

Animal Autonomy E-Reader edition farangis



Edition Farangis: Animal Autonomy E-Reader

Jahrgang 2, Nr. 1

August 2020

ISSN 2700-693X

Arts / Fragments by Farangis G. Yegane and Gita Yegane Arani.

Ecocide and Speciesism and Faunacide

Sentience indicates the intricate connectedness of life, it shouldn't be about standards of anthropocentric analyses

antibiologistic antispeciesist animal sociology

Sentience – eco-social and almost incomparably unique or the one you will measure by which standards?

Sentience stands in contexts, do you poke into the functionalities of a beings nervous system to analyze the “quality” of their sentience, then you set the standard with human notions of what they treat as neurologically relevant sentience, or do you understand that all interaction between nonhuman animal life and the natural environment is an interaction marked by sentience, by physical interaction on endlessly complex and fragile levels, which would be the kind of sentience/s you can't fit into the idea humans normally hold about their own cognition as “higher” – then you step into the hierarchical conflict zones of “human” self-definition.

Sentience indicates the intricate connectedness of life. You can't easily open a door for a human defined “standard” side of sentience, while closing a door to other facts and phenomenons of sentience and be eco-ethically and antispeciesistically fair.

Establishing a language of “right, dignity and integrity” in terms of nonhuman animals should in my point of view be a venture of highlighting interrelatedness, of a lot of differentialization work amongst social and ethical-ecological fields and of creating new spaces of thinking.

--

Sentience raises many questions about what exactly we discuss ...

Speciesism means destruction by definition

The “common denominator” is often used to derogate animality:

Like “animals and humans both experience emotions/sensations like pain, joy, hunger, affection” ... yet nonhumans are supposedly driven by instinct the same people say at the same time ...

The common denominator only is that: a common denominator. It doesn't explain animality in any sense autonomous from human domination.

Putting ourselves as “humans” in hierarchies over nonhuman animality mostly stays in place with people citing the classic common denominators, where nonhumanity is attributed with any similarities or resemblances we think fit for the nonhuman animal realm.

As long as people explain nonhumanity in terms of biologicistic or any other reductive parameters, common denominators aren't really a step to break up the theoretical disenfranchisement that always makes up the basis for human societies to ‘destroy by definition’.

The common denominator gains its sense when you accept the compared one in their own autonomous and thus inviolable rights.

Example: People cite motherhood yet describe nonhuman animal motherhood in reductive and no explicit terms, and compare nonhumans in somewhat belittling terms, like highlighting biologicistically, ethologically understood behavior and needs, deindividualizing subjective experiences as if nonhuman fates were less complex narratives. Any example where common denominators are described will currently probably go into that direction thoughtwise. Modern mild and biologicistic speciesism.

--



Cognitions and sentiences in their own ways

Can anybody tell me why anyone needs scientific proof about animal cognition and sentience, etc. Address the individual/group themselves to get an answer in and under their own terms!

Those middlemen are never authorized to judge about cognitions/sentiences that they most likely don't even understand – by measuring limited criteria with limited parameters.

Those middlemen see the animals in question in oversimplified ways, in relation to factual reality, just to offer some well-meant biologicistic data about your “species” in question.

They'd never use such parameters to describe themselves, as humans, but nonhumans can supposedly be objectified and limited in such scientific ways.

Nonhumans are social subjects/selves/agents not biological objects.

--

Social replacement

Weird when people call the human friends of a nonhuman animal their “dad” e.g., blurring out that this nonhuman has own parents (– and these nonhuman families have tragic histories ...), while talking at the same time about what's supposed to be radical antispeciesism.

Weird also when humans pose with single nonhumans for photos, acting as if being with a human was the greatest thing, and socializing for nonhumans with other nonhumans would be a bit secondary at that moment. There is a lot of these type of weird things going on the “our” (the vegan/AR) movement.

Scrap the biologicistic speciesism that leads you to assume that nonhumans wouldn't know that the/ir entire world is being oppressed. A reductive concept of intelligence leads you to think of nonhumans as having to be pressed into the human concepts of how to measure perception.

The bad thing is that we still run around with views of animals and animality that are not much different to the “animal-machine” model (by Descartes), only on an “advanced”/“diversified” biochemical level. The idea that animals are acting in causalistic ways is still similar.

See also: A Question Answered by a Question ... Can Animals Reason?

<https://www.simorgh.de/objects/a-question-answered-by-a-question-can-animals-reason/> or

Edition Farangis: Animal Autonomy E-Reader 2, page 4, 2018,

https://farangis.de/reader/edition_farangis_animal_autonomy_reader_2.pdf

--

Stereotyping nonhuman animals

The German “artgerecht” is a speciesist term

A very biologicistic term: “artgerecht”: The German language holds a term that describes that there can be things/actions by humans that are “artgerecht” to do to nonhuman animal species in encounter and “treatment”. That there are human actions/treatments that are suitable for a specific species. This term stems mostly from animal agriculture to legitimate their imprisonment and killing of nonhumans and from zoologists classifying nonhuman animals by defining in a reductive way their specific typical “needs”.

Humans wouldn’t want to reduce themselves onto categorical needs such as: foraging, territorial behaviour and reproduction. The term “artgerecht” exactly invites you to see nonhumans and their behaviour in such reductive ways. All behaviour is classified and traced back to some categories humans hold a definitory might over.

Ecological complexity in regards to nonhuman animal sociology is not really a subject for anyone who applies such typical form of biologicistic speciesism. The tragic thing is that many people in the German speaking countries use exactly this term when they seek to defend nonhuman animals, and this kind of terminology is not being reflected critically at all. Like they want justice for nonhumans, but they also want to keep pigeonholing nonhumans biologically in such fundamental ways.

Meaningful, super complex behaviour becomes belittled with clichés of nonhuman species behaviour. It’s a term that leaves nonhumans in their situations where they are exposed to human definition, when allies use such terms, they are not making these settings visible.

“Artgerecht” bases much on the concept of “instinct” – which is one of the most questionable concepts to encounter nonhuman animals and animality with and “artgerecht” always means the setting is given or influenced by humans.

Interesting is also that the rhetorics of the deliberate or wanted impact of human actions depending on species, which implies that a nonhuman is or should be treated (indirect passive role attributed to nonhumans) “artgerecht” in a manner predetermined by frames humans construct and prepare for the nonhuman, are always scrutinously chosen fitting to each different setting: labs, farms, households, ... and that dependent on how people classify each

of the species. So “artgerecht” means: any generic biologicistic speciesism, while it consciously pretends to be meant to some advantage for the nonhumans within contexts of human definitory spaces. It never means the nonhuman animals are understood as self-creative active agents in any environment in a sense beyond instinct, beyond biologicistic and/or any other deterministic-pattern held ready and an explanation mode nonhuman ‘animal behaviour’. Any behaviour becomes subject to reductive interpretations. No open space in terms of definitions is allowed from the human defining side.

(Variation on fragmentary thought: “Artgerecht” always means the setting is given/influenced by humans. Interesting is how rhetorics, that imply that a nonhuman is or should be treated (...) “artgerecht”, tend to just modify ideas/institutions of domination. The details for the staged normalcy are always chosen carefully dependent on setting and animal group: labs – agriculture – captivity – mingling with wildlife. The idea behind the progress supposedly aimed at by the “artgerecht” treatment/measure (...) always sets forth that a nonhuman is basically instinctual. This is the old prejudice about nonhuman animality not be self-creative.)



Unique atrocity speciesism

Edibility in the case of the human-animal-relationship always goes along with the legitimization of “meat eating” via objectification of the animal body. The question should thus not be the distracting: “are we ‘allowed’ to consume nonhuman animal bodies”, but: why are you eating the ‘opposite’ animal subject?

--

Criticizing human supremacism while practicing it?

An animal sociology should in our view ideally be a system of full access to animality, i.e. nonhumans are social agents, the old view of “society” as “the strictly human realm” is passe. We live on earth. It doesn’t make sense otherwise.

--

Animal Sociology means just that

Nonhumans are a case for their own sociology, and not one for our biology. Probably only 1 percent of people in the Animal Rights movement understand the necessity of anti-biologism in antispeciesism. They understand the problematic key role biologism has played in racism, in sexism ... and as we see finally too: in the derogation of nonhuman animality.

Antibiologistic antispeciesist animal sociology to build/develop/evolve liberated terms. 1% ... and even if it’s just you ... don’t let the others act as if humans like you wouldn’t exist.

--

Deindividualizing subjectivity

Taking animals/animal groups “as a whole” still often deindividualises. Something like an antispeciesist-antibiologistic animal sociology would be a emancipative approach to counter a deindividualization. Talking about speciesist injustice means talking single fates –billions of single fates. Routinely blurring out the fate-scope means avoiding the subjective level of ‘nonhumanness’. Objectification even if “well meant” is derogatory towards nonhumans.

Speciesism is not alone the institutionalized killing it's also the ritualized killing. In fact they are the same.

Antispeciesist Animal Sociology

Institutionalized killing as a ritual killing

Speciesism is not alone the institutionalized killing it's also the ritualized killing. It's the sacrifice – done for the “human good”. The idea of sacrificing the life of the other for my own “greater good”, still holds the facet of the meaning the subjective-other must have had in my eyes, before or as I chose to sacrifice him/her. A sacrifice means to hurt/harm the other, to hurt/harm his/her integrity that is being put below some “other, ‘higher’ needs...”.

If I trace the killing back to pure “utilitary needs” humans had, how do you explain speciesism beyond its institutionalized face, where nonhumans have become pure objects of humans explaining them? That is, how do you explain ritual killings or speciesism in culture, arts, religion? Speciesist sadism/brutality?

The other is there.

--



Caruna living in Sasha Farm Sanctuary.

Speaking of nonhumans

When humans discuss animal communication/languages they inadvertently reveal how reductive the applied analytical frameworks they believe in factually work.

All complexity of nonhuman animal communication/language that is going beyond any of the concepts we might use, can't be fathomed at the moment in which you decide to set the standards, instead of leaving the subject open to stand for itself and acknowledging your limitations in comprehension.

Understanding nonhuman animals is not a playground for humanity to show how omniscient their understanding of the world is. We should be able to respect borders, differences, uniqueness – we don't have to define others in order to respect them as “whole” equally complex yet different/varied ... beings.

Ecosocial Schisms, April 2020

--

Notes on Animal Rights and politics (1)

Subordinating animality under any of our most promising political systems, somehow misses the point, since they all base on humancentered ideals so far. Politics for animality will have to evolve on foundations of spatial and bodily freedom from destructive human interference and definition – on all levels.

Political tangents between new and common approaches can be a helpful path, but yet all political ideas that we know imply anthropocentric objectifications of nonhuman co-existence. The dominant strains in our histories of knowledge themselves purport the bases for the typical ethical shortcomings that mark the Anthropocene.

--

Activism

Where activism for nonhumans divides: You can either name the fundamental wrong of speciesism or remain criticizing only the symptoms of a cause. The discourse about nonhuman concerns evolves through naming injustices on all the levels on which they occur.

Don't substitute instinct with instinct when you can't speak differently about nonhumans

A habitualized recourse on speciesist thinking patterns by animal rights activists > “animals are instinctual beings” > is communicably compatible with society's speciesist norms, yet it's mere continued biologicistic discrimination against nonhuman animality. Speciesist language stands for entire unjust worldviews – and either you opt for expressing alternative views on animality or you keep being a repeater of the echoes.

--

Biologicistic speciesism and you

We want to satisfy our basic sensual needs, because we're instinctual beings – unlike you are. We forage, we breed, we think in terms of territory, we are intelligent and sensitive, but all within the frame of instinct. And that's more or less all you need to know to understand our kind of being human. This is how biologicistic speciesism works – in and outside the animal rights movement (...). It applies a reductive lens to your life, where all you do is predetermined by behavioral parameters they tie to their abstract and arbitrary concept of “instinct”. Concepts like “thinking” are understood as bound to biological markers, language is just seen as comparably primitive – again bound to instinctual behaviour, e.g. How can this possibly be antispeciesist?

--

Earth's Children aren't taxonomic categories

Some of us contextualize life as “earth's children” – as interacting multifaceted existential selves, families, groups ... , while others continue to project taxonomy as the predeterminant factor of social lives on earth. Multifaceted lives on one side, are seen as biological castes on the other.

--

Animal hatred and ecology

Theriocides are happening unquestioned, while climate neutrality is being envisioned.

Animality's habitat > 'nature' > is continuously being appropriated as being the indisputable space of human domain, while earth's history has proven that the masters of fostering and retaining a holistic ecological balance are undeniably and almost exclusively the nonhuman ones.

--

Too much reformism

Animal rights advocates who take reformism for fundamental change:

Don't fall into the biologically arguing trap of discussing nonhuman animals needs to “live out natural instincts”, when as an animal rights advocate we ought to speak about fighting injustice, and when we ought to analyze, criticize and oppose the ways in which oppressive systems function – if we want to inspire a fundamental change in society.

The systemic injustice towards nonhumanity gets legitimized on the theoretical levels, primarily like reducing animality to instincts/biologically explicable behaviour.

You would never want to discuss human rights on this level by seeing everything through a biological lens, but you don't have a problem to use this speciesistically reductive lens on animality by conveying the message that nonhumanity and instincts would go hand in hand.

The stunning thing is, you even believe it's a charitable deed to do so ... you expect the world to change, yet you cling to old speciesist frameworks.

When you discuss nonhuman animal rights and interests, please try to apply the biologicistic frame to yourself to see little sense it makes.

--



Ecosociability

See totalitarianism from the standpoint of nonhumanity's ally and wonder who all in our societies turns the eyes away from the harsh terror and the total fears and destruction caused.



© Edition Farangis 2018