



## **THE INDEPENDENCE OF VALUE AND MEANING**

Gita Yegane Arani, *veganswines*, 16<sup>th</sup> August 2007.

As what regards humans, I am *allowed* to hold my own views. As what regards nonhuman animals: somebody else is gonna tell me.

I am done with having others rule my view on the world. The world is not simply existent to be put into the *definitions* of ethicists, scientists, economists, politicians, or whomsoever.

Being part of the universe means being in a "place" of astonishment, a place for admiration, most of all: a place for respect towards all existence.

I am done with people making me watch their self-centred impacts on the course of history. I'm choosing my own *perspective*.

## THE PARALLEL as a theoretical pattern of thinking

A *homo-sapiens-centric* human considers himself to be in a parallel position to the other natural phenomena. Nature is felt as if merely producing itself out of an almost passive condition, nature is seen as a huge complex of *causality and determinism*.

The subsumation "**nature**", in the concept of typical humancentric thinking, is understood as something *passive*, even where nature has been banned into *non-existence*, while the idea of "the human" is thought to **exclusively** represent a comprehensive awareness of what means *presence per se*.

\*\*\*

There is an imaginary parallel condition, and on one hand you have the so-called passive "natural world" and on the other hand you have the so called "aware" human state of being.

That means in other words: that what is external to the human state of being, is being localized in the dimension of *standing-in-opposition*, in some specific type of way. This type of way is most easily to be compared with the parallel: THE PARALLEL STANDS IN *RELATION* BUT WITHOUT *CONNECTION*.

\*\*\*

A parallel, which represents an ideal circumstance for measuring the one side against "the other" in a ratio of a fixed relation, seen from the perspective of denying the *existence* of "the others" by classifying everything except the "self-concept" as "*being relatively narrow in function*".

That what is "other", is practically not simple enough to be fitted into the simplicity of the system of *homo-sapiens-centricity*. The reality of Animals and the Nature is by far too complex.

This also means, a highly complex form is subjugated to being translated into the simplifying procedure of *scientific proof*, to then be considered as a bit more important on its side of the parallel.

The complexity of "nature" remains on its side of the parallel, and cannot jump the line, but can increase in meaning alone by its being existent in the *same dimension* as where the "human being" is ... *the shared habitat*.

The separation which the parallel relation creates, stands in dependence to the understanding of "self" (the self-concept), since nothing else instead can banish the one immediate reality, that threatens to run into the acts of definition and deduction, as readily as the arbitrary wilfulness of "the self".

The *real* would thus end up dissolving the homo-sapiens-central tendency for active determinism ... .

**PORTRAIT OF A COW ON THE TOP OF THE PAGE BY  
COURTESY OF FARANGIS.DE**

© paddling of the ducks 2007