

*Organ harvesting example:* Fred runs a farm on which human beings are raised to age 18. On their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, they are slaughtered and their organs used to save lives. Each slaughtered human saves about five lives. Since their organs don't do people much good if they aren't in good shape, the humans on the farm live active, happy, healthy lives until their slaughter. If the farm didn't exist, none of the humans raised on the farm would have been born.

*deontological moral theory:* these say that what makes an act morally wrong or permissible is not just the good or bad it leads to

*moral duty to x* (same as "moral obligation to x") = it is morally wrong to not do x

*A has a moral right to x* = it is morally wrong to stop A from xing, or from having x (even in some cases where it is morally overall good to stop A from xing)

### **Regan's argument**

1. It can be wrong to kill (or harm) a human even doing so is overall morally good (humans have a right to life (or to not be harmed)).
2. If human beings have rights to life, then some animals have this right as well.
3. Thus, some animals have a right to life.
4. Certain "environmentally friendly" practices violate animal rights even if they are overall good.
5. Thus, certain environmentally friendly practices are morally wrong.

### **The argument for premise 2**

*difference argument*

- a. All humans have rights to life (or to not be harmed).
- b. If there were a difference between humans and all animals such that no animals had rights to life (or to not be harmed), then not all humans would have rights to life (or to not be harmed).
- c. Thus, there is no difference between humans and all animals such that no animals have rights to life (or to not be harmed).

*best explanation argument*

“We are each of us the experiencing subject of a life, a conscious creature having an individual welfare that has importance to us whatever our usefulness to others. We want and prefer things, believe and feel things, recall and expect things. And all these dimensions of our life, including our pleasure and pain, our enjoyment and suffering, our satisfaction and frustration, our continued existence or our untimely death - all make a difference to the quality of our life as lived, as experienced, by us as individuals. As the same is true of those animals that concern us (the ones that are eaten and trapped, for example), they too must be viewed as the experiencing subjects of a life, with inherent value of their own.”

- i. The best explanation for why humans have rights is that they have interests / welfare.
- ii. All subjects of a life have interests / welfare.
- iii. Thus, all subjects of a life have rights.
- iv. All sentient animals are subjects of a life.
- v. Thus, all sentient animals have rights.

**John Locke on property**

From *Second Treatise of Government* (1690)

“As much as any one can make use of to any advantage of life before it spoils, so much he may by his labour fix a property in... Nothing was made by God for man to spoil or destroy...”

“God gave the world to men in common; but since he gave it them for their benefit... it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational (and labour was to be his [the industrious] title to it)....”

“...in the wild woods and uncultivated waste of America, left to nature, without any improvement, tillage or husbandry, a thousand acres yield the needy and wretched inhabitants as many conveniences of life as ten acres of equally fertile land do in Devonshire...”

“...land that is wholly left to nature, that hath no improvement of pasturage, tillage, or planting, is called, as indeed it is, waste.”

(sections 31-42)

*Locke's argument*

1. The native Americans get less benefit from the land than would English settlers; they waste the land.
2. There is nothing wrong with removing the wasteful person from the land, as long as it is overall good to do so (If one wastes land, then one has no right to that land)
3. Thus, there is nothing wrong with English settlers taking the land from native Americans; it might still be wrong to kill them and take their land, but forcing them to relocate (e.g. to reservations) is morally permissible.