

"Animal Rights and Collateral Management Structures

Since the time of Aristotle and the Stoics, the entelechy is considered to be the right of every living species and they all deserve our respect.

Something similar appears in the *Conatus* by Spinoza the idea of the animal rights is formed by Montagne and Rousseau.

The need for respect towards the non human beings, was mostly developed since 1993 and after Taylor, Mathews and O' Neill.

In a philosophical level however, all the former set the matter through a clear anthropocentric conception, since the very nature observation is translated into a typical human idiom.

Nowadays there are some extremely important new data. On the one hand genetists (and in fact the neo-darwinists) place the human being in a general developmental classification while the view of the "selfish gene" treats man, like all the rest living beings, as a more or less successful vehicle of the dominant genetic material. On the other hand, the neuroscientists place emphasis on the neuronal complexity of a brain from the human to a widely interactive grid of concepts of different of living entities, placed in a surrounding world. Researchers like Zeki and Ntinopoulos, challenge even the highly efficient structure of the human body or, at least his ability to exploit the incoming perceptual data, something that many animals can.

All the above things show the need for redefining what a human is, by exceeding the human-centered theory. Here we need to face a current contradiction: the living world that surrounds the human observer is unavoidable observed by a human brain, which raises the request to be dealt with, objectively or at least intersubjectively. In other words, contradicts the emerging of the world without the need of an observer, to the sole observer's obligation to react appraisingly and morally.

At this point, on the one hand we can see the need to set the principles of a convention on which the intersubjectivity will be based, and on the other hand the emerging of a relative conception regarding the morality (as it has been discussed at the beginning on the 20th century), as the only one that can apply the moral obligation is the man. In order to avoid the problem, Brennan's observation that we often confuse the terms "nature" and "culture" is extremely useful.

It is typical that we talk about animal welfare culture or about recycling culture etc. While, the meaning of nature, can be described from the models that are used in the CERN reactor, to an idyllic landscape presentation. However the laws that govern our relationship with the animals is in fact product of a culture, of a superficial part of each *Zeitgeist*. This happens, in Wölfflin's words, because we see the nature through the prism of our civilization, which many times is distorting.

The same morality, after passing through the Kantian and the utilitarian simplifications, seems to have lost most of its connection with the political philosophy. We should examine of course the kind of nature we have this time of period.

The point of view of the big-urban receptors has banned the meaning of the "natural" in the depths of the well-designed documentaries, while "the window to the world" from the Renaissance has been totally substituted by visual simulacra that are becoming more and more convincing, resulting to the complete confusion and inability to distinguish between the real and the virtual.

Arne Naess (Deep Ecology) or Freya Mathews (Ecofeminism) type of concerns have no longer any meaning, since the anthropological standards from which they have derived, have already been erased from the simulating standards of the new massive cartoon heroes.

The different monetarisms get almost completely detached from the political philosophies,

from which they should normally derive from, as applied economic systems. In fact, in our days the financial theories are not at all scientific, but they manage to be turned into new ideologies (for example the opinion attack of Friedman against the Keynes model). Since everything must be "used" in the most effective way, we have a fast track reaction to the available nature and the available animals, productive or not.

Now it is very important to restore Lyotard's assumption that human laws cannot affect the animals, since they exist beyond any human establishment. Even more that the distortion of our living conditions have resulted to the distortion of their ontogenetic and phylogenetic data. Typical examples are the abnormal city strays, the abnormal birds in the landfills, but also the abnormal panda in the Chinese tourist observation parks.

Since it is necessary, some laws must undertake the administrative part of our relationship with the rest of our biological partners, in our postmodern world we often thought, that, since the individual cultures are our glasses that forbid us to negotiate with nature per se, we could at last exceed our individual legal systems and trust the supernatant collateral management structures. For example, the European Law, the EU directives, or the permanent Euro-American Conciliation Committees.

But, in an end, just because the financial theories have turned into ideological flags, we have ended into a increasing malfunction of the collateral management mechanisms that were supposed to regulate the relations among the different cultures.

On the other hand this malfunction seems to complicate the situation, by creating and even blurrier Zeitgeist, while the quality of democracy is becoming even worse. In all these mechanisms, our biological partners are outside these institutionalizations, but they experience them, and they are victimized in the worse possible way, while the relative morality end up into *condicio sine qua non* and Nature (which exists without any observer) becomes useless, since, all the living beings are treated like *res*(things) and not as subjects. We clarify of course this widely accepted influence opinion of Peter Singer that we mustn't ask if the animals can think or if the animals can communicate with each other(of course they can), but if the animals suffer. Because, only under the prism of this question, rises the need for rejecting the relative morality, and the need for substituting it with conditions of consistent reference.

In an end, the more we allow the degradation of the managing mechanisms for leveling the cultural differences, the brutal use of our biological partners and the destruction of the real Reality (meaning, the remaining nature beyond the simulations), the happier and inadvertently we will discover that we ourselves are outside the institutionalization mechanisms that we not only force to the animals but also to ourselves"