

# Outline: Strategies to Defend Nonhuman Animals. A Map to the Arguments for and against Them

Oscar Horta  
University of Santiago de Compostela

<i>MAIN APPROACH</i>	<i>PARTICULAR STRATEGY</i>	<i>ARGUMENTS FOR THE STRATEGY</i>	<i>REPLIES TO THESE ARGUMENTS</i>	<i>RESPONSES</i>	<i>REPLIES TO RESPONSES</i>
<b>CHANGING THE LAW REGARDING NONHUMAN ANIMALS</b>	<b>Regulationism</b>	Legal changes are the only ones that will ensure that animals' interests are respected	Legal changes depend on the public's attitudes	Legal changes also influence the public's attitudes	The dependence of the public's attitudes on the law is far smaller than the dependence of the law on the public attitudes
					Even if legal changes strongly determined the public's attitudes, because the public's attitudes is the key factor, changing the law should not be followed as a strategy valid in itself, but a tactic of the really valuable strategy (changing the public's attitudes)
			Changes in the public's attitudes are the key changes for nonhuman animals not being harmed		
			Achieving legal changes entails an enormous amount of resources		
			Regulationism does not provide protection from harms to nonhuman animals that are caused in situations in which they are not used as resources		
	Regulations lead to abolition	There is no logical connection	Incremental regulations may		

			between incremental reforms and a prohibition of a practice	eventually make it unprofitable to use nonhuman animals	
			Regulationism justifies the use of nonhuman animals, thus making its abolition harder	Regulationism spreads the idea that nonhuman animal interests count, thus making its abolition more feasible	Regulationism provides some people with a justification to use nonhuman animals, while they lead some other people to question the use of nonhuman animals and speciesism
		Regulations achieve now actual and concrete improvements for nonhuman animals	The changes that regulationism can achieve are not significant ones	As more regulations are approved, the public's attitude may move forward and more important regulations will be achieved	That will only happen if the public's attitude change, so the public's attitude are the key, rather than the regulations
			We should not discriminate against the animals that will live in the future for the sake of those who exist now		
<b>Incremental prohibitions</b>	Legal changes are the only ones that will ensure that animals' interests are respected	<i>See the discussion above in the case of regulationism</i>			
	Incremental prohibitions lead to abolition	Prohibitions, and campaigns for them, may give the impression that the practice prohibited is worse than others	Prohibitions spreads the idea that nonhuman animal interests count, thus making the prohibition of other practices that harm nonhuman animals more feasible	Prohibitions give some people the impression that the practice prohibited is worse than others, while they lead some other people to question the use of nonhuman animals and speciesism	
	Incremental prohibitions achieve now actual and concrete improvements	Because of the public's attitudes towards nonhuman animals, only minor prohibitions are possible to achieve	As more prohibitions are approved, the public's attitude may move forward and more important ones will be achieved	That will only happen if the public's attitudes change, so the public's attitude are the key, rather than the prohibitions	

		for nonhuman animals			
<b>Struggling for the recognition of full legal rights for some nonhuman animals</b>	Achieving full legal rights for some nonhuman animals is something attainable	Campaigning or achieving full legal rights for some nonhuman animals may give the impression that some nonhuman animals deserve full legal rights more than others	Campaigning or achieving full legal rights for some nonhuman animals breaks the species barrier and makes it easier for humans to see other nonhuman animals as deserving legal rights	It may lead some, or maybe many people to see other nonhumans as deserving legal rights, but it generally gives the impression that some nonhuman animals deserve full legal rights more than others	
		It may require an enormous amount of resources			
	Some nonhuman animals deserve full legal rights more than others	Such a view is speciesist			
	Having full legal rights entails having the same legal status humans have, thus ending speciesist law	<i>True, although achieving such legal status is impossible without a change in the public's attitudes</i>			
	Having full legal rights ends any use of nonhuman animals				
	Having full legal rights entails not only negative rights not to be harmed, but also positive rights to be helped				
<b>Struggling for the recognition of full legal rights for all sentient beings</b>	Having full legal rights entails having the same legal status humans have, thus ending speciesist law	<i>True, although achieving such legal status is impossible without a change in the public's attitudes</i>			
	Having full legal rights forbids any use of nonhuman animals				
	Having full legal rights entails not only negative rights not to be harmed, but also positive rights to be helped				

<b>AFFECTING THE PRODUCTION AND THE OFFER OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS/ SERVICES</b>	<b>Rescuing animals</b>	Rescuing animals achieves now actual and concrete improvements for nonhuman animals	The number of animals thus helped is very little (or none if they are replaced)	It is the animal victims that matter, not the public's opinions	The key changes depend on the public's attitudes
			Depending on how rescues is carried out, they may alienate the public and impede they listen to our arguments		
		Rescuing animals helps other animals not being used by making it more difficult to produce animal products/ services	Inasmuch as there is a demand for animal products/ services, it is unlikely no one will satisfy it		
		We should do something now for existing animals and not focus in those who may exist later	Many animals will be exploited in the future, and not to give their interests the weight we give to the interests of those who exist now is discriminatory against them		
	<b>Sabotaging the use of nonhuman animals</b>	Sabotage saves animals by making it more difficult to produce animal products/ services	The number of animals thus helped is very little or none		
			Sabotage may alienate the public and impede they listen to our arguments	It is the animal victims that matter, not the public's opinions	The key changes depend on the public's attitudes
	<b>Closing down businesses that use nonhuman animals</b>	Closing down businesses that use nonhuman animals saves the animals that will be used by them	The number of animals thus helped is very little or none		
		Closing down businesses saves the lives of other animals by dissuading others from producing	Inasmuch as there is a demand for animal products/ services, it is unlikely that no one will satisfy it		

		animal products/ services	If the campaign is carried out by means of intimidatory tactics, it may alienate the public and impede they listen to our arguments, which means more animals will not be saved	The public's opinions do not matter if we can stop the production of animal products/services	We cannot stop the production of animal products/services without changing the public's attitudes
<p><b>CHANGING THE ATTITUDES OF THE PUBLIC</b></p> <p>[According to an alternative categorization, this approach might be divided into two main approaches: (i) affecting the demand for animal products/services; (ii) changing the public's consideration of nonhuman animals]</p>	<p><b>Reducing the demand of animal products/services for reasons that do not have to do with animal interests</b></p>	Reducing the demand of animal products is the only way to end or reduce massively the production of animal products/services	Those who are involved in the production of animal products/services can and do influence the demand	The influence of producers in the demand can be countered if the public's attitude change significantly	
		Changing attitudes regarding speciesism and the moral consideration of nonhuman animals is very hard	The success of this course of action depends on factors other than the interests of animals that may vary through time		
			This course of action may make appear the defense of nonhuman animals trivial		
			Questioning certain uses of nonhuman animals for reasons that do not have to do with animal interests cannot further a general case for the consideration of nonhuman animals		
			Changing attitudes regarding speciesism is the key to change the situation of nonhuman animals, so we must do it eventually however difficult it is		
			Speciesism is unjustified, and		

			should be fought against as animal exploitation is	
		It is easier for those who do not use nonhuman animals for nonmoral reasons to reject that use on moral grounds	<i>True, although questioning certain uses of nonhuman animals for reasons that do not have to do with animal interests cannot further a general case for the consideration of nonhuman animals</i>	
			If following this course of action takes resources out from a course of action that would lead humans to reject the use of nonhumans for moral reasons, the efficiency of this course of action may be questioned	
	<b>Reducing the demand of animal products for moral reasons that have to do with nonhuman animals' interests without questioning speciesism in a wider way</b>	Reducing the demand of all animal products/ services is the only way to end or reduce massively the production of animal products/ services	<i>See the discussion above in the case of the strategy that aims at reducing the demand for reasons not related to nonhuman animals' interests</i>	
		It is possible to end or significantly reduce the harms that humans inflict on nonhuman animals without questioning speciesism, by merely arguing for the moral consideration of nonhuman animals	<i>True, although questioning speciesism makes it easier to spread the idea we should help nonhuman animals</i>	
			Speciesism is unjustified, and should be fought against as animal exploitation is	
			Nonhuman animals are not only harmed by humans, and there are other situations in which we could help them even if	We have no reason to help nonhuman animals, we should only refrain from harming them
				For an animal, the source of the harm she suffers is indifferent, we should be equally concerned with all the harms they suffer

			we have not been the ones who have harmed them		Most of us defend we should not only refrain from harming humans, but also help them, so not assuming the same view with regards to nonhumans is speciesist
<b>Questioning speciesism</b>	Changing speciesist attitudes is the only guarantee that humans will not demand animal products/ services, and that nonhuman animals will not be exploited	Changing speciesist attitudes is a long and hard process	However long it takes, changing speciesist attitudes is the only way to end or reduce massively the harms humans cause to nonhuman animals		
				Speciesism is unjustified, and should be fought against as animal exploitation is	
	Changing speciesist attitudes is the only guarantee that humans will not harm nonhuman animals in other ways apart from the institutionalized production of animal products/ services	It is possible to achieve this without questioning speciesism, by merely arguing for the moral consideration of nonhuman animals	<i>True, although</i> questioning speciesism makes it easier to spread the idea we should help nonhuman animals		
	We should not oppose only the exploitation of nonhuman animals, but also any form of discrimination they suffer	We are justified in favoring humans inasmuch as we do not cause harm to nonhuman animals	Favoring humans arbitrarily is speciesism and is morally unjustified		
	Changing speciesism attitudes is necessary for humans not only refraining from harming nonhuman animals, but also helping them when they needed	It is possible to help nonhuman animals without questioning speciesism, by merely arguing for the moral consideration of nonhuman animals	<i>True, although</i> questioning speciesism makes it easier to spread the idea we should help nonhuman animals		
				We have no reason to help nonhuman animals, we	For an animal, the source of the harm she suffers is indifferent, we

			should only refrain from harming them	should be equally concerned with all the harms they suffer	
				Most of us defend we should not only refrain from harming humans, but also help them, so not assuming the same view with regards to nonhumans is speciesist	