

Animal Knowledge

Palang LY

It's astonishing, why are we willing to accept that the burden of proof lies with the nonhuman animals and their allies, to make clear *who* they are, when a human-centred society doesn't even have the will and ability to see the full spectrum. Why do we, their allies, bow in to human methods of research on things that can't be proven and that don't have to be proven?



© 2008, FARANGIS YEGANE

Their individual life's dignity does not need to be proven; it needs to be acknowledged, without restrictive conditions.

What the AR community should learn is to claim the rights, the foundation of dignity, the freedom that really lies outside of paradigms that were (and are) installed to quite contrarily draw lines as aggressive borders.

We tie our human standards and insights on a.) language and b.) on our specific capacity to utilize nature, and we see both these things as *qualifiers* that are intertwined: Language plus the capacity to utilize nature as a resource!

It never occurs to us that other beings could have a more sustainable and clearly wise concept of how to live on planet earth, that their ancestral relation over millions of years has given them insight on how to interact in other ways with nature and their natural environment.

We would deny that, because we don't accept that nonhumans have *concepts*. We think concepts can only occur with certain qualifiers ... , and we think that nature couldn't have possibly taught nonhuman animal ancestors things they *decidedly* built their cultures on.

We think nonhuman animals don't decide these things.

I could go on, but my point is that we as AR people err so bad, because we don't want to take the stance that would make us jump in the cold water of radical new perspectives in terms of: de-humanfocusing and thus deconstructing sources we refer to as basis of knowledge about life.

We keep putting new wine into old bottles when we don't come up with a new architecture of basic knowledge.