

IRRELEVANCE (reworked on it on the 13th of Dec. 2003)



By Gita Y. Arani-May also in love to my husband Rob ... in admiration of all different-than-human-animals and those who commit their lives to struggle against the borderless spectrum of human-inflicted violence against nonhuman animal individuals.

... And I am vegan

Maybe it's important to write things out freely - as fresh as they come from feeling to whatever ... Hand? I think that it is impossible to criticize somebody who is accustomed to having full-blown rights in our human and humanely ruled self-made self self society.

Free poetry. No use? At least there is a use in it being the real aberration from all that is felt as normal ... *Normality*: is it really calming you down, calming your feelings down to a perfect equilibrium with your time-peers: the human companions in your time. I have nothing in particular to say, haven't I?

No I do have something to say, but I can't explain it in a way that makes any sense in a common sense of making the sense. So, being logical in the normal terms, doesn't help me in any way in conveying what I would really want to say. If I am not important to anyone but myself ... in the sense of importance ... should I give up speaking out myself.

Even if it is only the rudiments of language that I can still use. I have nothing at hand. I know that. But what else do you have except you having some normal - and only in that sense relevant - stances. On what do your stances look! What is the outside that you are referring to? To me it is the same outside.

We have been swallowed up by sets, we (- as an entity in some questionable sense) have made ourselves. By those sets I don't mean me myself and I looking out, referring to something that I can sense is there. Senses - in which way would they matter to you? How do your senses combine with your stance? And where are you? How do you accommodate? Old questions that have all long been put into the human drawing room where we occasionally all meet: communicating in the restricted set way as we do now ... But ... The questions have been raised.

Have they ever been answered? All the questions that have raised the issues which we circle as a merry go round (what issues consider simply what is considered as "normality"). We still have to ask all those certain same old questions again, and again, and again. But who is

willing to still ask them. What questions? Who had raised what questions? You shouldn't ask. It's embarrassing that one does, no? Answers don't lie in reality? What reality? Who's reality? Who? What? It!

Shifting, the alphabetically quarreling

A friend, or rather not-friend (I haven't got many - I mean either way ...) had just accused me of being too much a sort of an illusionist outsider. Especially that would go for my special kind of emotionalist hatred that I feel for absolute animal haters, and what that hatred, *put into* reality, amounts to, ... actually.

So, anyway, I asked the friend, non-friend why he would put me in an antagonist situation only because the world would turn also against me. He diverted, saying that he felt I had accused him of being sexist, that he would not tolerate anyone calling him a sexist, because he would be no sexist. Actually he is one though. And he even is the worse version of them - I'd say. He is a sexist who does not admit it. And in fact another thing is, he is diverting things from issues that really are more urgent to be treated, by putting a stupid argument platform in the room.

There is no possibility of constructiveness in this, at all

He says he is equally interested in the same matters ... but if those matters were so important to him, as he claims them to be, for what reason does he put certain other matters into an unrelatable middle of an argumentation platform.

I tell you why. It is because he is more into certain matters than into anything else. The world would be a harmonious place with people like him, he suggests by arguing always in or with self-evidence. Having the normal sense, the calming ability of putting humanocentric matters in a self-circling form into focus, and not touching other grounds on relatively different levels.

But now I shall raise the question ... first of all, veganism *can* be something that is or would be normal. The possibilities lie in the present. Future? ... Me being a person with whom that friend could communicate or even work together for the case, doesn't matter to him, he finds the questions of mentalities (... due to sex or whatever) too important for himself.

Things have to be put into daylight somehow. Things concerning us vegans, anti-speciesists or however we may call or define ourselves. We have to make as much fuzz as all the other self-important self-admirers have been doing for millions of ages. And you know what. I've had enough of people telling me about animals rights and not even raising a finger for the whole thing when it gets difficult. I hate people who then, when things don't work so well, simply cut out the supposedly "dead" material by dismissing all that appears fruitless, not functioning. And you know why, because it is not the dead material that doesn't work. It is the majority that doesn't want to change their stances. And for that I am not guilty and it doesn't help cutting me out of your life. I'm positive, so why do you make me negative?

... globally relevant, again? Though not the major issue ...

And now what?

Yes, maybe I should give up fumbling in things that have been well settled by now. Maybe. But maybe I should also give up asking myself why humans behave in the way they do, and

why this natural behaviour changes from time to time. It all gives me a headache, as usual. Others seem to be comfortable with how things go within the finely woven net of human interaction. I am not happy neither nor anything else with it ... But output of any kind seems in my personal case so unwanted, because of the way of putting the question. Others are geniuses, but not because of their geniality - whatever that may or not be - but because of what they represent within the net.

Freedom of speech is put in itself ad absurdum, when freedom is not even the question in the aspects of communicating something at all ... which point is a form of communication seen as such ... ?

I can say something and whatever I wish to. But I can't find that it's at all understood, let alone the question of the each relevance for whom ... and why what has what relevance to whom (- "unnaturally", what would be natural? What serves as a model. How much has supposed arbitrariness in definition of terms, something to do with aspects of communication seen in different sets). Tooled restrictedness in communication, make me unfree in speech ... and in the end renders me stupid anyway. (Why not!) Language is an instrument in human society as a whole, and not so much a means of instant or direct communication. The instrument is an instrument for suppressing other philosophies in being.

AND NOW!

I DONT BELIEVE IN THE BIOLOGICAL ARGUMENT TO FURTHER SPECICISMFREE WITHIN THE ANIMALS' FREEDOMSDON'T IGNORE THE REALITY OF SENTIENT BEINGSFINALLY THROWN HUMAN CULT VALUES ALL OVERVEGETABLES - BUT AROUND YOU THEY ALL CAST THEIR EYES DOWN WHEN THEY PASS THE BLOOD-SHOPS, THE RESPONSIBLE BY SELLING MURDER FOR FOOD. (At least my point is made clear.)

I have to alter my anticipations. What a sentence. Adapting logics to language? Or vice versa? Never nothing to say ... No meaning ... Meaning to what extense. In which sense: Meaning.

All nothingness gets meaning if it *interferes*? Stuff even with the unpronouncable act of enforced meaninglessness.

It is a special "meaningless" word for him to say pork. What if I said ... human brain cooked ... it would lack the kind of "meaningless" relevance.

What makes irrelevance as it nowadays occurs so obscurely relevant - as an incidence. Elusion from the unjust act.

Le histoire macabre

The win results from a quality of victim produced? Piggy's not a drug. Decision is ergo sum? ... What tool is cogere ... and what is ... SENSERE.

I find that every anti-speciesist should speak out about anti-specieicism

It doesn't need intelligence to talk about experiences, perceptions one is making with the specieicist human beings' ideology. Why should I wait with starting to operate verbally on the issue. My head is exploding about the way the specieicists 'see' nonhuman animal individuals.

Should I wait until I'm able to draw up a coherent argumentation and then find out that the other side doesn't mind anyway. Meat eating in humans is necrophilia & vice verca. That doesn't need coherence, either.

Massmurder on the biological argument

When I speak about masses and when I speak about murder, wouldn't most people put doubt on a validity that these - and even more other terms - can be applied on animals, generally. The exclusion of the nonhuman animals' interests of almost all main 'discussion matters' is nothing new. (I don't really need to say that the anti-specieicist view and her opponents are inherently incompatible.) But even if I adapt the more appropriate terminology, which is by now on many levels given, for dealing with speciesism and defend animal rights issues and talk anti-spesisism in the very best informed way, most people still wouldn't find it necessary to listen, reconsider, etc....

On the other hand, to entirely disregard important terms that circle around in the debate, makes a discussion frequently and strangely enough stick on the commonplace humanocentrist perceptions and ideas ... (at best it lets the frustration about failing to raise the issue straightforward, accumulate as a sort of emotional heap that is neatly kept outside of any political sphere anyway) ... But I believe that has something to do not at least with sort of the personal commitment one gives the issue ...

In admiration of all different-than-human-animals and those who commit their lives to struggle against the borderless spectrum of human-inflicted violence against nonhuman animal individuals.

All the very best wishes to those have the honesty that doesn't understand itself in homocentrist terms.