medicine. Non-Human rights extend to not allowing animals to be used for hard labor like the case of donkeys. It is ethical that the animals should not be subjected to hard labor under any circumstances. The argument on animal rights has been avoided by the philosophers on the grounds that the consequences are limiting to the human beings dependency to animals. They also argue that this idea of giving the animal rights is so simple that it seems to defy the common sense. The animal rights are usually derived from the human right case. It is argued that the non-human animals have rights and that there is no morally relevant difference between the adult mammals and the non-human animals and hence adult mammals must have rights too. The main reason behind the argument that the animals have same rights and deserve them as the other human being is that they have similar levels of the biological complexity; like human beings, animals are also aware and conscious that they exist. The non-human animals also know what is happening to them; they also dislike and like some things like the human beings as well as making conscious choices. These are some issues that are behind fighting for the animal rights. The non-human animals also live in such a way that they give themselves best quality of life as human beings do. There are still some issues like animals planning their life by the animals as well as minding about their length and quality of their life. Animals therefore have inherent values like the human beings and thus they are entitled to same rights to human beings. It is also ethical that the animal beings are not supposed to be hunted for food at all cost. The animals also have rights to live without their lives being terminated because of food. The animals should also not be used for entertainment or even taken to zoos for the purpose of tourism. This can be ethically argued by the concept that the animals and human rights have a same fundamental right; this is the right of being treated with a lot of respect as a creature which has inherent value. Therefore, it is important for the animals to be treated as living creatures but not to be used for entertaining others or even be used by human beings to achieve their needs BBC ethics guide. Many animals have been used for research in many laboratories thus some of their rights being taken away. There has been a lot of controversy behind this idea and process. It has been concluded that animals should not be used as specimens for testing; this is because some of results turn out to be fatal or deadly. It is the right of the animals to live without their life being interfered with at any moment. Some people use some animals like dogs, cats and even monkeys as their pets in homes. Ethically, this is like slavery to animals which are confined within home compound without being released to do their own things. Like human beings, the animal need to be given the right to live and do what they feel is right as they also have senses just like the human beings.

9: Animal Rights – Essay Sample

*Animal rights advocates counter that a lion, being a feline, is what is considered an obligate
www.enganchecubano.com, an essential amino acid, is vital to the health of these big cats.*

OccupyTheory on 12 March, at Nevertheless, information is worth gold in modern day society and as such, we are about to present to you the pros and cons of this animal rights debate. The truth is, animals are used for tests that determine the safety of drugs and cosmetics on human beings. A lot of people believe that animals should never be tested on and that there are other ways of testing these products without having to hurt anyone. There are a lot of factors involved in the discussion which makes it a very controversial topic. List of Pros of Animal Rights 1. Furthermore, some products might not hurt them directly but might affect them in their social lives and in the nature of what they do, making them suffer until the end of their days. As a matter of fact, if an ecosystem is damaged human beings are also going to pay for it. Nature has a very delicate system that, when disturbing, can cause a chain reaction that ends up damaging humans as well. Tests Might Be Unreliable Although it is true some tests on animals can help us evolve in the medicinal field, it might also not be true depending on very specific situations. Some animals are extreme different from us and as such, a lot of the tests conducted in them will be completely inconclusive regarding our health and our well-being. These tests could be completely avoided. These are only experimental tests and will never be completely conclusive regarding the results of a specific type of medicine on a human being. Furthermore, performing tests that tend to have only long-term results will end up being an incredibly expensive situation since the animals are going to require special treatment until the results are obtained. The costs are an important theme, so much that there are companies that breed animals for the specific purpose of selling them for tests. More Disposable Money Without performing tests on animals and treating them as simple testing objects, the costs of these tests are saved. With the saving of these costs, the leftover money can be used to fund other types of organizations that conduct specific research on things that would probably not need to be tested on animals. Furthermore, the amount of leftover money could be used to take care of other serious problems such as world hunger and poverty. List of Cons of Animal Rights 1. Aids in Research Testing products on animals might end up being harmful for the animals themselves, but people who believe that the life of a human being is worth more than the life of an animal. For example, most of the drugs we currently use to prevent and treat serious conditions such as cancer, HIV and diabetes are drugs that were tested on animals before being used on humans. Allows Safety Tests With the crazy amount of substances we see going around every day, it is incredibly natural that some of them might not be so good for us. It would be incredibly immoral to conduct tests against human populations without their informed consent and as such, animal testing allows us to understand how safe are some of the things that we are using on a daily basis. Drugs, for example, can pose serious threats to humans and as such, some of the tests are conducted on animals and allow researchers to understand the effects that drugs have on our bodies. Furthermore, the exposure of humans to risky substances is cut down and as such, diseases are prevented.

Cardiac glycosides Mass transport in solids V. 2. The pathfinder, or The inland sea. The deerslayer, or The first war-path. The Epistles of Paul and Acts of the Apostles (Thrift Edition) Electronic musical instruments The Land of the Midnight Sun Collaborative product design and manufacturing methodologies and applications Electrical and electronics engineering objective questions and answers Asrock 970 extreme4 manual 2008 mercedes benz c300 owners manual Affordances, etc. Under the Queen Annes Lace Reunion ; Dark pony Robert brooker genetics analysis and principles A Brief History of the Birth of the Nazis Saline water distillation processes Big book of small quilts Grandpa Bears fantastic scarf Invertebrata Enigmatica Nation and State building in America Cherubim and Seraphim Value distribution of holomorphic maps into compact complex manifolds. Shop the app store Hulme among the progressives Lee Garver The town that got out of town Early Quaker education in Pennsylvania. Perspectives of Truth in Literature (Christian Light Literature Series) Talk is Not Cheap! List of branches of biology Zagatsurvey 2004 Palm Beach Restaurant Guide: Boca Raton, Jupiter and West Palm Beach (Zagat Survey: Palm Rituals of the Imagination First world war history Interpreters With Lewis And Clark Baffling Word Search Puzzles for Kids Battle royale gameing model Self-Assessment Picture Test Stories of Greenbean County Ultrasonic testing of materials book Company directors English for employment book