Research Questions
Do nonhuman animals have interests that deserve equal concern and treatment as humans do—and how should humans treat animals?
◊
Should humans be punished for harming animals just as they are for harming other humans?
◊
Must all non-human animals be treated justly or is there some limit: What constitutes one as a being or a person?
◊
What is speciesism and why is it morally wrong?

Sources / Argument
Peter Singer’s principle of equal consideration of interests theory gives equal weight to the interests of all those affected by one’s actions.

Jeremy Bentham’s claim that to have interests and to deserve equality, all the sentient being must have is the capacity for suffering or enjoyment.

Tom Regan’s absolutist theory of the principle of equal inherent value: All individuals have equal intrinsic or inherent value. All mammals beyond the age of infancy are individuals.

Bernard Rollin’s challenges to the position that humans do not have a moral obligation to treat nonhuman animals equally.

Stephen Clark on moral rights of animals: humans have ethical obligations—negative duties—not to harm animals.

Findings and Conclusions
Many nonhuman animals are persons and deserve equal treatment and consideration just as humans do. Because of this, humans must treat nonhuman animals humanely and not cause them any suffering or pain.

Humans must learn to respect their fellow nonhuman persons and should be punished for animal cruelty.

Persons who commit acts of cruelty to animals are at increased risk of committing crimes or acts of cruelty to human persons. The cruelty to animals must not be ignored.

Speciesism is analogous to racism.