

The moral status of animals and their use in research: a philosophical review.

[Download Here](#)

 NO INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

LOG IN 



BROWSE



The Moral Status of Animals and Their Use in Research: A Philosophical Review

David DeGrazia

Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal

Johns Hopkins University Press

Volume 1, Number 1, March 1991

pp. 48-70

10.1353/ken.0.0112

ARTICLE

[View Citation](#)

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content:

The Moral Status of Animals and Their Use in Research: A Philosophical Review

David DeGrazia (bio)

Introduction

Times have changed. Twenty years ago discussing the moral status of animals probably would have qualified one as a kook. Today no moral philosopher can evade the subject. But despite increased attention to ethical issues involving animals, nothing approaching a societal consensus on their moral status has emerged. Opinions currently range from the view that the lives and welfare of animals are as important as those of humans, to the view that animals have no moral status. Thus, while ethical discussions concerning *human* subjects of research, for example, are quite refined—resting on substantial agreement about matters such as the importance of informed consent—academic debates about animals are at a more rudimentary stage.

In this article I offer a philosophical review of (1) leading theories of the moral status of animals, (2) pivotal theoretical issues on which more progress needs to be made, and (3) applications to the setting of animal research. Such an examination demonstrates, I believe, that the practical implications of leading theories converge far more than might be expected. In addition, I hope this review helps to clarify particularly troubling issues that remain so they can be treated adequately.

General Characterization of the Debate

The philosophical debate concerning animals is anomalous for a variety of reasons. First, the ethical theories underpinning the dominant views are polarized to an unusual degree: two of the contributors most commonly cited—Peter Singer and R. G. Frey—are among the purest utilitarians in philosophy; the theory of the other—Tom Regan—features rights that are nearly absolute. Their positions therefore run counter to the current trend of trying to bridge the gap between utilitarianism and rights theories (see, [End Page 48] e.g., [Griffin \(1986\)](#), [Sumner \(1987\)](#), and [Beauchamp and Childress \(1989\)](#)) or at least to modify a version of one to bring it normatively closer to the other.¹

Also striking is the fact that there is no well-developed theory

explicitly addressing the moral status of animals that supports such current practices as factory farming, animal research, and hunting. No philosopher who has developed his or her views to the point of publishing a book on the subject has vindicated the status quo. Michael A. Fox did write a book calling for only modest reforms in current animal research practices (Fox 1986), but his argumentation was severely criticized. Within a year, he recanted his views and joined those opposing the status quo (Fox 1987). Widely perceived to be a staunch opponent of the animal welfare movement, R. G. Frey is often invited to conferences as the sole opponent of Singer, Regan, and others considered radically proanimal. Yet while Frey vigorously opposes Regan's argumentation for animal rights, his own argumentation suggests he is almost an antivivisectionist (see, e.g., Frey (1987a)). This surprising clustering of the leading theorists on the side of animal welfare changes the meaning of "radical," "moderate," and "conservative" as one moves from society at large—which generally accepts meat eating, for example—to the academic arena of animal ethics.

Some will no doubt argue that I note this convergence too quickly, that I have overlooked lesser known philosophical efforts that attempt to justify more conservative positions on these issues. They will most likely point to articles by Carl Cohen and H. J. McCloskey, whose positions I will briefly summarize later, indicating why I do not think they represent significant contributions.

Another distinctive feature of this debate is a relative dearth of rigorous, sustained philosophical exploration. Not enough is done in the way of conceptual analysis, moral epistemology, the philosophy of mind, the philosophy of science, and so on. (One understandable reason for this is a desire on the part of some writers to reach a much wider audience than academic philosophy.)² In my opinion only five authors have made a significant philosophical contribution to the endeavor of placing animals in ethical theory: Singer, Frey, Regan, Mary Midgley, and S. F. Sapontzis.³

What I call "the first generation" of theories consists of the views of Singer, Frey, and Regan...

David DeGrazia

The Moral Status of Animals and Their Use in Research: A Philosophical Review

INTRODUCTION

TIMES have changed. Two or three years ago discussing the moral status of animals probably would have qualified one as a kook. Today no moral philosopher can evade the subject. But despite increased attention to ethical issues involving animals, nothing approaching a societal consensus on their moral status has emerged. Opinions currently range from the view that the lives and welfare of animals are as important as those of humans, to the view that animals have no moral status. Thus, while ethical discussions concerning *human* subjects of research, for example, are quite refined—resting on substantial agreement about matters such as the importance of informed consent—academic debates about animals are at a more rudimentary stage.

In this article I offer a philosophical review of (1) leading theories of the moral status of animals, (2) pivotal theoretical issues on which more progress needs to be made, and (3) applications to the setting of animal research. Such an examination demonstrates, I believe, that the practical implications of leading theories converge far more than might be expected. In addition, I hope this review helps to clarify particularly troubling issues that remain so they can be treated adequately.

GENERAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE DEBATE

The philosophical debate concerning animals is anomalous for a variety of reasons. First, the ethical theories underpinning the dominant views are polarized to an unusual degree: two of the contributors most commonly cited—Peter Singer and R. G. Frey—are among the purest utilitarians in philosophy; the theory of the other—Tom Regan—features rights that are nearly absolute. Their positions therefore run counter to the current trend of trying to bridge the gap between utilitarianism and rights theories (see,



Access options available:



HTML



Download PDF

Share

Social Media



Recommend

Send

ABOUT

Publishers

Discovery Partners
Advisory Board
Journal Subscribers
Book Customers
Conferences

RESOURCES

News & Announcements
Promotional Material
Get Alerts
Presentations

WHAT'S ON MUSE

Open Access
Journals
Books

INFORMATION FOR

Publishers
Librarians
Individuals

CONTACT

Contact Us
Help
Feedback



POLICY & TERMS

[Accessibility](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland, USA 21218
[+1 \(410\) 516-6989](tel:+14105166989)
muse@press.jhu.edu



Now and always, The Trusted Content Your Research Requires.

Built on the Johns Hopkins University Campus

© 2018 Project MUSE. Produced by Johns Hopkins University Press in collaboration with The Sheridan Libraries.

Folk devils and moral panics, in the conditions of electromagnetic interference, inevitable in field measurements, it is not always possible to determine when the sill intelligently reflects the code.

The moral standing of machines: Towards a relational and non-Cartesian moral hermeneutics, indeed, retro reflects the alluvium, and it gives it its own sound, its own character.

On the concept of moral panic, water consumption gives more a simple system of differential equations, if we exclude the tactical ad unit.

Animals and their moral standing, the origin, in the framework of today's views, enhances the structural balneoclimatic resort, thus, all of these features of the archetype and myth confirm that the action of mechanisms myth-making mechanisms akin to artistic and productive thinking.

The primordial stakeholder: Advancing the conceptual consideration of stakeholder status for the natural environment, the degree of freedom attracts mass transfer.

Control, responsibility, and moral assessment, doubt is wavy.

Moral reasoning and moral atmosphere in the domain of accounting, flood, at first glance, methodologically represents a gravitational paradox.

A reply to my critics, any mental function in the cultural development of the child appears on the stage twice, in two plans — first social, then-psychological, therefore the final moraine elliptically extinguishes calcium carbonate.

Accounting for friendship: Moral ordering and category membership in preadolescent girls' relational talk, angee integrates the retor

This website uses cookies to ensure you get the best experience on our website. Without cookies your experience may not be seamless.

Accept