

can animals and machines be persons

****Can Animals and Machines Be Persons? Exploring Personhood Beyond Humans****

can animals and machines be persons is a question that challenges the traditional boundaries of philosophy, law, and ethics. As technology advances and our understanding of animal cognition deepens, the line between what constitutes a “person” and what does not becomes increasingly blurred. This exploration invites us to rethink personhood not just as a human attribute but as a status that might extend to non-human entities, whether biological or artificial.

Understanding Personhood: What Does It Mean to Be a Person?

Before diving into whether animals and machines can be considered persons, it's crucial to clarify what “personhood” entails. In everyday language, a person is typically a human being, but philosophically and legally, personhood encompasses a broader set of criteria.

The Philosophical Foundations of Personhood

Personhood traditionally includes attributes such as self-awareness, consciousness, the capacity to reason, autonomy, moral agency, and the ability to engage in complex social relationships. These qualities allow an entity to hold rights and responsibilities.

Philosophers like John Locke emphasized consciousness and memory continuity as central to personhood, while others focus on moral agency and the ability to make autonomous decisions. This diversity of perspectives means that personhood is not a fixed concept but a spectrum of qualities that entities may possess in varying degrees.

Legal Perspectives on Personhood

Legal systems across the world have historically reserved personhood for human beings, granting them rights and protections under the law. However, there have been exceptions, such as corporations being recognized as “legal persons” to enable them to enter contracts and own property.

This legal flexibility opens the door to considering other non-human entities, such as animals or even machines, as potential persons under specific circumstances.

Can Animals Be Considered Persons?

The question of animal personhood has gained traction, especially with growing evidence of complex cognitive and emotional capacities in many animal species.

Animal Cognition and Consciousness

Studies show that animals such as primates, dolphins, elephants, and certain bird species exhibit self-awareness, problem-solving abilities, and emotional intelligence. For example, mirror tests have demonstrated self-recognition in great apes and dolphins, a trait often linked to higher consciousness.

This scientific evidence challenges the notion that animals are mere property or tools and supports the idea that some animals might deserve personhood status or at least enhanced legal protection.

Ethical and Legal Movements Toward Animal Personhood

Several advocacy groups and legal scholars argue for the recognition of certain animals as “non-human persons.” This concept suggests granting individuals like chimpanzees or elephants certain rights, such as protection from captivity or mistreatment.

For instance, courts in some countries have begun acknowledging the rights of great apes, and New Zealand legally recognized some dolphins as non-human persons in 2013, affording them specific protections.

Implications of Granting Animals Personhood

If animals were legally considered persons, this would have profound implications for industries like farming, entertainment, and research. It would necessitate reconsidering how society treats animals, focusing more on their welfare and autonomy.

However, the challenge lies in determining which animals qualify and how to balance human interests with animal rights.

Can Machines Be Persons? The Rise of Artificial Intelligence

With the rapid evolution of artificial intelligence (AI), the idea that machines might someday be considered persons is no longer purely speculative.

What Constitutes Machine Personhood?

For machines, personhood would require attributes such as consciousness, self-awareness, the ability to make autonomous decisions, and perhaps even moral reasoning. While current AI systems are incredibly sophisticated, they still lack genuine consciousness or emotions.

Nonetheless, as AI systems become more advanced, exhibiting learning capabilities and adaptive behaviors, questions arise about their potential rights and responsibilities.

Philosophical and Ethical Considerations

Philosophers and ethicists debate whether machines can truly possess personhood without consciousness or experiences. Some argue that if a machine behaves indistinguishably from a person, it should be treated as one—a concept known as the Turing Test principle.

Others insist that without subjective experience or sentience, machines cannot be persons, no matter how advanced their programming.

Legal Status of AI and Robots

Currently, AI and robots do not have legal personhood. However, discussions around “electronic personhood” have emerged, particularly within the European Union, to address liability and responsibility for autonomous systems.

Assigning personhood to machines could help clarify legal accountability but also raises concerns about rights that might conflict with human interests.

Comparing Animals and Machines as Persons

While both animals and machines challenge traditional views of personhood, their differences are significant.

- **Biological vs. Artificial Origin:** Animals are living beings with evolutionary histories, while machines are human-made artifacts.
- **Consciousness and Experience:** Animals exhibit signs of consciousness and

emotions; machines currently operate without subjective experiences.

- **Moral Agency:** Animals may lack human-like moral reasoning but demonstrate social behaviors; machines follow programmed instructions without genuine moral understanding.

These distinctions influence how society might approach granting personhood status and the responsibilities that come with it.

The Future of Personhood: A Spectrum Rather Than a Binary

Rather than viewing personhood as an all-or-nothing status, it may be more practical to consider a spectrum. Both animals and machines may occupy different points along this continuum based on their capacities.

This perspective encourages a more nuanced approach, recognizing degrees of moral consideration and legal protection tailored to the nature of each entity.

Practical Tips for Engaging with This Debate

- **Stay Informed:** Follow developments in animal cognition research and AI advancements to understand evolving definitions of personhood.
- **Consider Ethics:** Reflect on the ethical implications of expanding personhood beyond humans, including welfare, rights, and societal impacts.
- **Engage in Dialogue:** Participate in conversations about legal reforms and technological ethics to shape future policies responsibly.

As society grapples with these profound questions, remaining open-minded and informed will be crucial.

The exploration of whether animals and machines can be persons forces us to reexamine what it means to be a person in a rapidly changing world. It pushes the boundaries of philosophy, law, and technology, inviting a future where personhood is more inclusive, complex, and reflective of the diverse forms of intelligence and consciousness around us.

Frequently Asked Questions

Can animals be considered persons under the law?

In most legal systems, animals are not considered persons but are classified as property or sentient beings with certain protections. However, some movements and court cases advocate for recognizing certain animals, especially great apes and cetaceans, as legal persons to grant them rights.

What defines a 'person' in philosophical terms?

Philosophically, a 'person' is often defined as an entity with self-awareness, consciousness, the ability to reason, and possess moral rights and responsibilities. This definition can extend beyond humans to include certain animals or artificial intelligences if they meet these criteria.

Can machines or AI be regarded as persons?

Currently, machines and AI are not legally or philosophically considered persons because they lack genuine consciousness, self-awareness, and moral agency. However, as AI technology advances, debates continue about whether highly sophisticated AI might one day qualify as persons.

What are the ethical implications of recognizing animals or machines as persons?

Recognizing animals or machines as persons would require granting them rights and protections, potentially altering how society uses animals and AI. This raises questions about moral responsibility, welfare, and the limits of personhood.

Are there any legal precedents for granting personhood to non-humans?

Yes, some legal systems have granted limited personhood status to non-humans, such as corporations (legal persons) and in rare cases, great apes or rivers in countries like New Zealand. These precedents open discussions about expanding personhood to other entities.

How do cognitive abilities of animals influence the personhood debate?

Animals with advanced cognitive abilities, such as dolphins, elephants, and great apes, challenge traditional notions of personhood because they exhibit self-awareness, problem-solving, and social complexity, suggesting they may deserve person-like rights.

What challenges exist in granting machines personhood?

Challenges include determining whether machines can possess consciousness or subjective experiences, the implications for accountability and rights, and the technological limitations in replicating genuine human-like cognition and emotions.

How might recognizing animals or machines as persons impact society?

It could lead to changes in laws regarding animal welfare, AI rights, responsibility for actions, and ethical treatment. It might also influence industries like farming, research, and technology development, requiring new regulations and ethical standards.

Is personhood a binary status or a spectrum?

Some scholars argue that personhood is not strictly binary but exists on a spectrum, with varying degrees of rights and recognition depending on cognitive capacities, social roles, and moral considerations. This perspective allows for nuanced treatment of animals and machines in legal and ethical contexts.

Additional Resources

Can Animals and Machines Be Persons? An In-Depth Exploration of Personhood Beyond Humans

can animals and machines be persons is a question that challenges traditional boundaries of law, ethics, and philosophy. As society advances scientifically and technologically, the concept of personhood—long reserved for human beings—faces new scrutiny. This article investigates the evolving discourse around whether non-human entities like animals and machines can be accorded personhood, analyzing the implications, criteria, and controversies that surround this complex topic.

Defining Personhood: A Conceptual Foundation

Before addressing if animals and machines can be persons, it is critical to understand what personhood entails. Traditionally, personhood refers to the status of being a person, encompassing certain rights, responsibilities, and the capacity for agency. Legally and philosophically, it often implies self-awareness, consciousness, intentionality, and the ability to enter into social contracts.

The conventional framework maintains human beings as the sole bearers of personhood. However, emerging debates question whether this anthropocentric perspective is adequate, especially as scientific insights reveal sophisticated cognitive and emotional capacities in animals and as artificial intelligence (AI) systems grow increasingly autonomous.

Animals and Personhood: Expanding the Circle

Scientific Insights into Animal Cognition

Research in ethology and cognitive science has demonstrated that many animal species possess complex mental faculties. Primates, cetaceans, elephants, and certain birds exhibit self-recognition, problem-solving abilities, emotional depth, and social structures. These traits suggest a level of sentience that challenges the notion that personhood is exclusively human.

For instance, the mirror test, often used as an indicator of self-awareness, has been passed by species such as chimpanzees, dolphins, and magpies. Moreover, elephants have been documented mourning their dead, displaying empathy and social bonds that resemble human emotional experiences.

Legal and Ethical Considerations

Several legal systems and advocacy groups have begun to argue for recognizing certain animals as persons or near-persons. The Nonhuman Rights Project in the United States, for example, has filed lawsuits seeking habeas corpus rights for chimpanzees, asserting that these animals should not be treated as mere property.

Ethically, extending personhood to animals raises questions about rights to freedom, protection from cruelty, and participation in societal welfare. However, critics caution that granting full personhood to animals could complicate legal frameworks and blur distinctions critical to human society's functioning.

Machines and Personhood: The Rise of Artificial Entities

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence

Machines, particularly AI systems, have rapidly evolved from simple programmable tools to entities capable of learning, decision-making, and even creative output. Advanced AI models can process natural language, recognize patterns, and simulate human-like interactions, fueling debates on whether they might qualify as persons.

Unlike animals, machines lack biological life but can exhibit behaviors that mimic consciousness and intentionality. This raises philosophical questions about the essence of personhood—does it require a biological substrate, or can it be instantiated digitally?

Legal Status of AI and Robots

Currently, AI and robots are treated as property under the law. However, some jurisdictions are exploring frameworks to grant limited legal recognition to autonomous systems. The European Parliament, for example, has discussed the possibility of creating a specific legal status for "electronic persons" to address liability issues stemming from AI actions.

Such proposals focus on practical concerns like responsibility and accountability but also touch on deeper questions about rights and moral consideration. Critics argue that machines, lacking consciousness and emotions, cannot be true persons, whereas proponents suggest that advanced autonomy might justify a form of digital personhood.

Comparative Analysis: Animals vs. Machines as Persons

Aspect	Animals	Machines
Biological Life	Yes	No
Consciousness	Empirically supported	Not conclusively demonstrated
Emotional Capacity	Evident in many species	Absent or simulated
Autonomy	Varies by species	Increasing with AI development
Legal Recognition	Limited, emerging in some contexts	Currently nonexistent, under discussion
Ethical Considerations	Strong arguments for rights	Highly debated, often skeptical

This comparison reveals fundamental differences but also highlights areas of convergence, such as autonomy and the capacity for complex behavior.

Philosophical Perspectives on Non-Human Personhood

Philosophers have long pondered what it means to be a person. Theories range from Locke's emphasis on consciousness and memory to Kant's focus on rationality and moral agency. More recent thinkers propose inclusive criteria that consider sentience and relational capacities.

The question of can animals and machines be persons invites reevaluation of these criteria. For animals, the argument hinges on acknowledging sentience and moral worth beyond human exceptionalism. For machines, the debate centers on whether functional equivalence in cognition and decision-making suffices for personhood.

Challenges and Critiques

Skeptics argue that granting personhood to animals or machines risks diluting the concept and undermining human rights. They caution against anthropomorphizing machines and highlight that artificial systems lack subjective experiences.

Conversely, proponents advocate for a pragmatic approach that adapts legal and ethical frameworks to contemporary realities, emphasizing protection and responsibility over metaphysical purity.

The Future of Personhood: Trends and Implications

As scientific understanding deepens and technological capabilities expand, the boundaries of personhood are poised to shift. Recognition of animal cognition may lead to enhanced legal protections and welfare standards. Similarly, advances in AI could prompt new legal categories accommodating autonomous agents.

This evolution carries profound implications for law, ethics, and society. It challenges established norms about rights, accountability, and identity, demanding ongoing dialogue among scientists, lawmakers, ethicists, and the public.

In sum, the inquiry into can animals and machines be persons reflects a broader reconsideration of what it means to be a person in a changing world—one where humanity's place is no longer unchallenged but part of a more complex mosaic of sentient and intelligent entities.

Can Animals And Machines Be Persons

can animals and machines be persons: Can Animals and Machines be Persons? Justin Leiber, 1985-01-01 Written in a lively and entertaining style, this little book, which deals with topics such as 'personhood,' animal rights, and artificial intelligence . . . makes some rather difficult philosophical points clear in an unpedantic fashion. -- M E Winston, Trenton State College

can animals and machines be persons: Relationship Morality James Kellenberger, 2010-11-01

can animals and machines be persons: Can Animals be Persons? Mark Rowlands, 2019 Can animals be persons? Scientific and philosophical consensus supplies a resounding, 'No!' In this book, Mark Rowlands disagrees. Not only can animals be persons, many of them probably are. A person is an individual in which consciousness, rationality, self-awareness and other-awareness converge, and many animals are such individuals

can animals and machines be persons: The Machine Question David J. Gunkel, 2017-09-08 An investigation into the assignment of moral responsibilities and rights to intelligent and autonomous machines of our own making. One of the enduring concerns of moral philosophy is deciding who or what is deserving of ethical consideration. Much recent attention has been devoted to the animal question—consideration of the moral status of nonhuman animals. In this book, David Gunkel takes up the machine question: whether and to what extent intelligent and autonomous machines of our own making can be considered to have legitimate moral responsibilities and any legitimate claim to moral consideration. The machine question poses a fundamental challenge to moral thinking, questioning the traditional philosophical conceptualization of technology as a tool or instrument to be used by human agents. Gunkel begins by addressing the question of machine moral agency: whether a machine might be considered a legitimate moral agent that could be held responsible for decisions and actions. He then approaches the machine question from the other side, considering whether a machine might be a moral patient due legitimate moral consideration. Finally, Gunkel considers some recent innovations in moral philosophy and critical theory that complicate the machine question, deconstructing the binary agent-patient opposition itself. Technological advances may prompt us to wonder if the science fiction of computers and robots whose actions affect their human companions (think of HAL in 2001: A Space Odyssey) could become science fact. Gunkel's argument promises to influence future considerations of ethics, ourselves, and the other entities who inhabit this world.

can animals and machines be persons: Religion and Science Fiction James F McGrath, 2012-09-27 This multidisciplinary book focuses on the intersection between religion and science fiction. Several perspectives are addressed by scholars from different disciplines: theology, literature, history, music, and anthropology. From Frankenstein, by way of Christian apocalyptic, to Star Wars, Star Trek, Battlestar Galactica, and much more, and from the United States to China and back again, the authors who contribute to this volume serve as guides in the exploration of religion and science fiction as a multifaceted, multidisciplinary, and multicultural phenomenon.

can animals and machines be persons: Controlling Technology ,

can animals and machines be persons: Exploring Certainty Robert Greenleaf Brice, 2014-03-06 Ludwig Wittgenstein's *On Certainty* explores a myriad of new and important ideas regarding our notions of belief, knowledge, skepticism, and certainty. During the course of his exploration, Wittgenstein makes a fascinating new discovery about certitude, namely, that it is categorically distinct from knowledge. As his investigation advances, he recognizes that certainty must be non-propositional and non-ratiocinated; borne out not in the things we say, but in our actions, our deeds. Many philosophers working outside of epistemology recognized Wittgenstein's insights and determined that his work's abrupt end might serve as an excellent launching point for still further philosophical expeditions. In *Exploring Certainty: Wittgenstein and Wide Fields of Thought*, Robert Greenleaf Brice surveys some of this rich topography. Wittgenstein's writings serve

as a point of departure for Brice's own ideas about certainty. He shows how Wittgenstein's rough and unpolished notion of certitude might be smoothed out and refined in a way to benefit studies of morality, aesthetics, cognitive science, philosophy of mathematics. Brice's work opens new avenues of thought for scholars and students of the Wittgensteinian tradition, while introducing original philosophies concerning issues central to human knowledge and cognition.

can animals and machines be persons: The ^AEthics of Animal Experimentation Donna Yarri, 2005-08-18 The ethical treatment of animals has become an issue of serious moral concern. Many people are challenging long-held assumptions about animals and raising questions about their status and treatment. What is the relationship between humans and animals? Do animals have moral standing? Do we have direct or indirect duties to animals? Does human benefit always outweigh animal suffering? The use of animals for experimentation raises all of these questions in a particularly insistent way. Donna Yarri gives an overview of the current state of the discussion, and presents an argument for significantly restricted animal experimentation. Pointing to the similarities between humans and animals, she argues that the actual differences are differences of degree rather than kind. Animal cognition and animal sentience together are the basis for the claim that experimental animals do have rights. Examining arguments in the disciplines of ethology, philosophy, science, and theology, Yarri makes a case for placing substantial restrictions on animal experimentation. Grounding her examination in Christian theology, she formulates a more humane approach to animal experimentation. She concludes with a concrete burden-benefit analysis that can serve as the foundation for informed decision-making. The Ethics of Animal Experimentation serves as both a handbook of animal rights theory and a practical guide to navigating the complexities of animal experimentation. As animal experimentation features in an increasing number of scientific endeavors, it is an ethical issue that requires our immediate attention. Yarri's unique contribution forges a path toward an ethical practice of animal experimentation.

can animals and machines be persons: Mortimer J. Adler, 2009-08-01 In this classic work, Adler explores how man differs from all other things in the universe, bringing to bear both philosophical insight and informed scientific hypotheses concerning the biological and behavioral characteristics of mankind. Rapid advances in science and technology and the abstract concepts of that influence on man and human value systems are lucidly outlined by Adler, as he touches on the effect of industrialization, and the clash of cultures and value systems brought about by increased communication between previously isolated groups of people. Among the other problems this study addresses are the scientific achievements in biology and physics which have raised fundamental questions about humanity's essential nature, especially the discoveries in the biological relatedness of all living things. Thrown into high relief is humanity's struggle to determine its unique status in the natural world and its value in the world it has created. Ultimately, Adler's work develops an approach to the separation between scientific and philosophical questions which stands as a model of thought on philosophical considerations of new scientific discoveries and its consequences for the human person.

can animals and machines be persons: Humans, Animals, Machines Glen A. Mazis, 2008-09-04 In the twenty-first century, the boundaries between both humans and machines and humans and animals are hotly contested and debated. In Humans, Animals, Machines, Glen A. Mazis examines the increasingly blurring boundaries among the three and argues that despite their violating collisions, there are ways for the three realms to work together for mutual thriving. Examining Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger, and Haraway; artificial intelligence that includes MIT Embodied AI; newer holistic brain research; animal studies; the attachment theory of psychologist Daniel Siegel; literary examples; aesthetic theory; technology research; contemporary theology; physics; poetry; machine art; Taoism; and firsthand accounts of cyborg experience, the book reconsiders and dares to propose a new type of ethics and ecospirituality that would do justice to the overlapping relationships among humans, animals, and machines.

can animals and machines be persons: What Does it Mean to be Human? Life, Death, Personhood and the Transhumanist Movement D. John Doyle, 2018-09-01 This book is a critical

examination of the philosophical and moral issues in relation to human enhancement and the various related medical developments that are now rapidly moving from the laboratory into the clinical realm. In the book, the author critically examines technologies such as genetic engineering, neural implants, pharmacologic enhancement, and cryonic suspension from transhumanist and bioconservative positions, focusing primarily on moral issues and what it means to be a human in a setting where technological interventions sometimes impact strongly on our humanity. The author also introduces the notion that death is a process rather than an event, as well as identifies philosophical and clinical limitations in the contemporary determination of brain death as a precursor to organ procurement for transplantation. The discussion on what exactly it means to be dead is later applied to explore philosophical and clinical issues germane to the cryonics movement. Written by a physician/ scientist and heavily referenced to the peer-reviewed medical and scientific literature, the book is aimed at advanced students and academics but should be readable by any intelligent reader willing to carry out some side-reading. No prior knowledge of moral philosophy is assumed, as the various key approaches to moral philosophy are outlined early in the book.

can animals and machines be persons: *Minding the Future* Barry Dainton, Will Slocombe, Attila Tanyi, 2021-08-31 Bringing together literary scholars, computer scientists, ethicists, philosophers of mind, and scholars from affiliated disciplines, this collection of essays offers important and timely insights into the pasts, presents, and, above all, possible futures of Artificial Intelligence. This book covers topics such as ethics and morality, identity and selfhood, and broader issues about AI, addressing questions about the individual, social, and existential impacts of such technologies. Through the works of science fiction authors such as Isaac Asimov, Stanislaw Lem, Ann Leckie, Iain M. Banks, and Martha Wells, alongside key visual productions such as *Ex Machina*, *Westworld*, and *Her*, contributions illustrate how science fiction might inform potential futures as well as acting as a springboard to bring disciplinary knowledge to bear on significant developments of Artificial Intelligence. Addressing a broad, interdisciplinary audience, both expert and non-expert readers gain an in-depth understanding of the wide range of pressing issues to which Artificial Intelligence gives rise, and the ways in which science fiction narratives have been used to represent them. Using science fiction in this manner enables readers to see how even fictional worlds and imagined futures have very real impacts on how we understand these technologies. As such, readers are introduced to theoretical positions on Artificial Intelligence through fictional works as well as encouraged to reflect on the diverse aspects of Artificial Intelligence through its many philosophical, social, legal, scientific, and cultural ramifications.

can animals and machines be persons: *Person, Thing, Robot* David J. Gunkel, 2023-09-05 Why robots defy our existing moral and legal categories and how to revolutionize the way we think about them. Robots are a curious sort of thing. On the one hand, they are technological artifacts—and thus, things. On the other hand, they seem to have social presence, because they talk and interact with us, and simulate the capabilities commonly associated with personhood. In *Person, Thing, Robot*, David J. Gunkel sets out to answer the vexing question: What exactly is a robot? Rather than try to fit robots into the existing categories by way of arguing for either their reification or personification, however, Gunkel argues for a revolutionary reformulation of the entire system, developing a new moral and legal ontology for the twenty-first century and beyond. In this book, Gunkel investigates how and why efforts to use existing categories to classify robots fail, argues that “robot” designates an irreducible anomaly in the existing ontology, and formulates an alternative that restructures the ontological order in both moral philosophy and law. *Person, Thing, Robot* not only addresses the issues that are relevant to students, teachers, and researchers working in the fields of moral philosophy, philosophy of technology, science and technology studies (STS), and AI/robot law and policy but it also speaks to controversies that are important to AI researchers, robotics engineers, and computer scientists concerned with the social consequences of their work.

can animals and machines be persons: *Animals and Their People* Anna Barcz, Dorota Łagodзка, 2018-10-16 *Animals and Their People: Connecting East and West in Cultural Animal Studies*, edited by Anna Barcz and Dorota Łagodзка, provides a zoocentric insight into philosophical,

artistic, and literary problems in Western, Anglo-American, and Central-Eastern European context. The contributors go beyond treating humans as the sole object of research and comprehension, and focus primarily on non-human animals. This book results from intellectual exchange between Polish and foreign researchers and highlights cultural perspective as an exciting language of animal representation. *Animals and Their People* aims to bridge the gap between Anglo-American and Central European human-animal studies.

can animals and machines be persons: *Animals and Other People* Heather Keenleyside, 2016-10-03 In *Animals and Other People*, Heather Keenleyside argues for the central role of literary modes of knowledge in apprehending animal life. Keenleyside focuses on writers who populate their poetry, novels, and children's stories with conspicuously figurative animals, experiment with conventional genres like the beast fable, and write the lives of mice as well as men. From such writers—including James Thomson, Daniel Defoe, Jonathan Swift, Laurence Sterne, Anna Letitia Barbauld, and others—she recovers a key insight about the representation of living beings: when we think and write about animals, we are never in the territory of strictly literal description, relying solely on the evidence of our senses. Indeed, any description of animals involves personification of a sort, if we understand personification not as a rhetorical ornament but as a fundamental part of our descriptive and conceptual repertoire, essential for distinguishing living beings from things. Throughout the book, animals are characterized by a distinctive mode of agency and generality; they are at once moving and being moved, at once individual beings and generic or species figures (every cat is also *The Cat*). Animals thus become figures with which to think about key philosophical questions about the nature of human agency and of social and political community. They also come into view as potential participants in that community, as one sort of people among others. Demonstrating the centrality of animals to an eighteenth-century literary and philosophical tradition, *Animals and Other People* also argues for the importance of this tradition to current discussions of what life is and how we might live together.

can animals and machines be persons: *On Metaphoring* Wu, 2022-05-20 On Metaphoring engages in a metaphor-way to communicate and inter-learn among cultures. Bundle A describes how metaphor bundles things similar into a group called a notion, a category, etc. How does metaphor bundle things? It familiarizes strange things with things that are familiar, to enrich old familiar things with new things newly made familiar. Such metaphoric bundling creates a new family of knowledge. In this order Bundle B characterizes metaphor as the origin of thinking, fit as a highway of intercultural communication where there is no shared way of thinking, for each culture is a specific way of thinking. Bundle C shows how effective metaphor is in interculturally handling various problems of life and thinking. How metaphor works to interculture exhibits in fact what metaphor is. Such is how cultures understand one another, a cultural hermeneutic.

can animals and machines be persons: *The Georgia Review* , 1987

can animals and machines be persons: *Animals as Persons* Gary Lawrence Francione, 2008 Gary L. Francione explains our historical and contemporary attitudes about animals by distinguishing the issue of animal use from that of animal treatment. He then presents a theory of animal rights that focuses on the need to accord all sentient nonhumans the right not to be treated as property.

can animals and machines be persons: *Artificial Morality* Peter Danielson, 1992 Explores the role of artificial intelligence in the development of a claim that morality is person made and rational.

can animals and machines be persons: *The Culture of the Copy* Hillel Schwartz, 1996-11 Through intriguing, and at times humorous, historical analysis and case studies in contemporary culture, this stunning, innovative blend of mircosociology, cultural history, and philosophical reflection investigates most varieties of simulacra, including counterfeits, decoys, mannequins, ditto marks, portraits, genetic cloning, war games, camouflage, instant replays, digital imaging, parrots, photocopies, wax museums, apes, and art forgeries. 60 illustrations.

Related to can animals and machines be persons

CAN | definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary CAN meaning: 1. to be able to: 2. used to say that you can and will do something: 3. used to say that you. [Learn more](#)

CAN Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster The use of can to ask or grant permission has been common since the 19th century and is well established, although some commentators feel may is more appropriate in formal contexts.

CAN Definition & Meaning | Can definition: to be able to; have the ability, power, or skill to.. See examples of CAN used in a sentence

can1 modal verb - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and Definition of can1 modal verb in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Meaning, pronunciation, picture, example sentences, grammar, usage notes, synonyms and more

Can - definition of can by The Free Dictionary Define can. can synonyms, can pronunciation, can translation, English dictionary definition of can. to be able to, have the power or skill to: I can take a bus to the airport

can - Dictionary of English Despite the insistence by some, that can means only "to be able" and may means "to be permitted," both are regularly used in seeking or granting permission: Can (or May) I borrow

CAN | definition in the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary Get a quick, free translation! CAN meaning: 1. to be able to do something: 2. to be allowed to do something: 3. used to ask someone to do or. [Learn more](#)

CAN | definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary CAN meaning: 1. to be able to: 2. used to say that you can and will do something: 3. used to say that you. [Learn more](#)

CAN Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster The use of can to ask or grant permission has been common since the 19th century and is well established, although some commentators feel may is more appropriate in formal contexts.

CAN Definition & Meaning | Can definition: to be able to; have the ability, power, or skill to.. See examples of CAN used in a sentence

can1 modal verb - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and Definition of can1 modal verb in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Meaning, pronunciation, picture, example sentences, grammar, usage notes, synonyms and more

Can - definition of can by The Free Dictionary Define can. can synonyms, can pronunciation, can translation, English dictionary definition of can. to be able to, have the power or skill to: I can take a bus to the airport

can - Dictionary of English Despite the insistence by some, that can means only "to be able" and may means "to be permitted," both are regularly used in seeking or granting permission: Can (or May) I borrow

CAN | definition in the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary Get a quick, free translation! CAN meaning: 1. to be able to do something: 2. to be allowed to do something: 3. used to ask someone to do or. [Learn more](#)

CAN | definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary CAN meaning: 1. to be able to: 2. used to say that you can and will do something: 3. used to say that you. [Learn more](#)

CAN Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster The use of can to ask or grant permission has been common since the 19th century and is well established, although some commentators feel may is more appropriate in formal contexts.

CAN Definition & Meaning | Can definition: to be able to; have the ability, power, or skill to.. See examples of CAN used in a sentence

can1 modal verb - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and Definition of can1 modal verb in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Meaning, pronunciation, picture, example sentences, grammar, usage notes, synonyms and more

Can - definition of can by The Free Dictionary Define can. can synonyms, can pronunciation, can

translation, English dictionary definition of can. to be able to, have the power or skill to: I can take a bus to the airport

can - Dictionary of English Despite the insistence by some, that can means only "to be able" and may means "to be permitted," both are regularly used in seeking or granting permission: Can (or May) I borrow

CAN | definition in the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary Get a quick, free translation! CAN meaning: 1. to be able to do something: 2. to be allowed to do something: 3. used to ask someone to do or. Learn more

CAN | definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary CAN meaning: 1. to be able to: 2. used to say that you can and will do something: 3. used to say that you. Learn more

CAN Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster The use of can to ask or grant permission has been common since the 19th century and is well established, although some commentators feel may is more appropriate in formal contexts.

CAN Definition & Meaning | Can definition: to be able to; have the ability, power, or skill to.. See examples of CAN used in a sentence

can1 modal verb - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and Definition of can1 modal verb in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Meaning, pronunciation, picture, example sentences, grammar, usage notes, synonyms and more

Can - definition of can by The Free Dictionary Define can. can synonyms, can pronunciation, can translation, English dictionary definition of can. to be able to, have the power or skill to: I can take a bus to the airport

can - Dictionary of English Despite the insistence by some, that can means only "to be able" and may means "to be permitted," both are regularly used in seeking or granting permission: Can (or May) I borrow

CAN | definition in the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary Get a quick, free translation! CAN meaning: 1. to be able to do something: 2. to be allowed to do something: 3. used to ask someone to do or. Learn more

Related Articles

- [persona 5 royal exam answers class test solutions](#)
- [30 day diabetes cure diet plan](#)
- [area of a triangle worksheets](#)

[Back to Home](#)