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Animal rights is an ethical problem which holds no objective right. Rights are concerned with the protection of a being from external forces, for example, the right to life. It is understood by most that no being has the right to take another's life. Yet, all rights only fall those whom hold the capability to reason.

Kant, a deontologist, favours this view. Only those able to reason can fulfill their duty and if they do not, they exist purely on survival instincts. For example, a bee does not know as it is its duty.
Although Kant's theory is often associated with deontology and duty, the ethical implications are not limited to legalistic reasoning. Kant's categorical imperative, which states that one's actions should not only be morally good in itself but also have the potential to become a universal law, is a fundamental principle in this context. Kant argues that actions are morally right when they are done for the sake of duty and not merely to achieve a particular outcome or benefit oneself. This approach contrasts with consequentialist theories, which focus on the outcomes of actions as the measure of their moral worth.

Kant's view that humans must fulfill their duty to oneself leads to the conclusion that animals cannot be treated as ends in themselves. The differentiation between human beings and animals is thus based on the ability to make moral judgments and the capacity to understand moral duties. Kant believes that animals lack the necessary cognitive abilities to make a moral claim on the rights of others, which is why they cannot be considered as moral agents in the same way humans are.

Therefore, the ethical treatment of animals is not based on the notion of property but rather on the recognition of their intrinsic value and rights. The categorical imperative suggests that we should treat animals not just as means to an end but as ends in themselves. This ethical framework emphasizes the importance of compassion and respect for all living beings, regardless of their species.
remains emotions form his theory as 'emotional clauscule judgement'. Thos is viewed in the 'axe murder example'. It is clear emotion is fundamental to the human mind; it is also apparent many humans form emotional obligations to pets, and can therefore not condone animal cruelty. Kant fails to recognize the human's natural inclinations and can therefore not be recognized to resolve any moral problem.

Utilitarianism seems to give a more possible attempt in resolving the ill-treatment of animals. Bentham regards all beings as one, the main concern is what produces the 'greatest happiness for the greatest number'. This includes animals as 'all are place under the governance of two sovereign masters: pleasure and pain'. This appears more justified as Bentham appears to address the animals feel pain and have the ability to suffer. This appears coherent to the natural right of prevention of pain and right to life.

Bentham highlights how the life of one small killer produces less happiness than the life of five puppies. Therefore, in this situation one must save the five puppies as it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number. However, Bentham does not believe in rights. Under Bentham neither humans, or non-human animals have rights. Bentham world of sacrificed ten chickens for one baby and therefore appears to remove all intrinsic worth and holds no abstraction which makes the theory appear romantic.

Although Bentham's utilitarianism focuses on how the ill-treatment of animals it is disregarded depending on each situation Bentham's
the theory appears to hold little arguments as to why it should be favored as it disregards the human life where necessary.

There appears to be conclusive theory which resolves the problem of the ill-treatment of animal rights, as rights themselves are subjective. There is no universal right which is emphasized through cultural relativism, therefore it is illogical for a theory to attempt to resolve the ill-treatment of animals. Throughout the modern age it is beginning to become more objective that animals should not be neglected due to Peter Singer's "speciesism." According to Singer to favor the life of a child over a dog is just as immoral as favoring racism and sexism one must aim for equality. Yet, by nature all exist under the influence of "survival of the fittest" therefore one will never encounter true equality.

Yet, if all were to abide by the theory of utilitarianism rights would become unnecessary and therefore the ill-treatment of all animals would be protected when possible. Although ill-treatment will still remain, to the extent to the ill-treatment of animals would fall.
Plan: Assess whether nations have rights?

Yes

Cultural relativism highlights how they differ, but all individually have rights.

Yet just as they can be removed does not mean they do not exist.

W.T. does not protect these "rights".

- China: rights cannot be natural as they are easily removed, therefore nations cannot really have rights.

- In rights to exist they must be universalized.

- P.I. restricts one's right to freedom (you must have a seatbelt).

- No state (nation) can exist without government as it becomes unstable - one does not have live rights if they are being governed.

- Freedom of speech in the United Kingdom but not in Communist China. Therefore, there is an unseen level of control as to whether nations truly have rights.

- Communist China has highlighted how one has the ability to remove one's right. For example, the
Human nature is a subjective opinion which differs dramatically throughout many political thinkers. It seems apparent that man needs guidance and stability which is provided through many political authorities. Yet, many thinkers deny the need for political authority claiming human nature is peaceful, and already all theories collapse. Therefore, it is more conclusive to claim that human nature is such that political authority is necessary.

John Locke determined "man to be free" which is entered throughout classical liberalism. According to Locke, by nature man is peaceful and therefore are may conclude if by nature man is peaceful, one does not need a political authority. Yet,
Mill, another great classical liberal, highlighted this is not the case. Mill believed the government to be essential (like Locke) as it is a neutral umpire ensuring the protection of man's human rights. Mill believed in the right of the prevention of harm. "The right to save my first ends, where you face begins." Therefore, political authority must remain governance to negative liberty and must simply prevent physical harm. Negative liberty being free from restrictions. This appears contradictory to man being peaceful by nature, and man was peaceful there would be no possibility of violence. Therefore, the correct doing this governance is essential. Yet, this peacefulness is human nature in the original position. Human nature can be corrupted, and therefore Mill's theory appears to become not coherent. This prevention from harm ensures all can enhance their freedom. Therefore, political authority is necessary as human nature can be changed over time.

However, anarchism seems to disagree. Anarchism believes in existence without government, political authority. Man is peaceful and rational, according to anarchism, and therefore man can co-exist peacefully without state interference. Yet, although anarchism appears superficially sound, it is highly optimistic of man. Human nature appears to differ from each individual as each human's character differs. For example, one may be peaceful yet the next destructive. Therefore, the attempt to lay a theory on an ever-changing aspect of humans seems empirically unobtainable. Anarchism is associated with chaos and destruction showing how man can coexist from
his apparent "peaceful nature." Marx attempts to remove government also. Marx believed capitalist government to be an oppressive force governing the bourgeoisie over the proletariat, preventing man from his "species being." Political authority causing man to become enslaved. Yet, it appears possible Marx's theory was caused from his economical loss of wealth and may therefore become an idealistic argument. Marx therefore introduced his concept of Communism. A nation which overruns capitalism, redistributing wealth. Yet, for a communist state to work it must begin under state rule. History has highlighted the destructive nature of communism. Therefore, man needed no government by nature, communism is contradictory as it is reliant on a political authority to begin.

Human nature is an unknowable truth as one cannot go back to the "original position" to determine one's human nature. It is apparent that a man's nature differs from a serial killer; therefore one cannot attempt to objectify the subjective to build an assumption on human nature. Political authority is essential to man as it is clear that one's "survival instincts" are selfish and one will always wish to better oneself. Thus, the government is essential in perpetuating humanity by enhancing their chance of freedom (positive liberty) for example, receiving an education. All should have the chance to receive an attempt at reason which removes them from their "human nature" of selfishness and "survival of the fittest."