



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: A
ARTS & HUMANITIES - PSYCHOLOGY
Volume 22 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2022
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

The Impact of Anthropological Machine on Women and Non-Human Animals: A Study of Coetzee's *Disgrace*

By Durgesh Malla

Abstract- This article unfolds the impact the anthropological machine on women and non-human animals in J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*. The research method implemented in this article includes the post-humanist view that dismantles the divide between humans and non-human animals. Consequently, the study discovers the bare life of both non-human animals and women through the process of inclusion and exclusion. So, this research output clarifies the unethical practice of men, which has dichotomized society into a human and non-human world. The conclusion drawn from this study displays how the animalization of women is parallel to the animalization of non-human animals.

Keywords: anthropological machine, animalization, bare life, biopolitics, posthumanism, impact.

GJHSS-A Classification: DDC Code: 292.13 LCC Code: BL781



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



The Impact of Anthropological Machine on Women and Non-Human Animals: A Study of Coetzee's *Disgrace*

Durgesh Malla

Abstract This article unfolds the impact the anthropological machine on women and non-human animals in J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*. The research method implemented in this article includes the post-humanist view that dismantles the divide between humans and non-human animals. Consequently, the study discovers the bare life of both non-human animals and women through the process of inclusion and exclusion. So, this research output clarifies the unethical practice of men, which has dichotomized society into a human and non-human world. The conclusion drawn from this study displays how the animalization of women is parallel to the animalization of non-human animals.

Keywords: anthropological machine, animalization, bare life, biopolitics, posthumanism, impact.

I. INTRODUCTION

I argue that anthropological machine equally animalizes both women and nonhuman animals in *Disgrace*. This impact of the anthropological machine reduces women and non-human animals to bare life. Accordingly, this machine reduces the women and non-human animals to bare life through the procedure of inclusion and exclusion from the state. This bare life excludes certain beings and species from political space and complete freedom but includes them to be controlled, managed and excluded from political space. Such a bare life as the intermediate space is somewhere between the natural world and political mechanism. My second and important claim is that anthropological machine victimizes both women and nonhuman animals.

Giorgio Agamben, an Italian Philosopher, has originated the term Anthropological Machine. In the book *The Open: Man and Animal*, he defined an anthropological machine as, "A machine or device for producing the recognition of the human" (26). To Agamben, this machine gives identification about humans by excluding animals. This recognition produces the boundary between humans, nonhuman animals and women. Equally, Agamben claims, "Insofar as the production of man through the opposition man/animal, human/inhuman, is at stake here, the machine necessarily functions by means of an exclusion" (37). For Agamben, the anthropological machine works by

separating man from animal and human within humans through exclusion.

Anthropological machine animalizes certain beings by reducing them to bare life without giving them the privilege to demand their rights. Reducing human and non-human animals to bare life is associated with a mechanism of exclusion. Through exclusion, the anthropological machine dichotomizes organisms as human and non-human animals. Additionally, the aforementioned idea shows how anthropological machine reduces non-human animals and women to bare life.

Furthermore, the purpose of this research is to explore the anthropological machine as the cause of bare life. This research aims to determine if anthropological machine animalizes women and non-human animals. It also focuses on whether women and non-human animals are not considered fully human or animal. Similarly, the objective of this research work is to highlight the unethical treatment of women and non-human animals, which is the cause of the social divide in *Disgrace*.

As this research delimits the area of study, the researcher selects the issue of women and non-human animals regarding the bare life. In this context, this study analyzes that women and non-human animals are at the intermediary space in *Disgrace*. For conducting such research in *Disgrace*, both conceptual and theoretical framework is necessary as the system of academic research.

While analyzing the problem of women and non-human animals, the researcher explores the anthropological machine in *Disgrace*. Such an anthropological machine has animalized both women and non-human animals by excluding them from the mainstream of society. As narrated in *Disgrace*, "You were raped" (157). A group of men raped Lucy. She is weaker in comparison to these men. Lucy is unable to defend herself because she is deprived of the social defence system. Similarly, the anthropological machine reduces non-human animals to bare life. As described in *Disgrace*, "They shot the dogs" (108). The dogs outside were shot by a group of men. For instance, a group of men shot dogs that represent non-human animals. These men treat dogs as non-speaking beings as they cannot defend themselves. This event clarifies that women and nonhuman animals are sufferers of the

Author: Institute of Advanced Communication, Education, and Research (IACER). e-mail: friendlydurgesh9@gmail.com

anthropological machine. So, they are in a state of bare life where they cannot demand their rights.

The researcher conducts the entire research through existing literature, textual analysis, epistemology, and post-humanistic approach. As a qualitative study, the researcher uses online, primary and secondary sources to meet the objectives of this research. Based on the claim of this research, the researcher will find whether the anthropological machine impacts women and non-human animals in *Disgrace*. Such epistemology explores how women and non-human animals are in the state of bare life. Likewise, this research uses a posthumanist approach to identify the bare life. Accordingly, such identification contributes to the justice of both humans and non-human animals. To lead this, the research paper addresses why the anthropological machine animalizes women and non-human animals, how anthropological machine animalizes women and non-human animals, and why only women and non-human animals are animalized.

The anthropological machine excludes human animals, non-human animals, and their rights. Consequently, women and nonhuman animals lack equal access to political space to demand rights. As a result, both women and non-human animals are somewhere between natural life and political life. Besides, Agamben illustrates, "This machine can best be understood as the symbolic and material mechanisms at work in various scientific and philosophical discourses that classify and distinguish humans and animals through a dual process of inclusion and exclusion" (qtd. in Calarco 98). For Agamben, this machine includes certain beings or species to manage, exploit, control and dominate.

Agamben regards the domination over species and beings as animalization. Living creatures are at the camp created by the state in which they are biopolitically managed, however giving them the illusion of freedom. For example, if there is no political space and if the living organisms don't have wilderness either, their life is suspended between natural life and political life. That suspended life Agamben describes as bare life. So, if living beings are animalized, reduced to bare life, they are included to be excluded from the state.

To clarify the dual process of inclusion and exclusion, Agamben highlights the anthropological machine by explaining pre-modern and modern anthropological machine. In pre-modern anthropological machine, slaves and barbarians are turned into a human without completely being human. The disgraced society reduces the slaves and the barbarians to animalize them. According to Agamben, "Human beings who take an essentially animal form are used to mark the constitutive outside of humanity proper: the infant savage, the wolf-man, the werewolf, the slave, or the barbarian" (qtd. in Calarco 99). Agamben claims slaves and barbarians are humans in animal forms. The pre-modern anthropological machine humanizes slaves and

barbarians without completely being humans. This machine exploits and treats slaves and barbarians like animals. It means the slaves and barbarians are in a state of bare life as they cannot claim their rights.

In the broader sense, the effect of this machine places humans to bare life. In the view of Agamben, the modern anthropological machine turns humans into animals without realizing that they are humans. For instance, the Nazis turned Jews people into animals. Clarifying the anatomy of the modern anthropological machine, Agamben claims, "It functions by excluding as not (yet) human an already human being from itself, that is, by animalizing the human, by isolating the nonhuman within the human: Homo alalus, or the ape-man" (37). In the opinion of Agamben, the impact of this machine does not treat women as human. The modern anthropological machine works by animalizing certain human beings by separating human beings within themselves. To Agamben, the missing links between human and non-human animals cause neither an animal nor human life, but merely a bare life.

The modern anthropological machine is deeply political and unethical. It is the root cause of the dehumanization of humans and non-human animals by keeping them in the margin. The effect of this machine exploits humans by not considering them fully humans. For evidence, the Jews are humans who are animalized and exploited by separating them within the human body itself. They are in the state of bare life. Human and non-human animals are animalized as they have a bare life where they are rendered without right, justice and social inclusion. When non-human animals or women cannot protest, they become non-speaking beings. This is the production of the anthropological machine.

The above-mentioned idea explains that animalization is exclusion, be it certain aspects of humans internally as well as the exclusion of non-human animals externally. Animalization is the anthropological machine at work in full intensity, erecting 'fictional' humans at the cost of exclusion of minorities as well as nonhuman animals.

Further, Agamben argues that the Anthropological machine includes human and non-human animals to be excluded from the state as the state has total power. For Agamben, certain beings or species are included to be only managed, exploited, controlled and dominated. This machine differentiates human and non-human animals by animalizing them and reducing them to bare life through the process of inclusion and exclusion from the state. This means all living organisms are in the camp created by the state, in which living organisms are bio-politically managed. So, humans and non-human animals are in the intermediate space where they lack access to have rights. This anthropological machine in J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* has caused the state of bare life regarding women and non-human animals.

In addition, language is the mode of the anthropological machine which causes the social divide between humans and nonhumans. Ernst Haeckel, a German zoologist, naturalist, and philosopher explains, "What distinguishes man from animal is language" (qtd. in Agamben 36). To Haeckel, it is the language that places humans higher than non-human animals. Emphasizing the above-mentioned data, Haeckel explains the idea of ape-man as, "To man a peculiar being that he called 'ape-man' or, since it was without language" (qtd. in Agamben 34). In the view of Haeckel, non-human animals and human animals become non-speaking beings in absence of language.

Moreover, the lack of language causes the state of bare life to human animals and non-human animals where they cannot demand the right to have rights. Based on biological evolutionism, the human would be ape-man without speech or language. A being without a language separates man from an animal. As a result of this, Agamben contributed to the idea of the ape-man.

Additionally, dehumanization is a state where human and non-human animals don't have the means to defend themselves without speech or language. Focusing on animalization, Agamben explains, "Only a shadow cast by language, a presupposition of speaking man, by which we always obtain only an animalization of man (an animal-man, like Haeckel's ape-man)" (36). For Agamben, man is unable to defend himself without the presence of language due to dehumanization. The human would be ape-man without speech or means to defend. Following the above-mentioned idea, the word 'animalization' refers to the bare life. A bare life cannot demand the right to have rights. Bare life is an intermediate life between natural and political life.

The above-mentioned explanation justifies that biopolitics is a political mechanism. Michel Foucault a French philosopher, writer, and literary critic's conception of biopolitical is operationalized when "Dominant modes of politics have come increasingly to take the form of the controlling, governing, and shaping of life and not simply wielding the sovereign power to kill" (qtd. in Calarco 54). For Foucault, biopolitics refers to politics that govern and manage people, minorities, refugees, and foreigners. Such a mechanism excludes living organisms without having rights. It is a state-created camp which bio-politically manages certain beings and species without giving them freedom and rights to survive.

Agamben expands on the biopolitical as "Totalitarian or democratic form, contains within it the virtual possibility of concentration camps and other violent means of producing and controlling bare life" (qtd. in Calarco 100). In the interpretation of Agamben, biopolitics excludes people by keeping them in manageable spaces or camps. The people don't have a biopolitical space to organize the community and demand their rights. If there is no political space, and if there is

no wilderness either, our life is suspended between natural life and political life. That suspended life Agamben describes as depoliticized life or bare life.

The depoliticized life causes human and non-human animals to be reduced or animalized so that they can be treated as the state wants to use. The state includes people and takes away all their rights because it runs most of the time under the state of exception where it suspends all the rights that living organisms have. People don't have political space to demand rights. In this context, animalization suspends humans and non-human animals between natural life and political life. They lack access to rights. For Instance, in concentration camps, Jews didn't have political space to demand their rights.

To eliminate the unethical treatment of women and non-human animals, a post-humanist approach is used. Posthumanism recommends the option for social justice. Similarly, humanism ethics favours human animals, whereas post-humanism contributes ethics or justice for both humans and nonhuman animals. The post-humanist ethical justice to Jacques Derrida, a French philosopher, is to multiply the differences between humans and non-human animals and humans themselves. According to Derrida, "Multiply differences and distinctions between various animals, between animals and humans, and then within the human itself" (qtd. in Naas 233). Derrida illustrates that human beings should multiply the difference between non-human animals and humans and within humans. Furthermore, such a recommended idea of Derrida can justify for both humans and non-human animals.

Derrida formed deconstruction between humans and animals by saying there are more differences in animals and there is difference between humans and animals too. Derrida posits to multiply the difference between humans and non-human animals and within humans rather than obliterating it. Also, he suggests, stop positivizing humans and negativizing animals. Derrida claims that multiplication of difference erases the binary opposition between humans and non-human animals and within humans. This idea of Derrida clarifies that erasing the difference is not the solution to remove the binary opposition between humans and nonhuman animals. Rather, human beings should multiply the differences to erase the binary opposition between humans and non-human animals and within humans.

Moreover, for Agamben, the Anthropological machine causes the risk of women's life. In the opinion of Agamben, "The critical and destructive gesture of jamming anthropological machine is just as important as a positive project of articulating another non-binary and nonhierarchical concept of the human" (Calarco 107). Agamben's stopping anthropological machine posits a nonhierarchical concept which erases the unequal boundary established between the human animals and nonhuman animals and within humans like

women and slaves. Humans need to stop the anthropological machine implemented in society. If humans jam anthropological machine, it will abolish the root of hierarchy between humans and animals and within humans.

In conclusion, this research finds how anthropological machine animalizes women and non-human organisms, whereas this same social mechanism humanizes the men in the society. This leads to finding out the social injustice in *Disgrace*. Consequently, the same machine pushes the animalized women and non-human organisms to bare life. On the contrary, men have access to power, privilege and the political paradigm of society.

Additionally, this research recommends Derrida's radical justice and Agamben's idea of jamming the anthropological machine to avoid the difference between human and non-human animals and within humans. If the state, government or concerned stakeholders follow radical justice and the idea of jamming the anthropological machine, the boundary between human and non-human organisms can be dismantled. Ultimately, such activities of the government can establish justice for women, men, and non-human animals. Moreover, it would be better if the state's policy-makers bring the policy to follow Derrida's radical justice and Agamben's idea of jamming the anthropological machine.

WORKS CITED

1. Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. California UP, 2004.
2. Calarco, Matthew. *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida*. Columbia UP, 2008.
3. Coetzee, J.M. *Disgrace*. Penguin Books Ltd, 1999.
4. Naas, Michael. "Derrida's Flair (For the Animals to Follow...)". *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2010, pp. 219-242. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156916410X509931>