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**ARGUMENT RECONSTRUCTION**

The argument reconstruction is made on the use of animals for laboratory test. Irrespective of the purpose of the test, the harm that humans give to the animals cannot be justified. Many argue that it is not unjust while others argue that it is unethical to use nonhuman animals. Tom Regan in his research discussed that animals are used in harmful, non-therapeutic medical research. He argued that although humans are used for vivisection after proper ethical appropriation, while non-human animals’ vivisection is not developed by fully satisfied ethics (Regan, 2012). The animals face pain for an experiment or research which would not benefit them. Peter Carruthers argues that humans possess moral standing while nonhuman animals do not have such stands. This is because animals do not have any rights. Therefore there is no violation of rights and ethics during vivisection.

 Argument of Tom Regan is true as evidence shows that most of the other arguments are based on the benefits that humans get by vivisection while it is also important to research and argue on the loss or harm of the animals. Comparison between the species can allow people to minimize the harmful impact over the non-human animals due to vivisection. The other argument given by Peter Carruthers is proven through the evidence that animals have emotions and feelings like a human. But the way humans claim moral and rights, animals do not. The animal only needs protection that no unnecessary harm shall be given to them (Carruthers, n.d.).

 From the two arguments, it is concluded that non-human animals are used for vivid sections. It is beneficial for the human. But it is not giving any benefits to the animals that are being used for experiments. Also as they possess feelings and emotions, I think moral values and ethics should be appropriately addressed before using them for vivisection. Peter Carruthers has focused on the benefits of humans. Therefore, he concluded his argument in favor of vivisection by ignoring the fact of the life cycle that depends on not only humans but also plants and animals.
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