

Ten theses on Zoo futurism and the technologies of the future

Dominique Lestel

Résumé

Le texte présente le Zoofuturisme comme une proposition philosophique et artisticoexistentielle visant à repenser la relation entre les humains, les animaux et les technologies du futur. L'auteur soutient que la philosophie académique traditionnelle est devenue insuffisante pour comprendre le monde contemporain, marqué par l'accélération technologique, la crise écologique et de profondes transformations ontologiques. En réponse, le Zoofuturisme propose dix thèses, articulées autour d'une pratique philosophique hybride, située entre la philosophie, l'art et la sciencefiction. L'idée centrale est le passage d'un idéal de vie *avec* les animaux à un idéal de vie *dans* les animaux, compris comme une cohabitation symbiotique, métabolique et existentielle. L'auteur introduit le concept de réactivation perpendiculaire de l'espèce, selon lequel l'humain n'abandonne pas son espèce, mais la réorganise en intégrant des caractéristiques d'autres espèces de manière non darwinienne. Ce processus est conçu comme une technologie existentielle permettant « d'habiter le monde autrement ». Le Zoofuturisme est également présenté comme une réponse possible aux crises climatiques et à l'effondrement écologique, en défendant l'invention de technologies de survie fondées sur la réanimalisation de l'humain, en opposition aussi bien au transhumanisme qu'aux postures apocalyptiques ou décroissantes.

Mots-clés : Zoo futurisme; Technologies du futur; Relation humain-animal; Technologie existentielle; Crise écologique et survie.

Abstract

The text presents Zoofuturism as a philosophical and artisticoexistential proposal aimed at rethinking the relationship between humans, animals, and future technologies. The author argues that traditional academic philosophy has become insufficient for understanding the contemporary world, marked by technological acceleration, ecological crisis, and pro-

CONTACT: Dominique Lestel, ENS/PSL, Department of Philosophy, lestel@ens.fr



Aion Journal of Philosophy and Science

© 2026 the Authors

This work is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License.

found ontological transformations. In response, Zoofuturism puts forward ten theses, articulated around a hybrid philosophical practice situated between philosophy, art, and science fiction. The central idea is the transition from an ideal of living *with* animals to an ideal of living *within* animals, understood as a symbiotic, metabolic, and existential form of cohabitation. The author introduces the concept of *perpendicular reactivation of the species*, according to which humans do not abandon their species but reorganize it by incorporating characteristics of other species in a non-Darwinian way. This process is conceived as an existential technology that makes it possible to “inhabit the world differently.” Zoofuturism is also presented as a possible response to climate crises and ecological collapse, advocating the invention of survival technologies based on the reanimalization of the human, in opposition both to transhumanism and to apocalyptic or degrowth-oriented positions.

Keywords: Zoofuturism; Future Technologies; Human–animal relations; Existential technology; Ecological crisis and survival.

With Zoofuturism, my goal is to address the question of future technologies *and* the philosophy that accompanies their development in a personal way.

To think about questions such as future technologies or the becoming of humans and living beings, we must invent new ways of practicing philosophy — or thought because philosophy as it is usually practiced in universities has become largely obsolete.

In other words, we’re not going to redo Kant, Hegel, Wittgenstein, Quine, or Derrida *to grasp*¹ the issues of the contemporary world in becoming.

From this perspective, Zoofuturism can be described as the improbable but thrilling marriage between my most fundamental philosophical interests and some of my most haunting childhood dreams — slipping into the skin of individuals of another species², sliding into the scales of a saurian, or becoming something of the butterfly for the span of a few wingbeats.

Zoofuturism is a term I coined in 2016 while preparing a lecture at the Arts Décos. This detail is not insignificant, because it was a lecture given in an art school. I was invited to speak about human–animal relations, and my goal was to introduce disorder, the unexpected, and *fun* into an intellectual space that gives too much importance to good intentions and a stifling seriousness — the kind that undermines the intellectual and existential creativity that truly excites me. Today, my work on

¹ ‘To apprehend’ rather than ‘to think’, because this venture requires the theorist to involve themselves — we leave the space of ‘pure’ discourse. It is also a reference to the opening toward a ‘field philosophy’, which has little to do with a rehearsed positivist empiricism, as some believe.

² I will consistently use the expression ‘other species’ (*espèce autre*) rather than the more usual ‘another species’ (*d’autre espèce*). Far from being a mannerism, this lexical choice is meant to highlight how strange an individual of another species appears to a human — not merely as a member of a different species, but as the member of a *disquieting* species.

Zoofuturism is also, as we will see, the continuation of an adventure that has led me *to practice philosophy differently* — at the crossroads of conceptual analysis, artistic practice, and science fiction — of which my work on *Insurrectional Machines* was an important step.

Rather than giving a traditional lecture, I will instead present ten central theses, which make no claim to exhaustiveness but aim to introduce a perspective that still remains largely to be invented. These theses vary in scope and importance.

Thesis 1. Moving from an ideal of life *with* animals to an ideal of life *in* animals

As a first approximation, Zoofuturism can be described as the stance that allows one to move from an ideal of life *with* animals to an ideal of life *in* animals.

What is being evoked here is not merely sharing an ecosystem with animals on a behavioral level, but *cohabiting symbiotically* with them, that is *metabolically, behaviorally, and semiotically*.

Living with a pet already means *becoming something of that animal*.

Two things should be noted. First, *the ambiguity of the sentence in French*, which means both transforming oneself through that animal and being able to put oneself in that animal's place. Second, its *reversibility*.

Living with a pet also means allowing that animal to become something of us.

On this subject, I'm fond of the anecdote about the old woman at the veterinarian's, who places her dog on the examination table and says: "Doctor, we have a stomachache".

As Montaigne said about La Boétie, "because it was he, because it was I," but for the French writer it was, of course, a human being who was concerned.

Thesis 2. Enchant myself

I don't just want to live with my cat, I want to *encat*³ myself. "Enchater": the word doesn't exist in French, and here we see a major feature of Zoofuturism, which develops a playful and creative closeness with language — not only with its vocabulary but also with its grammar.

Here we understand that my conception of philosophy stands in opposition to *youknowwho*⁴, who seeks the future of thought in a largely fantasized archaeology of the Greek language.

A conception of philosophy rooted in ordinary language is also excluded.

My philosophical approach gives primary importance to language, and it does not hesitate to invent words or twist grammatical expressions to make them more effective.

French, then, but modified to be more efficient.

Pedants will reproach me for my barbarisms, my solecisms, and generally for

³ *Chat* is "cat" in French (N.T.)

⁴ Leo Strauss used to say, about the same individual: 'hewhoshallnotbenamed', if we are to believe George Steiner's recollections in his conversations with Ramin J.

my baroque grammar, but I let them bark. As it's said in *Tintin*: "The dog barks, but the caravan passes." I am the caravan.

To encat myself, then, but also to endog myself, enfish myself, or insectize myself, and many others besides — asking myself what unique perspective each choice of animal offers, without limiting myself to real zoology; certain forms of imaginary zoology present intellectual opportunities that would be a shame to overlook⁵.

Thesis 3. Zoofuturism must be understood as a perpendicular and individualized reactivation of the species

Zoofuturism, then, aims to account for the mobilization of multiple techniques *to invent forms of existence at the margins of species*.

A technology of the perpendicular reactivation of the species.

Zoofuturism can thus be characterized, at a first level, as a technology of the *perpendicular reactivation of the species*.

The perpendicular reactivation of the species sets up mechanisms that make us inhabit the species in a nonconforming way — that is, a nonDarwinian one; I do not enter into competition with other species to access ecological resources, but instead assimilate some of the characteristics of individuals from another species in order to be of my own species *otherwise* than those who belong to the species "naturally" are.

In Zoofuturism, one does not leave one's species; one *remodels it*.

From this point of view, Zoofuturism becomes a form of tinkering with phylogenesis.

It requires abandoning the belief in a linearity of Evolution in which one would pass from one species to another.

Each species does not only display adaptive innovations in relation to the species from which it descended. It also carries with it characteristics that it has disconnected from preceding species, and that it can partially reactivate outside any adaptive requirement — and in this sense, this reactivation can be described as perpendicular.

What does it mean to "inhabit one's species"? To be part of a species from the standpoint of the first person.

The question being posed here is neglected by both biologists and philosophers — namely, what it means to *inhabit one's species*, that is, *to be part of a species from the firstperson point of view*.

Zoologists consider the species as a whole. They now acknowledge the existence of *singular animals*, such as the knottying orangutans I studied with Chris Herzfeld, or talking chimpanzees like Washoe.

Knowing how a given member of a species *personally* experiences their speciesmembership remains a largely unexplored question.

⁵ One could revisit the phenomenon of the vampire from this perspective. On 'real' vampires, see Lestel's unsettling book *L'animal Singulier*, Seuil.

Belonging to a species as adventure.

For both the biologist and the philosopher, belonging to a species remains a typological characteristic; but it is also an *adventure* that can be expressed very differently depending on the agents involved, and that can lead to *disturbing idiosyncrasies* — particularly among those, more numerous than one might think, who feel themselves to be of another species⁶, or who refuse to remain confined to a single species⁷.

The pseudopsychiatric explanation.

When faced with such an extravagant claim (in the literal sense: one that steps off the beaten paths), the mistake would be to reduce it to forms of mental pathology and to call in psychiatry. From this point of view, those who want to change gender are small players; wanting to change species is a far more ambitious undertaking.

Thesis 4. Zoofuturism as anarchism of the species

Zoofuturism is an anarchism of the species. Darwinism, to begin with, is deeply anarchistic in spirit through its *bottomup* dynamics, which operate by trial and error without being configured *a priori* by any overarching *topdown* schema such as the teleological *Grand Design* of creationists.

Evolution gives even weak species a chance.

A non-Spencerian interpretation of Darwinism would instead emphasize the magnificent fact that even the most delicate, the weakest, and the most extravagant species have managed to carve out their own place without being *broadly* eliminated by the more aggressive ones.

To experience the species in another way existentially, and not only empathetically.

Zoofuturism deepens this anarchistic strain within Evolution by potentially allowing each person to experience the other species not in an *empathic* way (imagining oneself in the place of the other), but in an *existential* way (metabolically occupying the place of the other).

To belong to a species as a *personal choice* and not as a *phylogenetic destiny*.

The Zoofuturist stance therefore develops an explicit *noborder* project by refusing to be confined by what could be identified as species boundaries, and by considering that belonging to a species is just as much a matter of personal choice as of a phylogenetic destiny imposed by a fortuitous birth. The capricious adolescents who protest that they were not consulted about being born (a claim that should be understood as an ontological eccentricity deserving conceptual elaboration) adopt a sterile complaint that could be more fruitfully transformed into a more subversive desire not to remain confined to the species assigned to them at birth.

⁶ See, for example, the ‘Otherkin’ phenomenon, where people gather who do not feel they belong to the species into which they were born.

⁷ Whether the question also arises for other species remains open — but we do see examples of it in certain monkeys.

To multiply shortcircuits within the phylogenetic space.

The relationship to phylogenesis remains today a monopoly of biologists. Zoo-futurism makes it possible to turn phylogenesis into something other than an arrangement oriented toward the future. It replaces a multiplicity of détourned temporal sequences for the very tidy arrangement oriented from past to future and always kept under control. But the phylogenetic space is far too rich and interesting to be left in the clutches of the biologists.

In this sense, Zoofuturism can be characterized as a way of reconceptualizing phylogenesis in order to multiply improbable shortcircuits within it, outside the Geneva Convention.

Thesis 5. Zoofuturism as a new capitalist niche

A certain number of sensitive points within Zoofuturism must be confronted headon.

Zoofuturism, for example, constitutes an emerging capitalist market that could be characterized as that of a *nonnutritive consumption of other species*.

Some ways of engaging in it are inexpensive, but one must acknowledge that the most exciting ones rely on new technologies, such as biotechnologies or information technologies, which are among the most costly. The project can be made highly subversive by mobilizing enormous resources that exist only in a capitalist society.

Speaking only of capitalism is, in any case, somewhat simplistic, because one of the problems of Zoofuturism lies in its relationship with the military and with war.

Some might see a paradox here: resorting to what destroys the world in order to confront its announced destruction. What would the alternatives be? A return to a largely fantasized past is not a realistic option, and fighting evil with evil is a traditional strategy — well illustrated by the Greek notion of *Pharmakon*. The political objection concerning the sharing of resources is more pertinent.

Access to such *transpécifique* experimentation should be widely available — should we speak of a “democratic Zoofuturism”? I will not answer these questions here; I am merely raising them.

Thèse 6. Le Zoo-futurisme comme adaptation au changement climatique et comme dispositif postapocalyptique à neutraliser les vaincus

Zoofuturism does not propose a purely aesthetic conception of the Living.

Zoofuturism as a response to current climatic upheavals.

Zoo-futurism offers a response to global warming, to the collapse of biodiversity resulting from the anthropization of the world, to the generalized pollution of ecosystems, and to humanity's desire to extend itself beyond its traditional ecosystems — by enabling life in extreme atmospheres and by inhabiting the oceans and the cosmos.

Inventing effective survival technologies.

Faced with the geological upheavals that threaten us, we generally evoke three options: an *appropriate technological response*, *apocalyptic disappearance*, or the *choice of degrowth*.

Contrary to what many intellectuals believe, I think we must invent effective survival technologies — just as the Living, indeed, has always done. From this point of view, a return to the Paleolithic is an inconsistent fantasy⁸.

Posthuman as the *reanimalization* of the human

A central question of our time is therefore expressed in a brief proposition: what technologies will allow us to survive the geological transformations of the world brought about by its anthropization?

Zoofuturism suggests developing technologies that would paradoxically allow humans to transition to the posthuman through a *reanimalization of the human* — by transforming themselves into living agents capable of surviving in ecosystems where the temperature is 50°C, where oxygen is lacking, where the pressure is far higher than that at the Earth's surface, or where gravity does not exist.

Mimetic evolutionism, Darwinian evolutionism, Lamarckian evolutionism.

From a Zoofuturist perspective, humans can survive on the condition that they reanimalize themselves by borrowing from animals what they lack. This results in a mimetic, borrowbased evolutionism that is very different from Darwinian and Lamarckian evolutionisms, in which one species appropriates characteristics of other species in order to survive. The Zoofuturist stance is the antizombie film⁹.

Reactivating skills from the *World Before*

Zoofuturism therefore engages in a *philosophical and artistic* perspective that regards climate warming not as an apocalyptic endgame, but as an opportunity to reactivate what had been neglected, eliminated, or concealed in *the world before* — a very interesting expression that I borrow from the discourse that developed during the Covid crisis, and which I radicalize on a scale that is not only historical but also evolutionist.

A postapocalyptic device for neutralizing the defeated.

From this point of view, Zoofuturism is a *postapocalyptic device for neutralizing the defeated*.

The expression may rightly make one bristle, but it becomes understandable once we realize that the defeated, here, are those who already consider themselves as such and who organize themselves as survivors engaged in resistance, resentment, and morality — the degrowthers and all those, more generally, who believe that there is nothing left to be done in a world that is now set on its final slope¹⁰. The defeated, in this sense, are those who conceive the ongoing ecological catastrophe as an oppor-

⁸ This is, for example, the goal of anachoprimitivists like John Zerzan, who is also one of the most extreme, since he even dreams of returning to a time before the emergence of humans.

⁹ On this subject, see the delightful chapter by JeanPaul Déléage.

¹⁰ A slightly politically aware reader will notice the reference to the Stalinist slogan of *the final struggle*.

tunity to cultivate sad passions and to establish various systems of subjugation and reeducation for the recalcitrant.

Thesis 7. Zoofuturism as a war machine against the Transhumanists

Zoofuturism must also be understood as a “war machine”¹¹ against Transhumanists such as Ray Kurzweil or Nick Bostrom, who aim to move into the posthuman by becoming superhuman — eliminating disease, eradicating death, and increasing their cognitive capacities.

The transhumanist project has provoked passionate rejection among “humanists” who deplore the hubris of the project and the return to traditional forms of humanism; but as Raphaël Liogier has pointed out, one cannot oppose such an exciting project by mobilizing outdated relics that are largely obsolete¹².

Only a project at least as exciting can oppose the Transhumanists. That is what Zoofuturism aims to be. What is sought is not to become a human++, but *to become, in another way, a different kind of human*.

Thesis 8. Zoofuturism as an existential technology

Zoofuturism is anchored within the framework of an existential technology¹³. An existential technology does not simply allow one *to do something*: it allows one *to live who one is in a different way*.

A technology that allows one to wander at the edges of one’s species.

Zoofuturism engages in a technology that allows one *to wander at the edges of one’s species* by visiting other species.

Understanding the expression requires setting up *a phenomenology of the ambivalent zones* that separate certain species from certain others.

We do not have the same degree of proximity with all species. Humans are closer to a great ape than to a cat, and closer to a cat than to a beetle — the greater the phylogenetic distance, the more complex the technologies that must be mobilized.

In this regard, one may wonder whether certain species are out of reach. Can one, for example, engage in a becomingvirus or a becomingbacteria?

Visiting other species: substituting tourism for predation.

Visiting other species; the expression deserves some reflection on what it means. *Tourism is substituted for predation*, with the difference that in this kind of tourism which is neither cultural nor spatial one transforms oneself.

This represents a break with the standard evolutionist dynamic, according to which entering a new species is *irreversible* (one cannot go back), *involuntary* (it

¹¹ On the notion of the ‘war machine’, see Deleuze and Guattari, *Mille plateaux*, Minuit.

¹² Raphaël Liogier,

¹³ The term was, for example, proposed in: « Technique et esthétique » : quelle est la question ? », *Le Portique* [En ligne], 3 | 1999, posted online on March 11, 2005, consulted on August 25, 2023. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/leportique/292> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/leportique.292>, but I am using it here in a different sense.

does not result from a personal choice but from a collective fate), and unique (one cannot engage in several species).

An essential performative dimension

The performative dimension of Zoofuturism is not secondary, and it is no coincidence that artists are at the forefront of Zoofuturism¹⁴.

The becoming-animal of Zoofuturism is not a metaphorical, allegorical, psychiatric, or purely literary posture.

The aim of Zoofuturism is to *genuinely* enable humans to experiment with other species.

This technology, moreover, has no reason to be homogeneous. It may rely on benign forms of technology, for example through masks or costumes, but it is also intended to draw on more invasive technologies, such as biotechnologies, nanotechnologies, or information and communication technologies such as AI or persistent digital worlds.

When I say that I want to ‘catify’ myself, I do not merely mean imitating a cat more or less faithfully; *I mean introducing something of the cat into myself*, for example, vibrissae that would allow me to relate to the world as a real cat does through these particular sensory organs.

Zoofuturism has nothing metaphorical about it, and it is in this sense that it requires particular technologies — existential technologies.

Understanding Zoofuturism in the context of a history of existential technologies

To be fully understood, Zoofuturism must be grasped within the context of a history of existential technologies one to which historians of technology and philosophers have not given the importance it deserves¹⁵.

Without dwelling excessively on this point, it is necessary to distinguish two types of technologies — technologies that allow one to do things, and technologies that allow one to inhabit the world differently and to transform oneself, which I will characterize as *existential technologies*.

One may mention prayers and rituals, but also writing and music, as well as certain uses of psychedelic drugs and many others.

My last two theses are more general than those linked to Zoofuturism *sensu stricto*, but they point to the necessity of constructing a paradigm that allows it to be fully thought.

Thesis 9. Practicing philosophy as a branch of science fiction

It is difficult to situate the Zoofuturist approach within the current intellectual

¹⁴ I show this clearly in Lestel (2018).

¹⁵ Hypothesis to explore: a characteristic of contemporary Western thought, materialist and atheistic, is that functional technologies have been favored because they are the ones in which Westerners have become the most proficient — while existential technologies have been neutralized in another sphere, that of the arts, literature, or religion.

and institutional landscape for multiple reasons.

It would no doubt have to be placed somewhere between *philosophy*, a certain *artistic practice with epistemic and political ambitions*, and an *ecofuturist activism* that sees the contemporary ecological crisis as an opportunity for new worlds to emerge rather than as an apocalyptic catastrophe marking the end of the one we know.

Even if counterexamples can always be put forward, the sterility of university philosophy departments leads to the observation that truly creative philosophy is now being done elsewhere — for example, in art schools, where we find artists who think about the contemporary world in highly creative ways, and perhaps in the near future within certain companies.

The world has shifted into an accelerated space of disruptive innovations, and from this follows the necessity of inventing unprecedented ways of practicing philosophy.

The world has shifted into science fiction.”

The observation is far from original, but all its consequences are far from having been drawn: the world has today shifted into the universe of science fiction¹⁶. Without claiming to be exhaustive, one may mention the discovery of exoplanets and the resulting nearcertainty that elaborated extraterrestrial life forms and extraterrestrial civilizations exist; the development of the internet and powerful AI; the growth of biotechnologies and nanotechnologies — but also Covid19, which confined all the most developed countries; the collapse of biodiversity; global warming; the emerging migrant crisis; the acute awareness of the limits of energy resources; the possibility of changing gender; the omnipresence of religious terrorism, etc. Science fiction has been the only domain to imagine these major upheavals and to begin taking them seriously.

Orienting philosophy toward the future rather than toward the past.

Faced with this major geological rupture, academic philosophy is incapable of thinking about what is happening. It is highly diverse, but the majority of those who practice it institutionally share a common ethos organized around two fundamental poles — that of *the history of philosophy*, which holds that philosophy is an endless commentary on the great authors; and that of a model of thought that privileges *a certain form of logic* — that is, a largely Aristotelian conception of logic, the logic of predicates mixed with the spirit of seriousness that has always fascinated clerical circles, whether religious or secular. These two poles are today largely obsolete for thinking the contemporary world in becoming.

The philosophy of the future begins today.

A number of philosophers are already aware of the need to draw closer to science fiction in order to think the contemporary world — with two major pioneers be-

¹⁶ Paul Virilio emphasized the importance of the phenomenon of the world’s acceleration, but it was Élie Halévy who himself conceptualized an acceleration of History.

ing Gilles Deleuze¹⁷ and Donna Haraway¹⁸. Restricting ourselves to the Francophone sphere, we can also mention, in very different styles, Gilbert Hottois, Guy Lardreau, Pierre CassouNoguès, and above all Isabelle Stengers, by far the most interesting.

All these authors, however, adopt a similar approach that remains both very timid and very traditional, consisting in commenting on sciencefiction texts or films.

Zoofuturism requires the development of a more radical philosophical approach, making science fiction an original mode of reflection that leads the theorist to immerse themselves in science fiction itself.

To consider that a response to global warming would be to reanimalize the human does not consist in commenting on an author who might have written a novel on this theme, but in thinking about the theme itself as a phenomenon.

To be equal to the phenomenology of today's worldinbecoming, we must begin by profoundly modifying our conception of science fiction, seeing it as a speculative practice of reason of which science fiction in the traditional sense is only one modality, philosophy being another.

Changing the style of philosophy

In this transformation, it is not only a matter of opening philosophy to science fiction (a move already unthinkable for most academic philosophers), but of decisively changing style by adopting a form of extravagance in thought that breaks with the stilted seriousness of philosophical writing.

Philosophy must train itself to 'think big' — both to think on unusual scales and to take risky bets by mobilizing multiple registers of expression, in particular by overflowing into performance, into forms of fiction that are its own, into artistic experiments, into existential commitments¹⁹, and even into mediumistic and psychedellic experiments.

I will not dwell too much here on its methodological aspects and will limit myself to briefly mentioning some of its features: evaluating and correcting the epistemic biases of humans and the ethnographic biases of the Western theorist; constructing conceptual landscapes through which important questions can be thought; adopting a pluralist and inclusive perspective; adopting the approach of 'Surface Thinking' (as opposed to the hermeneutic approach); and, above all, *subverting Popper's principle of falsifiability* in the manner of Paul Feyerabend.

Transforming the very ontology of the philosopher

In this logic, the extreme consequence of this perspective leads to profoundly modifying the very ontology of the philosopher, by envisaging *philosophers hybrid-*

¹⁷ G. Deleuze, 1972, « Avant-propos », de *Différence et répétition*, PUF, p.3.

¹⁸ See for example *Primate Visions*.

¹⁹ This is in particular one of the major issues of emerging field philosophy, which some people unduly try to reduce to a mere empirical component.

ized with AIs and genetically modified philosophers²⁰. Contemporary philosophy is indeed based on a major postulate that is never made explicit nor discussed, namely that a human philosopher can think in a relevant way everything that is worth thinking, granting a particular species (*Homo sapiens*) an exorbitant cognitive and intellectual privilege.

Thesis 10. Establishing new institutions

A practice of philosophy such as the one I have outlined in this presentation is difficult for most academic philosophers to accept, and establishing it within the current university landscape is an extremely challenging task — perhaps even a lost cause from the outset.

It is too speculative, too transgressive, too provocative, and it engages in multidisciplinary perspectives that are far too unusual.

Academic philosophy is a controlled practice that hides behind a highly artificial discourse of tolerance and openness, and that has adopted very restrictive criteria for what philosophy should be, criteria that it applies in a manic fashion.

Practicing philosophy in the perspective required by Zoofuturism therefore requires creating not only new institutions but even new kinds of institutions — and one should not count on the State (nor on the multiple *ad hoc* committees that parasitize it) to achieve this.

It is in the artistic sphere that ‘thinking’ happens most today, and such an institution should be both theoretical and artistic, bringing together highly diverse practitioners and creative individuals around adventurous projects with heterogeneous sources of funding.

Conclusion

Rather than a theoretical conclusion, a conclusion in the form of a few scattered remarks.

Contemporary technologies are blowing apart our *understanding of the real*. The categories we typically rely on are no longer functional, and most of our dichotomies now have only limited relevance. What is real can no longer be opposed to what is fictional, for example.

Technology makes it possible to reactivate the phylogenetic space through micropotentialities that remain untapped

The Zoofuturist stance as a particular approach to the environmental crisis and the technological explosion that accompanies it.

²⁰ During the autumn of 2014, the director of the philosophy department at the ENS, Marc Crépon, organized a study day in which each member of the department was to briefly present their ongoing research. I then gave a presentation on the hybridized philosopher and the genetically modified philosopher, which provoked astonishment and incomprehension, expressed in the same silence that would have followed the intervention of an extraterrestrial philosopher.

The aim is less to focus on protecting organisms that are disappearing than on the necessity of engaging them in dispositifs in which they become parts of us and in which we become parts of them.

Positive remark: by becoming something of those who are disappearing, we find a way to *involve ourselves personally* in this phenomenon of disappearance.

Negative remark: by assimilating ourselves to those who are disappearing, we assimilate them to ourselves in an unprecedented way, and we complete their disappearance.

Bibliography

- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F., 1980, *Mille plateaux*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., 1968, *Différence et répétition*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Halévy, É., 1901, *Essai sur l'accélération de l'histoire*, Paris, Alcan.
- Haraway, D., 1989, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*, New York, Routledge.
- Lestel, D., 2004, *L'animal singulier*, Paris, Seuil.
- Virilio, P., 1977, *Vitesse et politique*, Paris, Galilée.
- Zerzan, J., 1994, *Future Primitive and Other Essays*, Brooklyn, Autonomedia.