



A nonhuman-inclusive critique of the view on aesthetics and speciesism on the current Animal Rights and Animal Liberation movements (fragment)

The Animal Rights discussion ends here:

- The *missing discussion* of **specifics of nonhuman oppression**, in its exact manifestations as humiliation, degradation, negation, violence is currently a hinderance of further development in the political efficacy of the “Animal Rights movement”.
- The discussion is omitted in sectors that deal with
 - interrelated oppressive systems > how is it to be specifically “food” e.g.
 - with Animal Liberation, which takes biologism uncriticized (as if not posing a problem with nonhumans, only for humans) > the entire layer of theories are not “liberated”
 - in the Human-Animal-Studies sector which so far seems to a.) separate between the quality of human versus nonhuman oppression and b.) does not contextualize with environmental ethics due to a seperative focus on nonhuman animals and humans > academic adherence creates insufficient epistemologies

- Contextualizing animality within *the broadest possible fields* seems to be necessary, in order to create an **adequacy in perspective** on sociological, ecological, philosophical e.g. parameters and qualifiers of the nonhuman situation as faced with speciesist oppression.

Specifics of oppression in speciesism: I am taking **aesthetics** as this is the most overlooked field of problem within the Animal Rights movement considering the powerfulness aesthetics hold in human societies and the specifics of speciesism and *aesthetics as an oppressive tool*.

- Aesthetics in arts is one way in which animal degradation takes form. In which ways does this occur?
- The exact '*speciality*' of speciesist and/or nonhuman derogative aesthetics can be observed.
- What makes up aesthetics in its cultural function overall. The central roles have to be considered which wilfulness (Willkür), taste/preference (Geschmack, Präferenz), mode (Machart), subjectiveness play.

Nonhuman-inclusiveness

- **“Thinking experiences” (Denkerfahrungen) of nonhumanity** must be taken into account > multiplication with the perspectives of nonhuman others on the basis of e.g. the shared fact of **individual existence and individuality** – leaving difference and don't require sameness (this is my posulation), yet locate “life” in “one world” (...).
- *If we exclude nonhumanness again from all possibilities of angles of narration and narrative, we keep on repeating and perpetuating the initial species-denouncing act.*