

Animal Autonomy E-Reader edition farangis



Edition Farangis: Animal Autonomy E-Reader

Jahrgang 3, Nr. 1

April 2022

ISSN 2700-693X

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

Fragments in Antibiological Animal Sociology: From Antispeciesism to Animal Objectification.

Fragments in Antibiologicistic Animal Sociology: From Speciesism to Animal Objectification

Decolonialism doesn't explain forms of nonhuman objectification ... 3

Subversion and Oppression ... 3

Critique of mainstream Animal Allies ... 3

Ethics and Rights, as always (dangerously narrowly understood in technocratic environmentalism) ... 4

Alternatives for the term speciesism ... 4

Alternative terms for speciesism ... 5

Animal portrayals in language 1 ... 5

Trauma 1 (on biologicistic approaches to trauma) ... 5

A Nonhuman can't be reduced to a symbol ... 5

A fragment on insect mythologies ... 6

Animal cultures: relations ... 6

Animal cultures ... 7

Defend whom and how ... 7

Animality and conceptual corners ... 7

Speciesism/Animal Objectification and deprivation (1) ... 7

No shared positions on animal and human ethics ... 7

Antispeciesist/Anti-Animal-Objective plurality being blurred out ... 8

Ethical exclusionists ... 8

Decolonialism doesn't explain forms of nonhuman objectification

Decolonialism does not explain forms on nonhuman objectification and human “ruling via definition” in regards to “(nonhuman) animality” (which in itself is yet a term to be argued about and to be analyzed).

Decolonialism is one thing, Animal Objectification has its own histories, even when problematics converge and overlap, e.g. in terms of ecological, eco-social contextualities. Brining decolonialism in as the solution for forms of animal objectification puts all hope on intra-human cultural diversity and ignores the dilemma of human definition of animal identity, which is simply not considered to be a historical major mistake seen in itself.

Decolonialism applies to intra-human constellations while the schism between “animal” and “human”, as some form of great hierarchically applied identities, stands outside of intra-human conflicts.

The notion of “human“ and the notion of “animal” differs with individuals, differs in different times and in different cultures. Bringing us all together under the assumption of functionability can't solve the source of conflict between the predominant varied human notions of “human” and varied human notions of “nonhuman and animal” which resulted in today's settings that we persistently have with animal objectifications.

Also, the problem with decolonialism to be applied as a tool to dismantle animal objectification raises the question of why the histories of animal objectification can't be addressed with their own complicated specifics.

Subversion and Oppression

Who pretends that subversion functioned differently in society than oppressive patterns, with both relying on similar basic assumptions about the human-animal-nature schisms – mostly in regards to the phenomenons of “existential meaningfulness” and the question of “self-authority”?

Critique of mainstream Animal Allies

Those most visible of today's animal allies (the animal rights and animal liberation movement) are equally unwilling to abstract from the biologism they apply to their perspectives on animality in a seemingly unquestioned manner, not different to any perspectival view on animality expressed in the conventional foundations of “human” hybris.

They equally limit their view to the equation: human > reason/self-authority; animal > instinct/application of any reductive definitional view. The paradigm-shifts in concepts of culture, languages, and sociability/socialness themselves haven't taken place in human emancipation

yet, to extend to nonhuman groups and individuals. Manifoldness and heterogeneity do not appear on the human map, outside of hierarchical hegemonic ideas of life and living beings in general.

Argumentation routinely lays a burden of proof in a comparability of nonhumans to humans, as if a.) some unique standard of measurement always had to be taken, and b.) as if “human” could be grasped as a single monolith, when in comparison to “nonhuman”.

Ethics and Rights, as always (dangerously narrowly understood in technocratic environmentalism)

If you conflate the facts of ecological human destructivity with the factuality and bare existence of animal bodies, by statistically and quantitatively adding up the array of damages caused by the existence of animal bodies in animal agriculture, then you make these animal bodies responsible for human actions of animal objectification.

Why don't you instead name the injustice that animal bodies live through and die under? Do you assume that ecological destruction has nothing to do with the violations of nonhuman spaces? At least you never seem to talk about the harsh facts of injustice towards nonhuman animals when you discuss the ethical fallacy of anthropocene destructivity.

Reminder: Ethical talk without (animal) rights isn't plausible.

Alternatives for the term speciesism

PREAMBLE

We need a term that describes the broad discrimination/s or injustice/s exerted by human collectives and human individuals towards nonhumans animals and towards nonhumanity overall – in all its facets in which these oppressive mechanisms, thoughts and actions occur in different human cultural layers, such as religion, science, law, arts, etc.

Also, we need a term for the overall phenomenon of human destruction and destructivity in these regards. I refer to it as faunacide, as far as nonhuman animals are concerned. Some criticize the term “speciesism” on various grounds, I ask everyone to come up with more descriptive terms for what we witness and might conceive differently.

Alternative terms for speciesism

SPECIES-/ANIMAL-DEROGATION ; SPECIES-/ANIMAL-DEROGATIVE /-
DEVALUATION /-HUMILIATION -...

Animal portrayals in language 1

Why do speciesists and antispeciesist alike verbally make/cite basic similar descriptions when it comes to talking about Nonhuman activities, referring to instinctual behavior patterns more or less? Observationwise they both obviously fetch their language from the same biologicistic box. As if lived subjectivity, outside that of a “human” self, was non-describable. As if an idea of generic pictograms ruled our language about what in reality is the nonhuman autonomy missed by these portrayals per definition.

Trauma 1 (on biologicistic approaches to trauma)

When nonhumans are forcibly subjected to trauma, it does produce trauma, but translates into a problematic that a biologicistic approach to nonhumans won't be able to unravel. Trauma occurs in context with all fine tunings of psyche and mind – can't ever be understood by violence.

A Nonhuman can't be reduced to a symbol

Antibiologism in Antispe: Animal Symbolism vs Animal Mythologies.

A start to my argumentation:

Animals as symbols is a dangerous terrain to step on, since

- 1.) images are to be seen in contexts of concrete modes of usage and are never stand-alone, absolute “symbols”.
- 2.) When you have an epistemic background in which animals are mythological, they can never be reduced to symbols – or would you call deities or your god or your friend or ideals appearing anywhere to ever be just a “symbol”?

A symbol is a proxy for something else that it stands for. When it's used to refer to real existent individuals you ethically enter a slippery slope, you start reducing the world to pictograms. Reducing the receptive interpretations of animal representations to “animal symbolism” fails to see the intricate languages expressed about human/animal relationships e.g. in arts but also in the iconographies of daily speciesism.

I wrote an English fragment on a difference between symbolism and mythology with this text:

A fragment on insect mythologies

A fragment on insect mythologies and insect representations, and why symbolism is not sufficient to explain the relation

Insects in mythology are mostly explained as a phenomenon that stands for a “symbolism”. It seems that authors/researchers find it hard to imagine that for instance the Scarabaeus (attributed in the Egyptian pantheon to the God Kheper), a “dung beetle”, was appreciated for more than just that, what humans attributed to him in terms of their own anthropocentric concept of the earth, its meaning and the universe.

What if for instance the early Egyptians did see a world of unique value in the life and activities of the scarab beetles?

It could likely be that it was fascinating to observe, how the beetles rolled this ball of soil and dung, to think about what meaning the beetles might have given to their existence on earth overall. Maybe it was that ancient civilizations/cultures had an ability to take nonhuman animals as cultures? A small beetle that rolls a ball like a planet, from which new insect life would spring forth

A typical thought you find on the topic of nonhuman animals and nature in mythologies is, that humans would imbue nature with meaning. Quite contrarily, people could have felt that nature did in fact have meaning, and that nature (being) is meaning in itself.

As far as I could find out now, the most prominent mythologies about insects and alike, evolve around: bees, butterflies, spiders, scorpions, cicadas and the scarab beetles.

If we add the heavy weight of underlying such a relationship in mythology to our today’s definition of “symbolism” – that is if we say that i.e. such insects were mere symbols for anthropomorphic attributions – then we should scrutinize more closely the epistemological history of “symbols” and the term’s etymology to shed light on the construct that we apply here.

I extended this draft in German here:

E-Reader: Gruppe Messel 2018 / 4. Jg. 1 (2018), Heft 4. ISSN 2700-6905, https://farangis.de/reader/e-reader_gruppe_messel_2018_4.pdf

Animal cultures: relations

Animal cultures vs species. Relating to Nonhumans as Humans:

If you segregatively can’t relate socially (including empathically) on all or any level with Nonhumans, you equally create spaces where humanity is condemned to be self-centric: subjectivity can relate and there are no borders in the good and bad.

Animal cultures

The better option with our limited vocabulary is to speak about Animal cultures instead of Animal species. (Nothing new but needs to become practice.)

Defend whom and how

Interesting when people defend humans from humans insistingly on the back of nonhumans. Refined speciesism.

Animality and conceptual corners

Why treat nonhuman concerns in assigned fields, instead of debiologizing the typical stances on animality? “Being a human” is still taken as a sociological state, while “nonhuman behaviour” is routinely relegated into the categories of being biologically driven/dominated.

- Animality can be seen in debiologized ways.
- Embracing existential plurality means wider perspectives than anthropocentrism are required

We can mutually learn as social and ecological beings.

Speciesism/Animal Objectification and deprivation (1)

Nonhumans are constantly put into a Kaspar Hauser-like situation, where it is assumed that imprisonment and deprivation from > social bonds and contexts experienced in relative freedom > creates a justification for further and deeper going discriminatory means, until finally the affected is free to any abuse by anyone of the ruling human collective.

No shared positions on animal and human ethics

If a high in human ethics is inseparably accompanied by factual animal degradation coming in any form, then such ethics are questionable and can't be left uncriticized because of the imperative of “humanness”.

Human ethics are questionable in how they function within. To use the notion of “humanness” to legitimate objectifications of animal bodies is part of the prolongment of inner human injustice equally as it is injustice towards nonhumans. The forced, expected exclusive solidarity with “the human” separates the logics of socio-ethical communities from one another.

Antispeciesist/Anti-Animal-Objective plurality being blurred out

Part of speciesist history in our society/ies is that critique of animal hatred, derogation, and so forth is muted. It can't be that we first have to be ‘publicly visible’ for our stances on animality

to get noticed, accepted and be part of the debates. Most antispeciesist sentiment in its plurality is blurred out or reductively narrowed down

Ethical exclusionists

Activists that mention all ethical environmental and social issues except animal rights and speciesism/animal objectification/. . . . Sounds familiar? Let's make these 'awkward exceptions' a cause for criticism.



© Edition Farangis 2022