

# Philozoe

edition farangis



## Edition Farangis: Philozoe

Volume 3, No. 1, January 2024, ISSN 2702-8178.

Animalistic Issue > Art and Speciesism series

Philozoe. An e-journal on image creation, mythologies and experiencing subjectivity. Arts and fragments by Farangis G. Yegane Arani and Gita Yegane Arani.

## Animalistic Issue > Art and Speciesism 1 (Preliminary version)



## The Animalistic Issue; Art and Speciesism 1.

We have meanwhile published various newer PHILOZOE readers in German, with the ISSN 2702-816X, differing from our English edition with ISSN 2702-8178. After a pause since 2021 we now continue the English series with this issue dedicated to the unpleasantly little critically discussed subject of Animal humiliation and objectification in the the contemporary arts scenes.

Our main broader focus into which we embed the way in which we discuss this subject is > loaned mythologems > Lehnmythologeme and with that > questions about the philosophical anthropocene as to the point where one could say it initiated and started taking its course.

Saying that we should stress that we explicitly mean the hegemonial anthropocene, an differentiation that needs to be highlighted so that no misunderstandings may occur in regard to perspectival questions and questions of consequence as the analytical angle.

In regards to the *anthropocene in general* we shall add our notion on this, which may be expressed in our following idea – assuming that being human is somewhat basically all about questions of *right* and *ethical legitimacy*:

The interesting thing is the major human groups don't necessarily agree on Human Rights as such, and that those who do agree on Human Rights (as such) hold rather different views on what Human Rights should entail, and the reasons why they differ in their views equally may vary.

*Das Interessante ist, dass sich über Menschenrechte als solche überhaupt nicht alle menschlichen Großgruppierungen einig sind, und dass die, die darüber einig sind, unter Menschenrechten sehr Verschiedenes verstehen und aus unterschiedlichen Gründen verstehen möchten.*

Saying that we turn our focus on our notion of Human Rights as Animal Rights supporters. So after the sporadic yet thoughtwise and reflectionwise intense collection of observations about SPECIESISM IN ART / ANIMAL OBJECTIFICATION IN ART we may finally present our loose eclectic compilation running under the Arbeitstitel: the Animalistic Issue.

Besides this we started an a new cooperative Animal Rights project focusing on ARTS AND SPECIESISM at > <https://tierrechtsethik.de/hoerbarkeit-sichtbarkeit-und-tierrechte/> [09.01.2024] and an arts project against the sect-like ideological driven – analogous aswell as digital – social networks that shaped and settled themselves around what we call “the Iitsch”.



## Your life being reduced to being a Specimen

Here is No. 1 an artist who uses slaughtered lambs to indicate something. That what she is indicating might be of a political meaning to her and to the people who agree with her on a certain viewpoint. Now why does she use a dead lamb and not any other entity that she might like to objectify? Because the life of the specific lamb does not have any special, relevant “meaning” to her (apart from the instrumentalizing effect she employs), and I assume she would not even understand why a particular life of a particular animal should have any big meaning at all. She seems to connect the oppression of the indigenous people with the conflicts that ride modern day Cuba. And it seems she believes that using the

lamb as an indicated sacrifice on the altar of arts will rectify that what is wrong in the world today. Only: necrophilia only encourages the necrophiles.

> Tania Bruguera: El Peso de la Culpa (The Burden of Guilt)

“Tania was standing before a Cuban flag which she had herself woven from human hair, a butchered lamb hung around her neck. She spent approximately 45 minutes mixing Cuban soil with water and eating it...”

[http://www.universes-in-universe.de/car/havanna/szene/e\\_tania.htm](http://www.universes-in-universe.de/car/havanna/szene/e_tania.htm) [re-accessed 09.01.2024]

--

Here is No. 2. Temple Grandin is famous, because she models slaughterhouses and says it's all being done with love – well she says that in some other words. Here she had been making sofa chairs that tell us about the privileges (the feeling good factor) of sitting in a chair with the slaughterhouse in the back of the mind, because her chairs she says, are modelled after some device she uses in slaughterhouse construction. Only, who needs to feel superior with his ass sat on an armchair? Bet you, she will always have the lobby of the 'humane slaughtering' advocates behind her back.

Wendy Jacob with Temple Grandin – The Squeeze Chair Project

“A collaboration between renowned animal scientist Temple Grandin and Chicago-based artist Wendy Jacob. The effects of Grandin's autism led her, at age 18, to develop an apparatus, based upon cattle handling chutes, which applied soothing...”

<http://www.artfacts.net/index.php/pageType/exhibitionInfo/exhibition/18631>  
[Link not retrievable anywhere anymore]

<https://listart.mit.edu/exhibitions/squeeze-chair-project-wendy-jacob-temple-grandin#:~:text=The%20effects%20of%20Grandin's%20autism,her%20anxiety%20and%20environmental%20sensitivity.> [accessed 09.01.2024]

--

And No. 3. Some person called: Brandon Ballengée. There are today a lot of so called Animal Rights artists and Eco artists who undermine their self-proclaimed causes, by turning what's top down to the bottom. Diversity comes from freedom and plurality, and these guys here for example take away the freedom bit, and stick your ass right into a test tube, to find out how much your life sucks, or they want to save you by showing everyone what a sucking loser you are in this life on this earth. Why is life used in an exemplaric way here? I guess they'd add that what they are doing is for some greater purpose.

*Your life being reduced to being ai "Specimen".*

"Since then he has had numerous exhibitions nationally and internationally in which he presents photographs and biological samples of the creatures he collects..."

[http://greenmuseum.org/artist\\_index.php?artist\\_id=19](http://greenmuseum.org/artist_index.php?artist_id=19) could only retrieve site now via

[https://web.archive.org/web/20061014192307/http://greenmuseum.org/artist\\_index.php?artist\\_id=19](https://web.archive.org/web/20061014192307/http://greenmuseum.org/artist_index.php?artist_id=19) [09.01.2024]

(Although I think the or any greenmuseum is potentially a sensible idea, and I do respect there might be an ecologically interested and centered idea behind such projects, I think that any such space should be more clear about their position on the value of animal life and the co-world in general.)

Species Reclamation Via a Non-linear Genetic Timeline; An Attempted Hymenochirus Curtipes Model Induced By Controlled Breeding, 2000  
live specimens, varied housing, preserved specimens, digital photographs, Apple Powerbook; dimensions variable (detail).

<http://www.genomicart.org/ballengee.htm> only retrievable at  
<https://web.archive.org/web/20040127042445/http://www.genomicart.org/ballengee.htm> now [09.01.2024]

--



## Biologistic arts links

A questionable validity of some sense of “self-dignity” in arts and the arts discourse.

It’s pretty logical that I can always perceive that which reflects my desires and needs as more valuable, than ‘whatever’ I don’t perceive, simply because it’s out of my cognitive reach. These following links represent a small range of examples of artists, and the discourse about their works, in which one can see how much the idea of “aesthetics” here are pretty blatantly self-circling.

All that comes up is the collective pro or contra attitude towards the degree of how people can have AN impact on WHAT either is or is not of their immediate concern.

It obviously does not come to these artists minds ... that whatever is out of the reach of their positive concern can vice versa also have an impact on them, philosophically, insofar as it puts them on a scale of relativity as soon as they interact with “THE OTHER” (phenomenon)!

(THE CHRONICALLY SCEPTICAL OPPONENTS ADDITIONAL VERRY UPSET COMMENT IS: “Now anybody can say: whoopidoo, f\*\*\*ing stupid animal rights a++++holes.

Nevertheless, Here are my two cents about the f\*\*\*ing stupid destructive art-creating-scene and its bootlickers.”)

How remarkable “the other” is – whether dead, tortured, killed, or alive. Really, how can you unmake that what constitutes the concept of “dignity” in life?

By deconstructing it? Can I deconstruct the phenomenon “love” etc. simply by not loving etc.?

FIRSTLY:

Jill Greenberg (USA/CANADA). My short comment on her: Whole range of destructivity in arts existent, ranging from “twisted” to ultra destructive. Here is a comment about one of the sickish sort:

[https://web.archive.org/web/20070615072835/https://www.kantor.com/blog/2006/06/jill\\_greenberg\\_child\\_abuser.shtml](https://web.archive.org/web/20070615072835/https://www.kantor.com/blog/2006/06/jill_greenberg_child_abuser.shtml) [as re-retrieved on 10.01.2024]

As far as I as an AR person can judge her works: She likes to set up her photos so, that animals – on her animal photo series' – are supposed to look stupid, and stuffed, or ridiculous ... They are, as far as one can see on the web, all in artificial manmade settings.

Her willing objects (adult people, like stars) are those she seems to be most “highly” successful with. Interesting why it needs the unwilling “objects” for her fame.

I agree with the opinion written in the site linked above. It’s real sick how she approaches kids.

--

A link on a comment about Damien Hirst’s (UK) way of devaluing other’s lives:

And in the context on a sidenote: The famous British philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) has his skeleton stored and exhibited at the University College, London [see also in general for Bentham <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bentham-project>, 10.01.2024]. I find that a better piece of art really than Hirst’s diamond and skull art. What I'd like to know is: who’s skull is hidden in Hirst's diamonds?

Great article by Mr. Gopnik here that brings it to the point:

An Anatomy of Consumption  
By Blake Gopnik  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Friday, September 7, 2007

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/09/06/AR2007090602623.html> [last accessed 10.01.2024]

--

SECONDLY:

‘A Self-Proclaimed Artist and an Inexplicable Act of Cruelty’, NYTimes

[http://movies.nytimes.com/2005/04/27/movies/27cat.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://movies.nytimes.com/2005/04/27/movies/27cat.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)  
[10.01.2024]

“Two of the cat's assailants come off as bored, alienated and none-too-bright young men seeking a nihilistic thrill. The third, Mr. Power, is a more complex figure, an intelligent and well-spoken but possibly psychopathic art student who has long been obsessed with the death of animals (he once took a job in an abattoir, he says, to better understand the suffering of the animals he ate). Among the least sympathetic figures in the film are two local gallery owners who seem callow and pretentious as they refuse to judge Mr. Power for his actions. Though it clearly takes the position that the animal's death was a crime, Mr. Asher's film is likely to leave viewers eager to discuss the limits of artistic freedom and the extension of human rights to animals.”

The Filmmaker on his site (CANADA):

<http://www.roughage.org/>

>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20050204191658/http://www.roughage.org/cas.html>  
1 [re-accessed as archived, at 10.01.2024]

“Jesse Power, ex-vegetarian, was an art student when he conceived a new project. In May 2001, he enlisted two friends, Anthony Wennekers and Matthew Kaczorowski, to help him kill a cat. The intention was to make a video that protested the unthinking consumption of factory-slaughtered animals by killing, cooking and eating a cherished domestic pet – a feline posthumously named Kensington by animal-rights activists.”

THIRDLY:

Francis Upritchard (NEW ZEALAND ... and, also a self-described “ex-vegetarian” – whatever this hip/top statement is supposed to imply)

“Let’s talk about some of the stuff you’ve made. I’m interested by that photo you showed me of a stuffed cat, what’s the story behind that?

‘My brother Robert got given \$20 to dispose of the family cat...’”

[http://www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk/artists/francis\\_upritchard\\_articles.htm](http://www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk/artists/francis_upritchard_articles.htm)

>

[https://web.archive.org/web/20060926055957/http://www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk/artists/francis\\_upritchard\\_articles.htm](https://web.archive.org/web/20060926055957/http://www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk/artists/francis_upritchard_articles.htm) [10.01.2040]

FORTHLY:

Natalia Edenmont (SWEDEN)

I suggest anybody to take a sample about what people think not by reading the blog authors waffle, but by reading the comments he got

[http://sbutler.typepad.com/main/2005/01/nathalia\\_edenmo.html](http://sbutler.typepad.com/main/2005/01/nathalia_edenmo.html) >  
[https://web.archive.org/web/20050326111751/http://sbutler.typepad.com/main/2005/01/nathalia\\_edenmo.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20050326111751/http://sbutler.typepad.com/main/2005/01/nathalia_edenmo.html) [10.01.2024]

here is a text in German I wrote regarding Natalia Edenmont:

<http://www.simorgh.de/pdf/blick.pdf> > find this comment of mine at the end  
as an appendix sort of

--



## Wurst

My life is your life

The only thing that's being made clear in Bansky's <http://thevillagepetstoreandcharcoalgrill.com> archived website, also see > [https://bit.ly/banksy\\_sausages](https://bit.ly/banksy_sausages) (google search results) is that animals are seen here as pathetic in their Erscheinung and that it seems to be thrilling to ridicule their physics and their core existential problems. It seems that the primate used in that exhibition is made from a taxidermically preserved body or parts of a nonhuman animal body. Exactly as if the usage of dead nonhuman animals in arts wasn't a form of objectification.

What difference does it make to state that such arts have an ethical or political idea that drives them, when the only impact really generated is a self-serving feel-good factor about being human or belonging to the group that enjoys the privilege of not being speciesistically put out as an proxy for anything else but yourself?

Art likes to pretend that it has a moral weight, and it likes to misuse that moral weight it believes to intrinsically purport.

--

The same usual necrophilia thing goes for <http://pollymorgan.co.uk/> [10.01.2024] who is a taxidermical artist and assures the visitors of her site that her art is motivated by some form of “love” for nonhuman animals.

--

The best of the worst I recently came across was yet another notorious example of the scientist + artist cross-overs: <http://www.rachelpoliquin.com/#/ravishingbeasts/> [10.01.2024] formerly <http://www.ravishingbeasts.com> > <https://web.archive.org/web/20120303091438/http://www.ravishingbeasts.com/> [10.01.2024].

And to sum this all up and to branch it constructively out: Have you ever thought about the relation of taxidermy and why biology renders the world as nothing more than a scientifically dissectible blueprint?

Whenever bodies or body parts have been preserved for an onlooker, disrespect and prejudice has been involved.

--

**FROM THIS POINT I LEAVE THE FOLLOWING PAGE as they are up til this date and for the moment do not revise them for a problem of shortage of time ... I will revise them still and the fully revised issue will follow later ...**

--

If nonhuman animals were not robbed of their natural rights to live, and if their dignity was being respected, we would consider any taxidermical or other comparable displays of an animal's dead body as shocking, just as we view the display of human body parts / dead bodies ... like the body parts for example of the dead Saartjie Baartman: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saartjie\\_Baartman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saartjie_Baartman) (whom her abusers called the "Hottentot Venus") which were preserved and exhibited. Or, remember the necrophile bodypolitics of nazism that led to the unbelievable:

<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Holocaust/medmurder.html> [1]

... I found this interesting article about taxidermy: "Second Skins: Semiotic Readings in Taxidermic Reconstruction"

Pauline

Wakeham,

<http://www.indigenouspolicy.org/index.php/ipj/thesis/view/41> (was accessible in 2005 at

<http://www.transcanadas.ca/transcanada1/wakeham.shtml>)

It would be apologetic to explain why I take this position, but nevertheless I want to remind you that many people hold a humanocentric view, and that to them it is perfectly normal if nonhuman animals are being ab/used or degraded, to us at this project the world is a place that isn't selecting humans as their choice species that can, without consequence, rob anybody else who is either different from them or/and holds a different view, of their rights.

Rights exist on a basis of a plural truth, also on an inter-species social basis. Rights aren't a simple matter of decree but of social reality.

--

# Selling nonhuman animal life

Why it sells?

Troutsite <http://www.troutsite.com/art-main.html> is a site by an artist who successfully convinces his viewers that he is actually appreciating and probably even “scientifically respecting” nonhuman animals. See artist at: [aldrichart.org](http://aldrichart.org)

Alongside his naturalistic artistic praise of Linnaeus’s taxonomic system (the man who came up with the category “Homo sapiens” ...) the artist sells the viewer something “real”: namely dead animals. The artist sells death, in other words – a taxonomic necessity, and necrophilia sells cos it’s being bought.

Linnaeus’s idea of a “homo sapiens” is not just what falls under the term speciesist, it is also racist (Scientific Racism), see for example this interesting article:

‘Scientific Racism’ in Enlightened Europe: Linnaeus, Darwin, and Galton by Shah Aashna Hossain <http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/exchange/node/1852>

“...Before Linnaeus proposed the ideas mentioned above [...], ‘race’ had been used to distinguish between different nationalities. But after he proposed the system above, Europeans began to identify themselves with a larger group: ‘white’ people.”

--

## Being a swine too

Who cares about what life?

Nonhuman animal life becoming a part of yet another supposedly ethical environmental arts project.

Insa Winkler: The Acorn Pig ...

Growing and growing up [http://www.insawinkler.de/files/index\\_E.php?id=98](http://www.insawinkler.de/files/index_E.php?id=98)

Can one really underlie nonhuman animal life – or (might aswell) human life – the understanding of ethics and of arts that anybody might hold on a shared common level or individually?

I don't think so, you can't simply decide yourself about what is ethically ok if another being is affected in any way. Where you draw the line is up to your moral standards, but everybody will eventually draw a line somewhere where she or he feels the ethical borderline is being crossed.

A hypothetical reply to the animal protectionist friends regarding sustainable organic animal farming must also be added in this context, because it's not just the organic freaks who consider a change in "raising" and "slaughter methods" an ethical improvement in animal welfare matters: not all means are ok to reach some supposedly "idealistic" end.

Think about where moral and ethical advancement environmentally lies?

--

## Pesi Girsch's "Nature Morte"

Pesi Girsch aestheticises the corpses of dead animals on some of her photography.

[http://members.tripod.com/pesi\\_girsch/stillalife.htm](http://members.tripod.com/pesi_girsch/stillalife.htm) (accessed 23rd April 08 )

On her bio she portrays herself with a baby kitten nevertheless: [http://members.tripod.com/pesi\\_girsch/bio.htm](http://members.tripod.com/pesi_girsch/bio.htm) (accessed 23rd April 08 ), so one can assume that she sees some qualitative difference between being amongst the living or being amongst the (I assume) somehow made-to-be-dead. I guess I

rightly assume that the ducks and the weasel type of animal on the dead animal photos of hers, did not die from natural causes.

One could say that it gives the dead animal a dignity to be draped into becoming a display for a photo taken by a human for them animals to look aesthetical while dead. But I wouldn't agree with that. I see a type of typical encryption here, which turns art into a tool for viewing the real with the specific attempt to find an objective standpoint, instead of arts as a way to only relate to the real in a subjective way, which would put an emphasis on a more free and autonomous thinking.

Why does the arranged corpse of an individual animal has to become an object of a photo?

Why are the dead animals displayed in a sterile, soft and clean – a seemingly peaceful or mute – context on Peri Girsch's photos, when the real death of the animals had – and this is my assumption – been taking place in a wholly different context that preceded this type of setting.

What matters to me is the perspective of the animals, and I automatically imagine that they didn't want to die through the hands of humans (the photos leave it factually unclarified how the animals came to death). The set up encryption subtly suggests that I need not care about these individual animals as a viewer. That they only matter now that they have been given a meaning in an anthropocentric context.

Both is depressing: the imagination of the death and seeing the animals displayed in this way of peaceful, aestheticized “bizarreness” on the photos. Worst of all is to imagine that the lives, i.e. the form of existence of beings other than humans, doesn't matter as lives to the photographer. Pesi Girsch arranges the condition of being dead in these animals in a way that is demeaning to their selfness and to their otherness from us.

--

# Vive la Biophilia — They can by no means negate the dignity of life!!

Arts and Necrophilia:

CATERINA PURDY MOHN, exhibited a (amongst others) by the Transition Gallery, East London and StuArt Gallery, Siantiago Chile, according to Saatchi and Saatchi

<http://www.transbuddha.com/content/caterina-purdy/>

<http://www.last.fm/music/Purdy+Rocks>

Purdy Rocks (her techono type of music)

<http://profile.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=user.viewprofile&friendID=109868701>

<http://www.portaldearte.cl/autores/purdy1.htm>

It's pretty easy to impress anybody or maybe especially the mainstream arts scene with anything super necrophile. This Chilean artist is yet another successful example to prove this assumption right.

A few things seem to come together: the desire for success, the desire for getting a kick out of vanity, and the hunger for the pain/degradation/devaluation/negation ... of the "other" and, not to forget, a warped and faked pseudo political correctness. Also it looks pretty much as if such artists seem to really don't want to belong to the "weak" side of the world.

Yeah they are just soooooo powerful with their necrophilia! The abyss of the ideological death squad.

--

# More than 2 million signatures

The elitist attitude of the “arts industry” has so far tended to ignore so called public sentiment, unless it fits their interest.

I just learned about the case of the starving dog who was being exhibited, and I just signed the petition linked on this blog:

<http://guillermohabacucvargas.blogspot.com/>

The nutcase artist who brought the dog into the gallery...

Guillermo Habacuc Vargas <http://artehabacuc.blogspot.com> “I am 32 years old and an artist. Recently, I have been criticized for my work titled ‘Eres lo que lees’....”

... probably didn’t expect that people would react. He obviously strongly believes in alluding to Descartes’ “Cogito ergo sum” – the person who came up with the animal-machine model (just do a search on “animal-machine” and Descartes).

In the context the guy set up, the sentence: “you are what you read” implies a ranking made between different cognitive abilities. Implicitly he suggests that reading is better than not reading, because if you don’t “read” (books etc, ever), you can’t be anything at all.

Starving doesn’t matter to that guy, at least not when you are a dog.

And this is basically where the Cartesian link to “I think, therefore I am” is: Descartes excluded any other condition apart from thinking as worthy of being REALLY meaningful in any way.

The self-centeredness of both a “human system” (the belief in the exclusive importance of cognizance, because useful for ...) and the self-centeredness of the human herself “as-set-apart-from-nature”, is the connector here.

This type of inhumane activity which runs under the terms of arts can straightforwardly be perceived as an expression of human megalomania.

*More than 2 million signatures*

The elitist attitude of the “arts industry” has so far tended to ignore so called public sentiment, unless it fits their interest.

I just learned about the case of the starving dog who was being exhibited, and I just signed the petition linked on this blog:

<http://guillermohabacucvargas.blogspot.com/>

The nutcase artist who brought the dog into the gallery...

Guillermo Habacuc Vargas <http://artehabacuc.blogspot.com> “I am 32 years old and an artist. Recently, I have been criticized for my work titled ‘Eres lo que lees’....”

...probably didn’t expect that people would react. He obviously strongly believes in alluding to Descartes’ “Cogito ergo sum” – the person who came up with the animal-machine model (just do a search on “animal-machine” and Descartes).

In the context the guy set up, the sentence: “you are what you read” implies a ranking made between different cognitive abilities. Implicitly he suggests that reading is better than not reading, because if you don’t “read” (books etc, ever), you can’t be anything at all.

Starving doesn’t matter to that guy, at least not when you are a dog.

And this is basically where the Cartesian link to “I think, therefore I am” is: Descartes excluded any other condition apart from thinking as worthy of being REALLY meaningful in any way.

The selfcenteredness of both a “human system” (the belief in the exclusive importance of cogniscance, because useful for ...) and the selfcenteredness of the human herself “as-set-apart-from-nature”, is the connector here.

This type of inhumane activity which runs under the terms of arts can straightforwardly be perceived as an expression of human megalomania.

--

## visual rhetorics and its traps

Fresh water under what old bridge?

I've somehow stumbled across a video by the British band "the Prodigy" that gives me the creeps. The song is called "Baby's got a Temper" and it displays cows crammed into some space where the band themselves sing on a stage and some nude young ladies are "forced" by some older lady with a whip to milk the cows. There is some video-storyline-framing around all this, but the main message is to sexualize an act of speciesism.

I think this video is highly influenced by the current arts discourse, which likes to use a speciesist outlook as a chosen perspective with which the onlooker aesthetically likes to identify.

The band "the Prodigy" acts as if they were just soooo punkish and they pretend to be rebellious thus. Only, against what is their "rebellion" directed? Against nonhuman animals? Especially against cows? It seems that's exactly what it is, the band conveys the message in this video: it's rebellious if you are against nonhuman animals.

And why could that be rebellious?

Because the speciesist utopian ideal feels that an "animal principle" is undirectable. Nonhuman animals don't share anything with "us" that would make "us" want to live with them, because an "animal principle" requires "us" to come to terms with a lived pluralism on the most existential plane. But "we" don't like pluralism in the first place.

Rebelling against the “animal principle” implies both, a rejection of nonhuman animal diversity as much as a rejection of human diversity, because the only “agent” that can possibly possess “the only one permitted truth”, is he or she who is anti-all.

A truth that directs itself anti-all, that negates everything, seems to be an “only truth”. A pluralist outlook on the other hand, would never draw a line at any border... .

--

## with an anthropological message

The Leipziger artist Rigo Schmidt seems to know how to combine speciesism with biological racism in the unhidden form.

Through the reinforcing effect of objectifying an object by depicting it, an idea is being “worked out” and voluntarily and involuntarily revealed about a supposed interrelation of “Man”, “Animal”, and “Nature”. The concept of this triangle is totally devoid of soul and ethics. Only, the “white man”, and the “white man in fur” he depicts somewhere, and the controllability aspect conveyed by manifold paintings of dead animals as “being displayed” , are the values that get aestheticized. Nature is degraded, and if you are a human, you better be on the perpetrators or, put technically, on the destructors side, or you are a real “natural loser” ... etc.

Check out his works on here, if you are interested in what I mean. Or whatever:

<http://wohnmaschine.de/wm/malerei.0.html?&L=cat>

[http://www.union-gallery.com/content.php?page\\_id=831](http://www.union-gallery.com/content.php?page_id=831)

--

## Our antispeciesist attitudes > Farangis Yegane: The Crown of the Creation

Subjectivity can't leave you either on top or below, also being of a different nature, being built completely or relatively different than a human, can't leave a nonhuman animal below.

Any position taken, individually or in evolutionary terms, has it's own qualities. (The values of the qualities are hard or impossible to measure against each other.)

“There I bow my head – at the feet of every creature. This constant submission and homage, of kissing God all over, someday, every lover will do. Only there I prostrate myself – against the beauty of each form – for when I bring my heart close to any object I always hear the friend say, ‘Hafiz I am here.’”

Check out our > Visual Opinions Workshop

The Crown of the Creation. A thought related to that.

The foundations of the rights of all life, don't lie in first giving or first creating those rights. The foundations of rights are intrinsic to life (in its interconnected and in its individualized condition).

It's necessary to develop enough will to differentialize on the theoretical and the practical plane, in order to find solutions of how to respect the dimensionality of the inherence of the rights of all life.

Palang LY

--

# Yet another one

Christian Siekmeier ( practices “outreach” through <http://thisisexile.com> ), amongst so many others...

Desire of a male ideal. Speciesism often plays a crucial role in such a desired image: hunter or slayer is being adored by his object-of-love (a woman or another man).

<http://janwandrag.com/maletrouble/chris.html>

The ideology of hunters and their sympathizers takes the inward form of a secret cult, on the outside the hunting ideology constitutes a pillar of the homocentrist society. Life at its best equals a process of hunting. You hunt as a destructive act, and you hunt for fun. You’re the ruler of those who must fear you, and you are a ruler of those who nourish upon your prey, metaphorically, ideologically and practically/physically.

The idea that “nature” can provide you with a spot for where you can lay in ambush: <http://www.christiansiekmeier.com/urban/Dickicht.html>

Hunter or hunting-idealizing artists, a whole batch of extreme speciesists named together in their pro-hunt + arts context

<http://justinjamesreed.blogspot.com/2007/07/erika-larsen.html>

<http://justinjamesreed.blogspot.com/2007/08/hunting.html>

Now I should contrast this section of the big speciesist fraction of the contemporary arts world with the relevant grassroots political side of life (And I assume that the ‘grassroots political side of life’ expresses something more impactful to the human ethical development than speciesist anthropocentrist/homocentrist destructivity).

Check out some of the iconography of the HuntSabs:

[http://www.badgerland.co.uk/seeing/links/other\\_animals/anti\\_hunt.html](http://www.badgerland.co.uk/seeing/links/other_animals/anti_hunt.html)

[http://www.nwlacs.co.uk/lancashire\\_hunts.htm](http://www.nwlacs.co.uk/lancashire_hunts.htm)

<http://www.huntsab.org/history.htm>

[http://3.bp.blogspot.com/\\_aNPZgIE44Ns/R1FIIn718SI/AAAAAAAAAII/i1njMXUxA3o/s1600-R/huntsab.bmp](http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_aNPZgIE44Ns/R1FIIn718SI/AAAAAAAAAII/i1njMXUxA3o/s1600-R/huntsab.bmp)

<http://www.eco-action.org/dod/no10/sabbing.htm>

--

## a local journalist and her speciesist connection

Long time no speciesism I've been writing about ... and no, of course there isn't any lesser speciesism in arts than as badly as we had it before too. An awkward incident took me to land at the daily poisonous dose of speciesism in art recently ...

I was googling the net for the "For Example Mithras – Part Two" exhibition by Farangis Yegane which the Museum Schloss Fechenbach currently hosts, when I found an article that – and this just besides – showed a false image of a lady who was wrongly introduced on the picture as the artists Farangis Yegane. We uploaded some photos of Farangis now to make any possibly remaining error clear ... because, (yippee yeah) by now that newspaper has corrected the erroneous annotation of their photo, after our request to do so (they made the correction on the 15th of March.) Anyway, I had looked up the author of that article with the wrong person shown in our exhibition as "the artist", and this is where speciesism threw itself into my face – at the second glimpse though. So, hence this post:

The author of the article generally writes about her local arts scene in Darmstadt it seems, and links her favorite artists on her site. There are two of the artists she links as recommendations, so to say, who really match the unfortunate image of the typical artist-speciesist. Let's get to see what I'm talking about: ... she deleted her personal site by now and can't retrieve it, anyhow on the site of the speciesist-friendly journalist Anja Trieschmann the visitor is introduced to:

A. <http://auslender.blogspot.com/2010/02/pure-da-morto-sorridente-il-porco.html> the display of the "aesthetics" of the forced death of an animal, displayed and sought to be aestheticized as an act of art.

and

B. <http://www.monikagolla.de/INDEX.Fotos+Objekte.htm> sexual organs and intimate body parts of nonhuman animals being displayed, and <http://www.monikagolla.de/INDEX.Fotos+Objekte.htm> somewhere else the human body is being bereft of its dignity and its dignity of intimacy, via a negative form of "generalization" evoked by an exhibitionist type of a behavioral act by her models who display their rectal ends (?) for the camera; both artist and the model are into some "break-a-taboo" thing with their idea it seems – a repetitive act in arts it never seems to overcome it seems. Then, more speciesism again, <http://www.monikagolla.de/INDEX.Fotos+Objekte.htm> images of meat / sausage as arts. Not really any more spectacular than what we usually encounter, but any such spectacle that seeks attention with the degradation of life (especially by intentionally showing acts of degradation of life and its dignity) is what it is: a prolongment of the destruction caused by speciesism, by humanism and by a form of arts that feeds the destructive mainstream-machinery.

Destructivism often tends to have a self-accumulating effect, where people create their own epistemological aporias.

--

# Speciesism sells for a reason

Speciesism sells for a reason. Just an / any example:

Joanna Newsom – kinda speciesist ... ppl feel SO natural with dead nonhuman animals around them, the links I had weren't retrievable anymore, here are other ones <https://www.kqed.org/arts/128815/joanna-newsom-have-one-on-me> , [https://twitter.com/alt\\_\\_joanna](https://twitter.com/alt__joanna) [10.01.2024].

The aesthetics of a living human showing herself with dead nonhuman animal life. Speciesism sells for a reason ...

What is that reason? Speciesism seems to give people a feeling of the or a human 'principle of power' to be superior over a principle of a animal vulnerability. If we take a closer look at what makes nonhuman animals more vulnerable, we can see that their ways of living reveals major aspects of where our own drawbacks lie.

All life is diverse. We all live either varying or fundamentally different forms of live. Sociology has put a veil over the fact how much human societies are fundamentally diverse in themselves. Nonhuman animals take and live an own position in how they are, and thus in how they are being different to us (THE OTHER). They have their own form of diversity amongst their own animal cultures.

Both humans and nonhuman animals relate their lives to their environmental contexts. And all life shapes the world.

If I, as a human, put a nature around me – aesthetically – that consists of dead animals, then I, as a human, am the only active part in this world. The animal might be “dead and beautiful”. Still I am the only active part in this world ... . I consider this “aesthetical” stance to be dangerous, because it ignores the politicalness of animal existence as an active agent that is conjoined with the rest of nature.

The view that animals and nature are passive “non-agents”, is a view that has been long time established, by the rulers and intellectual elites, by most major and minor religions and cults, by the natural sciences, and by human civilizations, societies, tribes, groups and individuals.

Human might nevertheless has been established on a wrong basis.

P.S. I forgot, I think it’s my right to criticize a star (or basically anybody who is praised and “redeemed” in society) on the basis of putting somebody into question instead of accepting their ideas / arts / opinions whatever. If you find such an attitude disagreeable, and you if you think everybody has to follow the mainstream, then it is basically your concept of might that conflicts with my concept of right.

--

## fucking naive

PIG 05049 : Christien Meindersma : just another homocentrist human anesthetizing an anal-retentive bystander mentality in speciesism

Compare how this young woman and her journalistic partner thematize taking the life of a nonhuman : <http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2010/mar/27/from-one-pig-185-products>, using mainly the argumentation of how useful that killing is.

A homocentrist argumentation. The mental frameset remind me of the accounts slaughterhouse workers gave in interviews Gail A. Eisnitz made in 1997 <http://meat.org.uk/slaught.html>, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slaughterhouse> ... .

There is nothing different or special when either a woman or a man talk about their aggressive homocentrist attitudes, or when they anesthetize them as Meindersma does.

Meindertma and Buford seem to think that it is art to accompany the nonhuman animal in whose killing Buford takes part and Meindertma acts as a bystander, collecting all the details of de-individualisation

There is no difference to these objectifications than when any farmer or slaughterer do them. Just because an account of institutionalized murder is given in “arts form” – and because it’s curated as arts, we are not dealing with morally neutral grounds here.

What is arts about it, is that we can see how the innocence, that our good old humanistic values wanted to attribute to the normal human individual, are yet again being sold out by projects such as these: No normal human individual is NOT capable of doing the most horrendous atrocities at the same time while rationalizing their deeds as reasonable, sensible and smart. And history told us that already way too many times anyway.

Now to think that questioning and eradicating homocentrism wouldn’t be the next big task we as humans have to address, if we don’t all want to fall prey to the sickly normal minds of the average human, would be unrealistic.

To get the best answers about the trustworthiness of any speciesist reasoning about animals, is to simply turn the paper and look: yeah human values, human ideals, and how do we humans deal with each other and stand towards each other? It doesn’t work either. Speciesism kills, and all other discriminatory -isms do their parts of destroying the dignities of individual lives as much as they can too.

By focusing on the point of view of the ‘human group’ (and their ‘interests’ that they won’t let to be ignored) on the false and pathological reasons of why “we humans” have “a legitimate interest” in “using animals”, we shift the focus away from two things:

A. we shift our view from the human conflicts that prove there is nothing such thing as ‘the human’ (one big single) interest

and B.) we overlook that nonhuman animals and the environment can be understood as an opposed value, one that homocentrism seeks to destroy, negate, annihilate. Our view is turned away from that possible perspective too.

The view the speciesist people hold, typically tries to make us think that we are dealing with a redundant life.

And we are not.

This swine they objectified is to me my family, soulwise, earthhistorywise.

Check out > Burnt Cross – ‘look into their eyes’

Comment: This woman also misses the point, when she tries to convince anyone that there is a “usefulness” hidden behind killing this nonhuman animal, that she tries to perversely even so tear out of the anonymity of the horrors of the breeding, farming and slaughterhouse machinery, do display a redundancy of the individual life. Veganism is spearheading in the other direction, it does not seek to deindividualize life, but respects the individual. At least ethical veganism does that.

Also she tries to show with this “work” most extremely, but also with her “work” involving the wool industry and individual sheep, in full moral detachment, how “useful” killing the nonhuman animal who she maintains to call “PIG 05049” is. There is no ambiguity in her work, assuming there was just shows how much we got used to any types of animal objectification.

This blog, sees an ambiguity, yet notes:

“Finally, it should be noted that the book was supported by an organization called IMAGRO – Strategy and creativity for the agricultural and food industries – and includes the following message from them: ‘We hope this book will serve as a contribution to our original mission: reduce the gap between producer and consumer. We do this not out of sentimental reasons, but on the basis of our core values. This led us to support Christien Meindertsma in regard to her art project.’”  
<http://an-intellectual-carrot.blogspot.de/2009/05/pig-05049.html>

Ethically this is non-arts, because if this was art, then any form of killing that could be seen as useful and that would be described as such by the murderer and by the bystanders, could be classified as arts, if the artist just wants that to be so.

This artist draws her distinction in terms of whether you are dealing with a nonhuman animal or humans in an arbitrary yet inexplicit way; from an animal rights point of view it's as wrong to objectify a nonhuman animal as it is to objectify a human.

The ill-advised argumentation that you practically can't live vegan today, doesn't change anything about the nature of evilness that is being supported here under the way-too-often used disguise and polish of an "artistic freedom".

And the argument that meat has been consumed in the past hundreds of years (and for millennia) can't be held against the goals veganism heralds, to eliminate the usage of nonhumans as chattel.

Artistic freedom has boundaries, and we set them.

--

## Aesthetics, are yours real?

Speciesism and some form of aesthetics, they seem to inevitably go together, and this creates a major ethical problem. How do these two connect? Maybe because aesthetics can help to give an excuse to prolong a wrong stance that one is acting up to and is aware of doing so.

Speciesism comprises the conscious element of violence and active or witnessed (onlooker) brutality towards a nonhuman animal or nonhuman animals. The consciousness in brutality is being aestheticized by putting the act of violence in a frame of doing something supposedly noble, dignified, heroic, cool.

Aesthetics can also – instead of being a destructive act – be a part of a momentum that breaks the chain of self-deception that speciesism forms in a human. The 'sense of aesthetics' in a person depends on the drive behind their objectives.

Does the aesthetical understanding only has to rectify her actions, and thus just be a means to an end?

Or, is the sense of aesthetics really the sense of connecting to the outer real world that's being perceived?

Does aesthetics have to be constructive to comprise an appreciation for the "other" which reveals the difference between onlooker and object? In the end of the day I can relate to the world in a form that negates the "other" through my will to destroy. Constructively I can otherwise relate to the world by seeing what there really is.

Check out these great tracks and their lyrics (below the vid's) on my youtube channel:

Trial – Cycle of Cruelty

Anchor – It kills you to know

--

## Does being a speciesist make someone special?

Does being a speciesist make someone REAL REAL REAL REAL special?

And artists do usually want to be very special to stick out, to make themselves a name, create themselves fame, etc. No actually no, being a speciesist doesn't make you special in the arts scene unfortunately, but still in particular young artist women who seem to mistake mainstreamism as subversiveness as long as it involves degrading nonhumans, seem to get enthralled by turning arts into their own little speciesist necrophile playground.

Taxidermy can't be understood as something morally clean ( <http://www.farangis.de/blog/wurst> see top too ). Some <http://looovetinkebell.com> also known as Katinka Simonse belongs into the vast array of conquistadoritas who seem to want to have invented the wheel of speciesism new – practically, theoretically she is most likely not even aware of this -ism (or even any other connected -isms). Ms Simonse is yet another one of her kind. You can compare her attempt of mixing aesthetics with destructiveness with the other artists whose names I listed on this blog and you will find out she is not really as special and she might try to be.

What all these arts interested speciesists do is pretty much self-explanatory as much as self-circlingly allo-destructive. (The list will however have to be added to.)

--

## Gentle speciesism?

[stop press: 28 February 2012 – Slaughtering Chickens For “Art” Cancelled in Lawrence, Kansas.](#)

Killing nonhuman animals as “art”. Yet another patho... case doing just that. No comment, yet again it speaks for its own state of pathology.

Amber Hansen is to be found at: <http://vimeo.com/user5118234> and <http://www.amberhansen.com/home.html>, who she is?

Just read this:

STEVEN F. EISENMAN

Professor of Art History

Northwestern University

The following is the email letter I sent to the Spencer director, curator of modern art, and curator of contemporary art:

Dear Dr. Hardy,

I read with interest that your museum is planning an exhibition called, “The Story of Chickens: A Revolution.” As a scholar of modern art, and historian of the image of animals in art (the subject of my forthcoming book), I must tell you that there is nothing “revolutionary” about your exhibition or its subject.

The depiction in words and images of the killing or exploitation of animals for the purpose of encouraging kindness extends back more than two hundred years. Such works — and John Lawrence’s profusely illustrated treatises circa 1800 come to mind — always supported the most conventional of beliefs: that humans are the crown of creation (the pinnacle of the “Great Chain of Being”) and possess the God-given right to own, exploit and kill any animal, so long as the slaughter is done humanely. This line of reasoning — sometimes called “welfarist” — has sanctioned the killing of billions upon billions of animals every year, usually in the cruelest manner imaginable.

What is avant-garde, even “revolutionary” today — because it refutes the cruel, old stereotypes — is the view that animals are sentient creatures who possess a right to life and autonomy. This perspective is embraced by many scientists, (such as the pioneering ethologist Donald Griffin) philosophers (such as Bruno Latour) artists, (including Sue Coe), and writers (for example J.M. Coetzee).

In the interests of a progressive museology and simple humanity, I ask you to cancel the planned exhibition, “The Story of Chickens” and to renounce any killing of animals for the sake of art-making.

With respect,

Stephen F. Eisenman  
Professor of Art History  
Northwestern University

(Curator, “Gauguin: Artist of Myth and Dreams,” “The Ecology of Impressionism,” “Design in the Age of Darwin,” etc.)

--

ELIZABETH SCHULTZ

Former faculty member of the University of Lawrence  
Member of the Board of Directors of the Spencer Museum of Art

To: Spencer Museum of Art:

Last night I received the following news regarding an upcoming event at the Spencer, and I must say that it causes me deep concern. Although I recognize the SMA's desire to engage our community in provocative and meaningful discussions (and I must assume that this is the visiting artist's intention as well), I am nonetheless distressed by the Spencer's decision to endorse and encourage a project which sponsors the actual (not figurative) deaths of five animals.

It is disturbing to me that the Spencer would be associated with the slaughter of these animals, especially after they had been well and even lovingly cared for within the museum for a month. Certainly, the project forces viewers and participants to consider the inhumane treatment of millions of animals in slaughterhouses throughout the US and the world and the disjuncture that is made between the living animal and the consumption of meat. I question, however, whether the Spencer needs to enact the final part—the chickens' slaughter—of Amber Hansen's project in order to make these points. I feel strongly that the entire project demonstrates human power over and control of animals (the androcentric position, perspective), which is crucial for us to acknowledge, but that its culmination in their planned deaths and a gourmet meal is cynical and fascistic. Although the deaths would occur off site (away from the museum), I feel that the museum would be tainted, blood-splattered forever.

I very much hope that the Spencer's program planners will 1) consider alternative ways of asking questions about the complexity of humans' relationships with animals in general and about the implications of the corporate meat industry in particular and 2) eliminate this particular project from its spring programming. I certainly will be glad to discuss this with you in person. Elizabeth Schultz

--

SAVANNA SCARBOROUGH

To: Spencer Museum of Art:

This project would be more aptly named, “The Story of Chickens: A Betrayal.” The description of Hansen’s proposed ‘art installation’ is a sanctimonious crock, exceeded only by her alarming lack of consciousness and clarity of intention within the project itself. If volunteers and community members became true guardians of these birds, and came to see and care for them as the sentient individuals they are, they would not in good faith then turn on their friends, watch their murder, and shamelessly eat them the next day. I would personally view that as a form of cannibalism. Children are naturally keyed in to the natural world, sensitive to their true connection with non-human animals; they haven’t yet been desensitized by society to put on their blinders and to accept the false proposition that certain animals are our food and other animals, our companions. They also get the inherent betrayal of trust when animals they’ve cared for and raised are then slaughtered.

If Hansen were to present an ‘art project’ that would begin to challenge the hypocritical bias of the kinds of megalomaniacal assumptions about food animals corporatocracy promotes, it might merit approval as a kind of revolution, though I wouldn’t be so unctuous as to call it art; leave that to great artists! I fervently ask that Spencer Art Museum withdraw its support of Ms. Hansen’s ill-conceived project, because not only is it not art, it contradicts and turns into a sham the deeper, more truthful meaning of her statement: “Interacting with animals allows us a more complete understanding of humanity; it reminds us of our relationship with the natural world, and our responsibility in caring for it.” Savanna Scarborough

Source of infos: [http://www.upc-online.org/entertainment/120208chicken\\_slaughte\\_r\\_art.html](http://www.upc-online.org/entertainment/120208chicken_slaughte_r_art.html)

--

# A short note about speciesism and aesthetics

Speciesism and some form of aesthetics, they seem to inevitably go together. This might be so because aesthetics can help give an excuse to prolong a wrong stance that one has taken, a wrong stance that one is acting up to and aware of doing so.

Speciesism comprises the conscious element of violence and active or witnessed (onlooker-) brutality towards a nonhuman animal or nonhuman animals in general.

The consciousness in brutality in speciesism often get aestheticized by putting the act of violence in the frame of doing something supposedly noble, dignified, heroic, “cool”, smartly provocative.

Aesthetics can normally also be a part of a momentum that breaks any chain of self-deception, and be a vehicle to relate to the experienced world. The sense of aesthetics isn't something value-free, it's something that depends on the motivations in an onlooker or an artist.

Does the aesthetical understanding in a person seek to rectify her actions and worldview only, and is thus just a means to an end? Or is the sense of aesthetics really the sense of connecting to the outer real world that's being perceived?

I can relate to the world in a destructive form through the will to destroy and demean it, and I can relate to the world by seeing what is really there.

--

# objectification and taxidermy

Speciesism in art is for a big part taxidermy in art

This site writes: “Well they are dead anyway” ...  
<http://www.ravishingbeasts.com/taxidermy-artists/>

But they exactly use the dead bodies of nonhuman animals because these animals obviously have lived before. Using a dead body is a means to gain possession in a definitory way over the de facto existential part of a living being – even when the individual is dead. Obviously there is a meaning of the procedure and use to the makers and onlookers of “taxidermic art”, because otherwise they could be using their own skills to sculpt their ‘works of art’ instead of using the physical remains of an animal body.

Taxidermic “art” is a way to grievously ridicule the fact that nonhuman animals are victimized by the majority of the human societies (people used human bodies in a comparable objectifying way).

Taxidermic “art” stands on the side of the human speciesist majority, in that it implicitly supports the normalcy that this majority segment of society has established. You are allowed to see the animal body as an object – not more and not less.

Taxidermic “art” uses a dead individual’s body – a body: a temple of any living being’s existence. Anybody who omits this scale of animal subjectivity automatically sides with the speciesist stance.

The kind of artists/arts that employ taxidermy and their audience rub into your face what they feel is “art” to tell you something that I would sum up as: ‘Look what we can do, look what we do to the inhabitants of this world. We care, but in a destructive and derogatory way.’

Effectively this type of artistic expression is an attempt to mute animal rights and antispeciesism, their ignorance towards critique comes across like an attempt to push other stances into absurdity, by using the cynical rhetoric toward animality

and by riding comfortably on the wave of the overall lack of self-critique in contemporary art.

Animal objectification is an accepted visual rhetoric that gives the artists a means to silence ethical non-relativism and any critical and moral standpoint on the display of animal bodies in art.

What this art also is doing is that it is catering to the oppressive patterns that we have in our societies. In a way much of the mainstream art does that today, simply by voluntarily reducing self-expression to speaking in just one single language of aesthetics, thus suppressing basic individuality and plurality in artistic expression.

Speciesist and nature-derogative art marks the spearhead of ideological human destructiveness though. While amongst humans people tend to act as if they are “open for discussion”, speciesist and nature-derogative “art” seems to voluntarily or involuntarily make clear that the capacity of free thinking, that humans claim for themselves, is merely a hatred for the existential realities and the independence in the meaningfulness all other existence.

It’s a question of might.

Here is an interesting example of an artist doing what she calls “vegan taxidermy” : <http://www.vegantaxidermy.com/>. A nice and interesting artistic project. (One could imagine abstract forms of such arts too.)

I’ve been mentioning taxidermy in previous posts, many speciesist artists use dead animals or their body parts. One of the most famed ones being Banksy, who is considered infallibly subversive by his fanbase and media <https://www.farangis.de/blog/wurst>.

--

# Kunst und Speziesismus: Artscience

Gerda Fischbach see [http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/people?personen\\_id=1516014703778](http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/people?personen_id=1516014703778)

This page is full of extreme speciesist art

<http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/people/role/team>

<http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities>

## FLESH

First of all, the meat was needed for isolating primary animal cells. Once the animal tissue had been swabbed with ethanol, a tiny section was removed and immersed again in ethanol.

[http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/bioart\\_](http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/bioart_)

## TAXIDERMISTRY

“Things that Talk“ – at the Naturhistorisches Museum Wien. It shall be a source of inspiration and provide an unusual view of the museum

## SPECIESIST BIOLOGISM

I will review a number of mechanical problems we offered kea in lab and field and I will show the way their behavioural flexibility may even include acquisition of tool use behaviour.

more speciesist biologism

[http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/field\\_research](http://artscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/field_research)

more speciesist biologism

Bernd Kräftner \* Video Projection and discussion:  
“Harlow’s monkey studies on deprivation”

[http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable\\_3](http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable_3)

more speciesist biologism

Field Research

A report, fully photo-documented, from the FIWI, Research Institute of Wildlife Ecology, by Max Kropitz and Zahra Shahabi opened this Roundtable, focussing on issues such as taxidermy, experiments' set up using mice and studies on fish behaviour.

[http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable\\_16](http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable_16)

extreme speciesist biologism

ROUNDTABLE

Field Research

He proposes a new kind of art called “attraction art”, through the same approach and also discusses the role of the public as an equal part of the artwork in a performance piece.

[http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable\\_17](http://artsscience.uni-ak.ac.at/activities/roundtable_17)

and there is much more on that page listed. Not digging deeper now.

--

Klangstuecke > <https://www.farangis.de/blog/antispekunst-1> ;  
<https://www.farangis.de/blog/lebe-fuer-antibiologistischen-antispeziesismus> [10.01.2024]

*“Warum mag ich iitsch nicht ... ”. Devoid 3.*

Warum befasst sich der Großteil der Tierrechtsszene nicht mit dem Thema Speziesismus in der Kunst? Welche Fragestellungen in Hinsicht auf das Mensch-Tier-Verhältnis und die erfahrene Realität von nichtmenschlichen Tieren werden hier gemieden? Thema: Ästhetik und Antispeziesismus.

*Lebe für antibiologistischen Antispeziesismus. Klangstück “Lebe für antibiologistischen Antispeziesismus”. Lebe für antibiologistischen Antispeziesismus.*

--

## A totalliberation problem

Total liberation has a funny logic: you cling human ‘liberation’ to animal ‘liberation’. So you compare your problem to that of nonhumans. Yet again when you compare problems of nonhumans to humans, in the specifics, then this gets vehemently dismissed as being against human rights.

I wonder if ‘liberation’ comes in degrees depending on what someone thinks would ‘liberate’ one/the other. Physically ‘liberation’ is the most important political action. Yet in the realm of discrimination, the term ‘liberation’ has a patronizing aspect about it ... .

Suppression – and in the case of nonhumans specifically extreme objectification – cannot change facts about the targeted subjects, their own integrity. In terms of discrimination exerted by humans in societies, ‘defense’ and seeking justice, is seen kind of different than only as ‘liberation’ like what seems to be offered to

Nonhumans and ‘Nature’ here. This is carrying the same old double standards with it ... .

To deny that people, at any time, anywhere, can exert foul play and discrimination against all and any other subjects, is a gross self-illusion, and sounds like there were some super good humans somewhere who had the right on their side in every case at any time, etc. Not realistic / helpful. Only a superficial-still-cover-up.

--

Missbräuchliche Theorien spiegeln problematische Weltbilder.

Abusive theories mirror problematic worldviews.

#languagediversity on #epistemicbiologism

--

## Asociaciones

Venerari et honorare terram!

Was passiert – mit wem – wenn die Menschen nicht aufhören, Tierkörper mit Nahrung gleichzusetzen und über Tierkörper als Ressourcen zu verfügen?

Der Ausdruck ihres Selbstverständnisses?

Dominium terrae?

„Seid fruchtbar und mehrt euch, füllt die Erde und unterwerft sie und waltet über die Fische des Meeres, über die Vögel des Himmels und über alle Tiere, die auf der Erde kriechen!“ Genesis 1,28

Der Kirchenvater deutet: Werke Laktanz (250-325) De ira die, Vom Zorne Gottes (BKV), „13. Alles in der Welt dient zum Nutzen des Menschen [...] Als Gott den Menschen schuf, gleichsam als Abbild Gottes und als Krone des göttlichen Schöpfungswerkes, da hauchte er ihm allein die Weisheit ein, damit er alles seiner Herrschaft und Botmäßigkeit unterwerfe und alle Annehmlichkeiten der Welt genieße.“

Tiertheologie / Tiertheologie: Trennung zwischen Objekten der Bezugnahme und subjektiver Bezugnahme

--

# Analogievergleiche: Fressadel

Und wir singen:

Der Speziesist zum Tier: mit Deinem Gesicht solltest Du Dich häufiger mal rechtfertigen. So, das kannst Du nicht HINREICHEND, so dass Du meiner Vorstellung davon genüge tätest? Also mach ich einen Witz aus Deiner Vernichtung. Aber davor, lass ich Dich ein wenig raus.



# Speciesism and Arts, Nazi-Speciesism, Nazism\* and in Memoriam of Andreas Hochhaus

*Im Vorab: der Zusammenhang ist das laute Schweigen über spezieistische Kunst, im Gegensatz zu anderen spezieistischen "Kulturräumen" ...*

Speciesism and Arts, Nazi-Speciesism, Nazism\* and in Memoriam of Andreas Hochhaus

In advance: the context is the loud silence about speciesist art, in contrast to other speciesist "cultural spaces" ... >

Inseparable in a speciesist system. "The German artist" does it the völkisch way, with all around support, that's the unsurprising novum and the logical consequence of an old ongoing problem that we are dealing with here: the greed for might over death and humiliation, for instance...

And it's all done with narrowing down human hatred and human enmity to their core shame point of access ... read of this example:

"Nevertheless, Höller feels no inhibitions about eating the animals – wild birds are among his favorite foods. In order to enjoy the protected species Ortolan – a songbird considered a delicacy in France, where it is first fattened, then drowned in Armagnac and then eaten with a cloth napkin over its head to capture as many flavors as possible – the artist decided to breed the rare bird species at home. But when the chicks were finally born, he couldn't bring himself to eat them. He only came to his palate when a female fell victim to a male. The brilliant idea for the brutalist manifesto came to Höller, appropriately enough, while eating a bird dish in Ferran Adrià's legendary "El Bulli" restaurant. There he was served the brain of a woodcock, embedded in its own skull." Source: [https://www.schirn.de/magazin/whats\\_cooking/vom\\_atelier\\_an\\_den\\_esstisch\\_carsten\\_hoeller/](https://www.schirn.de/magazin/whats_cooking/vom_atelier_an_den_esstisch_carsten_hoeller/) [accessed 17.08.23]

The artist made arts objectifying Pigs together with the other acclaimed German artist Rosemarie Trockel in one of the annual Kassel documenta arts spectacles.

So what about the German Animal Liberation Movement and/or the German Animal Rights Movement? And yes, how is it where you might live?

The German “Animal Liberation” network die “Tierbefreier e.V.” never showed any interest in the subject of speciesism in art. But they are for “total liberation”, etc. Right. What this is to say is: that we got a huge problem here with speciesism in the arts scene, yet those who act like they express what Animal Liberation is all about just don’t seem to care about ideological and that encompasses aestheticized animal objectification.

Yet at the same time they claim to face, fight and possibly try to dismantle speciesism also on the cultural levels. So what exactly is the arts and culture business. Who’s been reading their Adorno? Who’s been able to contextualize? Or do they try to say that there is no need to ... . Whatever, there is no reasonable explanation.

Who knowingly doesn’t fight propaganda is to be seen as being a bystander or an accomplice, either or both. And just placing some Kitsch to create a comfortability zone doesn’t face anything. Or do you always phrase critique that harmlessly? Some academics of the Animal Liberation scene here even cooperate proactively with artists who are known to be overt speciesists, some have been using animal objectifying taxidermic exhibits and are being embraced by the international “Animal Rights movement” (we live in the time of the false flags).

So the Tierbefreier e.V. wrote in an issue where the editorial was dedicated to Art and Animal Liberation, bypassing any naming of the ongoing hyper-dominance of speciesism in art as a big factor amongst the oppressive tools of hegemonial anthropocentrism ... :

“art history is taken up by Julia Richter in her article Nonhuman Animals in Man-Made Art. She builds a bridge from ancient cave paintings to modern, vegan alternatives to modern, vegan alternatives to classical artists’ tools such as brushes and paints”

and

“Colin Goldner gives us an insight into the diary of an art philistine. He reports his experiences at art exhibitions and asks the question if art can be used for the liberation of of the animals\*.”

and

“Unfortunately, the important topic of music is not addressed in the issue. However, we hope that in the course of 2021 we will be able to add an article on animal liberation music. For now, we hope you enjoy reading and viewing the artwork!”

source: <https://www.tierbefreiung.de/pdf/tb110.pdf> [accessed 17.08.2022]

... and that in the country which has the biggest and most ideological Nitsch-Fanbase within the left and the right of the political circus.

No critics at all? Far from the truth. But they are not as visible as they should be

Sadly in 2022 the only “broadly accepted activist” here who openly opposed the Nitsch-Scene: Andreas Hochhaus – who later changed his name to Andreas Bender (after a long fight against a German religious sect in his Animal Rights journal “Voice”) passed away. And what is quite embarrassing is that the obituaries by his own scene from the German Animal Liberation and Animal Rights movement didn’t even mention his important targeted activism and protests he used to hold in the late 1990ies against the Nitsch-Establishment in the Rhein-Main-Arts scene. He had also – and everybody back then knew that – covered the Nitsch-Speciesist-Orgies-Hype in his “Voice” magazine at that time. A shame that his activism in this area didn’t get any support.

\* Nazicism stands for an allergy toward Nazis btw.

# Appendix

## Dein Blick

Palang LY, 2004

Es ist schwierig darüber zu schreiben: Das Töten von Tieren in der Kunst. Mir wurde vor kurzem eine Email zugeschickt in deren Anhang sich Fotos befanden die zutiefst erschütternd sind. Auf den Fotos waren die Gesichter fotografierter Tiere zu sehen. Diese Fotos waren das, was das Kommerzgeschäft Kunst mitunter am Laufen hält. Auf den Bildern sah ich brutal erniedrigte, gefolterte und ermordete Tiere.

Diese Tiere auf den Fotos sind die Opfer einer Künstlerkonsorte, die sich aus Schweden, Engländern, einer Russin an vorderster Front und weltweiten Zuarbeitern zusammensetzt. Die Tiere wurden zu Opfern um inszeniert zu werden. Die Idee der Bilder, sagt der Galerist, ist das Leben als „erbärmlich / pathetic“ darzustellen. Die Hochstilisierung der verachtenden Haltung gegenüber dem Leben zur Kunst, trifft den verletzbarsten Sensibilitätsnerv.

Es fällt mir schwer über diese Kunstformen zu sprechen, weil es hier um Aufzeichnungen von Folter geht und weil diese Kunst als Provokationswährung gegenüber der Tierrechtsbewegung dient.

Diese Wertigkeitskombination findet in den Kunstgalerien und Messen ihre Abnehmerschaft en masse.

[...]

Der Wert des Lebens hat in der Kunst schon lange ausgedient, die Umkehrung vom Lebenswert in den Tod, ist heute profitabel. Während wir uns mit der verwundbaren Ethik des Lebens befassen und uns um die Erhaltung seiner Respektierung kümmern, hat sich die Kunstwelt seit längerer Zeit auf die Vermarktung der Idee des Terrors gegen das Leben durch Tötung und emotionalen Schrecken spezialisiert und findet dabei immer weitere Höhepunkte.

Das Übervolle Maß an Zerstörung durch die Menschheitsgeschichte hindurch, reicht vielen Künstlern und Kunstliebhabern gedanklich nicht. Die andere Seite der Geschichte, in der nach Frieden durch Ethik gesucht wurde und wird, und wofür Lebewesen immer wieder ihre eigene Wirklichkeit einsetzen, erwirkt im Shibboleth der Entwürdigungsdialektik in der modernen Kunstszene bei weitem keine Sinneserweiterungen, sondern im Gegenteil, die Bewegkraft moderner Kunst ist immens dabei, eine Philosophie in der Zerstörung allgemeiner Lebensethik zu suchen und zu finden.

Der künstlerische Ausdruck dieser Formsprachen, die als Befunde über Logik und Sinn von Zerstörung ästhetisiert werden, findet seinen Wiederhall in vielen intellektuell und finanziell einflussreichen Hauptfragmenten der Gesellschaft und er wird mit einer Einmaligkeit von den theoretisch Dogmatischen als für geistig wertvoll befunden. Triebfeder ist die Machtzufriedenheit im Wissen über die unerschöpfliche Möglichkeit immer weitere destruktive Geister in der Annihilierung ethischer Validität zu vereinigen. Und die anderen, ihnen sind diese Art der Gemeinplätze zuwider.

Viele Menschen kokettieren mit der Angst schlechthin, aber die Angsterzeugung zur Ästhetik zu stilisieren, ist ein Kapitel, das sich am expansivsten zu potenzialisieren weiß. Da sind die Künstler, die das Fleischessen und die dem vorausgehende Tötung verherrlichen (mittels Erotisierung und Ideologisierung). Da sind die, die das Wort „Fleisch“ zu sog. U-Musik singen; die, die Tiere und Menschen durch Spektakel zu entwürdigen wissen, da sind die zahllosen weiteren Erscheinungen künstlerischer Symbolakte pathologischer Dissimulation und die Anhänger und Befürworter, geeinigt in ihrer Belehrungsart über die Entwürdigung als einem vermeintlich bio-ethisch rationalisierbarem, neuem menschlichen Ziel.

Hinter dem Schattenkabinett an bereits etablierten und persistent weiter propagierenden Künstlerpersönlichkeiten, leben weitere Schattenkabinette von Galerien, Werbeagenturen, Künstlerverbänden und das übliche Weitere, das auch sonst wo hinter jeder menschlichen Verrohung steht.

Soweit, so schlecht. Wir haben es mit einem Problem einer künstlerischen Ideologie der ästhetisierten Verachtung des realen Lebens zu tun und mit einer ihr zuarbeitenden Industrie. Beide sprechen eine eigene, gemeinsame Sprache und

beide habe sich ihre eigenen Spielregeln entworfen. Was sollten wir tun? Zum einen sollten wir uns durch diesen Strom in der Kunstbewegung nicht von Aktion abschrecken lassen. Viele haben die Erfahrung gemacht: Wenn etwas furchtbares geschieht, möchte man seine Augen von all dem abwenden. Man merkt dann aber, dass das zur Veränderung der Situation nicht helfen wird.

Das Augen abwenden ist das, was diese Art des künstlerischen und kunstliebhabenden Destruktivitätsklientels sich wünscht, damit deren Akteure ihren Terror weitertragen können und um so weiterhin Tiere und Menschen direkt oder indirekt zu entwürdigen. Der Spaß am Terrorisieren anderer gilt übrigens in vorderster Linie auch für die Kunstliebhaber innerhalb dieser Szene. Wenn Sie einem dieser Menschen begegnen, werden sie das was ich meine hautnah erleben dürfen.

# Entry from our Edition Farangis / Gruppe Messel Tierrechtsarchiv > hardcore punk 1984

<https://www.discogs.com/release/1128968-Anti-System-No-Laughing-Matter>

## Anti-System – Wot! No Meat?

The death toll rises, 32 billion in 83  
Are you so ignorant, you cannot see  
The agony and pain that goes on  
But you're the murderer you can't see no wrong  
Ramming down the flesh without a thought  
Wot No Meat! So you bought  
How can you live with this murder on your mind?  
Well, maybe you're deaf or maybe you're blind

Animals aren't ours to eat but they're living creatures  
They're not some butchers sunday features  
Now who eats three whole cows, 17 pigs, 25 lambs,  
420 chickens and numerous other animals?  
You in your average lifespan!  
Now think about it!

Album: Anti-System – No Laughing Matter  
Label: Reconciliation Records – reconcile 1  
Format: Vinyl, LP, Album, Gatefold  
Country: UK  
Released: Mar 1985  
Recorded at Woodlands Studio October '84.  
Includes 20-page, political statement/art booklet.

Tracks / Titles

- A1 Rhetorical Stagnation
- A2 The End Was Inevitable
- A3 Brainwashed
- A4 World That God Made
- A5 Dying In Agony
- A6 Big Fallout
- A7 Don't Worry
- B1 Strange Love
- B2 Wot! No Meat?
- B3 No Laughing Matter

Synthesizer – Neil\*

Vocals – Paula\*

- B4 So Long As
- B5 Animal Welfare
- B6 Empty Threats!

Recorded At – Woodlands Studio

Pressed By – MPO

Bass – Keany\*

Drums – Phil\*

Engineer – Neil Ferguson

Guitar – Varik

Layout [Booklet Compiled By] – Anti-System, Paula\*

Mastered By – Porky (5)

Vocals – Kev\*, Mick\*

More Bands and Musicians listed in our TIERRECHTSARCHIV @ GRUPPE MESSEL, EDITION FARANGIS also with statements will follow!

## Impressum

Edition Farangis  
Untergasse 7 / Marstallweg 8  
61250 Usingen / Taunus  
Deutschland  
mail@farangis.de  
Tel. + 49 6081 6 88 24 49  
www.farangis.de

Autor:innen: Tschördy Gita Marta Yegane Arani und Lothar Yegane Arani geb. Prenzel.  
Übersetzer:innen: Gita Marta Yegane Arani (Tschördy / Palang LY)  
Illustrationen/Illustrator:in: Farangis G. Yegane (Gertrud Waltraud Lück-Flender).  
Herausgeber:innen: Lothar Yegane Arani (Prenzel); T. G. M. Yegane Arani; Edition Farangis

Erscheinungsdatum: Januar 2024  
Kontakt Daten: [www.farangis.de](http://www.farangis.de)  
Copyrights: Edition Farangis 2024



© Edition Farangis 2024, Usingen / Ts.