

# Conclusion

We have no good reason to accept the *human superiority thesis*. Moreover, we have good reasons to reject: (i) that human interests are more worthy of consideration—from either an impartial or partial perspective—than nonhuman animal interests; and (ii) that human lives are more (objectively) valuable than nonhuman animal lives. In brief, the justification that so many use to defend so many of their relationships with animals is bogus. If you believe that because humans are more *significant* than animals we may, with few if any moral strictures, eat, hunt, and vivisect them, you now have reasons to reconsider.

It is worth noting that I have made concessions for the sake of providing supporters of (*HST*) with the strongest case possible. I have imagined that no nonhuman animals have even the capacity to entertain future-directed states, that they are incapable of having reflexive thoughts, and that they lack the ability to form plans and projects. In truth, I believe that we have strong empirical evidence that many nonhuman animals have all of these powers, and that the armchair philosophical musings that have animals incapable of performing any of these mental feats are terribly misguided. I ask skeptics about this point to peruse the last three to four years of the *New York Times*. You will find quite a few articles and reviews on the latest research on animals, and almost all of it suggests that we humans have been denigrating their abilities, skills, talents, and intelligence for millennia. I'll leave it to anthropologists, psychologists, and cognitive scientists to explain why we have systematically engaged in this practice, although I suspect that the reasons will ultimately be traced to our unflattering proclivity to abuse power.