

Animals: Who Gave You the Right to Experiment with My Body?

Ioanna – Maria Stamati¹

Abstract

The Science Fiction genre has been a means for humans to comprehend reality. A major part of the fantasies in the genre is cross-species beings of human and animal DNA. Recent studies show that in some countries the legislative framework accepts research and experimentation with guinea pigs to create cross-species beings with transhumanistic purposes. According to Bokota the umbrella term to refer to the results of the above phenomenon is Chimeras. The results of this technological process are unquestionably impressive but, who has gotten permission from these animals to use their bodies and take their genetic material for the possibility of humans to survive a bit longer than expected? This study focuses on the definition of the human, the monster, and their bodies, on bio-ethical issues that highlight the fragile equality of beings and answers to the question of whether Chimeras can be an alternative term to refer to Posthumans.

Keywords: *Animals; Chimera; Posthuman; Organ Farming Phenomenon; Life*

Introduction

The Science Fiction genre “often predicts or prepares the future, canceling out the word impossible” (Sampanikou, 2002, 438). For the reader to fully understand the above sentence, this paper will draw on the theoretical framework given by Pierre Lévy in his work “*Becoming Virtual, Reality in the Digital Age*”. With the constructive framework of Gilles Deleuze as the basis of his thinking structure, Lévy defines the real and the possible as two different ways of “Being” and rejects the illusion that the possible is not real now, but is possible in a future time (Lévy, 2001, 22; Deleuze, 1994, 168-182). The virtual, on the other hand, holds the sense of creation, as something innovative is realized at the time one is having the idea, usually as a new solution to a hypothetical problem. The virtual can be a sense of a new functionality to an object, a new idea to a problem, or a new morphological and genetically living being, thus a new species. And yet, at the moment one thinks of this functionality, the virtual becomes possible. However, the functionality becomes actual when one implements the idea (Lévy, 2001, 22-24).

The above theoretical framework implies the limitations of the human mind but also, the need, the curiosity and the fear of gaining the motive for expansion of humanity's control of the planet (Del Val, 2022, 5). Drawing from this theory, this study will try to explore humanity's limitations and ethics of the organ pharming phenomenon with the use of new creatures. Furthermore, it is believed that this exploration has a Posthuman identity due to its challenging open subject of study. Del Val highlights that humans live in an already given Transhuman (Trash-human) culture (Del Val, 2022).

¹ Ioanna-Maria Stamati, Joint Postgraduate Program in Semiotics, Culture and Communication, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. E-mail: joannamarystamatis12@gmail.com.



Specifically, I will navigate through bioethics on the matter of the study to see if the expansion of this culture has an anthropocentric effect on the Paradigm view. Moreover, if the answer is positive, I will see alternative ideological approaches.

In the modern academic community, the word Posthuman is the key term for redefining the concept of human (Ferrando, 2013, 26). Within the Posthumanist world, several different movements are distinguished. Transhumanism is a movement within the Posthumanistic spectrum to describe the need and willingness of humans to become enhanced through technology with the goal of expanding the quality and quantity of the health and life span (Sorgner, 2021, 1). Metahumanism, on the other hand, adapts to the main qualities of Critical Posthumanism and “affirms the transformative power of technology but in a direction opposite to Transhumanism” (Del Val, 2021a, 4). Jaime Del Val is one of the main supporters of Metahumanism and expresses its goal of a renewed philosophy of becoming, of indeterminism and pluralism, of change as a never-ending mutation without the exclusion of death (Del Val, 2022, 6). In their own words, “Metahumanism is difficult to define as it works against the metaphysical tradition of being, through emergent concepts and embodied practices that are promising to enact a thinking of the body and in motion [...] (Metahumanism) proposes the shift from performance to metaformance, from content to frame, from form/structure to movement, emphasizing becoming as something not subjected to form, always relational and always incipient, always bodily and in motion, with a critical-creative grasp of technologies and the possibility to ontohack and reinvent them” (Del Val, 2021a, 3-4).

The possibility of ontohacking technologies and reinventing them accordingly to a certain identity aligns with the theoretical framework of this paper and is one of the main attributes of rethinking the differences in the definitions of beings. There are many ways to draw a line between humans, part-humans and non-humans through speech, language and image (Jakobson, 1959, 232-239), but this paper focuses on monsters too. Graham points out the meaning behind the word, as errors of nature (Graham, 2021, 186).

If, however, the human species developed through technology, in such a way that it becomes one with nature and not dominant in nature, it is likely to display such image and abilities (Graham, 2021, 188). The above sentence uses two times the word such, as an attempt to describe an outcome, an image of a monster as closely related to a human form, this image may differ in the minds of people. However, the Science Fiction genre in the audio-visual world has brought some of these images to life. A great example is the American television series *Teen Wolf*, in which the main characters have different supernatural structures. Specifically, they are based on real multicultural folklore of animals². The result is different formations of humans with elements from different animals, like wolf, fox, jaguar, scorpion etc. However, *Teen Wolf* is not the only audio-visual text to show supernatural creatures with enhanced abilities. Such examples can be found in *The Vampire Diaries* television series and *Twilight* (vampires and werewolves), *Siren* (creatures of the sea), *Ben Ten* (controlling morphosis of a man with Alien options through a watch) and the list goes on, but their image is human-like, and they live a daily humane life (Evans & Pettet, 2018, 68).

In recent years, there is a growing wave of pop culture, a supernatural genre that has passed through our screens in various forms and has normalised the image of the supernatural to the point that some people seek to be supernatural in more ways than most people can imagine (Dispenza, 2017). From couples that drink each other’s blood (Kirkpatrick, 2022) and identify as vampires

² This is a research project that is yet to be published due to the complex multicultural approach.



(Shepherd, 2019) to the belief in real-life werewolves due to historical gaps (Rheinheimer, 2008, 281-294), the supernatural genre has changed the gaze of the value of human life.

Can our imagination become reality though? In this paper, I will try to navigate through some ethical questions about the creation of chimeras, beings of human and animal DNA, for the solid purpose of the organ farming phenomenon. Should scientists proceed with creating chimeras and kill them days after they are born due to a complex legislative framework? Do we have to create this form of life at all? Is it too late to ask the previous question because they already exist?

The following section “*Humans & Monsters*” is an attempt to explain the complex situation of today’s reality on the matter and I believe connects the meaning of the words, “human” and “monster”, after the restoration of the perspective of human as an already chimeric being. The section “*Techno-Cultural Cruelty*” makes an effort to show, through study cases, the cruelty that humans and animals have been through because of the strive for the expansion of the life and health span of humans.

Humans & monsters

There is a promising field of research, which is at an embryony stage in the academic community. The creation of chimeras and hybrids with the specific combination of man and animal (Sorgner, 2021, 34), for the purpose of human evolution, as it is understood, implies that the human species will not remain in this form or will disappear the next millions of years (Hayles, 2021, 172-173; Sorgner, 2021, 34-35). Bokota, to highlight the difference between the Chimera and the Hybrid in a legal context, gives many examples from countries such as Japan, the U.S.A., Canada, Germany, Switzerland, Spain and Britain, who accepted cross-species research to an extent for purposes such as the possible growth of the organ farming phenomenon (Bokota, 2021, 107-111), among others. Chimera is an organism that “contains cells, tissues, genes or even organs and body parts of another organism, while a Hybrid is the result of impregnating the egg of one species with sperm from another species” (Bokota, 2021, 102-103). The Chimera term has differences in its definition in several fields. Specifically, in Genetics “the chimeras are hybrid products between multiple parent sequences, which can be falsely interpreted as new organisms, thereby inflating the apparent diversity”. In embryology, the chimera is one organism “consisting of two or more genetically different cell types”. In transplantation, the word chimerism is used to describe the presence of hematopoietic elements from a donor (allogeneic or xenogeneic) to a recipient (Bokota, 2021: 105; Sherringham, 2008, 767-768). Furthermore, in the Posthumanism and the Transhumanism movements, there is an extended discussion on the “mutation of man, who will remain just a brain and the body will be a machine” (Ellul, 2012, 417). Ellul likens this state to a transplant, placing it in the Chimera category (Ellul, 2012, 417). Sorgner, however, does not focus so much on the etymology and the definition, as on mixing any technique with other species (Sorgner, 2021, 34-36). On the other hand, Bokota makes it clear that hybrids are not so difficult to define despite the multimodal mixing of two or more species (Bokota. 2021, 104-105).

It should also be noted that the hybrid, beyond the human-animal mixing, holds part of the human identity for a long time. Specifically, Hammer indicates that the human 40,000 years ago lived alongside various forms of relatives, such as Neanderthals, *Homo floresiensis* etc. He emphasizes how recent studies of the modern and ancient DNA show the mixture of the people of Africa – the ancestors of *Homo sapiens* – with archaic people during periods of big migrations. This intersection helped *Homo Sapiens* to thrive (Hammer, 2013, 66-71). Hammer’s findings are aligned with Margulis’s life-long work of symbiogenesis as an evolutionary process (Margulis, 2010, 1525-1539). Nevertheless, in today’s common world the word evolution has lost its meaning as for the most

part it refers to becoming better or having an easier life through technology. An idea that is disturbingly associated with Transhumanism and is highly false, because of the new set of problems each technological solution creates, not only for the human but for the planet. Del Val calls out this systematic tendency as a culture of atrophied bodies (Del Val, 2022, 6-7).

The discussion of the intersections within the human as species seems to have had a universal role in the 18th and 19th centuries, as Crawford considers unfounded the suspicions of infertility and physical weakness of people with parents from different countries, such as the English and the French or the Spanish and the Chinese etc. Through the flourishing of culture and increasing examples of demographics, such as the above, he highlighted the empowerment that human hybrids possess, but he shows inferiority to other animals and singles out the human as a superior being (Crawford, 1865, 356-362).

The last belief that many still hold to this day, despite the transition to Postmodernism, can be transformed if one can look with detail at a myth Transhumanism is based on: Plato's Prometheus and Epimetheus (Franssen, 2017: 27-29, 41). In summary, Plato describes how Prometheus participated in the upbringing of humans. After the Olympian gods formed mortal beings from earth and fire, they appointed Prometheus and his brother Epimetheus to equip them with powers, abilities, and attributes. However, Epimetheus begged his brother to enhance the mortal beings by himself. However, he mismanaged the number of powers and qualities and ended up using them all in the equine animals. As a result, nothing was left for humans. To solve the problem, Prometheus stole fire, wisdom, practical arts, and technologies so humanity can have an equal chance to survive (Plato, 1956, 18-20; Franssen, 2017, 29; Stiegler, 1998, 187-188).

Firstly, for the reader to understand the scope of the myth as an influence on the Transhumanist world, it is necessary to refer to the book "*Life 3.0*", where Mark Tegmark calls the potential Artificial Intelligence (AI) of his hypothesis by the name of Prometheus (Tegmark, 2018). A focus that is made in several studies of the myth is on the name of Prometheus, which symbolizes the control of man and how by his act he perfects man in his likeness, that is, in general his partial deification (Franssen, 2017, 29, 31-32). His gifts are not for humanity's survival but are "a way to control the world with knowledge, science and technology" (Franssen, 2017, 29). This point of view leads the way of thinking on the Transhumanist movement and is part of its definition (Franssen, 2017, 42; Vita-More, 2021, 55-56). However, the studies of Bernard Stiegler and Ihab Hassan stand out from other approaches. Specifically, the latter, perhaps, is the only one who underlines with a moral eye that Prometheus, despite the meaning of his name, meaning prescient (Stiegler, 1998, 197), he is a thief (Hassan, 1977, 847). Stiegler, moreover, underlines Rousseau's point of view, that there is no initial weakness in man, he simply has not reached his end³ (Stiegler, 1998, 114-115).

Some Transhumanists may oppose the characterization of cross-species beings as problematic and argue that this is a way to be again one with nature. This paper makes it necessary to highlight in the above myth that the purpose of the process of properly equipping beings was the equality of chances to survive. The wrong process brought the Promethean note of fire and along with it the results of human development, which destroys all ecosystems (Marchesini, 2021, 2). Moreover, in a world where every human is trying to have self-control and rights of their own body by society, who has gotten permission from these animals to use their bodies and take their genetic material for the possibility of humans to survive a bit longer than expected?

³Aristotle's definition of end is reaching the goal of existence.



Furthermore, the questions about the rights are not limited to the animals but also, to other aspects of Chimeras. Degrazia mentions this in his work, along with other objections in the ‘Protection of the Endangered Human: Towards an International Treaty Prohibiting Cloning and Inheritable Alterations’ (Annas, Andrews & Isasi, 2002), where the authors emphasize that such possibility is “a crime against humanity in a unique way, as they may change the very essence of humanity” (Annas et al., 2002, 153; Degrazia, 2007, 313). Through Degrazia’s analysis, it seems that there is no clear definition for humanity, because anyone who objects uses human dignity as an argument or idea that men have the supreme moral status and any mixture with another species, will result in its oblivion (Degrazia, 2007, 309-315; Hauskeller, 2009, 99). The above lines circle back to the meaning of humanity and the lengths of action the species has taken to achieve the unachievable, survival. Some humans may fear death but are willing to experience this step of the circle of life, nonetheless, most of them are aware that after a few years no one will remember them as individuals who lived on earth. The limit of the species Paradigm is the oblivion of the species and its lifestyle culture as a unity. However, as Degrazia concludes it is highly implausible that a new species will “somehow damage the ‘essence of humanity’ – whatever that means exactly” (Degrazia, 2007, 313).

Beyond the subjective self-identification of each being which may differ, but socially is accepted as a human, Hauskeller, finds the root of the never-ending debate – due to mainly perspectivism and lack of education- of what it means to be a human. Specifically, he highlights the difficulty of distinguishing the descriptive meaning and the perspective of the word human (Hauskeller, 2009, 98). Furthermore, he narrows down the analysis of his question “what makes us human” to the differentiation of human genes from human-mouse chimeras. Are they partly human? An intriguing part of Hauskeller’s analysis is the reference to the Scottish Council’s warning on Human Bioethics, “if an entity is accepted as being created by human and non-human beings, then their entire identity and right to human rights and dignity could be challenged” (Hauskeller, 2009, 99). Again, with the last statement one can see the fear of humans to have equal rights with all the other living entities and not identify themselves as having the supreme moral status. One may think that this fear comes from the realization of previous actions concerning the health status of the environment etc. and how every other entity—old and new—feels about it.

Outside of the academic field and into the field of arts, specifically, in the audiovisual industry there is the question of curiosity. In 2021, Netflix due to the promotion of the *Sweet Tooth* series, which is structured with a human hybrid narrative, trusted Micheal Krivicka and his team to create a prank video on the streets of Los Angeles with a feathery animatronic hybrid baby to get people’s reaction, which was rather positive in the video (Netflix, 2021; Spry, 2021). Krivicka among other things said “We captured a lot of interesting characters, as you can see in the video, and most people really believed that it was a real creature that was alive [...] It took a total of three days to shoot the entire video. It was an interesting experiment to see who would [people] accept this creature and who would be upset or worried or even threatened” (Spry, 2021). The platform that published the above interview on Facebook, had 253 reactions, 68 comments and 51 shares. Some of the comments, without spreading any hate, have a critical point, questioning the video’s authenticity and people’s reactions to it, because they were much nicer than anticipated (SYFY, 2021). This is an example that is clearly linked with the theoretical framework of the paper concerning the limits of possibilities and virtualities and with the new field of human-animal chimeras. The prank video and the talk around it, is the evidence of how much or to what degree society plays with the idea of human-animal chimeras. This is also an indicator of how science fiction can prepare societies for a paradigm shift.

Techno-cultural cruelty

Hoffe infers how human beings are at the stage of struggling for recognition, with results “such as envy, jealousy, resentment, revenge but also forgiveness, sympathy or empathy, compassion, sorrow, and shame... From the anthropological view, there are two ways in which morality exists for human beings: intelligence and openness to the world” (Hoffe, 2013, 45).

Non-human animals, on the other hand, don't have that struggle because they didn't have a chance to fight for their rights, feelings etc. Animal abuse is not narrowed down to only just the creation of hybrid-chimeras. It's crucial to understand the length of abuse through examples not just for the life being created in the case of chimeras and hybrids, but for a far bigger picture. The section of Del Val's provocation paper of the MFF 2022 (Del Val, 2022) entitled 'Trash-human Enhancement and Planetary Health' highlights the main reasons for the ill state of the earth. Animal farming is essentially enslavement, exploitation, immobilization and generally a mass abuse towards the animals, just for the elite of humankind to enjoy nutritional privileges (Del Val, 2022, 12-16). Eberly has a more insightful perspective on the spectrum of informational communication concerning pig farms and, in her work, she corrects the term with “industrial animal factories”. She describes the real policies of care in the factories with the phrase: “they are treated as unfeeling cogs in a machine, subjected to unimaginable cruelty in the service of getting them to market as quickly and inexpensively as possible” (Eberly, 2019, 303). The anthropocentric view of the above practices is more than evident, however, the capitalist basis of humans even in unprivileged environments has shown uneducated choices based on marketing and economic games of the privileged (McMullen, 2015, 126-134), even when there are alternative methods of consumption. A fair example would be “clean meat”, which is identical to traditional meat (Le, 2018, 31-32).

For the paper, it is necessary to highlight a historic reference, so that the reader can understand the extent of cruelty guinea pigs⁴ also, go through. In 1926, Ilja Ivanov was the first to go beyond theoretical considerations and travel to Africa for the main purpose of finding female apes and inseminating them with male human semen. The funding for the trip and for the experiments was from the Soviet government and the Academy of Science of the USSR, who didn't find his purpose unethical in any way or form. The Academy of Science of the USSR stopped supporting him after it turned out that the second scale of his research was the insemination of African women with monkey semen, without their knowledge or consent. At last, he found the funding he needed for the journey and the experimentation, but his attempt was unsuccessful because the apes did not survive the journey (Kozhevnikova, 2016).

The above examples bring so many questions about the rights of animals and their future. Through these examples, it is realized that the main core of minimizing the rights of animals is the barriers to communication. One of the main purposes of this paper is to highlight the creation of hybrids and chimeras for the organ farming phenomenon, and one can only look through the ethics of today's reality to understand the injustice done to animals, if one can only think that the transplantation process is possible only in brain-dead cases and with permission from the involved humans. For animal to human organ transplantation cases, the most recent success was the case of David Bennett Sr. in January 2022. The transplant was a pig heart, but the patient died after 61 days, because the heart took longer than necessary to generate a beat (Dockser Marcus, 2022).

⁴ Animals for experimentation purposes.



Following the normative upbringing of human generations as superior to other animals, it is understood how the animal's point of view is not a priority. However, Sutherland argues also of humans undermining other humans until today. Black Americans until recently, were considered animals who faced scrutiny and died by amputation or/and lynching. Their parts were held by their killers and the crowd as a form of souvenir. Furthermore, Henrietta Lack's example can attest to the contemporary success of cruelty. Lacks died of cervical cancer, in October of 1951, at John Hopkins Hospital. "Lack's cells were used, without permission or informed consent, to create an immortal commercial cell line" with the brand name, HeLa cells, the commercial use of which continues today in contemporary biomedical research (Sutherland, 2017, 35-36).

The above examples of cruelty to both human and non-human animals, are raising concerns about the speed in solving problems, like the creation of Chimeras for organ farming, without thinking about the consequences. The sense of self is a perspectival paradigm, which may be blurring the limits if one has empathy and proprioception with the world. The latter two elements are the basis for connecting and reforming each being through a potential transformation of how we sense and move (Del Val, 2021b, 57-59). The concept of chimeras within this framework is not in the best interests of animals and the human care has already failed them. Again, all this just for the faint chance of saving a number of human patients every year without thinking of any alternatives and not educating the perception of death as welcome outcome (Shaw et al., 2015, 973) or more friendly to soul philosophies because atrophic stability for the human race can be translated as dignity in the Western/Elitist world. Metahumanism is maybe ready to welcome Chimeras and Hybrids as beings with equality, thus, their rights are like those of every other being and not for the solid purpose of enhancing Transhumanist purposes. This paper proposes that it is time to pause our questions for Chimeras and start to ask how to reach successful communications with other species. Maybe when we have the solid permission, we can reverse our aim to the creation of Chimeras for transplantation purposes (Wang et al., 2022, 1), if any other alternative possibility is a dead end.

Del Val's provocation paper which was discussed thoroughly at the 1st Metahuman Futures Forum has solutions to several problems this planet faces that are out of most humans' paradigmatic limits and this is the primary reason why this study is focusing on the missing permission of animals for going with on the outrageous ride of humans experimenting with their bodies for an enhanced atrophied human existence (Del Val, 2022). The permission itself is an anthropocentric structure, however, it can work also, as a psychological game. If one sets the goal of getting solid permission from animals, through ways I will discuss later, they will accidentally change the paradigmatic sense of self in a pluralistic world. Hence, they will activate the connection of their proprioception and kinesthetics with the world. After this transitional period, humans may really understand through metaformative technics a new reality and break many or all—depending on the psychological shock—anthropocentric structures. In this part of my analysis, I want to assure of my agreement with Haraway's Companion Species Manifesto and to quote a part of her statement: "contrary to lots of dangerous and unethical projection in the Western world that makes domestic canines into furry children, dogs are not about oneself. Indeed, that is the beauty of dogs. They are not a projection, nor the realization of an intention, nor the telos of anything. They are dogs" (Haraway, 2003, 11). I am fully aware that for a high percentage of people this paragraph is illogical, yet I am also aware that the trials for a successful animal to human organ transplant surgical procedure and rehabilitation of chimeric people (after surgery) will not stop due to anthropocentric structures like Capitalism. Transhumanism thrives on the Capitalist front and will want to keep using technology in ways that they believe are not harmful to nature, but some of their arguments are implausible. Thus, when

someone finds the way to understand animals for getting such permission, one will shift the paradigmatic reality of humans to a post-anthropocentric manner of communicating.

Many will ask, how will an animal ever communicate successfully with a human in order to give such permission for experimentation?

In 1963, Thomas Sebeok introduced the term Zoo Semiotics to the world. In his own words, Zoo Semiotics “is proposed for the discipline, within which the science of signs intersects with ethology, devoted to the scientific study of signaling behavior in and across animal species” (Sebeok, 1963, 465). According to Dash and Bhattacharyya, the Animal Communications system (ANICOMs) or Zoo semiotics in the academic field, have many mysteries to answer for the human parties (Dash & Bhattacharyya, 2017, 32-39). However, there is another communication medium with some living beings (other species) that might be the key to show the path and open communications for non-human and human animals.

This communication medium can be found in the science of forensic botany. In simple words, the management of a crime is the process of ensuring accurate and effective collection and preservation of physical evidence. Forensic botany can provide significant supporting evidence during criminal investigations. A plant through its DNA and plant material can «see» a crime scene. Plant evidence can be useful to determine whether a death is due to an accident, suicide, or homicide or what time of year a burial may have taken place, how long a body was buried in a certain place, if there was a reburial process and many more (Aquila et al., 2014, 820). This paper does not aim to explain a forensic botanist’s methodological process to get the results of the above examples. Nonetheless, if the communication of two different species, in this case, human and plant, can happen like computers exchanging data or due to psychological processes of both species, the human is already in the right direction.

Specifically, Ciobanu and Juhlin have already established a care framework for human and non-human interactions based on but exceeding at the same time the human-centered ideology of human-computer interactions (HCI) in human-plant communications (Ciobanu & Juhlin, 2022). If one can build a framework based on this ideology, a methodology can also be set for human-animal interactions with the goal of eco-friendly and Metahuman based—thus, pluralistic—symbiosis.

Finally, it is understood that cross-species research will not stop, because the curiosity and fear of the human mind for death and how one can escape it, but also, have a better life is far greater than any other warning. As humans with different ethical restrictions from different cultural backgrounds the reasonable goal to achieve is to find common grounds on how to move forward. Memory is not going to be erased and neither should researchers kill these living beings. We, also, can’t go back to the time when these chimeras didn’t exist, because humanity has to face or embrace the consequences of actions. The action of creating chimeras can create a reaction that with a certain attitude can balance or unbalance nature even more. Drawing from the theoretical framework one last time, one idea can create infinite possibilities, yet, humans need to start changing their paradigmatic limits to achieve the number of possibilities holding a sustainable future (Marchesini, 2022, 115).

Conclusion

At the beginning of this paper, I argued through study cases and examples that the Science Fiction genre can prepare the human for paradigm shifts. The basis of this argument was established by drawing from the theoretical framework of Pierre Lévy. Specifically, from the power the terms real,



possible, virtual and actual hold in perspectivism. Drawing from the possibilities these words hold, the analysis of this study became real.

Dystopian environments are multiplied on every screen with a strong supernatural element in its narrativity that has devalued life. Dystopia is the suffering reality. The term dystopia has the sense of cruelty for every entity experiencing it. In this reality, the experimentation of animals with the goal of creating human-animal chimeras is possible and real. This study was conducted to explore the idea of human-animal chimeras and the perspectivist approach of becoming a Metahuman framework. Within this frame, this paper highlighted that the complete definition of a species as a Paradigm has started its journey to fluidity. How can one possibly recognize what is a human, what is a monster and what is a non-verbal animal? The differentiations that make the terms people live today are not that different if one can look from another perspective. The point of view to experience these definitions is depending on the species. A 1940s Nazi will always consider Hebrews as humans, or will they always be animals? Is a Nazi a human or a monster? Is a chimera a new form of life that has done nothing wrong yet, or is it a monster? Are human Nazis the real monsters for Chimeras? Chimeras of human and animal DNA seem a far-fetched scenario of a low-budget Hollywood film, however, in many countries there are guinea pigs of this kind that live only for a certain period due to legalities. What wrongs did they commit to get the death penalty? Is it possible that some humans are yet again afraid of another species and that due to this fear the need for domination has emerged?

With my leave after the end of the 1st Metahuman Futures Forum, I realized that Del Val's provocation paper, what I have come to understand later as a call to discuss, precisely analyzed the main problems of our reality. Furthermore, the suggested solutions are not only out of most people's comfort zones but out of their paradigm's limits. Del Val's term, Planetary Holocaust, enhances a pessimistic view about our reality, and the holocaust of a kind, even when made by tools, like chimeras, enhances the reality of the term. The real purpose of this paper is to prepare the author and the reader for a paradigm shift, through the exploration of ethics on such subject. Metahumanism, at the end of this shift, is believed to hold stability for all animals—including humans—and plants, through the constant becoming. In other words, we will not use language with differentiations, like the use of human and animal to have a pluralistic nature. These issues will not bother us, as we forward to a new becoming. Other matters of discussion will surely be on display throughout the nature of our existence, but pluralism would be given. This is one of the reasons why I have played with the idea of expanding the anthropocentric techno-culture in nature with the concept of permission from animals for experimentation. This was a means for the reader to understand the dead end of the atrophied technological expansion of our reality.

Acknowledgements

I am sincerely grateful to Dr. Evi Sampanikou, Dr. Anna Markopoulou, and Jaime Del Val, for their encouragement, and insightful discussions that have greatly influenced and shaped the development of my thoughts. Their expertise and guidance have been instrumental in enriching my understanding of the subject matter. I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, which have greatly enhanced the quality of the paper. Last but not least, my mother for her unwavering support, even when unfamiliar with what I am talking about half of the time.

References

- Annas, G., Andrews, L., & Isasi, R. (2002). Protecting the endangered human: Toward an international treaty prohibiting cloning and inheritable alterations. *American Journal of Law and Medicine*, 28(2-3), 151-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S009885880001162X>
- Aquila, I., Ausania, F., Di Nunzio, C., Serra, A., Boca, S., Capelli, A., Magni, P., & Ricci, P. (2014). The role of forensic botany in crime scene investigation: Case report and review of literature. *Journal of forensic sciences*, 59(3), 820-824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/15564029.12401>
- Bokota, S. (2021). Defining human-animal chimeras and hybrids: A comparison of legal systems and natural sciences. *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 11(1-2), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ebce-2021-0001>
- Ciobanu, P., & Juhlin, O. (2022). Forms of care in human–nature–technology environments. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 2(3), 249-266. <https://doi.org/10.33182/joph.v2i3.1728>
- Crawford, J. (1865). On the supposed infecundity of human hybrids or crosses. *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, 3, 365-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3014171>
- Dash, N. S. & Bhattacharyya, A. (2017). The Animal Communication System (ANICOMs): Some interesting observations. *International Journal of Communication*, 27(2), 7-47.
- Degrazia, D. (2007). Human-animal chimeras: Human dignity, moral status, and species prejudice. *Wiley*, 38(2-3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9973.2007.00476.x>
- Del Val, J. (2021a). The dances of becoming and the Metahumanist Manifesto. Its genealogy, evolution and relevance 10 years after. In E. D. Sampanikou & J. Stasienko (Eds.), *Posthuman studies reader. Core readings on transhumanism, posthumanism and metabumanism* (pp. 299-304). Schwabe Verlag.
- Del Val, J. (2021b). The body is infinite/ body intelligence: Ontohacking sex-species and the bi r/evolution in the algoricene. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 1(1), 53-72. <https://doi.org/10.33182/jp.v1i1.1447>
- Del Val, J. (2022). Trash-human unhancement 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>
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Columbia University Press.
- Dispenza, J. (2017). *Becoming supernatural: How common people are doing the uncommon*. Hay House Inc.
- Dockser, M. A. (2022, October 31). Pig's heart took longer to generate a beat in transplant patient. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/pigs-heart-took-longer-to-generate-a-beat-in-transplant-patient-11667206801>
- Eberly, K. (2019). Establishing and enforcing a right to truthful information about pig farming in a fake news era. *Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law*, 34(2), 291-312. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26915648>
- Ellul, J. (2012) *The technological system*. Wipf & Stock.
- Evans, T. & Pettet, M. (2018). The magical is political: Deconstructing the gendered supernatural in Teen Wolf. *Fantastika Journal*, 2(1). <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/186725>
- Ferrando, F. (2013). Posthumanism, transhumanism, antihumanism, metahumanism, and new materialisms: Differences and relations. *Existenz: An International Journal in Philosophy, Religion, Politics, and the Arts*, 8 (2), 26-32. <https://existenz.us/volumes/Vol.8-2Ferrando.pdf>
- Franssen, T. (2017) Prometheus redivivus: The mythological roots of transhumanism. In E. D. Sampanikou (Ed.) *Audiovisual Posthumanism* (pp. 27-49). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Graham, E. (2021). The promise of monsters. In E. D. Sampanikou & J. Stasienko (Eds.), *Posthuman Studies Reader: Core readings on Transhumanism, Posthumanism and Metabumanism* (pp. 175-182). Schwabe Verlag.
- Hammer, M. F. (2013). Human hybrids. *Scientific American*, 308(5), 66-71. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sex-with-other-human-species-might-have-been-secret-homo-sapiens/>
- Haraway, D. (2003). *The companion species manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Hassan, I. (1977). Prometheus as performer: toward a posthumanist culture? *The Georgia Review*, 31(4), 830-850. <https://www.jstor.org/publisher/usggarev>
- Hauskeller, M. (2009). Making sense of what we are: a mythological approach to human nature. *Philosophy*, 84(327), 95-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0031819109000059>



- Hayles, N. K. (2021) What does it mean to be posthuman?. In E. D. Sampanikou & J. Stasienco (Eds.), *Posthuman studies reader: Core readings on transhumanism, posthumanism and metabumanism* (pp. 161-166). Schwabe Verlag.
- Hoffe, O. (2013). Homo sapiens, animal morabile: A sketch of a philosophical moral anthropology. *Evolution and the Future: Anthropology, Ethics, Religion*, 5, 35-48.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 232- 239). Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674731615.c18>
- Kirkpatrick, E. (2022, April 27). *Megan Fox confirms she and Machine Gun Kelly do “Drink each other’s blood” but only for “Ritual purposes”*. Vanity Fair. <https://www.vanityfair.com/style/2022/04/megan-fox-machine-gun-kelly-blood-drinking-ritual-purposes-only-glamour-uk>
- Kozhevnikova, M. (2016). Human-animal hybrids and chimeras in science history and today. *The Journal of the Polish Ethnological Society and the Committee of Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Vol. C*, 4-28.
- Le, B. (2018). Cleaning our hands of dirty factory farming: The future of meat production is almost here. *Australian Quarterly*, 89(4), 30–35. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26529681>
- Lévy, P. (2001). *Becoming virtual: reality in the digital age*. Plenum Trade.
- Marchesini, R. (2021). *The virus paradigm*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marchesini, R. (2022). Zoomimesis: How birds taught us that we can fly. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.33182/joph.v2i2.1863>
- Margulis, L. (2010). Symbiogenesis. A new principle of evolution rediscovery of Boris Mikhaylovich Kozo- Polyansky (1890–1957). *Paleontological Journal*, 44, 1525-1539. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0031030110120087>
- McMullen, S. (2015). Is capitalism to blame? Animal lives in the marketplace. *Journal of Animal Ethics*, 5(2), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.5406/janimaethics.5.2.0126>
- Plato (1956). *Protagoras*. (B. Jowett, Trans.). The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Rheinheimer, M. (2008). The belief in werewolves and the extermination of real wolves in Schleswig-Holstein. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 20(4), 281-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468759508579309>
- Sampanikou, E. D. (2002). Science fiction in the world of contemporary visual arts: the european science fiction comics culture. In D. Pastourmatzi (Ed.), *Biotechnological and medical themes in science fiction* (pp. 438-473). University Studio Press.
- Sebeok, T. (1963). Reviews for *Communication among social bees* by Martin Lindauer; *Porpoises and sonar* by Winthrop Kellogg; *Man and dolphin* by John Lilly. *Language*, 39 (3), 448-466. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/411126>
- Shaw, D., Dondorp, W., Geijssen, N., & de Wert, G. (2015). Creating human organs in chimaera pigs: An ethical source of immunocompatible organs? *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 41(12), 970–974. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2014-102224>
- Shepherd, R. (2019, January 25). Polyamorous couple who identify as vampires put on demonstration with ‘donor’ girlfriend. *Lad Bible*. <https://www.ladbible.com/community/interesting-polyamorouscouplewhoidentifiasvampiresputondemonstration20190125#:~:text=Meet%20Logan%20South%2C%2032%2C%20and,their%20%27donor%27%20girlfriend%27s%20blood.>
- Sherringham, T. (2008). Mice, men, and monsters: Opposition to Chimera research and the scope of federal regulation. *California Law Review*, 96 (3), 765-800. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20441031?seq=1>
- Sorgner, S. L. (2021). *We have always been cyborgs: Digital data, gene technologies, and an ethics of transhumanism*. Bristol University Press.
- Spry, J. (2021, June 11). *What if ‘Sweet Tooth’ was real life? Netflix prank video drops a hybrid into los angeles to find out*. SYFY. <https://occam3d.dev/syfy-wire/crowds-react-to-hybrid-baby-in-Sweet-Tooth-prank-video>
- Stiegler, B. (1998). *Technics and time 1: The fault of epimetheus*. Stanford University Press.
- Sutherland, T. (2017). Making a killing: On race, ritual, and (re)membering in digital culture. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture*, 46 (1), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pdct-2017-0025>
- SYFY. (2021, June 13). Well, this is terrifying. *Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/SYFY/posts/well-this-is-terrifying/10159701946506057/>
- Tegmark, M. (2018). *Life 3.0*. Penguin Books.

162 *Animals: Who Gave You the Right to Experiment with My Body?*

Vita-More, N. (2021). Transhumanist manifesto. In E. D. Sampanikou & J. Stasinko (Eds.) *Posthuman studies reader: Core readings on transhumanism, posthumanism and metabumanism* (pp. 49-56). Schwabe Verlag.

Wang, W., He, W., Ruan, Y., & Geng, Q. (2022). First pig-to-human heart transplantation. *The Innovation*, 3(2), 100-223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2022.100223>

Filmography

Netflix. (2021, June 11). *Real-life hybrid baby surprise, pedestrians react | Netflix* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OtkMcvBrMz4>

