

Animal Rights: Fundamentalist versus Pragmatist Ethics*

Intuitionist argument for animal rights fundamentalism:

1. I have an intuition that animal rights is right, or that unnecessary suffering in the animal rights sense is wrong and abolishing animals as property is right.
2. Animal 'welfarist' laws are contrary to full animal rights.
3. Therefore animal 'welfarist' laws are unethical.

Rationalist argument for animal rights pragmatism:

1. We ought to promote what is really best for sentient beings.
2. Full animal rights laws are best long-term, but animal 'welfarist' laws may be the best we can manage short-term.
3. If animal 'welfarist' laws are really best in the legislative short-term, therefore they are ethically acceptable or even required.

A. type of theory?	B. general type of proposal for legislative short-term?	C. concrete example of B.?	D. which sounds better purely in abstract or conceptually?	E. which would be better if we could concretely enact any laws one pleases or conceives of?	F. what is the real-world projected outcome in a capitalist society?	G. which outcome under column F. is <i>really</i> —not just conceptually—better for animals?	H. status of each approach?
animal rights fundamentalism	protecting 100% of an animal interest such as freedom of movement (or else no law reform)	capitalists giving same room to hens they would have in an animal rights sanctuary	this option	this option	nothing		confused at best, deluded at worst (animals prefer the really better, not unrealized, idle ideas)
animal rights pragmatism	substantial suffering-reduction or welfare-enhancement	taking hens out of battery cages, put in larger confines			close to or same as what is proposed	this option	helpful to animals at best, clear-thinking at worst

•Please note that the arguments above are necessarily, for reasons of space, only simplifications of Francione's intuitionist ethic and Szybel's rationalist best caring ethic.