

Received: 20 June 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/joph.v3i2.3096>

Introduction: Metahuman Futures Forum and Ontological Therapies

Jaime del Val¹ and Çağdaş Dedeoğlu²

This special issue is dedicated to the 1st Metahuman Futures Forum held in Lesvos on 1-2 October 2022, as part of the Bodynet-Khorós project co-funded by the European Union³ and contains part of the theoretical research of the project. The issue comprises a collection of seven papers, a book review, and the Metahuman Futures Manifesto, all of which contribute to the understanding of metahumanism and its relationship with posthumanism and transhumanism in the age of planetary holocaust.

In ‘Misunderstandings around Posthumanism. Lost in Translation?’ Evi Sampaniakou investigates the articles of the Metahuman Futures Manifesto, which was deliberated in Lesvos and subsequently approved by the forum’s assembly with minor modifications. Philipp Wolf’s article, ‘Antinatalism, Hannah Arendt’s Natality and a Metahuman *vita contemplativa*’ focuses on antinatalism, examining its implications. In ‘Animals: Who Gave You the Right to Experiment with My Body?’, Ioanna - Maria Stamati tackles the subject of animal rights in relation to the emerging industry of growing organs for exotransplantation. The issue also includes two papers that delve into aesthetic considerations. While Nikolitsa Gourgouli’s ‘Mutation in human nature and immortality’ explores the figure of the doll as a trope for challenging the human form, Ipek Kuran’s ‘The Dynamics of Posthuman Architecture’ investigates means of revirtualizing the actual through posthuman architecture. Both present offer thought-provoking insights. Moreover, Yunus Tuncel’s commentary engages with the provocation paper published by Jaime del Val (2022), titled ‘Trash-Human Unhancement and Planetary Health’, in an earlier issue of the Journal of Posthumanism. In this excellent selection of works, we have also included a book review in Spanish. Victoria Mateos de Manuel’s review of *El desencanto del Progreso. Para unacríticaluddita de la tecnología* by Andoni Alonso and Iñaki Arzoiz. Overall, this special issue provides a diverse range of scholarly contributions that critically engage with the concepts and discussions raised during the Metahuman Futures Forum.

Ontological Therapies for “humanity”

In this editorial, we also seek to introduce on a novel approach called ‘Ontological Therapies,’ which serves as a performative critique and anti-method. The purpose of Ontological Therapies is to challenge the fundamental ontological “fallacies” and beliefs associated with human supremacism, which have, for the most part, remained unexamined even within critical circles.⁴ This approach has

¹ Reverso Transdisciplinary Association and Metabody Institute for Liveable Futures.

E-mail: jaimedelval@metabody.eu

² Çağdaş Dedeoğlu, General Studies, Yorkville University, 2000 Steeles Avenue West, Concord, ON, L4K4N1, Canada.

E-mail: cdedeoglu@yorkvilleu.ca

³ For details, see <http://www.bodynet-khoros.eu/>

⁴ For details: <https://metabody.eu/ontological-therapies-hst/>



been actively employed in various instances throughout the previous year, particularly in conjunction with the Bodynet-Khorós project and the Metahuman Futures Forum. It is worth noting that most of these sessions were deliberately left unrecorded, allowing participants to freely express themselves. However, exceptions were made for recorded sessions of the Metahuman Futures Forum, both in its online format and during the gathering in Lesbos.

Reactions from participants

1. The claim for a clear performative staging that affords a ‘safe space’.
2. Guts reactions, especially in reaction to antinatalism or to radical veganism and the denunciation of the planetary holocaust and of the right to “occupy” the Earth, reactions which seem to express the still prevailing and mostly unquestioned supremacism in colleagues from posthumanist, queer, vegan or other circles.

This has led Jaime del Val to define the notion of *arché-taboos*: the primordial taboos on which human supremacism is grounded, far deeper than those dealt with by psychoanalysis, which are already part of supremacism. The foundational notions of human supremacy and human right to own the earth, to multiply and to dominate are dogmatic assumptions that seem impossible to question: *arché-taboos*.

It led also to an analysis of thresholds of tolerance with human supremacism, whereby for some critical colleagues things seem to be pretty fine and only cosmetic measures are needed: For instance in some discussions in Lesbos it appeared that while agreeing that we don’t have the right to occupy the Earth the way we do, the population occupation of the Earth in European territory we considered to be ok by some participants, the problem, if anything was elsewhere.

This resistance to recognise that the enemy is within all of us is a typical resistance to therapy (analogous to the resistance to psycho-analytical therapy), leading participants to think that the problem is always elsewhere, even if this has colonialist, Eurocentric or racist implications, besides being wrong.

As part of this resistance to therapy from European academics a questioning of cultural differences was raised. And, while there are cultural and contextual differences what the therapies claim is that all forms of sedentary occupation, dominion and multiplication happening since the Neolithic are problematic. Of course, a poor farmer in India does not have the same responsibility as Elon Musk, or other leaders and billionaires with their private jets... but everyone shares responsibility across degrees of a spectrum: from leaders, through agents, to population rich and poor. Agents will be those marketing, data, banking or other businesses and workers that are fanatically promoting the Extinction system without leading it.

We have also analysed the way the taboos raised by the therapies are entirely missing from social movements or the arts, including Extinction rebellion or similar movements. This may also be the reason for the missing intersectionality of most movements (for instance, the historical fragmentation between queer and environmental movements, as if the problems tackled by both had not the same roots). The focus on human individual rights as if these were separable from the rights of all life forms (and in conflict with these) is an underlying problem. As the Planetary Health or One Health discourses already propose, there is no human life, freedom, and dignity without a biodiverse and healthy planet.

It is expected that the therapy performances will evolve through various performances:



1. More detailed therapy sessions and methodologies focusing on investigating each person's Human Supremacist habits, ideas, beliefs, negationisms, contradictions, resistances, contributions to the Extinction and Planetary holocaust, etc.
2. The more explicit performative staging of the Trial Against Humanity as background for the therapy, linked to the actual signing of the Human Supremacy resign form and to the experiential therapy and the monitoring of the disalignments.⁵
3. Human supremacy test will be put in practice in further workshops in the MFF and long-term residencies at Reverso Centre.⁶
4. Report and policy making to be developed as art of the Bodynet-Khorós project and the Liveable Futures Initiative.⁷ This includes the need to abolish all exploitation of life on earth as condition for the future viability of human life, as well as stopping to promote natality and human occupation of the earth, promoting (and financing) instead queer and transspecies kinships, taking care of our nonhuman kin which we exploit, liberating it from the concentration camps called farms, inversely it includes the promotion of techniques of the Body for liveable futures. Farming, as the origin of the systemic problem, of sedentarism and overpopulation, is a core strategic point.
5. Actual Lawsuit being prepared by Jaime del Val with a group of Spanish Lawyers for the European Court of Human Rights against 33 states for not taking measures against farming as the most destructive industry created by humans that most severely threatens the future of human life. The alternatives being (as claimed in Del Val, 2022) in a complex transition that challenges both human overpopulation (via voluntary suspension of reproduction) and sedentary occupation of the earth (including agriculture), towards a renewal of gatherer cultures, aiming at a similar population as that which the sapiens had for 99% of its history: 1 million... moving with the flows of the Earth.⁸

What is ontological therapy?⁹

Ontology is the theory of being, concerning with the questions of what the world is and what we are. Ontological therapies are, on the one hand, a dismantling of false beliefs about what the world is and what we are based on a human supremacism that leads us to extinction: the belief that the human being is distinguished by something that makes him superior and that justifies a generalized domination, and an unlimited multiplication of the species. It is about dismantling and reversing an original inversion of values and perceptions that emerged with the systems of domination and

⁵ For details, see <https://metabody.eu/extinction-performance/>.

⁶ Human supremacy resign form and monitoring forms are available at <https://metabody.eu/ontological-therapies-hst/>. More information about the Reverso Centre can be found at <https://metabody.eu/centre/>

⁷ For details, see <https://metabody.eu/liveable-future/>

⁸ For details, see www.holocausto-planetario.org.

⁹ For details, see <https://metabody.eu/ontological-therapies-hst/>. The ontological therapies, test, form and monitoring table are an evolution of proposals Jaime del Val made around 2011 in the 15M/Indignados/Occupy movements under the Mutant Bitch assembly and their ontological strikes, see <https://metabody.eu/es/10-aniversario-15m/>, www.reverso.org/texts/15-Modulos-Zorras-Mutantes-15M.pdf, www.reverso.org/texts/DelVal-2015-15-metaprogramas--Metabody-Journal.pdf, and <https://madrid.tomalaplaza.net/2012/07/25/madrid-mayo-2012-zorras-mutantes-desplazadas/>.

multiplication in recent millennia. It is about dismantling the fallacy of being itself: of reality as made of bounded fixed entities.

On the other, they consist in creating new ways of thinking and living completely different from the legacies of human supremacism, reinventing, and opening up the atrophied perception towards a reality of pure becoming: a process of indeterminate relational co-emergence and transformation.

The double movement of ontotherapy aims to dismantle supremacist fallacies of domination and multiplication that lead us to extinction and mutate towards a new non-reductive, symbiotic, mutant, and open sensitivity.

Ontological Therapies are an ironic but serious reversal of other kinds of therapies (whether psychoanalytic, genetic, or other) which are about aligning oneself with the “Extinction System”: the set of systems of domination and “civilization” emerging over the past 10 millennia unleashing a mass extinction. Ontological therapy is a novel, experimental, philosophical-artistic “therapy” of disalignment for all “humanity” and for a metahumanity to come.

As different from the issues addressed in the Adorno Fascism Scale of personality of the Voight-Kampf Replicant Test in *Blade Runner*, we believe that human supremacy is rooted in all beings that think of themselves as human, the idea of humanity itself being an assumption of human supremacism. It is the belief in the distinctness and superiority of the human underlying our current toxic and devastating way of living and overpopulation, and the assumption that we have the right to multiply and occupy the Earth in the current devastating manner, while assuming implicitly the inevitability and desirability of current civilization and the inferiority of “Nature.”

The following questionnaire aims at testing and detecting the levels of human supremacy in humans and searching for alternative ontologies. Within this backdrop, we would like to use ontological therapy questionnaire as a way of self-reflection on our relationship with the planet and its habitants.

Ontological therapy questionnaire - Human supremacy test

1. Do you think you are human?

1.1. If yes, why? If no, why, and would you define yourself otherwise?

JV: No. I don't believe in the category human nor its supremacy dogmas but am aware that still partake in some of them though disaligning. metahumans are all symbiotic life forms. I consider the concept of “human” is an unnecessary ontological chimera whose only purpose is dominion, so is the concept of species: because species are ongoing processes of mutation, defined by their relations to other species, co-constituting the relational fields of ecosystems.

CD: Yes and No (see the explanation below, including the responses to the following sub-questions)

1.2. Do you think the human as singular species exists? Do you think “Humanity” exists other than as a supremacist belief, construct, and concept, and its associated way of living, earth-occupation, domination, and multiplication?

JV: No.



1.2.1. If yes, is it one or multiple, changing, or unchanging, separated from or related to other species?

JV: Multiple and changing and related.

1.2.2. If yes, do you think it is special and or superior to other life forms?

JV: No.

1.2.2.1. If yes, what makes it special/superior?

1.2.2.2. Do you believe in the validity of the concept of species? Why, or why not?

JV: No, species are processes of symbiotic mutations, species as distinct is a supremacist fallacy.

1.2.3. Have we ever been human (or cyborgs)?

JV: No, unless as belief and mode of dominant living. The cyborg is a trope for dominion: the atrophied body that extends technically in homogenous and quantitative way, dominating. Cyborgs are those who believe in, and partake in, a tendency to technical dominion, whose unrecognised telos is extinction. We have never been cyborgs, nor humans, unless as belief and way of living based on dominion.

1.2.4. (Why) is posthumanism still too humanist?

JV: Because it still assumes some boundaries and belief in technical control.

2. Do you see a threat of self-extinction? And of mass extinction?

JV: Yes, to both.

CD: Yes (see the explanation below, including the responses to the following sub-questions)

2.1. Is it a problem if humans get extinct?

JV: Not as great as 9 million species getting extinct.

Would this improve all others 8.7 million species' lives?

JV: Yes.

2.2.2. What about if 75% or 86% or more of the 8.7 million species get extinct because of current human way of living and overpopulation?

JV: Much worse.

2.3. If the human, or humanity, is only a supremacist belief, construct and concept, associated to a way of living, maybe the extinction of the human means the extinction of a concept, a belief and a way of living, mutating towards other modes?

JV: Yes.

2.4. Do you think extinction is unavoidable?

JV: No.

2.4.1. Or do you think human supremacy will “save us”?

JV: No.

2.5. How long do you think the situation can last before we get extinct?

JV: A few decades.

3. Do you think humans have the implicit right to multiply?

JV: No. we need to give account of our outrageous multiplication over the past 10 millennia.

CD: Yes. Every species beyond the human realm possesses the right to reproduce. However, the regulations surrounding the exercise of this right have traditionally been framed within a human-centred perspective and under the concept of nation-state sovereignty. Consequently, our inquiries should be focused on challenging the underlying assumptions regarding both the nature of the human and the principles of sovereignty.

3.1. If yes, why, and what to do with overpopulation?

CD: As has been articulated by many, attributing climate change or other global challenges solely to overpopulation is misleading. The emphasis on overpopulation detracts from the actual underlying causes, such as (post)colonial exploitation and warfare, while also providing a rationale for population control measures that disproportionately impact specific groups.

3.1.1. If not, should one embrace antinatalism and suspend voluntarily human reproduction to avoid extinction?

JV: Yes.

CD: Abstaining from reproduction is also a manifestation of the right to offspring, applicable to any species. The key inquiry here pertains to whether certain humans should intervene in the reproductive rights of other humans, particularly when such intervention aims to uphold the right to life of other animals (e.g., wolves) for the sake of ecological equilibrium. Is it ethically acceptable to apply such measures to non-human animals but not to humans? Or should the opposite be true?

3.2. What do you think of trans-species families as alternative to heteronormative multiplication?

JV: An option.

CD: Everyone should possess the right to form a trans-species family.

3.2.1. And of queer families as alternative to heteronormative multiplication?

JV: An option.



CD: Sure.

3.3. Do you believe in gender categories?

JV: No.

CD: Although I personally do not hold these beliefs, I am aware of their tangible social, economic, political, and ecological consequences. In my personal life, I actively seize opportunities to challenge and refute these beliefs, aiming to transcend traditional roles such as those of a man, husband, or father.

3.3.1. What do you think is their purpose? Do you think they have a purpose besides categorising bodies as mandatory reproductive entities in a system of multiplication by which we became the plague?

JV: No.

CD: I believe that the function of gender categories extends beyond reproductive purposes alone. These categories, along with the associated roles, serve to uphold societal control and order at various levels, including the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

3.3.2. Do you think you are man/woman, or would you consider rejecting these categories as non-binary body?

JV: I am neither.

CD: While I am open to considering various perspectives, I do not believe that is the central issue at hand. The key challenge lies in persuading individuals who derive satisfaction from their privileges within patriarchal structures established by humankind. We should ask what strategies could emerge to address this challenge in the current posthuman era.

4. Do you think humans have the right to occupy the earth with urbanisation, agriculture, transport, etc?

JV: No.

CD: No.

4.1. What effect do you think this occupation has on other life forms?

JV: Devastating.

CD: The current form of occupation has devastating effects on all life forms, more on the vulnerable ones.

4.2. Are you aware of the current 6th Mass Extinction and its relation to climate change, pandemics, etc?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes, the links are well documented by researchers.

4.3. Can this process go elsewhere than to extinction?

JV: No.

CD: With enough attention to all life forms, yes.

4.4. Do you think there is no other way to live?

JV: No.

CD: No.

4.5. What alternatives do you think exist or have existed, if any, to the current way of multiplying, occupying the earth and enslaving other species and humans, considering for instance gatherer cultures, animals, and evolution at large?

JV: We were living better and otherwise for 99% of our history.

CD: Permaculture, the slow food movement, and the prosumer economic model are notable examples. Drawing inspiration from indigenous philosophies can also provide valuable insights in developing principles that reject practices of proliferation, exploitation, and subjugation.

4.6. Transhuman is Trash-human? Technological singularity is an Extinction singularity?

JV: Yes, to both.

CD: Yes, if we conceive of the term “trash-human” as encompassing humans who contribute to both the squandering of life through excessive extraction for the production of specific technologies and the generation of copious amounts of waste due to their technologically mediated lifestyles.

4.7. Do you think agriculture, industrialisation and digitalisation are inevitable, without alternatives? Or that they are desirable in any way?

JV: No.

CD: They are not inevitable if a critical mass of individuals actively pursues other alternatives.

4.8. The superiority of weeds for a Metahuman R/evolution? Revival of Gatherer cultures?

JV: Yes, to both.

CD: Yes, and I refer to this phenomenon as the “persistence of the state of emergency”. It denotes an enduring state of emergence against nature that has persisted for thousands of years.

5. Do you think the human has the right to enslave and kill other species?

JV: No.

CD: Enslavement is unacceptable in any circumstance. And, I do not view killing as a right. However, there may be situations where killing is deemed necessary.



5.1. If yes, why?

5.1.1. Do you think it is a “natural law”?

JV: No.

CD: The response to this question hinges upon the underlying assumption about “natural law” that we adopt. If we align with Cicero (and the subsequent scholastic tradition) and consider the essence or existence as the source of natural law, then each individual necessitates a just society in order to fully exercise their natural law. Conversely, if we follow the Hobbesian tradition and posit power as the source of natural law, wherein the powerful have a right to enjoy their “natural law”, then regulations are required to curb the excessive exploitation of this right. Consequently, the enslavement of species ought to be prohibited, and stricter regulations should be implemented regarding the killing of such species.

5.1.2. If yes, do you really think such a planetary systemic slavery and killing ever existed before?

JV: No.

CD: No.

5.2. Do you think enslaving and killing humans is ok?

JV: No.

CD: No.

5.2.1. And enslaving and killing pets?

JV: No.

CD: No.

5.2.2. And enslaving and killing pigs in farms, considering they are as sentient and intelligent as dogs?

JV: No.

CD: No. I also believe it is important to question the act of killing trees and other plants.

5.3. Are you aware that many people claim companion species as their family and that legal rights equal to human are starting to be marginally obtained for them?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes.

5.4. Do you think there is a difference between killing a human and killing a member of the non-human family of a human, for instance a dog?

JV: No.

CD: No.

5.5. Do you think there is a difference between killing the non-human dog family of your dearest friend and killing pigs in a farm? If so, why?

JV: No.

CD: For me, there is no difference because I do not have any personal connection with either the dog or the pig. However, it is conceivable that the dog's family may perceive a difference between the two.

5.6. Are you aware that around 100 billion sentient beings are currently in concentration camps called farms?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes, however, I was not aware of the precise number.

5.7. Are you aware that farming is the most contaminating industry in the world consuming 80% of global agriculture and its associated land abuse, deforestation, zoonosis, and pandemic outbreaks, etc?

JV: Yes.

CD: I do not have an informed opinion on this.

5.8. Are you aware that going vegan is the most significant single habit change anyone can do for approaching measures against climate change, pandemics, etc?

JV: Yes.

CD: I do not know much about the scientific evidence on this causality.

5.9. Are you aware that for every human there are nowadays approx. 10 sentient beings enslaved and exterminated every year in concentration camps called farms?

JV: Yes.

CD: Not for every human, but for every rich carnivore human.

5.10. Are you aware that every single human person consuming animal products is directly financing the slavery, radical mistreat and assassination of approximately 10 non-humans per year, i.e. 500 to 1000 in a lifetime?

JV: Yes.

CD: Again, not every human, but the ones who buy those animal products produced in the animal farms.

5.11. What if pets or humans were in the place of enslaved animals in farms, would you still support farming?

JV: No.

CD: I do not need this comparison to be against animal farming.



5.12. Do you think such a radical speciesist and supremacist divide is tenable from a social justice position or from posthumanist/queer/decolonial/antiablist or other positions claiming justice, freedom and plurality?

JV: No.

CD: No.

5.13. Should one criminalise farms and all animal use as well as all, non-vegan products, production, distribution, and consumption? If not, why?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes.

5.13.1. Towards a vegan planet?

JV: Yes.

CD: Why not.

5.14. Learning from non-humans? Dogs, weeds, goats, cats, ants, spiders, beetles, birds, mice, salamanders, doats, insect swarms... Their superior body intelligence and non-verbal communication, graceful movement, capacity to live without depending on toxic systems, ethics, perception, co-sensing, etc.?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes.

6. Do you think agency, intelligence, ethics, politics, and freedom are exclusive of humans and of rationality?

JV: No.

CD: When it comes to agency and intelligence, the answer is a resounding “No”. It is crucial to shift our comprehension of ethics, politics, and freedom to perceive these qualities beyond the confines of the human domain. Developing a framework that embraces the ethics and politics of the body can serve as an initial step towards this goal.

6.1. Or inversely do you think the human is the only species incapable of freedom?

JV: No.

CD: No.

6.2. Do you think animals have agency, intelligence, ethics, politics, and freedom?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes.

And plants, protists, fungi, bacteria, viruses, molecules, or matter flows?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes.

6.3. Do you think categorisation and verbality are unavoidable features of the sapiens?

JV: No.

CD: I believe the human brain tends to simplify things to make them more easily understandable. However, the more we simplify the complex nature of life, the more challenging it becomes to address it in a fair and comprehensive manner. It is important to recognize that simplification and categorization are influenced by subjective evaluations and perspectives.

6.4. Do you think the world is made of bounded beings and things in relation to whom change is an accident? Or could this be a fallacy of supremacism that tries to paralyse the underlying processes of becoming?

JV: No, I do not think the world is made of bounded beings and things in relation to whom change is an accident. And yes, this could be a fallacy of supremacism.

CD: My answer is “No” to the former and “Yes” to the latter.

7. How do you think we have reached the point of being so dependent on planetary scale systems that are collapsing the planet while making us controllable?

CD: If we define planetary-scale systems as encompassing ecological and technological processes interconnected on a global level, I would begin by examining utilitarian calculations, profit-seeking motives, and the presence of ignorance as influential factors.

7.1. Do you know of any other species that is incapable of living without these dependencies?

JV: No.

CD: Every species exists with ecological dependencies, but humans also create technological dependencies.

7.2. Is this not a sign of our radical inferiority?

JV: Yes.

CD: I believe it could be problematic to view dependencies, including technological ones, as signs of inferiority. This is because certain dependencies may not be a matter of choice but rather a necessity. For instance, individuals with disabilities may rely on various technologies for their well-being and inclusion.

7.3. Are you aware that not long ago we were able to live otherwise, for most of the existence of the sapiens for 300,000 years?

JV: Yes.

CD: What does it mean ‘to live otherwise’?



7.4. Do you think industrialised digital societies offer experientially rich ways of living, or a desert of the real?

JV: No.

CD: Neither of them.

7.5. Is this a sound or a toxic way of living, for us?

JV: Toxic.

CD: I cannot speak for others, but from my perspective, the type of living we experience is becoming increasingly toxic with each passing day.

7.6. And for the planet and its 8.7 million species?

JV: Toxic.

CD: Obviously.

7.7. Why do you think non-humans have the capacity to live in more sustainable ways?

JV: They move and sense.

CD: Yes, because they do not have the same drive to prioritize profit over sustainability, unlike humans. Furthermore, governments and corporations often steer individuals away from alternative understandings of sustainability and instead promote the development of specific capacities aligned with their own agendas (Dedeoğlu & Zampaki, 2023).

7.8. How/when did we lose the embodied capacities that all non-humans still have, to live without the systems that are collapsing the planet?

JV: Since 3 million years ago and more since 10,000.

CD: I suspect that humans have never possessed such capabilities.

7.9. Why do you think we live in a culture that despises the body, movement, the senses and becoming?

JV: It is an offspring of sedentary dominion.

CD: The post-industrialist society presents a distinct dilemma concerning mobility. On one hand, it has rendered many individuals more sedentary and immobile, while on the other hand, it has given rise to a new class of highly mobile individuals known as the “delivery class”. This phenomenon recalls the two distinct classes portrayed in E.H. Wells’ novel *The Time Machine*, namely the ‘Eloi’ and the ‘Morlocks’. The wealthy but sterile groups may be compared to the impoverished but resilient groups in the future.

7.10. Do you think agriculture improved or worsened life conditions? And industrialisation? And digitisation?

JV: Worsened.

CD: While human life conditions have improved, it has come at the expense of worsening the conditions for other species. According to my earlier definition of self-extinction, this cannot be considered a true improvement for humans either.

8. Do you think human life and health should be extended and improved at whatever cost, even if this search for immortality implies a mass extinction and a species suicide?

JV: No.

CD: No.

8.1. How many of our illnesses do you think stem from the way of living we have created?

JV: Most.

CD: I do not know, but I can list a few of them from personal experience.

8.2. Is the search for longevity and 'enhancement' legitimate or a fascist elitist eugenics fantasy of the rich that happens at the expense of the radical suffering of most beings, unleashing a mass extinction?

JV: The latter.

CD: A costly fantasy.

9. Where are the limits to individual freedom?

JV: In the freedom of others.

CD: In the freedom of all species.

9.1. If they are in the freedom of others, who are these others? Humans only? All animals? All life forms? Molecules and matter flows?

JV: All life forms, molecules and matter flows.

CD: All life forms.

9.2. What is needed for Planetary Health to be sustained?

JV: Biodiversity, and the freedom of all life forms.

CD: A planetary approach to health.

9.3. If this implies biodiversity, what are the complex conditions in which biodiversity has flourished on Earth for 4 billion years, unlike in any other planet that we know of?

JV: Complex flows that we block.

CD: Autopoiesis and sympoiesis.

9.4. Openness and variation in flows may have something to do with it?

JV: Yes.



CD: Yes.

9.5. Can one separate organic and inorganic?

JV: No.

CD: No.

9.6. Determining flows, can it lead elsewhere than a mass extinction?

JV: No.

CD: If our genuine concern lies with the river, rather than seeking to control it, we can allow it to find alternative routes and flow naturally.

9.7. The will to determine and control in humans, where does it come from?

JV: From its own sensorimotor atrophy, which evolved into a self-enclosure in fears and paranoias, and a dependence on technical systems, in a loop of increasing alienation, unfolding gradually since bipeds found themselves in the savannah and exponentially since the rise of farming.

CD: I would suggest that the source of this inclination could be attributed to the interplay between fear and wonder. When fear surpasses wonder, our desire to control things becomes more pronounced.

9.8. Could it come from its own atrophy/unhancement, to having lost the capacity to move with the world's flows?

JV: Yes.

CD: I would also associate atrophy and the loss of capacity with fear.

10. Do you still want to stay hooked to the illusion of the Matrix, the illusion that everything is fine more or less, or would you dare to assume the desert of the real we have created?

JV: No.

CD: I have never been that optimistic, content person.

10.1. Do you take the red or the blue pill? (We know this sounds so binary, but still think about it)

JV: I took the red one long ago without even noticing.

CD: Which pill represents the illusion of the illusion?

10.2. Are you willing to question your own human supremacy and change the ways of living?

JV: Yes.

CD: Yes, always.

10.3. Or to take on small palliative measures?

JV: No.

CD: Never enough.

10.4. Or do you prefer to ignore the situation?

JV: No.

CD: Never.

10.5. Would you envision to undertake a gradual disalignment?

JV: Yes.

CD: Already started.

Q1 - CD: I think of myself as being human in a similar manner that a dog is dog, or a tree is tree. However, I am not solely a human, and my humanness is not extraordinary, just as a dog's dogness is not exclusively defining. Consequently, I reject the prevailing, limited, and exclusive definition of what it means to be human, as it is used to justify the mistreatment, exploitation, and slaughter of beings beyond the human realm. Terms such as posthuman and metahuman seem to offer more inclusive alternatives for conceptualizing humanness in a relational context. Nonetheless, it is necessary to replace these terms with a designation that is equally applicable to all organisms, perhaps extending to all forms of matter. The terminology should eventually eliminate the use of "human" or "man". Haraway's self-identification as "compost", which transcends the binary categorization of human and non-human, may have merit. At present, I embrace the concept of posthuman to acknowledge both the intricacy of life and the aspects of being human that surpass our traditional boundaries. Lastly, I am certain that it is crucial to form a collective front against the colonization of Earth and its habitats by transhumanist ideologies, with the aim of safeguarding the interests of all citizens.

"Human" is a term derived from the Latin word "Homo" (man). The conventional understanding of the human is based on the 18th century classification system developed by Linnaeus, where species displaying similar physical attributes, such as bipedal locomotion. Linnaeus was among the first to classify humans within the broader animal kingdom as *Homo sapiens* (wise man). However, this system of physical traits is now recognized as having limitations, and the use of DNA evidence has emerged as an alternative basis for species classification. According to DNA evidence, humans are primates with an approximate 98.8% similarity to chimpanzees.

Moreover, the scientific perception of *Homo neanderthalensis* as inferior to *Homo sapiens* has been challenged by recent discoveries of Neanderthal DNA. This indicates that there is no fixed or distinct notion of 'human' in the extensive evolutionary history of Earth. Humans are a species that has undergone continuous change over millions of years, and they are interconnected with other species in multiple dimensions, including biology, ecology, culture, and more. In a sense, humans have always existed as posthumans.

Given this context, the question of whether humans are superior to other species can be viewed as context-dependent as well. For example, no human can match the speed of a cheetah, making the cheetah superior in terms of speed. However, humans have developed some technologies, such as



vehicles, that surpass the speed of cheetahs, complicating the notion of superiority. I believe a more significant question revolves around value rather than superiority. Are humans more valuable than other species? While the scientific response to this question is “No”, a subjective answer depends on the specific context. For instance, throughout the extensive history of settler-colonialism, a cowboy placed more value on his horse than on a Native American. However, from the perspective of a Native American, a river might hold equal or even greater value than a human being.

The evolutionary-biological perspective should not be the sole consideration; it should be complemented by a political-economic viewpoint as well. It is crucial to acknowledge that the Linnaeus classification system mentioned earlier is not only anthropocentric but also carries a patriarchal bias. Linnaeus himself made statements that reflected patriarchal norms regarding women’s roles within societal structures (Ferrando, 2019). This reveals that, even though humans have always existed as posthumans, this perspective has never been widely embraced. The posthuman condition has always been mediated by power relations.

Additionally, the technologies employed by humans have undergone their own evolution. Humans have always existed as posthumans in the sense that they have been intertwined with technologies that extend beyond the human realm. However, the experience and outcomes of being entangled with external technologies, such as stone knives, differ from those of internal technologies, like computer-controlled prostheses. This implies that the posthuman condition itself has been subject to evolution. In its recent trajectory, there appears to be a trend towards cyborgization (and one could argue, using a network-based perspective, that humans have always been cyborgs to some extent).

Considering human evolution within this extensive historical trajectory, it becomes crucial to explore the possibilities and risks associated with cyborgization. I believe that this is the most pressing question that we, as posthumans and metahumans, need to address. Failing to do so will accelerate the self-extinction process on Earth.

Q2 - CD: In discussing self-extinction, it is essential to contemplate the concept of “self” to which self-extinction refers. The documented sixth mass extinction is unequivocally attributed to human activities. However, the concept of “humanity” typically excludes consideration of other animals as part of its “self”. By embracing an indigenous notion of subjectivity, we can expand our understanding of “self” beyond humans. From a relational ontological perspective, it can be argued that self-extinction has already commenced.

Furthermore, the term “human-induced” should not overshadow the fact that the activities driving extinction intersect with colonialism. In this regard, the forms of domination exercised by humans over both humans and non-humans are interconnected. Additionally, the indigenous perspective mentioned above urges us to contemplate crimes committed against the more-than-human, surpassing the boundaries of a human-centred understanding of agency, responsibility, and the legal systems rooted in property rights. Reevaluating and adapting national and international legal frameworks may serve as one of the approaches to halt, or at least mitigate, the ongoing extinction crisis.

References

Dedeoğlu, Ç., & Zampaki, N. (2023). Posthumanism for sustainability: A scoping review. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 3(1), 33-57. <https://doi.org/10.33182/joph.v3i1.2761>

Del Val, J. (2022). Trash-human unenhancement and planetary health: Undoing the planetary holocaust by reinventing movement and the body: A Manifesto for cosmic response-ability and the future of life. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 2(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.33182/joph.v2i1.1876>

Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.



Co-funded by
the European Union

