

# Necrophilia Serial Killer Luka Magnotta

Friday, March 16, 2012


Cannibal Serial Killer Luka Magnotta — Kannibalismus  
людоед

людоед  
каннибализм

Cannibalism is caused by the desire for an equitable fashion-conscious diet and the resulting [desire](#) , the [flesh](#) of another [man](#) to eat, to parts of his [personality](#) or his mana in the record.

In times of bird flu, mad cow disease and infested banana is the consumption of human flesh a risk-free variety, so as not to [vegetarians](#)to be. Especially juicy are the ham, the ideal roast for a four-member [family](#) arise.

As an international theme of the cannibals will be for a long time, "you eat what you are!" considered. This is disputed by members of the cannibalistic lebenseintellung.



Cannibal

Luka Magnotta

The cannibalism is gone in the near future on the rise worldwide. Increasingly reports appear on it. The man happens to be the only food source that even in times of famine (which incidentally are predicted to be taken seriously by future researchers in this century) is virtually unlimited. Human flesh provides high-quality species-specific protein and plenty of calorie-rich fat. In times of [bird flu](#) , [mad cow disease](#) and [swine fever](#) , it is also safe to consume almost.

Blog Archive

▼ 2012 (2)

▼ March (2)

Cannibal Serial Killer Luka Magnotta --- Kanniba...

Necrophiliac Serial Killer Luka Magnotta

Human flesh is the pork so similar that it leaves something to be flavorful and nothing. Especially profitable are the ham (thigh and buttocks), which can be prepared for a variety of specialties. Examples juicy steaks and succulent thighs, fat from the roast are called with a decent bacon rind bearing buttock. The fatty belly meat is used more as a soup, meat, while the back offers a variety of leaner roasts. Finally, it should be noted that humans like easy and fast as **pigs** can fatten.

=====

Der Kannibalismus entsteht durch das Verlangen nach einer modegerechten bewussten Ernährung und dem daraus resultierenden **Wunsch**, das **Fleisch** eines anderen **Menschen** zu verspeisen, um Teile von dessen **Persönlichkeit** oder dessen Mana in sich aufzunehmen.

In Zeiten von Vogelgrippe, Rinderwahnsinn und verseuchten Bananen ist der Verzehr von Menschenfleisch eine risikofreie Variante, um nicht zum **Vegetarier** zu werden. Besonders saftig sind die Schinken, die einen idealen Krustenbraten für eine vierköpfige **Familie** ergeben.

Als internationales Motto der Kanibalen wird schon seit langem "du isst was du bist!" angesehen. Dies wird aber von den Angehörigen der kanibalischen Lebenseinstellung bestritten.

Der Kannibalismus wird sich in naher Zukunft wieder weltweit auf den Vormarsch begeben. Immer häufiger tauchen Berichte darüber auf. Der Mensch ist nun mal die einzige Nahrungsquelle, die auch in Zeiten von Hungersnöten (die übrigens von ernst zu nehmenden Zukunftsforschern für dieses Jahrhundert prognostiziert werden) nahezu unbegrenzt zur Verfügung steht. Menschenfleisch bietet hochwertiges arteigenes Eiweiß und reichlich kalorienreiches Fett. In Zeiten von **Vogelgrippe**, **Rinderwahnsinn** und **Schweinepest** ist es zudem nahezu unbedenklich zu verzehren.

Menschenfleisch ist dem Schweinefleisch so ähnlich, dass es auch geschmacklich nichts zu wünschen übrig lässt. Besonders ertragreich sind die Schinken (Gesäß und Oberschenkel), die sich zu vielerlei Spezialitäten zubereiten lassen. Als Beispiele seien saftige Steaks vom Oberschenkel und saftige, fette Krustenbraten von der mit einer ordentlichen Speckschwarte versehenen Hinterbacke genannt. Das fette Bauchfleisch dient eher als Suppenfleisch, während der magerere Rücken diverse Bratenstücke bietet. Zum Schluss sei bemerkt, dass sich der Mensch ähnlich leicht und schnell wie das **Schwein** mästen lässt.

Dieser an Gynäkomastie leidende, ältere Herr wurde durch den Versuch, die Weltherrschaft an sich reißen zu wollen, international und national bekannt. Dieses Unterfangen scheiterte jedoch kläglich, da er nur Deutschland erobern konnte und das auch nur, weil der frühere GoGo-Tänzer einige deutsche Freier mit Privatvideos, die ihn in **Klamotten** zeigten, überzeugen konnte. Eine Lücke in seinem Herzen, die seither nur noch mit deutschem, türkischem, französischem und fremdenfeindlichem Blut gefüllt werden kann.



Cannibal Luka Magnotta



Luka Magnotta



Kannibale

Posted by Anonymous at 7:38 PM 0 comments

Recommend  
this on

Labels: Luka, Magnotta

## Necrophiliac Serial Killer Luka Magnotta



Necrophiliac Serial Killer Luka Magnotta ——— Luka Magnotta Photo 2011

---

"*Necrophilia* is defined as a sick abnormal fascination with death and the dead; or more particularly, an erotic attraction to corpses.

"*Necrophilia* is a psychosexual disorder and is categorized with the group of disorders which comprise the paraphilias, a subtype of psychosexual disorder involving unusual or bizarre fantasies or acts that are necessary for full sexual excitement."

"A person who commits a sexual penetration on the dead body of a human being is guilty of a category A felony and shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for life with the possibility of parole, with eligibility for parole beginning when a minimum of 5 years has been

served, and shall be further punished by a fine of not more than \$20,000. For the purposes of this section, *sexual penetration* means cunnilingus, fellatio or any intrusion, however slight, of any part of a person's body or any object manipulated or inserted by a person into the genital or anal openings of the body of another, including, without limitation, sexual intercourse in what would be its ordinary meaning if practiced upon the living."

When I was a young child, I used to spend much of my time alone, either in the woods or in the local cemetery, where there was the grave of a 19 year old boy who died in the early half of last century. I felt close to that boy, and would pick flowers in the woods and take them to his grave.

In 2003, I discovered a mummified corpse of a young man in a vault, in a church where I was doing restoration work for a friend. I fell in love with him, and it broke my heart to seal him in there. I wanted to take him home and look after him.

I day dream about having him here with me. Silly ordinary things like watching TV together, listening to music, taking him out for picnics, watching a DVD late at night before taking him up to bed with me. All very ordinary things, apart from the fact that I want to do them with a desiccated or mummified corpse.

I don't have a problem attracting living men. I'm just naturally attracted to the dead.

Some people never realize until its too late that excepting their feelings and not acting anymore is true freedom.

It's not cool to the world being a necrophiliac. It's bloody lonely. But I dont really care, I have never cared what people thought of me, most people are judgemental idiots. I'm unable to talk to anybody about it and there's always the knowledge that 99% of people would be repulsed by me if they found out about my feelings. Some people would even want to harm me.

Do I feel ashamed? never, but there's nothing but love in my heart for that man in the grave and the guy in the vault. I don't see myself as some creepy pervert. I'm just somebody who has feelings, real feelings, for dead men.



Luka Magnotta

JUST BECAUSE SOCIETY THINKS SOMETHING IS NOT "NORMAL" DOESNT MEAN ITS NOT RIGHT. SOCIETY IS WAY TOO CONCERNED WITH WHAT OTHER PEOPLE THINK, SO THEY END UP LIVING THEIR LIVES IN FEAR AND REPRESSED. FUCK WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE

THINKS WHO CARES!!!!!!

### Abstract

*This paper is about questioning social taboos and tradition in light of philosophical concepts. Why are certain acts regarded as morally incorrect, and would they still be incorrect were it not for the taboos that surround them? I take one of the more extreme cases of a social taboo (necrophilia) and ask my readers to momentarily remove from their minds their emotional and legal inclinations on the subject, and to simply consider the topic at face value with regards to concepts such as moral status and personhood.*

### Keywords

*Necrophilia, paraphilia, sexual deviance, ethics, thought experiment, proposal, moral status, personal identity, personhood*

### Disclaimer

I concede that this essay is a philosophical proposal and while works of this nature may seem out of place in a biomedical publication, I am submitting it for two reasons. Originally, the paper was sent in at the publisher's request. Professor Anil Aggrawal learned about my project, showed an interest, and contacted me with a request that I send the paper to him, as he may be interested in publishing it in this journal. While the publication and exhibition of my work is undeniably important to me, that is not the sole purpose of this submission. I seek to offer an objective viewpoint toward the ethics of necrophilia and to provide a possible understanding of why certain people may feel no qualms about the act. On some levels, I am playing devil's advocate and while this paper does, in essence, fall primarily into the realm of philosophy, I argue that all subjects-especially those within the sciences, namely biomedicine-require at least some consideration of ethics.

Before diving into the piths of this essay, I find it necessary to point out-as it can be easily misunderstood-that this essay simply employs the topic of necrophilia as a forum for theoretical discussion. It is an example of an area of - what I argue to be - moral indifference, and, most importantly, an exhibit of how social taboos can be found to be without foundation in light of a



logical analysis of ethics (if said taboos are based merely on unfounded traditions).

I would like to state here and now that I am not a necrophiliac. I have no interest in the practice, nor do I encourage it as it is not legally, socially, or hygienically supported. However, I argue that the practice is not, in itself, morally wrong.

The lexicography of ethics presents some complications because, to the best of my knowledge, there is no single word in the English language that concisely expresses my intended definition of "moral indifference." In essence, I argue for a spectrum of morality in relation to **"morally encouraged," "morally discouraged,"** and **"morally indifferent"** acts. *"Morally encouraged" actions would be things that one ought to pursue for the improved virtue of the individual and perhaps even the betterment of the populace as a whole.* On the opposite side of the spectrum, *"morally discouraged" actions are pursuits that one ought to avoid as they degrade the virtues of individuals and may even erode the moral health of society.* Within this spectrum, *"morally indifferent" actions fall somewhere within the vast gray area between the two poles* and pertain to acts that neither fulfill society nor degrade it on an ethical level. That is to say, while these actions-which are performed at the individual's discretion and in accordance with that individual's particular tastes-do not directly perpetuate moral advancement within that individual or within the populace as a whole, said actions can not be construed as an ethical impediment.

“ ...This paper argues against the commonly accepted notion that necrophilia is morally detrimental and, with the help of arguments based on ethical concepts, reframes the practice as morally indifferent. Due to the preexisting social taboo surrounding the subject, I am inclined to place stress on the argument that necrophilia is not morally wrong...”

Thus, they are of no moral consequence. *This paper argues against the commonly accepted notion that necrophilia is morally detrimental* and, with the help of arguments based on ethical concepts, reframes the practice as **morally indifferent**. Due to the preexisting social taboo surrounding the subject, I am inclined to place stress on the argument that necrophilia is not

morally wrong instead of equally stressing that it is neither right nor wrong.

My thought experiment is set within a closed, theoretical system. With arguments about the application of personal identity and moral status as the only variables. I argue that necrophilia does no moral wrong. However, the realm of reality presents additional variables of social opinion, human attachment, legality, and hygiene, which impede the application of the equation. In short, I argue that necrophilia is a practice that does no moral wrong, but I concede that the practice it is not feasible in reality because it violates preexisting standards.

I would also like to specify that rights, for the purpose of this essay, refer specifically to moral rights. The distinction is held between those and legal rights as this is an ethical debate and legality is virtually irrelevant, as laws do not necessarily dictate morality. Once the legislation behind necrophilia is stripped away, the subject is pushed into the ethical realm. In drawing this lengthy disclaimer to a close, I beseech the readers of this essay to acknowledge and consider my arguments on a purely moral, hypothetical level.

### Introduction

In this paper, I will argue that necrophilia is not morally impermissible (for clarifications on what is intended by this phrase, please see the disclaimer) on the grounds that corpses are no longer persons with identity; as such, corpses are not persons with moral status and rights. In addition, I will briefly draw attention to and question the time-honored notion of respect for the dead. It is my intention to persuade my readers to question their previous views on the ethics of necrophilia and, in turn, to propagate a questioning attitude toward social taboos in general. **Necrophilia** is defined by Merriam-Webster (11<sup>th</sup> edition) as "*the obsession with and...erotic interest in or stimulation by corpses.*" For the sake of this paper, the term will be used to refer to the practice of having sex with the deceased as the ethics of the mere unconsummated interest need not be drawn into question.

### Issue of personal identity



*...Some may associate the corpse with the person who once inhabited it and*



*claim that necrophilia violates the rights of said person. However, this argument fails in light of the notion of personal identity...* ”

The first issue I would like to address in depth is that of **personal identity** and **personhood**.

Some may associate the corpse with the person who once inhabited it and claim that necrophilia violates the rights of said person. However, this argument fails in light of the notion of personal identity. (It is important to note that **personal identity** is separate from **legal identity** - which is observable in the form of numbers and names associated with individuals - because the former is concerned with the idea of what makes a person the person they are, not the means by which society catalogs them.) Seventeenth-century philosopher **John Locke** argues for the necessary distinction between the body in his work, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), and a similar notion is adopted in the writings of eighteenth-century philosopher **Thomas Reid**. According to this theory, the body is simply a receptacle for the person,<sup>1</sup> comparable to an airplane and its pilot, respectively. Naturally, the person is the more valued aspect as it determines one's identity, and the body is merely the flesh which contains it.

The nature of the "person" is often questioned. In his work, *"Of Identity,"* (1785) **Reid** argues that the person is an immaterial, indivisible consciousness, or soul;<sup>2</sup> Locke argues the person is defined by conscious memory.<sup>1</sup> Locke's account of what happens to the person at death, although different in its explanation of what makes the person, somewhat resembles Reid's account. Those who accept Reid's view, or one similar, would be more inclined to argue that the person evacuates the physical body upon biological death. This is comparable to the pilot of the plane ejecting himself from the cockpit and landing safely on the ground as his faithful-or perhaps not-vessel crashes and burns. Eighteenth-century philosopher **David Hume** and modern advocate **Derek Parfit** suggest that one's identity is composed of one's perceptions or psychology. Now, those who accept Hume's discourse in *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1740)<sup>3</sup>- or Parfit's in *Divided Minds* and *The Nature of Persons* (1984)<sup>4</sup>-would be inclined to say that the person dies when the body succumbs to biological death, which is comparable to the pilot

dying within the plane as it careens into an unforgiving cliff-face. Either way, the corpse contains no properties of the person after biological death. As Reid would say, the immaterial consciousness has left the physical body,<sup>2</sup> and Locke would claim that the self as conscious memory persists, but not in its former body.<sup>1</sup> As Hume and Parfit would say, the mind-and thus the being's psychology and perceptions-are gone.<sup>3, 4</sup> That is to say that the body lying in the casket is merely a shell of the person who once occupied it. Whether the person survives after the body's biological death is completely dependent on one's view of personal identity, but regardless, the corpse remains vacant (until occupied by a prospective suitor).

#### Does the corpse possess moral status?

“  
*...After exploring the views of personal identity, it has been made evident that the corpse cannot be associated with the person it once was, and thus, necrophiliacs are not disrespecting a person by having sex with a corpse...*  
 ”

After exploring the views of personal identity, it has been made evident that the corpse cannot be associated with the person it once was, and thus, necrophiliacs are not disrespecting a person by having sex with a corpse. A related point I would like to make is that the corpse, as it cannot be associated with the person it once was - or any person for that matter-**has no moral status**. *Moral status is defined as the condition that bestows upon people their basic human rights. It is the quality that makes it immoral for one to treat the being in question with anything less than a certain degree of respect.* What gives a being its moral status is commonly debated, but I argue that a being must fulfill a certain set of criteria to be considered a moral agent.

**Mary Anne Warren**, a professor of philosophy at San Francisco State University, argues her ideas for the criteria of moral status in her work, *Ethics in Practice*(1992). She suggests that the primary characteristics that would determine personhood are **sentience, emotionality, reason, the capacity to communicate, self-awareness, and moral agency**. [Please see table 1]

**Sentience** - The capacity to have conscious experiences, usually including the capacity to experience pain and pleasure

**Emotionality** - The capacity to feel happy, angry, sad, loving, etc.

**Reason** - The capacity to solve new and relatively complex problems.

**Capacity to communicate** -

**Self-awareness** - Having a concept of oneself as an individual and/or as a member of a social group.

**Moral agency** - The capacity to regulate one's own actions through moral principles or ideals.

**Table 1 - Warren's six components that determine personhood**

Warren comments that while "[a]n entity need not have all of these attributes to be a person," the potential for a being to have moral status decreases if it possesses none of these traits.<sup>5</sup> Thus, it would be difficult to reasonably attribute moral status to a being with none of these traits, and this point is of central importance to the question of the ethics of necrophilia. Note that corpses possess none of these traits, and only beings that possess these traits in some combination can be attributed moral status. *So, corpses have no moral status.* If a corpse were a person with moral status, then it could be harmed. However, a corpse cannot be a person with moral status, as it fits none of the criteria for said status. *Therefore, one can do no wrong to a corpse.*

Some may argue that because a corpse was once a human being, it is entitled to the same treatment to which all human beings are entitled. I argue, however, that being genetically human is not enough to warrant moral status. If this were the case, one could attribute personhood ("personhood" being the criteria for considering one a person and thus an agent entitled to rights, respect, and moral status) to cancer cells and strands of hair. It seems that this quality comes at a much more complex price. *Does a corpse possess the residual moral status or any transferable rights of the person who once inhabited it?* This is a question similar to and depending on a notion of personal identity. *Is there residual personal identity?* If not, then there are no grounds for claiming residual moral status, since the moral status at the bare minimum requires some form of personal identity.

“

*...corpses cannot have moral status as moral status is dependent on a certain set*

*of criteria...*

”

Briefly put, **residual personhood** does not exist. The reason behind this is that corpses cannot have moral status as moral status is dependent on a certain set of criteria. Regardless of whether

one wishes to use Warren's set of criteria to determine personhood or an entirely different standard, one can reasonably argue that awarding moral status to something simply because it is genetically human is ungrounded, as this sort of proposition could attribute moral status to substances that simply do not deserve said status. If there is no moral status, there is no person to wrong.

#### **The issue of consent**

Some bring up the notion of **consent** when arguing against necrophilia. They claim that the corpse (or the person) would not have agreed to sex and therefore, any sort of necrophilic activity is invasive and morally impermissible. Yet, as it was stated in the segment on personal identity, *the body and the person are no longer one and the same once the body dies*. Therefore, one cannot consider either part to be connected with the other. Legality aside (as this is a moral debate, it only seems fair to push law into the sidelines for now), it becomes inconsequential whether the person offered consent to prospective necrophiliacs before said person passed on, as the body that is present now cannot be viewed on the same level as the person who once inhabited it. Also, as the person can no longer be connected with the body, what happens to the latter cannot be seen as a sign of disrespect; disrespect assumes a person is the target of that disrespect, but since the cadaver is not a person, there is no one toward whom to direct this disrespect. In addition, as it has been previously determined, the corpse is not a person, let alone an agent with rights or privileges. Not only is the corpse incapable of denying moral and legal consent, it is not entitled to deny said consent.

Because legality is pushed aside and because the body is no longer affiliated with the once-living person, the requests or possible wishes of the deceased can be discarded. One can assume this because-as it was previously stated-the author of said document cannot be likened to the corpse as there no longer exists a tie between the person and the body. In addition, as it was previously argued, residual moral status and personal identity do not exist. When dealing with a corpse, one is not dealing with a person, an organism that deserves moral consideration, or a being that can

deny consent. One is simply dealing with a body that is, crudely put, nothing more than a mass of decomposing cellular residue, and masses of decomposing cellular residue are fair game to paraphiles.

#### Comparison between necrophilia and embalming

Furthermore, the corpse is often subject to unpleasant invasion as standard procedure. In the embalming process, described in Richard T. Hatch's book, *How to Embalm Your Mother-In-Law* (1993), the body is completely stripped of all clothing and washed twice. In cases of rigor mortis, the embalmer is required to massage the corpse's limbs and extremities to loosen up the body, making it more possible and easier to work with overall.<sup>6</sup> Orifices are then swabbed with cavity fluid and packed to avoid leakage. After any necessary dental work, the mouth is stitched shut by inserting hooked wires into the gum tissue and tightening them. The face and body are shaved, and the eyeballs are washed and eye cups are inserted, which serve to provide the proper shape when the eyelid is closed. As much blood as possible is removed from the veins by a pump and replaced with embalming fluid, which is applied through six major injection points. A tube is then inserted into the abdomen to remove any residual fluid from organ decomposition. Finally, embalming preservatives are pumped through the body. Compare this process to conventional sexual activity in which fluid exchange is relatively minimal and, presumably, does not entail total exsanguination via pumps, eye-tampering, or mouth-stitching. The average necrophile does not have the means or the motive for that sort of endeavor.

“...the corpse is often subject to unpleasant invasion as standard and acceptable procedure - as in embalming. Then what is the problem with necrophilia?...”

Jessica Mitford mentions an even more disturbing aspect of the embalming process in her book, *The American Way of Death* (1963): "no law requires embalming, no religious doctrine commends it, nor is it dictated by considerations of health, sanitation, or even of personal daintiness."<sup>7</sup> That is to say that this fate, although religiously pursued and widely exercised upon

corpses, is virtually unnecessary.

I feel it is important-or at least interesting-to remark on the comparison between the two practices. Granted, if the corpse is not a person (as I argue), embalming does no wrong to the corpse, either. The comparison is drawn between necrophilia and embalming to show that **invasive procedures befall corpses on a regular basis**. Furthermore, while embalming is socially acceptable and necrophilia is not, the former could easily be perceived as more invasive.

LUKA MAGNOTTA

#### **The notion of respect for the dead**

The final argument I will explore that opposes necrophilia is that which concerns **the notion of respect for the dead**. It is a notion that rests on a time-honored tradition and nothing more, but one that generally arises alongside the topic of necrophilia. *This principle is often used as its own argument* against necrophilia, yet, in light of the previous arguments, I have to ask why humankind must maintain this tradition. Given the preceding arguments, it would seem as though this tradition is nothing more than an ungrounded, misunderstood notion that carries no moral obligation. As was previously mentioned, one can conclude that **the corpse is not a person** and has no moral status. It does not have the capacity to deny consent and it is nothing more than an object. Also, there is no tie between the person and the mass of decomposing cellular residue in question. Since arguments that support the status of corpses fail, what moral obligation do we have to respect corpses? If the notion of respect for the dead is-as I suspect-what ultimately makes necrophilia taboo, the practice could be considered morally impermissible no longer once said notion is found unjustifiable. From my perspective, the universal nature of this tradition does not adequately justify the condemnation of necrophilia.

Finally, even if my debate against the sanctity of this tradition does not convince my readers, it is still arguable that necrophilia doesn't disrespect the dead. one can still maintain this notion- however arbitrary and societally ingrained it may seem-because when one respects the dead, one

is arguably respecting the memory of the person (i.e., character traits, accomplishments, etc.), not necessarily the corpse itself. Thus, necrophilia does not degrade the memory of said person's character.



LUKA MAGNOTTA --- LUKA MAGNOTTA --- LUKA MAGNOTTA

Posted by Anonymous at 7:38 PM    0 comments

[Recommend this on](#)

Labels: [Luka](#), [Magnotta](#)

[Home](#)

[Subscribe to: Posts \(Atom\)](#)



