

Animal Autonomy E-Reader edition farangis



Edition Farangis: Animal Autonomy E-Reader

Jahrgang 3, Nr. 3

November 2022

ISSN 2700-693X

Art: Farangis G. Yegane + Gita Yegane Arani, Text: Gita Yegane Arani.

Contextualizing Fragments:

The Speciesism/Antispe angle and Animal Objectification

“Utilising” and loving ... 3

Animal Objectification and Negation ... 6

Opposing all Forms of Animal Objectification ... 6

Sentientism and Animal Sociology ... 8

Being and sensing ... 8

Faunacides are taking place ... 9

Ecocide – Faunacide – Genocide, ongoing (1) ... 9

Ecocide is foremostly and ethical issue ... 9

The term: sustainable ... 10

Territorial schisms ... 11

Animal Sociology and advocacy ... 12

Dedication and commitment ... 12



“Utilising” and loving

It's nothing exceptional that petting and slaughtering go hand in hand on small farms in 'pastoral' contexts (1), and for many in society in reality the two don't necessarily form a contradiction that could be considered as 'deeply grounded'.

- Who takes offence at the cutishly belittling imagery of animals whom end up on plates?
- Who takes offence at foal meat or horse butchery for example?
- Who takes offence at the fact that:
 - o killing wild animal species (which many people would indeed find potentially neat “to pet”) is the same as
 - o killing animal species that have been torn from their freedom by humans at some point?

Both animals in either situations are not served justice. Society, in its care about technocratic “sustainability”, tends to see “farm animals” only as ‘physical-problems-in-themselves’ and have no interest in saving them or fighting for justice on behalf of these individual subjects, etc. While wild animals are just the other side of the coin, though they seem to be protected, both are equally stuck in the same malevolent setting.

- Who takes offence at religious or spiritual-ritual rhetorics that may equate “respect for the creation” with “creation’s servitude to humans” – to the point of sacrificing animals to comfort their own human worldviews?

How do we conceptualize the things that are going on with animals?

The “carnism”-concept unloads the focus on a dichotomy of “indifference” versus “love of animals” that does not really exist.

The *functionalization of animals* to fit human desires and imaginations, is part of one and the same problem.

Animals are hurt, they are being humiliated, and belittled. And that affects all of them basically in some way.

The physical and the mental kind of terror (that brings along its physical consequences too) against animals – which overlaps within the whole setting of human- and animal geographies – cannot be traced back onto two separate and supposedly completely opposing stances in humans

- without simultaneously leaving the “stroked/caressed/loved” animals exposed to silent violence.
- and not take into account the psychology of the *ritualization* embodied or contained within the institutionalization of animal murder, which can never be merely a mechanistic, completely emotionally decoupled act. Mass murder and any decided murder of animals cannot plausibly be explained as ethical casualness. The act of animal murder is culturally anthropologically being actively “justified, defended and legitimized” in terms of animal objectification.

The stroking of animals is a farce and has little to do with respect for the animal counterpart, because the stroked animality is usually being decontextualized in terms of animal sociology, eco-sociality and overall sociology.

Addendum: the conflation of “gentleness” and “violence” is also known to us from areas of sexualized violence. To our knowledge, it is not yet really clear how and why these “socio-behavioral progressions” occur in a strikingly regular manner. In the case of animal objectification, however, the interplay of human attention/affection-towards-animals and the human-negation-of-animals is also part of a recognizable behavioral repertoire of people when they are in contact with animals; and physical assault takes place here too.

Addendum 2: So we assume that this contradiction (affirmation of negation to the ultimates) is not a real ethical paradox for humans. Also not, from our point of view, since “petting/caressing” does not really have to mean much that is positive, as is observable.

- (1) see def. of pastoral speciesism, E-Reader: Gruppe Messel, Jahrgang 4, Nr. 6, 2022.

Animal Objectification and Negation

People who deny

that all the known forms in which Nonhumans are routinely objectified, are in fact the most severe ways in which you can negate someone,

do look themselves through a heavily animal objectifying lense.

To turn someone into actual materials/'material resources'/material objects and total objects of external definition is a specific of oppressive animal objectification.

Your act of negating Nonhumans as 'being someone', is part of your narrow, homogenic thinking and part of the very same objectifying questionworthy standpoint.

Opposing all Forms of Animal Objectification

Why we step back from the Speciesism/Antispeciesism paradigm and focus on levels of Animal Objectification instead, which we think reaches deeper in the perspectival-based ethical problem that we are dealing with in the Animal Rights / Human Rights interfaces:

On which levels and layers do these angles operate:

Speciesism / Antispeciesism – operates on what at some point in history became the focal point of biological markers (the level of, for instance, morphology and phylogenetics, taxonomy). We have to look at how we understand the term “species” to operate this lense in Animal Rights sensibly.

From the angle deriving from “species” we can see how human society shaped and applied this very notion – legally, politically, culturally, etc.

Opposing Animal Objectification – assumes “animality” as a consciously “external” and lesser integrity-breaching, descriptive (aiming to be non-definitory) term, which creates more openness to an emancipatory language.

The angle of an opposition to “Animal Objectification” declinates cultural institutionalized and ritualized forms in which “animals” are being objectified on the descriptive and definitory level. It tries to be less presupposing in a burdensome manner.

Sentientism and Animal Sociology

What kind of disconnected sentience do we concede to nonhuman animals that (still) overlooks a full, a total spectrum of social and ecosocial reciprocity?

The social scale that we tolerate in nonhuman animals

is that of Darwin,

that of an inherent determinism

– as territorial patches within the manmade nowhere land, that lays outside of human-hegemonic definitional claims.

Being and sensing

Being or sensing/feeling ... ? Veganism vs. Sentientist struggles:

If someone argues forth or back for what argumentation is more substantial: that one of “life” (to be more meaningful as a criterion for human ethical concern) itself or that of “sentience”.

These angles are particularistic, foremostly if they move along the typical standardized philosophical borders.

Neither “life” nor “sentience” can be measured from a strictly human angle.

Animal Rights includes the ability to emancipate from objectivist humancentric viewpoints and enters into a philosophical space that allows freedom of the undefined: A basic respectful approach must not seek to overdefine its social and ecosocial environments.

Be it their lives or their sentience.

Faunacides are taking place

Faunacides are taking place, and the world seems to be quite passively watching, kind of summarizing this in terms of 'climate change' ...

And this one faunacide is the one in terms of 'species' and 'wildlife' ...

And the other concerns the Nonhumans relegated into forced birth/killing circles ... (lab, farms)

Another level of the ongoing faunacides is formed by the tragic intersections of both

Ecocide – Faunacide – Genocide, ongoing (1)

Climate change consists of a compound of consequences of different ways in which the environment is being damaged and destroyed.

All those single aspects of destruction are problems in themselves.

Environmental destructivity overall needs to be focused and addressed in regards to damages on all scales – that includes the microscales.

Simultaneously the human dimensions of how mindsets function, that enable and drive environmental harms in the name of “necessity” and “economic growth” need to be a point of societal criticism.

Ecocide is foremostly and ethical issue

The moral and the ethical aspects of environmental destruction need to be addressed for the sake of “nature”/nonhuman spaces/communities/life themselves.

The form of thinking that “nature” and nonhuman spaces exist for societal gains – in either direction constructive or destructive – poses a problem.

Our dependence on “nature” doesn’t legitimate our fundamentally hegemonial-anthropocenic attitudes towards “nature”.

The notion that nature and nonhuman spaces ought to serve human interests implies that we assume

a.) nature as a “resource”

and that b.) nature was void of autonomous meaning and ecosocial completeness.

Both notions are presumably the core ones that lead to destructive behaviour towards “nature”/nonhuman spaces.

Harming and polluting “nature” and nonhuman spaces are actions of anthropogenic ethical disregard for “nature” itself.

The term: sustainable

Sustainable ... sustainability in social terms, inevitable.

Sustainable ... when it means „growth“, seems a contradiction to economic-ecologic-justice.

Sustainable ... and beneath the term of “ ‘life’ on earth and water”, the rights and interests of ‘Farmed-Animals’ and ‘Lab-Animals’ (amongst other Animal Rights issues) are still being ruled out.

“Do you know all 17 Sustainable Development Goals?” >
<https://sdgs.un.org/goals> (15.10.2022)

The #EU uses too much language on sustainability that is incompatible with Animal Rights. The difficulties for animal advocacy and the injustice towards the (entire) Nonhuman Animal World have to become part of humanity's ethical home. We are positive the #UN can eventually help.

Territorial schisms

“Segregation” in terms of Nonhumans and Humans implies segregated ethics, segregated subjectivity, segregated attributions, segregated environmental comprehension.

Animal Sociology and advocacy

Where the notion of animality is mostly driven by biologism and general nonhuman animal objectification (philosophical, religious, legal, scientifically, and so forth) >

being “for animals”, being an “animal ally”, does not mean that these advocates share a similar view in their exact ideas of animal rights, ethics, animal lib, etc. >

Like in human rights and environmentalism/environmental rights, you get exactly all possibilities of possible worldviews, hopefully trying untangle the damage done.

Dedication and commitment

Animal Rights includes both:

An affirmation of the respect we hold for Nonhumans (the bridge of “dignity”, as holding a respectful stance)

A fight for clearing messed up terms, that allow for systemic and other factual harms and devaluations of Nonhumans.

Abusive theories mirror problematic worldviews.

#languagediversity on #epistemicbiologism

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: Gita Marta Yegane Arani (Tschördy / Palang LY).
Grafik 1: Farangis G. Yegane, Grafik 2: Gita Yegane Arani
Herausgeber:innen: Lothar Yegane Arani, (geb. Prenzel); Gita Marta Yegane Arani; Edition Farangis

Erscheinungsdatum: November 2022
Kontakt Daten: www.farangis.de
Copyrights: Edition Farangis 2022



© Edition Farangis, Usingen / Taunus, 2022