

[Word Count: 118]

In *The Case for Animal Rights*, Tom Regan advocates for the rights of animals, arguing against indirect duty views, the kindness-cruelty view, and building on utilitarianism. He is against the kindness-cruelty view, as he believes that acts of kindness and cruelty can be nuanced. In this essay, I will justify the kindness-cruelty view against Regan's counter argument. I believe that acts of kindness are always moral and that acts of cruelty can never be justified. In the kindness-cruelty view, kindness is defined as a virtue where a person acts out of an emotional motive, such as compassion or concern. Cruelty is when people act with a lack of sympathy or even derive pleasure from the suffering of others.

Part 2:

1. [A] Animals, including humans, are experiencing subjects of life and are able to feel pleasure and pain.
2. [A] People have direct duties to all humans, including those who are not rational beings, such as babies and intellectually disabled adults, to be kind and not cruel to them, as experiencing subjects of life and being able to feel pleasure and pain.
3. [From 1, 2] People have direct duties to be kind and not be cruel to animals.
4. [From 2] Showing kindness to one race over another is morally reproachable, as those acts are rooted in injustice.
5. [From 2] Abortion has debatable morality as an act lacking compassion.
6. [From 4, 5] **Kind acts are not always guaranteed to be right acts and cruel acts are not always guaranteed to be immoral acts.**
7. [From 6] The kindness-cruelty view is not sufficient in defining the morality of actions.
8. [From 6, 7] Therefore, it is necessary to turn to another moral theory, such as utilitarianism, to justify animal rights.

Part 3:

1. [A] Acting from kindness is good and virtuous.
2. [From 1] When a racist shows kindness to their own race, although the motive is not always, the act itself is good.
3. By showing preference to their own race over others, a racist lacks sympathy for other races.
4. [From 3] By definition of cruelty, showing kindness to only one's own race is an act of cruelty.
5. [From 2, 4] Acts of kindness towards only one's own race is immoral not due to the kindness of the act, but cruelty of disregarding other races.
6. [Empirical point] Human brains in fetuses do not develop enough to perceive life, including pain, within stages of pregnancy viable for abortion.
7. [From 6] Fetuses are not experiencing subjects of life and are unable to feel pain or pleasure.
8. [From 7] People have no direct duties to fetuses.
9. [From 7, 8] Abortion is not an act of cruelty as there is no lack of sympathy concerned, and does not work as an example of one.
10. [From 5, 9] Therefore, it is false that kind acts are not always moral, or that cruel acts can be moral.