

Persons

Lecture 2: Animalism

1. What animalism is, basically Paul Snowdon: 'Each of us is identical with, is one and the same thing as, an animal.' Is an animalist committed to defend this as a necessary truth?

2. What animalism is not Animalism is inconsistent with a number of different views, each of which can accept that *in some sense* we are animals. We can map the terrain using the following three distinctions:

- I am identical to an animal (A), or I am not identical to an animal
- If I am not identical to an animal, then I am either (B) wholly distinct from any animal or not.
- If I am not identical to an animal and not wholly distinct from any animal, then either (C) an animal is a part of me or (D) I am part of an animal

What is the closest rival position?

3. Too many thinkers The most familiar argument for animalism is the 'Thinking Animal' argument. Has been defended by Paul Snowdon and Eric Olson.

1. There is a human animal sitting in your chair
2. The human animal sitting in your chair is thinking
3. You are the thinking being sitting in your chair
4. You are a human animal

4. Animality argument The 'Animality Argument' is defended by Andrew Bailey in an attempt to improve on the 'Too many thinkers' argument ('You are an animal', *Res Philosophica* 93(1), 2016).

1. I am, in some sense or other, an animal
2. If I am, in some sense or other, an animal, then either I am an animal in the derivative and secondary sense or I am an animal in the primary and non-derivative sense
3. If I am an animal in the secondary and derivative sense, then there are two human animals in my immediate vicinity

4. But there are not two human animals in my immediate vicinity
5. Therefore, I am not an animal in the secondary and derivative sense
6. Therefore, if I am, in some sense or other, an animal, then I am an animal in the primary and non-derivative sense
7. Therefore, I am an animal in the primary and non-derivative sense

5. Animal ancestors argument An entirely different strategy is taken by Stephen Blatti, who exploits the idea that our being animals is entailed by evolutionary theory ('A new argument for animalism', *Analysis* 72:4, 2012)

1. I am not an animal (for *reductio*)
2. If I am not an animal, then my parents are not animals
3. If my parents are not animals because I am not an animal, then neither are their parents, etc.
4. If my parents' parents etc. are not animals, then evolutionary theory is not applicable to us
5. Evolutionary theory is not applicable to us
6. Evolutionary theory is applicable to us
7. Contradiction

6. Varieties of Animalism Does animalism in its basic form say too little? Must animalism say something about (a) the persistence conditions of animals; (b) what animals are made of?