Abstract

Controversy arises between personal beliefs and practices concerning the welfare of animals and animal rights. Western ideology defines animal rights in terms of protection of animals from cruelty through a requirement for humane treatment. The law protects animals from certain forms of brutal and merciless treatment in medical and scientific research and it prohibits slaughter of some animals for human consumption. The arguments concerning animal rights have long been debated among philosophers. However, solutions have proved difficult to find due to the dominance of the anthropocentric viewpoint. The rights of animals and trees are not accepted as inalienable rights but are rather seen as something granted by humans. This paper will attempt to clarify the controversy of animal rights and the effect it has had on human ideas. Western definition generally defines human value in terms of physical well-being but must also consider psychological well-being. Moral attitudes regarding the treatment of animals come from various standpoints including Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics and Buddhism Ethics and Morals. The first part of this paper focuses on the history and development of animal rights. The term animal rights was
first used by Frederick Schopenhauer (1788-1860) in his book titled, “Basic Moral”. He was a far-seeing German Philosopher who first raised the issue of animal rights and believed in universal compassion as the only moral guarantee for animal protection. Compassion is the goodness of character in human beings, and he who is cruel to animals cannot be a good man. Great Britain was a pioneer nation in this field as it passed the first animal protection law in the early 19th century. This law opposed cruelty against animals, and was especially intended to stop bull-baiting. After that, similar laws were passed to protect domestic animals such as horses and cattle. As a consequence, Colonel Richard Martin founded the Society for Animal Protection (SPCA) which gained the royal support of Queen Victoria. Since then, similar societies on animal rights have been set up in North America and Europe. The animal rights movement has developed and refined arguments for animal protection which were promoted side by side with scientific advances and connected with evolving human values. The second part of the paper deals with contemporary thinkers on the rights of animals such as Peter Singer, Tom Regan and the Eco-Feminism movement, although they express different points of view supporting animal rights and start their views from the shared idea that cruelty to animals is wrong. More extreme animal rights arguments cause controversial feelings and doubts as it is difficult to establish clear and universally accepted guidelines for the relationship between animals and human beings. Those who oppose the animal rights movement have their base in animal farming, animal testing for scientific research or medical treatment, meat consumption, and so on. Statistics have shown that modern laboratories have increased the amount of small animals for experimentation every year and that scientific testing methods are harmful to animal rights. Causing suffering to animals has become more acceptable and living harmoniously and sustainability with animals has become unimportant and unnecessary. Animals have become slaves to humans, so the cries of the slaves will never be heard by their master. The last part of this essay is devoted to finding
an answer to the problem of how one should behave regarding human values. It focuses particularly on the concepts of “Utilitarianism”, Deontological Ethics and Buddhist ethics. Self-realization, for practical reasons, may provide one clue for living rightly towards Animals.
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Introduction:

The world in which we live is a dualistic world. It is a man-made world within the world which is made by nature. If we look at the world closely, we shall perceive two sides of the same world which has the elements of beauty and ugliness. Can it be possible to transform the conditioned, man-made world into a place for animals to enjoy and live peacefully, and equal to humans as citizens of the world? When I use the term, “citizens of the world” I mean the plant and animal kingdoms as well. A world without animals is unthinkable and as everything is interconnected, animals and humans must have a connection in some way. Mankind depends on animals for survival but we rarely feel gratitude toward them. We do not seem to care much or even try to protect animals from being used as a means of enjoyment. Wild life and the natural environment have been destroyed gradually in every part of the globe for centuries. Till now we are still blind to the sequences of natural disasters which cause tragedy to thousands of people and for which human beings are the main cause. The theory of butterfly effect is not only a psychological explanation but it has been proved as fact in science. The problem of causation is explained within the butterfly theory. At least it provides information about the fact of causation and it provokes our sense of awareness to take precautions at the early stages to save the wild animals, the forests, and eco-system.

Everything is related. To live alone is impossible in reality. Pythagoras of Samos the ancient Greek philosopher supported the idea of relation. Relationship is equality. If anyone has a good relationship to an animal, he or she will treat her equally. Pythagoras's teachings focused on living harmlessly with animals and nature. He was a pioneer deep ecologist in the ancient world, long before Arne Nasse. Pythagoras introduced the issue of how to live harmoniously and live sustainability with nature. To live peacefully inwardly with the other requires intelligence. Relationship was Pythagoras’s most valuable teaching and it was told that his followers held this rule highly. A
Pythagorean could pay the debt of his friend or anyone who was in trouble and they lived in commune as a society which represented a group of non-violent existence. They were also vegetarian. For normal people, it is not a normal act to eat dog meat as we value the characteristics of a dog for loyalty. On top of everything else, a dog is a man's best friend. It is sad to say dog meat was eaten among the ancient Greeks and Heraclitus cried out loud when he heard the dog’s howl when it was beaten. Immediately, he was reminded that the dog was his old friend from that sound. Heraclitus believed in reincarnation and torturing animals were unacceptable to him. It is unfortunate for us to live in the morbid society where animals are part of the game of enjoyment, animals in a circus world and large numbers of animals killed every day by the food industry for the hungry people of the world. Is it time for us to change our perception completely towards animals? A wind of change brings hope for us in breaking through our pattern of maltreating animals and starting to learn how to respect their right to live without fear.

The idea of one world theory in which there is no separation between the man-made world and the natural world needs ethical and moral guidance. This idea, combined with a binding with hidden talent in the heart and brain, can lead to rethinking and renewing the structure of society. Animal rights can be used as a proper tool to connect the man-made world with the natural world without distortion of either. Let us light up the hope of righteousness to shine brightly for altruistic practices in protecting the rights of animals and trees.

The concept of Animal Rights : From whence did it come?

It has taken a long struggle to fight for Individual rights in the light of reason. The gaining of Individual rights did not come to men easily. We fight among ourselves to get rid of oppressive actions toward ethnic groups, gender, classes, and so on. The process of reshaping our way of thinking has been full of suffering and the struggling of humankind throughout history. We have gained victory
over oppressive actions against individual rights but animal rights have not yet won. I wonder who will fight for them if not humans? When was the time in human history that the idea of animal rights first emerged and gain some acceptance and public attention? The period, or timeline of world history in which animal rights become one of the controversial issues in our society may be difficult to trace back accurately. But the flow of love, sympathy and the feeling of care and concern for the well-being of trees and animals has long existed within the human mind. We have come across some good men from the past such as Pythagoras, Laozi, Buddha, and Jesus Christ who have shown deep understanding for how man and animals were connected.

Animal Rights was introduced for the first time in modern times through the writings of the German thinker, “Schopenhauer.” He used the term animal rights in a satirical sense and ridiculed man for brutal actions against animals. The rights of animals were not a major concern for the common people in his time. Germany is a meat eating society. Animals’ lives depend on the will of the owner in both the domestic and farming sectors. They are inferior to man in all aspects. God created them to serve mankind but man should not do as they will to animals. It is not rational to believe we are born with natural rights to oppress animals. Schopenhauer showed his compassion towards animals, especially dogs, in his writings. He posed the interesting question, “What kind of motivation can overcome the egoistic tendencies of an individual?” For him, it was true that morality was not taken from the commandments or the categorical imperative of Kantian ethics. Moral actions came from empirical investigation and compassion flowed naturally from man’s will. Schopenhauer answered the above question by affirming three fundamental incentives to human action; a) Egoism; the desire for one’s own well-being, b) Malice; the desire for another's woe, and c) Compassion: the desire for another's well-being. The three functions are fundamental motivations for ethical incentives. Schopenhauer blessed compassion as an incentive foundation for moral action. Man realized himself once more
in compassion. Recognition of the self through compassion connected man with all life. He found mystery in compassion and ethics for him can be described in the realm of metaphysics, not in theory of knowledge. He said, “A man who acts brutally to animals cannot be a good man”.

In modern times, the term 'animal rights' was found in the work of Jeremy Bentham, the British philosopher who defended the right of animals with regard to pain and suffering. He proclaimed the right of animals under the rule of utilitarianism. The rule stressed a calculation method of pleasure and pain for moral guidance. It was logically true to say animals also felt pain from our experience. Therefore, it was not absolutely right to harm animals in all cases. Bentham’s enquiry into animal suffering later became grounds for contemporary thinkers to fight for animal rights. He said, “The question is not, Can they reason? nor Can they talk? But rather Can they suffer?” Suffering is a sensation, and pain is obviously linked to living species. It is a strong argument for the philosopher and the champion of animal rights and liberty in our time named Peter Singer, who also feels the pain and hears the cries of animals. His moral attitude flowed from his own experiences of the world crisis regarding animals and he took a leading role in expanding his ethical arguments concerning the welfare of animals.

In the history of Western civilization, Britain has played a pioneer role in supporting the notion of animal rights. As early as the late 19th century this nation was passing laws to protect animals from being brutally and cruelty attacked, particularly with regard to bull-baiting. Colonel Richard Martin successfully founded the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) which gained the royal support during the reign of Queen Victoria. Nazi Germany, under the rule of Adolf Hitler also created laws preventing German people from harming animals. Since then, animal protection laws were implemented in other countries in Northern Europe and America. The
Animal welfare act was created in 2007 and it came into force in Wales and England. The law was a radical change in attitude and promoted a good example for EU Laws on animal welfare. Animal laws in European countries vary from light to strict laws depending on the culture and farming industry of the country. It was legal to use animals as an instrument for sexual desire in Denmark and Norway but these practices were prohibited in Germany. The Law of domestic protection or Animal protection laws in Greece, Bulgaria, Spain, and the Netherlands were very light. Domestic animals were tortured in a very horrible way such as letting them starve from hunger or shivering under the snow. Some dogs were found dead from hanging or parts of the body were cut, causing severe injury. In America the society for Animal protective Legislation (SALP) was found in 1955. SALP has actively lobbied for important pieces of animal legislation, for example, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act in 1966 followed by the Endangered Species Act in 1969, the Horse protection Act in 1970 and other laws on marine Animals. The society has as its main aim the strengthening of animal laws according to the current situation of the welfare of animals. The brief content of EU law of animal welfare states the following:

Whereas national laws concerning the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing have an impact on the condition and accordingly on the operation of the common market in agriculture on the conditions of competition and accordingly on the conditions of competition and accordingly on the operation of the common market in agricultural product. Whereas there is therefore a need to establish common minimum standards for the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing in order to ensure rational development of production and to facilitate the completion of the internal market in animals and animal products; Whereas at the time of
slaughter or killing animals should spare any avoidable pain or suffering; whereas, however, it is necessary to allow for technical and scientific experiments to be carried out and to take account of the particular requirements of certain religious. (EU laws of Animals Welfare; http://eurogroup for animals.org )

The above statements show little success of animal protection societies in lobbying governments to improve the laws governing animal slaughter houses in our time. Though most people seem unwilling to reduce their use of animal products, at least we see some progress in terms of animal welfare. With respect to improving the life of animals, it will take time to change the paradigm of thinking which governs the relationship between humans and the 'other'. The Rights of animal in term of respect to life or have equal status to Man was not fully accepted by the public. The level of understanding depended on Individual belief. It is the problem of Human values. Some may agree and take quick response to the philosophy of animal rights but some may turn against or blamed them for being extremists on animal case. It is against the law of nature which gives us the rule of Might is Right. The tiger has the right to catch the deer to satisfy his hunger. What is wrong with Man compare to a Tiger ? The answer is Man is the rational being and we possess the ability to think. To be able to reasoning and thinking is man capacity which animal may not be able to do so. Is it right for the Mighty to rule and conquer? Or Is it better for the strong to protect and sacrifice for the benefit of the weak? Look from the perspective of the vegetarian, we can survive without meat production. Let us rethinking about the love life issue, we may together remove our hand from killing zone. Actually, animal law is still not reach a full-fledged of international success due to differences in culture, belief, personal values, structure of society, size of agribusiness, life style of individual, and etc. But we still believe;
where there is a will, there is a way to care for the welfare of animals in pragmatic circumstances.

The situation of animal protection and welfare in Asia is far behind the Europe and North America. The idea of non-violence was familiar to Asian people generally, and repeated it again and again in the society for not harming animals. Wild life animals were used in Chinese medication, cooking dishes, leather business, hunting and exporting, etc., Hunting and Killing animals through order had decreased the size of wild lives animals in Asian forests, and in the near future some species of endangered animals will disappear forever. Moreover, the large scale of tropical rainforest in Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, Laos and Cambodia were clearance and the vast land was turned to rice field, rubber plantation, palm oil estate, housing areas, and animals farming business. The illegal logging business across the border damaged the eco-system in the Zone of SEA countries and it had tremendous affected to endangered animals species and the lost of biodiversity of plants which at the end will affected to animals kingdom. The Animals Law in SEA is not so effective in reinforcement due to corruption of the officers. Poverty, lack of knowledge in eco-system and no mercy for animals are causes motivated them to over exploited animals. In China, Animal Society was formed as early as in 1920 and the Animal Protection Society was set up in 1933 as the new wave of thought. In 1990, the idea was broaden covered wide range of Animal Protection Law, such as domestic animal law on street dogs and cats, the law concerning the hygiene of the slaughter house, animal testing, wild life animal protection, compensation in the case of animals violation, education to the young, etc. China was done a lot nowadays to promote a change in the society regarding to Animals Law. Animals were bully in many ways as part of Chinese civilization. Is it a time to rethinking and renew the relation between the two parties? EU countries took a first step banning leather from India because of the horrible means to end lives of poor animals. The large numbers of cattle were left in open
field, hungry, loneliness, fear, and desperate before marching on the line of death. Few of them were fainted when the very hot water (about 200 degree celcius) was splashed over the cattle’s skin. They were brutally killing without anesthetic for reducing pain and fear from death. To ending the injustice violation to animals, the International Animal Society offered help in many branches to set up animals societies in Asian countries covered wide ranging of animals protection and welfare such as Green Peace, Change Organization, Wildlife Animal Protection, PETA, and etc. They lobbied politicians in the parliament and used mass media to defend for animal rights and animal welfare. Animal must receive the rights under the civil law of protection, equal to human. Penalty for harming animals, the ethic of respect life of animals, and animal rights should be taught as part of environmental program in school’s curriculum. Besides, Thailand black market has been selling organs of wild life animals for decades. Animals’ organs were transported across the countries border to other parts of the world possible because of money and power. This is the truth about Animals situation in SEA countries and to bring sustainable and peaceful living with other species, we need time to share our knowledge and educated our own people. I firmly believe with the helping hand of Asian people, we one day can uprooting the reign of money which become part of modern structure in Asian society, for the sake of welfare and animal protection. The survival of animals is also our own survival.

Linda and Paul Macartney said, “If the slaughter house is a glass house. Everyone will be vegetarian”. (Lindzey, 2013) and Archbishop Desmond Tutu raised his voice of anti crime over animals. He said as thus, “I have seen firsthand how injustice gets overlooked when victims are powerless or vulnerable, when they have no one to speak up for them and no means of representing themselves to a higher authority. Animals are in precisely that position. Unless we are mindful of their interest and speak out loudly on their behalf, abused
and cruelty go challenged” ( Tutu. We must fight injustice to animals; www.ind Catholicnew.com ).

The cries of animals are not loud enough to be heard, the implement of animals law cannot reinforce the wrong doer around the globe efficiently. In spite of mercilessness in the structure of capitalism which money ruled, the animals and nature had been devalued and destroy gradually. And we lost the sense of compassion in human consciousness. Animal Rights are people’s choice for ethical or moral act in our times. It has a truth to say, Individual is an ethical agent for making choice on how to live righteously. Thus, the young must be educated in the hope that they will concern and care for future generation of Animal Kingdom. And this is the only way for the survival of the generation next of human beings.

The Controversy of Animal Rights and Human Values

Controversy arises between human values and practices of the people in animal welfare and animal protection. The Animal Welfare Law prohibited human to use animals as mean which caused suffering to the animals. The condition of living unit for animals farming, domestic animals or even animals for scientific test must be kept hygiene and the animals should not be lived in the bad surrounding. Animal Rights promoted the idea of equality, protected animal from merciless treatment of animals in scientific purpose or in consumption. Domestic animals should be protected from ill treatment of the owner and the code of law should indicated compensation act and punishment for animals death and pain. The Animal Rights was formed the concrete idea in our time by Peter Singer (1946-?). Australian philosopher who spent his life time speaking and writing books for the silent voice of animals. He proposed the idea of “Animal Rights” on the basic ground of suffering. Animals also feel the same pain as we do feel. Therefore, Animals have natural right to live equally. Singer witnessed the Australians were hunted down Kangaroos similar to the Aborigines were hunted by the white males
during the period of colonialism. Sadly, the progress in technical advancement of factory farming, of hunting whaling, and seal distorted ethical values in human mind. He said that we must progress beyond the speciesism of the era to make animals inferior to mankind by taking the final step of expanding the circle of animal rights ethic.

Peter Singer used suffering of pain as reason for defending animal rights similar to Bentham’s utilitarianism. Tom Regan (1938-?), American philosopher moved forward from the welfare of animals to support the idea of animal rights based on the argument of respect to life. The rights to live is a tradition natural right which inherent as part of living beings. Animals have a right to live, and to end live of the other species should be morally wrong. To implement the idea into practice, law and education are important for preventing ill treatment to animals in human thought and behaviors. Act of the individual starts from his or her choice and if the choice takes side on animal rights, then he/she respects life. Tom Reagan’s view that, act on the part of respect life of animal is the act of reasoning. Compassion for animals is not sentimental but it comes from reason.

Another philosophical trend of supporting animal rights is Eco-feminism. The eco-feminist movement was emerged from a group of intellectual women in the mid-1970s alongside with Green movement and feminist philosophers in politic and sexual bias. The structure of society is male dominant in a Patriarchy format. Man is oppressed women as well as nature. Men exploited Nature in the same way as Men exploited women. Women must come together and shouting for the cries of the weak, innocent, uneducated, powerless, etc, beyond the frontier of nation, race, culture, language to change the world. Eco-feminism supported the rights of animal by using argument in the frame thought of feminist ethics.

The central ideas of Eco-feminist theory are the empirical, the conceptual or cultural/symbolic and the epistemology. The empirical claim is related with scientific fact of global environment deterioration
in the glob is affected to women health and women labor in the household family. Feminist philosophy based on cultural aspect of white men culture and other races culture. The similarity of dualistic characters of man and woman which can be found in every society in Europe, Asia, North America or Africa was used to describe male dominant society. It was explained as thus; man is masculine, mind and rational. Woman is feminine, fresh or body, and emotion, etc. Woman is inferior to man and lacks of power to rule because of possessing the weak characters. Therefore, it is the right for Man to rule. Patriarchies’ is a symbol of sexism, warriors and power in eco-feminist philosophy. It comes the time for women to rebel from patriarchies power and free themselves from the bond of male dominant. In epistemology, women have made deep connection with nature far more than men. Besides, women were affected from the natural calamities so that they should own hers privilege ability to understand nature or even develop epistemology about natural world to aid the creativity of paradigm shift in practices. The argument of eco-feminist movement to support animal right and respect in life of the non–human world connected to the root cause of patriarchy society. This world is a Man world and nature is like women was dominated and exploited by men. The world of animals and plants are vulnerable and lack of power to protect itself from the mighty male domineering world. Women have to joined hand to protect the forest, natural resources, animals, women and children from the aggressive man. (Mellor, 1997; 1) The ethics of care and concern and the ethic of reciprocity for the weak is the central point of reasoning for animal rights protection from the standpoint of eco-feminist movement. Rosemary Ruether writes in her book New Woman/New Earth as follows; “Women must see that there can be no liberation for them and no solution to the ecological crisis within a society whose fundamental model of relationships continues to be one of domination. They must unite the demands of the women’s movement with those of the ecological movement to envision radical reshaping of the basic socioeconomic relations and the underlying values of this modern
An interesting comment on why do we need to protect natural world from the perspective of Canadian ecologist, David Suzuki states as thus, “If we don’t see that we are utterly imbedded in the natural world and dependent on nature, not technology, not economics, not science—we are dependent on Mother nature for our being and survival. If we don’t see that, then our priorities will continue to be driven by man-made constructs like national borders, economies, corporations, markets. Those are all human created things. They shouldn’t dominate the way we live. It should be the biosphere. And the leaders in that should be the indigenous people who still have that sense that the earth is truly our mother, that gives birth to us …….If we do not make that fundamental shift, then we will just go on…..and on that stuff, but we haven’t fundamentally changed in our relationship to the biosphere.” (Suzuki; Solution are in our nature; http://www.davidsuzuki.org/)

A group of radical movement on animal rights such as Eco-feminist involved their activities in the praxis of political and ethical connections within the practical context of law binding and voices for animal rights. As far as the environmental ethics is concerned women go against any development under the name of science and technology which violated animals and natural world. Killing ought to be blamed for demolishing the rights to live and uprooting the ethics of care for the fragile and vulnerable species. The animal rights movement also faced with the obstacles wings from scientific laboratories which depend on animal experiment, farming industry, food industry and animal industry and so on related to animal business.

The Animal Rights movement was attacked from many groups such as the vegan or non vegetarian, research scientist, farming business, breeding animals for laboratory experiment, vivisection animal for body of knowledge or scientific investigation, medical test, cosmetic and pharmacy industry, etc. The amount of small animals using in laboratory were increasing per year. In Italy recently the pro
animal rights activists closed down the animal laboratory and free numbers of mice from the cages in Milan University. The result caused a big problem to research scientists who spent a year to keep animals and technically observed the animal behaviors for case studies in Parkinson and Alzheimer’s disease. The radical activist went so far from the fact that animals were used in laboratory for utilitarian purpose. Scientists do not intentionally harm or even want to injure them. The dispute was difficult to set up because of their difference in what their beliefs. A group of biomedical scientists said that, instead of rescuing animals from laboratory test for saving human lives, they should free animals in the farming industry or animals in slaughter house. Less number of animals used in laboratory compare to numbers of animals killed for food industry. Finally, top European scientists have issued the Basel Declaration for solidarity with the sect research scientists whose research has been ruined by fanatical idea of animal rights. The scientists called on the government and law enforcement to do more protect research facilities. They still carry on the pattern of animal research and praised the value of animal research. EU scientists call for the help from society to condemn the violation act of animal rights movement in violence against research community under the pretense of animal protection.

As a matter of fact, small animals were suffered from being used in medical testing, drug poisoned or pain killer medicine or vaccination respectively. It becomes clear that the pain of small animals will not be heard and the fight for animal rights will not ending so soon. The argument of denying animal rights used logic for explaining as thus; “Animal cannot have right because animal cannot reasoning or thinking. Ability to think is reserved only for man. To be able to feel is ambiguous to proof animals have right, and the right of animal should not be taken root from suffering. In the case of meat eater, if tiger can eat meat, Why? Man cannot. If right comes from duty, what is duty of animals? Animal work on man’s will. Animal do not subject to responsibility, so they do not have duty as well as they
do not have right to choose as man can make a choice on his /her will. To conclude this part the controversy of animal rights evolving with human values. Man and his choice connected him with what he believed, and then action followed. The reflection of animal rights is though complicated but it is important for our choices to exist as human being for right livelihood.

**Moral and Ethical Solutions for Animal Rights: Kantian Ethic, Utilitarianism, and Madhayamaka Buddhist Philosophy**

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was a prominent German philosopher in the late 19 Century, Kant developed his ethical theory based on German character and his personal value on Reason. Kantian Ethic or Deontological ethics guide us to the kingdom of reason which has its core teachings on do your duty. The rule of Deontological Ethics stressed on the categorical imperative proposition rather than on Hypothetical Imperative proposition. The right act for Kant should be able to count as universal law and the positive consequence which come after the action cannot use as criteria for judging the right action. Kantian’s ethic is judging a man action from fulfill his duty. Any action which led by pure reason usually based on duty. Furthermore, it was ethically wrong to use people as mean to satisfy anyone’s end. For him, human being has hidden talent to go beyond sensation. Pure reason is related to practical reason. Individual person acts as autonomous for his/her ethical code. I think Kantian ethic gives us enough room to reflect on the ethical proposition by using pure reason to analyze for practical purpose. Kantian has three formulations as follow;

a) Formulation i, the Formula of Categorical Imperative Proposition.

b) Formulation ii, the Formula of Universal Law; Act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.
c) Formulation iii, the Formula of the End in Itself; So act as to treat humanity, both in your own person, and in the person of every other always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means. (Kantian Ethics; http://www.csus.edu)

The issue of animal rights is able to put into practice, analysis from Kantian formulation i and formulation iii as thus; a) the formular of Categorical Imperative proposition; Thou should not kill. Animal should not be killed. In any case killing is wrong doing. If we use pure reason to synthesize for understanding why take life of the other is ethically wrong. Animals own their lives and we do not have right to take away their lives. On the contrary man’s duty is to preserve life. So, Animal Rights movement should be supported. b) the formula iii, the formular of the End in Itself; Anyone does not own natural right to use someone as mean to satisfy his/her own interest. Animal is not equal to man. Animal is a thing and as we can use rock to satisfy our will. Can it be the same for animal? I will choose the stand point from Utilitarianism as suffer from pain is a quality of living beings. Animal possess this quality. So, Animal should not be treated as mean in any case. Therefore, Animal has right which we must respect. For Kant, any action which motivate from pure reason is a practical one and it bases on duty ethic. Let Animal enjoy life and it is wrong to use animal as mean for our end purpose. Formulation ii, is fairly difficult to win the case of the supportive argument of animal rights as very few persons can leap to the kingdom of pure reason to understand that animal rights can be hold as a universal law. Controversy arises in the beliefs and practices concerning to animal rights issue, and one voice for animal rights is not reach the gold yet. To think of animal right as a universal law for practical reason is sound impossible for everyone to accept it as an ethical rule. But for a few persons I found it has the possibility. Kant believed that Man has capacities to go beyond to the world of reason which the set of universal law come from. And if our action was guidance from universal law, we shall act rightly. It is the duty of universal man, act for the whole, not for the part.
Utilitarian ethic of Jeremy Bentham grounded on the utility of large numbers of people including the -I as ethical rule. The fundamental thought came from empirical; human enjoy pleasure and avoid pain. Therefore, any action which brings happiness to the large group of people is considered right. The rule focused mainly on the consequence, not on duty action. The calculation of pain and pleasure indicated what we ought to do? Rule Utilitarianism states that, “everyone should act according to the happiness of the many”. In which way the idea of Animal Rights beneficial to human beings? The argument to support Animal Rights on Utilitarian perspective need mature and experiences person to evaluate deeply into the pro and con of the consequences. The reflection of consequences are very important for the healthy way of considering whether it will be better to leave our hand off from animals business in some animals cases.

What is the benefit of human if we consume less animal products? Humankind will enjoy the clean and beautiful environment, peaceful living with the mind set of non violence, sustainability living without causing damage to animal lives, consume less energy, less toxic in the body, save cost for feeding animals in farming business etc. The farming business is not good for soil improvement and food for animals in farming was enormous. Population of animals will not overload for man to control. In the state of nature population of the animals is fairly balanced. What is the lost if we consume less animal product? So, we have to reflect our knowledge, experience, moral or ethical aspect of judgment to find proper answer. Then it comes the calculation part based on the principle of the rule which are; i) the consequence of the action must lead to the utility of the many. ii) any actions must follow the rule of utilitarianism iii) the consequence which lead to the utility of the many is right action.

Buddha’s teachings on compassion to sentient beings supported Animal Rights movement. The core teaching of Mahayana Buddhism is compassion. Law of dependent found in Madhayamaka philosophy
of Nagarajuna, everything is depended on one another, the existence of something must have something to depend on. Ultimate reality is not non-existent. The philosophy of Middle Way arises from denying Realism and Nihilism. Madhayamaka Buddhism supported Law of Dependent Origination of Life and Birth circle. But we should aware of Madhamaka philosophy that Nagajuna explained his dependent theory on the condition of thing arisen which has no relation with the unique nature of substance. Personally, I quite like the logic of Nargajuna in explain cosmic energy which form the cosmic karma of the self and collective selves from Madhayamaka point of view. Harming, killing cannot be the right act because of the will to kill is harmful to individual mind. If one wants to develop his/ herself should refrain from this action. The more you kill the more you become use to killing activity. It is always a resistance from the opposite party then you have to subdue him/her by using more energy to finish the game. It must have the consequences which later become another cause. The law is explained in the mysterious way and it lay hidden and link with all lives in this earth. Somehow, I feel it goes beyond words and language to prescribe how law of karma works on us. The safe side is followed the rule of refraining wrong doing according to the commandment of religions or philosophy theory. Love and Compassion for sentient being support Animal rights. Buddhism gave clear answer for our practical way to respect life of our comrades without species.

**Conclusion:**

Animal Rights become an issue of debating in many fields of study in our society. Why? Population of the world is increasing after the World War II, environment deterioration under the progress of modern society, food industry and animal product are in demand, and human ‘s life is depend totally on animals. I see the problem of the world and can predict that fresh water and the lost of balance of biodiversity and animals will affected the man made world in the
future. Unless we take right action and avoid the bad action which may come. We should listen to the warning of the philosophers and the Sages in the past for the future. It might not be absolute to say which ethical theory is the best solution for guidance our behavior related to Animal Rights, but we can think of and considered from the rule and apply it in a particular case. A man/woman who treats animal badly has a chance to treat people badly. Lord Buddha praises Compassion as incentive of moral action. Lord Buddha said; “As rain falls equally on the just and the unjust, do not burden your heart with judgments but rain your kindness equally on all.” (Dhammapada, 1955: 40)
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