

# THE MARKS OF AN EVENT: ARTS, SCIENCES, AND PHILOSOPHIES IN BARTHOLOMEW FEATHER

AS MARCAS DE UM ACONTECIMENTO: ARTES, CIÊNCIAS E FILOSOFIAS EM  
BARTHOLOMEW FEATHER

LAS MARCAS DE UN ACONTECIMIENTO: ARTES, CIENCIAS Y FILOSOFÍAS EN  
BARTHOLOMEW FEATHER

Roberto Dalmo\*

Universidade Federal do Paraná

**ABSTRACT:** This text makes an approximation to the concepts of Sciences, Arts and Philosophies in Bartholomew Feather (2023) associating them to the Classifying Machine of Humanities as a system of cuts in the creation of the concepts of Human and Humanity and, consequently, in the hierarchy of existences. In dialogue with contemporary authors who research the/in the anthropocene, I seek to address the dimension of human exceptionalism and the possibilities that are established from multispecies relationships. Emphasizing the events that emerge in the encounter between humans and more than humans - with emphasis on the species of Feather and the urban context, reading such concepts enabled the emergence of (sciences, arts, philosophies)-with, listing companionships, paths that make themselves evident to walk and possible and urgent decelerations in the context of a climate crisis in which we find ourselves.

**KEYWORDS:** Therolinguistics. Becoming-with. Bartholomew Feather.

**RESUMO:** O presente texto faz uma aproximação aos conceitos de Ciências, Artes e Filosofias em Bartholomew Feather (2023) associando-os à Máquina Classificatória de Humanidades como sistema de cortes na criação dos conceitos Humano e Humanidade e, consequentemente, na hierarquização das existências. Em diálogo com autoras e autores contemporâneos que pesquisam o/no antropoceno, busco tratar a dimensão do excepcionalismo humano e das possibilidades que se estabelecem a partir de relações multiespécie. Dando ênfase aos acontecimentos que emergem no encontro entre humanos e mais que humanos - com destaque para a espécie de Feather e ao contexto urbano, a leitura de tais conceitos possibilitou a emergência de (ciências, artes, filosofias)-

---

\* Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), researching the interface between Art and Science. He is a visual arts student at the School of Music and Fine Arts of Paraná (EMBAP) and is interested in multispecies relationships in urban contexts. This theme is addressed through various languages - photography, sculpture, painting, and performance. E-mail: robertodalmo7@gmail.com.

com, elencando companheiragens, caminhos que se evidenciam ao caminhar e desacelerações possíveis e urgentes diante de um contexto de crise climática no qual nos encontramos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Therolinguística. Devir-com. Bartholomew Feather.

RESUMEN: Este texto hace una aproximación a los conceptos de Ciencias, Artes y Filosofías en Bartholomew Feather (2023) asociándolos a la Máquina Clasificadora de las Humanidades como un sistema de cortes en la creación de los conceptos de Humano y Humanidad y, Por consiguiente, en la jerarquía de las existencias. En diálogo con autores contemporáneos que investigan el/en el antropoceno, busco abordar la dimensión del excepcionalismo humano y las posibilidades que se establecen a partir de relaciones multiespecies. Haciendo hincapié en los acontecimientos que surgen en el encuentro entre humanos y más que humanos - con énfasis en la especie de Feather y el contexto urbano, la lectura de tales conceptos permitió la aparición de (ciencias, artes, filosofías)-con, enumerando las caminos que se hacen evidentes para caminar y posibles y urgentes desaceleraciones en el contexto de una crisis climática en la que nos encontramos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Terolinguística. Devenir-con. Bartholomew Feather.

## 1 SOME INITIAL DROPPINGS

The comprehension of the anthropic effects on the planet has mobilized many research areas, such as geology, chemistry, physics, and also social sciences, such as anthropology, politics, sociology and philosophy – as an activity of concept creation. One of the concepts that arose quite strongly in recent years was the Anthropocene. Being used for the first time in the 1980s decade, by the biologist Eugene F. Stoermer and formalized in 2000 in a joint publication with Chemistry Nobel winner Paul Crutzen, the Anthropocene has mobilized varying understandings and developments such as publications, public debates and the emergence of specialized journals. Without the immediate intention to discard or discredit the productions of the Natural Sciences field, I shall emphasize the provocations by Anna Tsing, Jason Moore and Donna Haraway. This is because I consider them more interesting for the discussions that are intended as follows and because I understand that, somehow, they are more provoking for thinking the “human exceptionalism” – a “veritable *ontological state of expectation*, grounded on the self-grounding separation between Nature and History” (Danowski; Viveiros de Castro, 2017, p. 28).

Anna Tsing carries her approach from the Plantationocene notion – provoking us to think how plantations, as well as the development of what has been consolidated as “Agro” – which is not “pop” and it’s not “all”, as the ads try to sell – is intimately related with a large scale, monocultural mode of production that directly impacts the multispecific composition of the world. Tsing warns: “In the science of plantations, expertise and administration work together. Growers are never asked to comment on their crops. In the science of plantations, welfare is a formula calculated from above; collateral damage is expected, and no one asks: ‘well-being for whom?’” (Tsing, 2019, p. 59, free translation). It is planted on a large scale, time and life that can cohabit the rural space are managed, it is invested in death and pesticides that will “clean” the profitable “good” of all species that would reduce the chance of profit. Plantations are really a viable milestone for the moment in which we live, however, when we think about resource management and the reason for the existence of plantations, we think about the emergence and consolidation of the capitalist system. Thus, Moore (2022) claims that the Anthropocene concept would make an alarm sound, though incapable of explaining how the alarming changes occurred. The author questions capitalism, power, class, anthropocentrism and dualistic questions between “nature” and “society”, stating: “Capitalocene is an ugly word for an ugly system” (2016, p. 05).

In *Staying with the Trouble* 92016), biologist and philosopher Donna Haraway introduces the Anthropocene as a concept that would, not only help us think of anthropic action, but also would provoke us to think that not all “anthropos”, as species, generate the same impacts in the world – affecting it to the point of making us imagine its end (at least the world of said humans). In this context of debates and disputes over concepts, Haraway (2023) provokes, through authors like Lynn Margulis and Isabelle Stengers, to think about the arrogance of the modern “subject” that claims itself as a “subject”, but not beyond a tangle of multispecies interconnections. Thus, the author introduces Chthulucene. “My’ Chthulucene, even burdened with its problematic Greek-ish rootlets, entangles myriad temporalities and spatialities and myriad intra-active entities-in-assemblages—including the more-than-

human, other-than-human, inhuman, and human-as-humus." (p. 101). It is in this entanglement of relations that compose the Chthulucene that the author, inspired by Marilyn Strathern, tells us that

It matters what matters we use to think other matters with; it matters what stories we tell to tell other stories with; it matters what knots knot knots, what thoughts think thoughts, what descriptions describe descriptions, what ties tie ties. It matters what stories make worlds, what worlds make stories." (Haraway, 2016, p. 12).

It is in this context that the focal point of this essay lies.

In thinking which stories tell other stories, then, about ends of worlds and creation of others? In thinking with whom to compose, as well as proximities of connections. An essay about fabulating worlds and, maybe, experimentation with ways out. In the context of the Cat's Cradles that occur in the Anthropocene, which can be thought of as Capitalocene, Plantationocene or even Chthulucene, I seek to approach and connect with pigeons. Specifically, with Bartholomew Feather, companion, threatened by state anthropocentric biopolitics, threatened by everyday fascisms. In this essay, I intend to comment on the concepts of Sciences, Arts and Philosophies emergent in the thinking of this intellectual. For such, I will take as a basis the text *The Classifying Machine of Humanities: excremental writings* (2023) and the artwork *Pigeon's shit*, thinking from the critique of deceleration possibilities emergent of the event between human and pigeon excrement.

## 2 THE CLASSIFYING MACHINE OF HUMANITIES

*"The Classifying Machine of Humanities was made as such, invading, stealing, raping, creating sciences, arts and philosophies that legitimate its actions"*

*Bartholomew Feather*

The book *The Classifying Machine of Humanities: excremental writings* (2023), translated by Roberto Dalmo, emerges when the translator associates with Therolinguistic studies. He presents a compilation of texts collected between 2017 and 2022, around a public square that, for ethics sake, was nominated "March 7th Square". In a coordinated effort and collective work, which involved over 100 people, the samples were collected. With the help of the software *NbPbX 2.0*, the process of decoding and translation proceeded. In this context, Bartholomew Feather's thought revealed itself sometimes quite angry – since in his history it is evident a series of sufferings by its contact with the self-titled group "humans", but also, a generous vision that points ways built from a deep process of observation. In this text, I propose to highlight how the author comprehends the Sciences, Arts and Philosophies, since the formulations established by Feather are derived from an inverted viewpoint – if commonly we humans create vast lists with classifications and detailed processes of description of other species, known as "taxonomy"; if we humans established what would be animal behavior and gave it the name "ethology". Why do we not emphasize Bartholomew Feather's thought? Beyond searching for a universal thinking that encompasses all possibilities of existence, after all, this is an overly human way of thinking, Feather brings some impressions which are based in his constitution as an extremely subtle observer. The pigeon, in relation to other urban species, can coexist without generating a big fuss – obviously we can affirm that there are multiple processes of attempted mass extinction of urban pigeon populations, however, it still generates less chaos than the sight of a rat, for instance.

The Classifying Machine of Humanities arises, then, as a concept that appropriates Deleuze & Guattari and the book *Anti-Oedipus*, forgot and found by the author in a park bench.

A machine may be defined as a system of interruptions or breaks (coupures). These breaks should in no way be considered as a separation from reality\*\* rather, they operate along lines that vary according to whatever aspect of them we are considering. Every machine, in the first place, is related to a continual material flow (hylè) that it cuts into. It functions like a ham-slicing machine, removing portions\* from the associative flow. [...] Far from being the opposite of continuity, the break or interruption conditions this continuity: it presupposes or defines what it cuts into as an ideal continuity. This is because, as we have seen, every machine is a machine of a machine.

The machine produces an interruption of the flow only insofar as it is connected to another machine that supposedly produces this flow. And doubtless this second machine in turn is really an interruption or break, too. But it is such only in relationship to a third machine that ideally—that is to say, relatively—produces a continuous, infinite flux (Deleuze; Guattari, 1983, p. 36)

In establishing a Machine as a system of cuts, Bartholomew Feather claims that Humans are one part of Earth Habitants which, between that which has been assigned as life-death, also inhabit the Classifying Machine of Humanities. Nevertheless, such a process, because of its complexity, is thoroughly examined from repetition and difference-establishing resources.

The Classifying Machine of Humanities is deformed, nebulous, fluid. The parts: Machines of Machines - micromachines in relation to the Classifying Machine of Humanities; parts-derived, aggregates, so are. Fluids that compose with other fluids, produced by the pieces Sciences, Arts, Philosophies and composing among themselves their functioning (Feather, 2023, p. 36).

With this, the author establishes the interconnection between the pieces of a molecular engendering.

The Classifying Machine of Humanities classifies, segregates, groups, files, categorizes, divides, catalogs, identifies, labels, specifies, separates, distributes, enables, qualifies, approves, cuts. [...]. The Classifying Machine of Humanities will exist until, minimally, the extinction of those who inhabit it. The Classifying Machine of Humanities captures other Existential Machines for itself, that is, it feeds and develops from a colonizing machinophage process. As the Classifying Machine of Humanities is composed of pieces, at a molecular level, they vibrate - symmetrically, asymmetrically, to one side, to another, forward, backward, resonating strongly, imposing vibrations, capturing some new pieces and discarding others. The Classifying Machine of Humanities classifies Humanities - selects, ranks. Sciences, Arts, Philosophies, capture and are captured by the Classifying Machine of Humanities. It has thirst and searches, incessantly, Humanities to classify. It has traveled, invaded, raped, spat and classified, enslaved. The Classifying Machine of Humanities also turns the deleted pieces into useful pieces – the one that does not fit has already become king. The one that does not fit made insurgence and stayed there – dominating the machine, enjoying the pieces, dictating, classifying Humanities. The one who does not fit once becomes bourgeois (Feather, 2023, p. 35-36, free translation).

The conceptualization of the Machine happens in many moments, however, the quote above represents a good synthesis: elements are pointed, such as the extinction of other existences and, consequently, other ontological possibilities which are not included in the machine; its plastic and, at the same time, authoritarian character; and its history, when it is recounted from Eurocentric epistemic matrix. From such comprehension, Feather establishes, minimally, three forming criteria or constituent structures – entitled by the author as “pieces” of the machine – machines of machines. They are: Sciences, Arts and Philosophies – elements that I will approach in more detail in the following.

### 3 ARTS, SCIENCES AND PHILOSOPHIES

In countless moments of his book, Bartholomew Feather presents the Sciences, Arts and Philosophies as pieces of the Machine. The author starts by claiming that the group self-entitled as Humans learned that the Sciences, Philosophies and Arts contribute to the expansion of said humanity, that is, to the extent that the inhabitants on Earth, can expand their insertion in one or more of these domains, greater is the chance of being understood as humans. "However, I realize that the same categories of Sciences, Arts and Philosophies, mediated by Educations, which structure the splits and dig the abyss between the existences on Earth" (Feather, 2023, p. 18). It is important to assert that, for Feather, it is not all inhabitants of Earth that belong to the Machine and that there is not a direct correlation between the fluency of one particular piece and the possibility of belonging. There are macrosystems the author presents as “machinic thrones”.

The bourgeois, supported by the capitalist system, manages resources and points out ways of being, thinking and constituting values that reinforce capitalism that consolidates itself in one of the machinic thrones; the colonizer, managing existence, invading territories, dominating other inhabitants, consolidates colonialism as a system that reaches all constitution of the colonized; finally, the rationalist, holder of the order of the world and of the unique and correct way of thinking, of positioning himself in the world, the way of silencing the affections and superiority of one system of thought to the detriment of another. The three friends, seated on the machinic thrones, govern the classification of Humanities (Feather, 2023 p. 117, free translation).

With this, the pieces came to develop roles, also, of formulators of judgment parameters – which made possible for the classifications and framings in the possible humanities. For Feather, existences are highlighted, such as possible existences, conquerable existences, valid and repudiable follies, to the extent that the macrosystems of capitalism, coloniality and rationalism allow, or rather, understand that it is viable for their maintenance. Feather understands the role of institutionalized educations as the maintainer of the Classifying Machine of Humanities. By questioning “which sciences, which arts and which philosophies?” (Feather, 2023, p. 44), he claims that the Educations, in the form of pieces, will say it. That is, Education, when institutionalized, becomes the viscera of the Machine and, consequently, responsible for selecting which Arts, Sciences and Philosophies are useful to the maintenance of the machinic system.

The institutionalization of the Educations becomes a guarantee, for all those seated on the machinic thrones, that its inhabitants will know how to judge, to classify, to trim, to analyze, to compartmentalize, to assess and to attest according to its interests and, consequently, according to the interests of the Machine. Humanity is a diploma (Feather, 2023, p. 44, free translation).

When we think of education, we constantly associate it directly with schools. However, the author uses institutionalized Educations to comprise a range of processes, and with that, he speaks, yes, of schools, but not only schools.

The lessons learned from characters such as the Equilibrist, the Hacker and the Zombie is that they stress modes of existence in the Classifying Machine of Humanities, understandings of Arts, Sciences and Philosophies, and possible actions. The hacker establishes a criticism of the pieces and a desire for viral inoculation. He warns and provokes that the Sciences created by racist people in a racist world will have traces of racism, confronting an universal idea of neutral and impersonal knowledge. Arts and Philosophies are no different. Arts and Philosophies of all possible types were created, and none of them prevented colonization processes, enslavement and genocides. None of them stopped the annihilation of other existences. The Hacker faces a romanticized dimension that places the school in the center of possibilities of world-building and provokes: “the School is the heart of the Classifying Machine of Humanities, it is a fragment of the viscera turned into piece” (Feather, 2023, p. 86). For the Hacker, inhabiting the Classifying Machine of Humanities would happen as a process of fecal archaeology – collecting Arts, Sciences and Philosophies excreted and, with that, comprehending other existential Machines. Such a process would allow viral inoculations.

Faecal archeology is not simply finding something that has turned to shit, but finding what has turned to shit because it would threaten the Classifying Machine of Humanities. The fecal archeology makes it possible to obtain nutrients necessary for the hacker action, that is, find the values, measures that transfigure the Classifying Machine of Humanities (Feather, 2023, p. 92).

Feather presents the complexity of the human/humanity question when he problematizes the formulated rights system and that, somehow, tries to enable a better life. It is unquestionable that marginalized anthropos existences benefit from the existence of a legal system which allows land demarcations, race and class quota systems, and inclusion and accessibility politics. In no way is this put into question, but on the other hand, it is urgent to understand the functioning of the Classifying Machine of Humanities and the ills caused by human exceptionalism. No, we are not all human, there are some more human than others and, beyond humanism, there is an infinity of denied existences on Earth. The Sciences, questioned from the framework of Linda Smith; the Arts, as a system of representation, from the framework of Stuart Hall; and the Philosophies, from examples such as the dialog between Kant and Hume, which strain human and humanity concepts.

From the understanding of the Machine system, which paths are possible? That of the Equilibrist? the Hacker? the Zombie? All simultaneously and in constant movement is the answer presented by Feather, just as the pigeon that is philosopher, artist and scientist.

#### 4 PIGEON'S SHIT

Anna Tsing (2019, p. 87, free translation) tells us that "To occupy is to dedicate oneself to the work of living together, even where the possibilities are against us. It is to refuse - and also to recover. If we want to live, we must learn to occupy even the most degraded spaces of the earth. Our anger is necessary. Without it, we languish".

How, then, to fabulate within the most sterile spaces, to create survival strategies which cherish multispecies cooperation and encourage slow disruptions? The sterile spaces of Sciences, Arts and Philosophies are in dispute.

To look to the future, often, implies looking to the past. Ailton Krenak thinks of an ancestral future, a view to the sensitive questions that are effects of colonialism and the creation of a lifestyle guided by capitalism. Krenak also teaches us about cohabitation: "because if we can make forests continue to exist in the world, there will be communities within them" (Krenak, 2022, p. 64, free translation). The change in ways of life is also highlighted by Nego Bispo:

When agribusiness came here, we were told not to consume many of the fruits that we used to consume. Everything that was not a commodity was bad. [...] If nature offers you for free, why sell it? This is pure colonialism (Bispo dos Santos, 2023, p. 80-81, free translation).

To know, to think, to propose, to try and untie the knots of colonialism is part of the path, which is build by walking it. To imagine new ways of life, to encourage the "making-with" (Haraway, 2023, p. 111), and to rupture the human armor exposed by Krenak as a club which selects its members in a civilizational dance. As Danowski and Viveiros de Castro (2017, p. 123) point: "To speak of the end of the world is to speak of the need to imagine, rather than a new world to replace our present one, a new people, the people that is missing. A people who believes in the world that it will have to create with what ever world we will have left them".

The artwork entitled "Pigeon's Shit" consists of a partnership. A Becoming which constitutes itself, or at least tries to constitute itself as a Becoming-with. It is thirty metallic and of industrial production cans stickered with the text: "Pigeon's shit – content, 1 gr. liquid; conserved fresh; produced and canned; october 2024" in Portuguese, English and French. In the background, the name Bartholomew Feather repeats itself countless times, and in the lid it is written "produced by", with a picture of a pigeon attached to an analogue camera, a signature and a number. The direct reference is the artwork "Artist's Shit", by Piero Manzoni (1961). If Manzoni strains the art system and the artist's role in this work, Feather seeks other relations.



Image 1: *Pigeon's Shit*, by Bartholomew Feather and Roberto Dalmo

Source: The author (2025)

The association between capitalism and the industrial sciences, strongly driven by industrial chemistry, invaded the mindsets of the city's inhabitants. Nothing produced out of the industry has value. It is smaller, dangerous to life, less practical. Canning is the guarantee of pasteurization, urgent to a public health aegis and the maintenance of the *status quo*. Whoever tries to leave the country with a non-industrialized product will feel the power of incineration. State control, asepsis, controlled contaminations. We forget that, as Haraway teaches us, being one is always becoming-with many.

The canning controls the becoming-with. The canned, symbol of industrial society – Campbell's soup –, makes itself a valuable resource in the post apocalypse. Those who wish to survive build bunkers filled with canned food, they gather the remnants of industrial society and wish, after the catastrophe, to drag themselves with what remains of this way of life. The survivalism which does not face neoliberal planet destruction policies is nothing but an illusion. When the human world is finished, can the collection of pigeon's shit cans become a powerful resource to create a new world? Can the opening of the cans allow the opening of new possibilities? Canned becoming-with would encourage the emergence of an (art, science, philosophy)-with? Which possible paths to a world in which the "human" is in another relational position? Those are questions Feather promotes.

##### 5 (ART, SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY)-WITH: AN HUMOLOGY EXERCISE

To comprehend the Classifying Machine of Humanities encourages us to compose with excrements of cyborg-pigeons and inhabit the ruins of the Anthropocene. Among the cuts, are there possibilities for subversion? To Feather, the path would be through the aegis of Multiplexistence – a concept that arises as the coexistence in movement of the Equilibrist-Hacker-Zombie modes. This generous position is presented by the intellectual pigeon, perhaps, for believing that there is still the possibility of coexistence. I also bet, with doubts, in hopefulness. If Bartholomew Feather shows us the Arts, Sciences and Philosophies as pieces – which fabricate

and simultaneously are fabricated by the Classifying Machine of Humanities, what would be left for us, readers, of this short essay, that probably, because it inhabits the science piece, also compose the Machine? Perhaps the answer will be contaminated.

When Anna Tsing questions us about "how does an encounter becomes an 'event'" (2022, p. 73, free translation), the immediate answer is presented over the concept of contamination: "We are contaminated by our encounters; they transform what we are as we make room for others. At the same time that contamination transforms projects of creation of worlds, other shared worlds - and new directions - can arise" (Tsing, 2022, p. 73, free translation).

Tsing's understanding interacts with what the anthropologist Nastassja Martin presents in *In the Eye of the Wild* (2019, p. 101): "the event is not: a bear attacks a French anthropologist somewhere in the mountains of Kamchatka. The event is: a bear and a woman meet and the frontiers between two worlds implode." With Feather, it was possible to appreciate that the event, in urban contexts, can emerge from pigeon's excrements.

In a life accelerated by capitalism, by coloniality and by rationalism – three entities that support maintenance of human modes of existence and that, undoubtedly, state their exceptionalism – the Sciences, Arts and Philosophy which resonate, often, are fuel for the Classifying Machine of Humanities. How to counter-act? If the events can be intense, as told by anthropologist Nastassja Martin, it is not difficult to imagine that they can also be subtle, like the suitable encounter between the pigeon excrement and the executive suit (as a figure who inhabits the center of what the Classifying Machine of Humanities postulated as human). Therefore, the exercise of availability becomes unique. In this exercise, the pigeon assumes a central role in the configuration of urban events in the ruins of capitalism.

Bartholomew Feather, or Bart, is an idiot. What to learn from idiots? Isabelle Stengers claims that "But Deleuze's idiot, borrowed from Dostoievsky and turned into a conceptual character, is the one who always slows the others down, who resists the consensual way in which the situation is presented and in which emergencies mobilize thought or action."<sup>1</sup> (2018, p. 444). The subtle encounter between pigeon excrement and human promotes decelerations, opening up space for contaminations. The fungus and the death of the human, at least while crystallized figure of existence. The blurrer of borders. The catalyst of disponibilities. In this exercise of opening pores, of reconstructing human existences, of disponibility to inhabit the margin of the Classifying Machine of Humanities, the ground that is set is the one of encounters and contaminations.

Haraway would call pigeons companion species. Companions from *cum panis* – the one with whom we share bread; The one who inhabits squares, the idiot who thins out life's rhythm and the one that, like a sander, encourages us to create modes of existing in the time some dare to call Anthropocene. Due to the absence of bears in large metropolises, events emerge in contact with pigeons. The contaminations are fertile ground for the exercise of humology, science of contaminated bodies, of multiplexers, of becoming-with.

In *Aim for the Head: the zombies of the Anthropocene* (2024), Stefany Stettler brings quite an interesting account:

How would I be positioned facing the problem of the Anthropocene, animals, others, zombies and their causes? According to some members of the department in which I graduated in Philosophy, there is no philosophy in Brazil. If there is no philosophy, there are also no Brazilian philosophers. I, therefore, cannot call myself a philosopher, but a student of philosophy in an eternally unfinished process. I would also not be an anthropologist, although my research speaks more of humans than not-more-humans. Haraway, in *Staying with the trouble*, also rejects the terms derived from the radical *anthropos*-, replacing them in "Camille Stories" by humus, by com-post. Thus, with my title being denied by the department in which I graduated, and me, denying along with Haraway, the radical *anthropos*, I say the that I am a hummologist! (Stettler, 2024, p. 21, free translation).

---

<sup>1</sup> English translation, referenced by the Brazilian translation.

In this territory pointed by Stettler, since Haraway, I would like to allow myself some sproutings. My background is in the field of Chemistry, but although there is Chemistry in Brazil, I have dedicated my time to thinking about minor Chemistries, as well as their education. I spent my doctorate thinking about Human Rights. However, the meeting with Bart provoked me to deny the anthropos, to rethink and reposition myself. Therolinguistics emerged as a way of contributing to build a world in which, following the Zapatista maxim, many worlds can fit. The pigeon took me to the visual arts and provoked me to discover the performer that already existed in me. This feeling of not fitting, pleasant when we learn to appreciate it, is also quite hard.

Even though the “uno” being is profoundly discouraged by Feather (2023, p. 169), that points “the will of the being as the invibializer of the becoming”, reading Stettler made me realize I see myself a little as a humologist too. Will it be the emergence of a new discipline? The exiled territory? Is it my desire to fit? I am not sure... but it is good to not know. I do not desire that humology, as a proper ground for the effervescence of the becoming-with, become another must-be.

To think of the Arts, Sciences and Philosophies becomes, facing all that was presented by Feather, a great challenge. The consideration of such pieces – created and creators by the machine in never ending feedback – does not establish some distinctions that I, as human, see are necessary. It is important highlighting that, for us, these three pieces are quite polysemic and, with the intent of untying some knots, I record here that, in my analysis of Feather’s work, the author-pigeon directs his critique towards the “major” Arts, Sciences and Philosophies.

If we take as a basis Deleuze’s understanding of minorities, we realize that the minor Arts, the minor Sciences and Philosophies constitute another scheme of power circulation. Batalha (2013) establishes criteria for a work to be considered minor: 1) in the aesthetic field – bound to the imperfection of form, rhetorical inadequacy; 2) internal – related to poetic markers of its time; 3) the denotation of an excessive marginality, producing estrangement, a particular singularity; 4) sociological – highlighting the work in a cultural field thought of as secondary; 5) criteria that discriminate authors; 6) historical or historiographical; 7) criteria taken by the exiled minor author.

This analysis provides the emergence of three immediate considerations: The first would say that, despite all works belonging to the machinic scheme – with the exception of the ones produced by more than human companions – like Feather’s work –, it would not be fair to position them under the same aegis as productions located in the machinic center. The second search is an extrapolation: the same notes highlighted for literature can be thought of for other artistic genres, as well as for scientific and philosophical productions. There are minor philosophies, there are minor arts. The exercise of composing-with: art-with, science-with, philosophy-with or (art, science, philosophy)-with would be in a porous territory which would allow the effervescence of new worlds, new modes of existence. An (art, science, philosophy)-with, because we understand the power of human exceptionalism, would already be born minor and belonging to the exiles on Earth. Exiles as contamination zones that insist on existing, opposing any possibility of planned sterility by machinic processes. A fertile ground for humology. It is in exile territory – the Equilibrist falls out of balance, the hacker dodges and proposes viral inoculations, the zombie of the antisemic adhesions – which available bodies and multispecies companionships may sprout.

The third consideration would seek the essence of the becoming-with. Haraway (2022, p. 10, free translation) claims:

Being is always one becoming with many. Some of these microscopic personal biotas are dangerous to the self that writes this sentence; for now, they are kept under control by the coordinated symphonic measures of all the others, human cells or not, which make possible the conscious self.

There is no way to disagree with this biological understanding. Nevertheless, Feather’s philosophy considers the ruptures established by the Machine, ruptures that stop even the comprehension of being as a becoming-with many. It is in this field that the possibility of an (art, science, philosophy)-with stands out. Without such understandings of fractures and fissures boosted by the conceptual categories of “human” and “humanity”, every art, science and philosophy would already be, in essence, art-with, science-with and philosophy-with. The human exceptionalism, as a product of machinic cracks, makes itself an impeditive. This process is analogue to what Mark Fischer calls “Capitalist Realism”.

Fischer argues that the 1980s were a period when capitalist realism established itself and created roots, especially with Margaret Thatcher's doctrine, that said "There is no alternative" – a brief slogan circulating almost freely and feeding off of confusion between real and reality. While the real can only be understood as an "x unrepresentable, a traumatic void that can only be glimpsed in the fractures and inconsistencies of apparent reality" (Fischer, 2020, p. 35, free translation), reality is in ideology's field – an ideology presenting itself as an empirical fact, a necessity. Thus, capitalist realism would act, confusing real and reality.

We are encouraged to believe that there is not a way out and things "are as they are". In Feather's work, Human and Humanity establish that role of ideological construction of one reality. This factor stops the creations of more radical ecological constructions – given that even *Bem-Viver* [Good Life] was displaced away from native ontologies to inhabit the space of the Democratic State of Law and strengthen the mode of existence of hoarded and centralized power that states: "now we need to be ecological". Why trust the same structures which, no more than a hundred years ago, ranted about the need for a developmentalism? Why trust the same structures that killed natives, deforested, destroyed wellsprings with toxic waste and said everything was all right? Why trust the same structures that allowed Texaco to do what it did and get away with it? When I make such questions, I am not claiming that for *Bem-Viver* to compose a constitution is "bad". No, I do not think it is something bad and, to be honest, it is a milestone. It is much better to have a Democratic State of Law than an authoritarian fascist State. It is better for a State to be committed to ecological issues than a State committed to five or six Agribusiness entrepreneurs. When I question, I question the trust in such power structures. In the not-so-distant past, chemistry said "we invented plastic bottles, they are great". Today, chemistry says: "do not use them, they are awful". Today, it is correct, but that does not erase the fact that it is the same Global North white men dictating, for so long, what must be done. If we think about which stories tell stories and which worlds world worlds, it is important that many worlds compose the possibilities – listening, collaboration, composing-with.

The character of the Equilibrist that goes to other existential machines and comes back to the Classifying Machine of Humanities with a must-be is in question:

The must-be organizes itself, and we modify machinic categories. "Human and Nature Rights". The equilibrists create artifices, propose movements – decolonialities, subalternities, pluriverses and pluriversities. All as viable alternatives. Machinic improvement, improvement of the Classifying Machine of Humanities. The equilibrist says: it is capitalism's fault! Another says: it is colonialism's fault! The third tightrope walker says: they are both guilty, along with the patriarchy. Thrones are questioned and other "must-bes" are constituted and continue to improve the pieces, derived pieces, groupings and mega groupings. (Feather, 2023, p. 128).

We need more than the must-be, the ideology creator and regulator of collective life. Untying these knots and collectively composing alternatives are also fabulation exercises. They are exercises for rupturing a capitalist realism, a colonialist realism, a rationalist realism, a patriarchal realism and, mostly, considering the scope of this essay, rupturing the human exceptionalism, the anthropocentrism taken to the extreme. Even though we are humans talking about such exceptionalism and even though we belong to the sciences and even though this is an essay published in an indexed scientific journal, part of a field of knowledge, promoter of research. Untying these knots implies an exercise of proposing new modes of existence which, to be honest, are not even new. Feather's work invites us to exercise.

The difficulty perhaps lies in the lack of references, since the capitalists, colonialists, rationalists, the patriarchy act strongly to extinguish any antisystemic form of reference – indigenous, *quilombolas*, anarchists, communists... but also those we call animals, plants, fungus – our focus.

Writing this essay, I remembered my teenage years, when I read one of the first definitions of art. Although there was a great struggle to define it, the author used as a criteria that which was produced by humans. I confess I do not remember the author, I was just a teenager, but that struck me. "I cannot say what art is, but it is only art if it is made by humans"; overstepping it: "I cannot say what philosophy is, but it is only philosophy if it is made by humans"; "I cannot say what science is, but it is only science if it is made by humans".

I propose, then, as a hacking exercise of the Classifying Machine of Humanities, viral inoculations – to consider the Arts, Sciences and Philosophies conducted by more than human ontologies. Similar to what Bartholomew Feather did. Theroosciences, theroarts.

An exercise of composing references, stories of companionships to which we can connect. Pigeon geolocalisation did not have scientific status – may we begin considering it; Beavers building dams as an engineering knowledge. Humans learnt with those species and looted their knowledge, just as it happened with many *anthropos* existences. I could call this the *anthropo-knowledge* myth.

Fungus ability to occupy spaces, the resource management by ants are far from being considered knowledge. Why does an animal silhouette left in the clay is not understood as art, if the silhouette of a human, even if it is an outcast of the Classifying Machine of Humanities, is understood as such? Intentionality? How to assess the lack of intention in the animal, plant or fungus world? How to attest it? Bartholomew Feather composed philosophies, arts, what makes him better or closer to the *anthropos*? The possibility of translation?

Perhaps the question here is the fact that we consider ourselves the only beings with intelligence, or then the concept of intelligence is so anthropocentric that we ignore any other form of existence – a not so smart attitude, after all.

James Bridle in *Ways of Being: Animals, Plants, Machines: The Search for a Planetary Intelligence* (2023) recovers part of the background of animal experimentation, emphasizing the concept of intelligence. The absurdity done allows only one conclusion:

Rather, if we are truly to appreciate what non-human intelligence might consist of — and thus transform our understanding of our own abilities and those of others — we need to stop thinking about intelligence as something defined by human experience. Instead, we must from the outset think about intelligence as something more-than-human. (Bridle, 2022, p. 47).

For the author, defining intelligence based on what humans do is the narrowest way possible of thinking about it. If we broaden such definition and the choir of minds which manifests it we can, thus, allow for human intelligence to sprout in a new way. In a similar manner, I understand we can think that other minds produce other Sciences, Arts and Philosophies – even if such concepts are structures created by humans and for humans, or, as Feather would say, pieces of the Classifying Machine of Humanities.

I am not sure I have the same goals as Bridle with the intent of improving the concept of human intelligence and, in a way, I believe that such goal is a trace of human exceptionalism. The pigeon philosophies, emergent from Feather, are just excrements which, with an anthropocentric viewpoint, can form constellations. Directions to immanence. The urgency and emergency of the (art, science, philosophy)-with does not cease to be mediated by the *anthropos*, however, it opens up space for new modes of life and, perhaps, it is the multiplexistent mode of production – to appropriate Feather's concept.

## 6 OF INCONCLUSIONS

The relevance Feather's work has gained motivated the writing of this text. To think of the Arts, Sciences and Philosophies mobilizes a wide range of affects and the critique of such structures often are taken with a personalness of the being. Those who do not spare themselves of ranting about their identities as artists, scientists and philosophers, at once, assume the confrontation position. I have to say that Feather does not evade notes that mobilize many anguishes of the being and that is part of his work. To comprehend the Arts, Sciences and Philosophies as pieces constructed and constructors of the Classifying Machine of Humanities is not a problem when what is being questioned is not human exceptionalism, however, as pointed previously, if we, human, desire to leave our pedestal and, perhaps, to consider that there are more species with valid knowledge, important to life on Earth, this point is urgent. Sciences that reinforce human exceptionalism, that amplify splits and fractures between "Human"- "humanity" and Earth, discarding more than human ontologies, disregarding animal, plant and fungi existences – contribute to the enlargement of climate crises and to bring mass annihilation of all species, including the self-entitled "human" *anthropos*.

Investing in an (art, science, philosophy)-with, a path presented in dialogue with Feather's work, for me, is beyond the Equilibrist's step, in which a new must-be would be established. It is also beyond the realization that every being is becoming-with, even if we recognize the importance of such understanding. Feather, like an idiot in the Deleuzian sense, encourages us to decelerate; If the pigeons' excrement, when it hits the "human", allows decelerations and changes in course, it would be to discard all Feather's propositions to institute a notion of (art, science, philosophy)-with. No, even though I am human, there is still some common sense in me. I finish this text emulating Isabelle Stengers (2018) in her cosmopolitan proposition in stating that thinking and investing in (art, science, philosophy)-with is about decelerating the building of a common world.

Stengers (2018) claims that an ethos is not made as a direct function of its environment (oikos). It will always be an ethos of the being that reveals themselves as capable of it. With it, we do not transform it in a predictable way by changing its environment, however, no ethos would be, in itself, carrier of meaning, since we cannot predict what is a being either capable of or able to become. Thus, the oikos proposes, but it is the being that would arrange such a proposition, giving or denying it a meaning. "We do not know what could a researcher, claiming entitlement today, even the need for certain animal experimentation, become capable in an oikos that demands them of thinking "in presence" of the victims of their decisions" (Stengers, 2018, p. 449, free translation). I broaden it to a researcher, an artist, a philosopher. With that, I only allow myself to hope that such hesitation enables the creation of new paths. May new environments allow new ways of living, or rather, allow arts-with, sciences-with, philosophies-with: (art, science, philosophy)-with. Thinning, hesitating, articulating possibilities learnt in partnership with cyborg-pigeons and other companion species.

## REFERENCES

BATALHA, M. C. O que é uma literatura menor?/What is a minor literature? *Revista Cerrados*, Brasília, v. 22, n. 35, p. 113-134, 2013. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/cerrados/article/view/14137/12459>. Acesso em: 18 fev. 2025.

BISPO DOS SANTOS, A. *A terra dá, a terra quer*. São Paulo: Ubu, 2023.

BRIDLE, J. *Maneiras de ser* - Animais, plantas e máquinas: a busca por uma inteligência planetária. Tradução de Daniel Galera. São Paulo: Todavia, 2023.

CRUTZEN, P. J.; STOERMER, E. F. The Anthropocene. *Global Change Newsletter*, Estocolmo, n. 41, p. 17-18, maio 2000.

DANOWSKI, D.; VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, E. *Há mundo por vir?* Ensaio sobre os medos e os fins. Florianópolis: Cultura e Barbárie, 2017.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. *O anti-édipo*: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Tradução de Luiz B. L. Orlandi. São Paulo: 34, 2011.

FEATHER, B. *A máquina classificatória de humanidades*: escritos excrementais. Tradução de Roberto Dalmo. São Paulo: Livraria da Física, 2023.

FEATHER, B.; DALMO, R. *Merda de Pombo*. 2024. Técnica: lata, fezes de pombos.

FISHER, M. *Realismo capitalista*: é mais fácil imaginar o fim do mundo do que o fim do capitalismo? Tradução de Rodrigo Gonsalves, Jorge Adeodato e Maikel da Silveira. São Paulo: Autonomia Literária, 2020.

HARAWAY, D. *Quando as espécies se encontram*. Tradução de Juliana Fausto. São Paulo: Ubu, 2022.

HARAWAY, D. *Ficar com o problema*: fazer parentes no Chthuluceno. Tradução de Ana Luiza Braga. São Paulo: n-1, 2023.

KRENAK, A. *Futuro ancestral*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2023.

MANZONI, P. *Merda d'artista*. Técnica: lata, fezes humanas. 1961.

MARTIN, N. *Escute as Feras*. Tradução de Camila Vargas Boldrini e Daniel Lühmann. São Paulo: 34, 2021.

MOORE, J. W. (org.). *Antropoceno ou capitaloceno: natureza, história e a crise do capitalismo*. Tradução de Antônio Xerxesky e Fernando Silva e Silva. São Paulo: Elefante, 2022.

STENGERS, I. A proposição cosmopolítica. *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*, São Paulo, n. 69, p. 442-464, 2018. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/rieb/article/view/145663/139603>. Acesso em: 18 fev. 2025.

STETTLER, S. S. *Mire na cabeça: os zumbis do antropoceno*. Curitiba: Da autora, 2024.

TSING, A. L. *Viver nas ruínas: paisagens multiespécies no Antropoceno*. Tradução de Thiago Mota Cardoso. Brasília: IEB Mil Folhas, 2019.

TSING, A. L. *O Cogumelo no fim do mundo: sobre a possibilidade de vida nas ruínas do capitalismo*. Tradução de Jorge Menna Barreto e Yudi Rafael. São Paulo: n-1, 2022.



Received on February 19, 2025. Accepted on April 20, 2025

Published on September 25, 2025.