

THE FEMALE CONQUEROR IS A HUMAN (reworked on it on the 13th of Dec. 2003)

To Rob. By Gita Y. Arani-May



I am a vegan AR individual.

This is a case where I will apply reverse humanocentrism; there just would not be ANY other possibility.

I saw a girl. A nice girl perhaps. I can't even remember what her name was? Was it P.A.C.? Or did she prefer a male name for herself? Something like Eduard the Great Conqueror who goes to bed with all long-legged femmes he comes across, to prove the entire universe what a real man he is?

No, in fact I really can't remember. The only thing I can remember is that she was very beautiful. A long, slim face, with a long slim nose. Maybe she would hate me for giving that description of her. Well, anyway. P.A.C. declared herself a "veganish" person. Still I have not found out what she really meant when she said that. She said that eco-meat-production was ok.

So I have no clue what even her idea about even just vegetarianism is. Maybe she loves a meat-eating conqueror. Maybe she fell in love with a young vegan straight-edger. I simply don't know what veganism means to her. What would her way of understanding veganism have to do with the problems animals have ... , I really wonder.

Maybe she PITYS animals just as much as she pities herself. But she pities herself just a little more, cause she is like encaged in her own human existence with all its outskirts. I - at least - know what that means - too - . The outskirts of humanity.

... Being a real human, someone who always suffers from how badly she is treated by her coexistent society. At least she lives in something she is allowed to experience as a society, even if it is a vicious thing to her, somehow.

So P.A.C. or the conqueror told me, I remember, something about the problem she feels for not being loved. Is it such a high privilege to be loved by humans? Many others (that is, nonhuman animals) are totally denied to live their relationships. P.A.C. would have easily guessed it and I don't see why I should not admit it anyway. Yes I think hatred makes the only sense when it comes down to judging humans - always, in a sense.

I have a problem with that girl, the conqueror. She declared herself also, apart from being "veganish", to be a politically motivated feminist (be it male or female). Her feminism is driven by the question about love or not love - again. But her question only extends as far as her own species and their interests are concerned. It makes ME angry; fills me with hatred!

But still, she has the strange ability to put all in me ad absurdum. A least emotionally. At least.

Is sadness something negative? And if, why is it felt by the one who judges it as negative, as something negative? What is negativity anyway? Is an outcry something negative? There are people - I conscioulsy or decidedly say people here - who never suffer from sadness and for that cannot be judged negative in the sense.

Here, where I'm trying to explain what means destructiveness in (unuseful) friendships, I make a point: A friendship is unuseful when it doesn't share the same visions. By that I mean the visions about all that can be universalized.

One universalizes positivism. Negativism? P.A.C. says she needs "milk" cause she wouldn't have a vision or a paradise right now, and if she wouldn't have her "milk" there would be just nothing left in her life as a treat.

Nice treatment of others. But she probably don't count these others even as others. She circles in her humanocentrism, where she herself is the god who decides about who should be created and who should not be.

So there are only a few others that matter. To her at least. And at least now in the moment. She or he ... ? has a some relationship with a nonhuman. But does she see that her nonhuman friend also needs the social interaction with other nonhumans?

Or does she simply "pity" the "poor need" of the animal who searches for just the same, in a sense: loving relations, as that part of the primary of freedom and peace.

Peace is only reached when all aspects of potential violations of the physical intergrity of an individual are ruled out ... But we are practically far away from this. And this is something she CAN accept. And has accommodated now with saying: ok I get myself settled first and then I think about the rest of my creation.

Strange god. She says she needs a job. If she would be active she would get moral support from others, also if she'd (even) had to live on the dole.

Somebody has to change anything about the system. Well they all lie, she says. I say that about her; but also from another point of view. I don't understand why she is not giving up her "milk", and why she says she doesn't like radical AR activists, and why she says that for that reason she is not interested in the idea and movement, and why she says it is all too much stress for her and would make her ill, and she will for her dislike of "those ARA's" get involved with the Animal Rights struggle.

She just doesn't take it all very seriously, as long as it's not her own concern. She is not immediately affected from another being being killed for her of his body ... "flesh" ...

She is not affected from the milking-machine that sucks the milk out of your pregnant body.

She is not even affected if billions of future generations of these others will be killed in the same repeating procedure of abyssed torture, imposed death; endlessly. So. Why should it matter to her?

She is not even an animal; she is a human and has her own problems in her society where she gets pushed around and no one is loving her as the weak female or the strong male she is.

Maybe a sexual partner could fill the vacuums and gaps that are somehow around, and put ignorance to a fine and final perfection - with the daily milk of the others, too. No one would mind about their pain. "No one".

And "no one" would mind about their pregnancies, their pain. Negativity is nothing which can be judged straight away as bad or counterproductive. It reflects a state that is prevalent outside and is not denying positivity.

She would believe in those yin and yang concepts as the idea of enlightened femininity and maleness. That's the final stage of human development: being a real human male either or being a real woman. A female human!

How could I cut this long story short? I really do not know, there seems to be no circuit for human destructiveness. It always takes the long end.

I feel like someone has tried to destroy my whole individual self. If I'm losing my mask now, and become more aware of what I understand to be an aspect of nonhuman standpoints -- that is, in the end only the question of how one is positioned in what concepts that destructive humans have enforced, with all their means of force -- then, I would know the answer.

Is this why they say animals are stupid? Humans don't allow the other possibilities of question-putting? The question about what is the human self? Just a concept in the end of the day, and in the beginning, and always; in the middle of these ends and beginnings - if there are any at all.

Either I can judge myself now stupid or I can judge her. That's the human situation right now at this moment. One can either be wrong or right. There is no fate P.A.C., unless you create it? Privileged TOO live. The rest matters more to me though.

I fear to be hated maybe. But love doesn't help aswell. There is just more to it.

The worst thing she said, was the one thing: she doubted whether insects would have a nervous system. So I saw, she didn't even know what being an animal amounts to - being potentially destroyable; always. To her it is only something she believes to exist in her own creation, with her as the human giving them her definition.