



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Challenges for Environmental and Political Philosophy in the Anthropocene

(international conference)

16th – 17th January 2023

Bratislava, Slovak Republic

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Editors:

**Eva Dědečková
Peter Daubner**

**Supported by VEGA no. 2/0072/21:
„Tasks of Political Philosophy in the Context of Anthropocene“**



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



List of participants:

Mark Coeckelbergh

(University of Vienna, Vienna)

Dušan Gálik

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Güncel Önkal

(Maltepe University, Istanbul)

Martin Ritter

(Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

Agostino Cera

(University of Ferrara, Ferrara)

Anna Mravcová

(Slovak University of Agriculture, Nitra)

Petra Gümpllová

(Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena)

Gianluca Ronca

(University of Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo)

Alessandro Volpi

(University Vita-Salute San Raffaele, Milan)

Jan Géryk

(Institute of State and Law of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

Vít Pokorný

(Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Ústí nad Labem)

Eric S. Nelson

(Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong)

João Ribeiro Mendes

(University of Minho, Braga)

Daniel Buschmann

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Lorenzo de Stefano

(University of Naples Federico II, Naples)

Eva Dědečková

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Elise Lamy-Rested

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Vitor Pereira

(University of Lisbon, Lisbon)

Dominika Janus & Sarah Hicks

(Linköping University, Linköping)

Tomáš Korda

(Charles University, Prague)

Anish Mishra

(Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong)

Břetislav Horyna

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Loghman Kazem Pour

(Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin)

Rangga Kala Mahaswa

(Gadjah Mada University, Sleman)



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Mark Coeckelbergh
(University of Vienna, Vienna)

Freedom in the Anthropocene: Bringing political philosophy to global environmental problems

Abstract:

*In the current planetary ecological situation, often referred to as the Anthropocene, political thinking needs to become more environmental and environmental issues need to be not only tackled from an environmental ethics point of view but also from a political-philosophical perspective. In this talk I present my book *Green Leviathan or the Poetics of Political Liberty* as an example of how to use political philosophy in this context. I focus on the problem of freedom: what does freedom mean in the current global situation and how can we move towards a more relational understanding of the concept in the 21st century?*

Dušan Gálik
(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

The Term “Anthropocene” in Science and Philosophy

Abstract:

The term “Anthropocene” has become widely popular in environmental science, environmental (or eco-) philosophy and also in political philosophy. It is used as a label for a period in which human activity has increased to such an extent that it has caused (or has a crucial contribution to) global environmental crisis. On the other hand, in the natural sciences, especially in the geosciences, this concept has generated controversy about its appropriateness and proper role in the scientific investigation of Earth history. The aim of the paper is to show how the term “Anthropocene” is used in sciences and philosophy, to analyse and distinguish its different meanings from the point of view of philosophy of science with respect to the evolution of life on Earth and human socio-cultural evolution, and to point out the implications and influence of these meanings on the formulation problems and proposals for solutions in various scientific and philosophical discourses.

Güncel Önkal
(Maltepe University, Istanbul)

Environmentalism without Ethics in Anthropocene: Remarks on COP27

Abstract:

Today, environmentalism under globalism and its institutional hierarchy is not responding the ethical awareness of eco-philosophers adequately, rather it becomes a policy-making negotiation tool for sustainability targets of the growth and leading economies. Unfortunately, as we may reason out philosophically in COP27, the discourse that mentions saving planet is far from reflecting a concrete, just and proper policy for environmental justice for all. This picture shows the possible projecting conditions of a collaborative action for reconsidering environmental issues are formerly dominated and determined by current political ontology and its leading agents. The ontological gap between “nature” and “environment” is deliberately used vice-versa by the political ontology in terms of post-truth discourse as epistemology. The lack of social justice, the catastrophe in green politics, asymmetry in post-truth epistemology have one thing in common, i.e. rejecting the idea of sustainability of nature itself. If we see the unbalanced/unfair relationship between current “make-up green politics” and “environmental philosophy”, then there will be a room to revise the foundations of environmental ethics as an active eco-paradigm regarding debates on Anthropocene. In this study, following the discourse analysis of COP27, my aim is to expose the ignorance of key-ethical issues.

Martin Ritter
(Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

How to Become Earthbound?

Abstract:

There can be little doubt that, facing the current environmental crisis with its coming disruptive socio-political consequences, we need to acknowledge Earth as an inevitable horizon and perhaps even basis of our thinking. The question is, however, how to take Earth into consideration. And this question is inseparable from another one: what is Earth, after all? In my talk, I want to show two things: first, we undoubtedly need to make our thinking (and acting) Earthbound, but, second, it is questionable to speak of Earth itself. To establish the first point, I will briefly present the approach in current philosophy of technology demanding “a terrestrial turn” (esp. Vincent Blok’s version of it). To demonstrate the second one, I will utilize some of postphenomenological concepts to emphasize that we never have an immediate access to Earth. My talk thus intends to underline that each of our concepts, including that of Earth, is technologically mediated. Hence, when seeking to do justice to our Earthbound condition and to understand human agency in the Anthropocene, we must first of all reflect on and do justice to our own technicity.

Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.

Agostino Cera

(University of Ferrara, Ferrara)

The Paradox of Omni-responsibility: An Ethical Challenge for the Anthropocene

Abstract:

My paper sketches an ethical paradox emerging within the Anthropocene: the Paradox of Omni-responsibility. My basic assumption is that the Anthropocene represents something more than an aspirant geological epoch, namely the strongest candidate for becoming the “métarécit” of our epoch. Within this unprecedented scenario, human being leaves the role of the lord of a nature understood as object and takes on that of the “Planetary Manager” of a nature understood as living being. More precisely, nature becomes a kind of pet, i.e. something living but entirely dependent on our capability to take care of it, something for which we (must) feel totally responsible. I define this phenomenon Pet-ification of Nature. The combination between Pet-ification of Nature and the absolutization of the responsibility of the Planetary Manager generates the Paradox of Omni-Responsibility. Human being’s ecological/moral duty of total caretaking of its own environment gives birth to a new form of anthropocentrism: the Aidosean Prometheanism as outcome of an Aidosean man (after Aidos, the Greek goddess of humility). Promethean hybris emerges here as the paradoxical result of human’s hyper-interest and omni-responsibility towards nature. As a result, the Anthropocene proves to be the epoch in which Jonas’ “imperative of responsibility” no longer works as ethical standard.

Anna Mravcová

(Slovak University of Agriculture, Nitra)

On Environmental Citizenship and the Emphasis on Environmental Responsibility in the Context of the Deepening Environmental Crisis

Abstract:

The Anthropocene period has brought an unprecedented expansion of civilisation and enormous technological advances leading to a highly interconnected world. However, all this has come at the expense of the environment. The exploitation of nature along with the reckless and predatory life of humans have gradually led to the emergence of a global environmental crisis which, even with all the means and decades of efforts of the world community, has not been solved or even necessarily mitigated. The paper therefore seeks to highlight and examine the significance of the still emerging concept of environmental citizenship, building on classical conceptions of political philosophy and the resonant emphasis on environmental responsibility that comes with it. Environmental citizenship is increasingly becoming a necessity, building on the unifying principle that citizenship as such possesses, emphasizing responsibility for the whole to which we all relate, to which we feel a sense of belonging, for whose development we are responsible. Findings point to the growing potential of this concept as one of the possible key factors for achieving a more sustainable world for the future, however requiring active approach of the states.

Petra Gumplová

(Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena)

Common Ownership of the Earth in the Anthropocene

Abstract:

The paper analyzes the conception of common ownership of the earth (COE) and its recent appropriations in the theory of global distributive justice. Taking Mathias Risse’s conception of COE as the main reference point, the paper asks whether and how can the conception of common ownership of the earth correct the failures of the existing dominant system of sovereign territorial rights to natural resources and whether it provides a plausible starting point for thinking about natural resource justice in the age of the Anthropocene and its concomitant environmental decline and the climate crisis. After providing a brief summary of Risse’s argument, I focus on three central aspects of Risse’s theory of COE: 1) the concept of ownership and its underlying ontological assumptions, 2) the basic needs thesis, and 3) the implications of common ownership for the climate justice. Concerning the first, I argue that due to ontological assumptions built into ownership’s structure and the corresponding relation to non-human world it authorizes, it is problematic to meaningfully extend it to global domain and utilize it to protect what I argue is better captured by the term global commons. Concerning the basic needs thesis, I argue that Risse relies on an implausibly ‘speciesist’ and anthropocentric notion of basic needs which can no longer hold in the Anthropocene. I explore the question whether the replacement of basic needs with human rights can partially mitigate the basic needs thesis failures. Thirdly, I discuss Risse’s view of intergenerational justice and the proposal of a fair distribution of burdens of climate change mitigation. Here I argue for the framework of global commons to be used instead of common ownership. Overall, I argue that in the current environmental predicament, COE no longer appears to be a meaningful conception to ground the morality of human relationship to natural environment and provide plausible distributive or other implications for the allocation of natural resources.

Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.

Gianluca Ronca

(University of Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo)

**The Rights of the Ecosystem and the Rights of Future Generations:
A Comparison between International Documents and Italian Constitutional Revision**

Abstract:

The global threat of global warming is nowadays not only recognized by the vast majority of the scientific publications and by the main national political agendas, but it has also become central to the public debate at all levels. This paper naturally assumes the recognition of the phenomenon and its urgency as an indisputable evidence. It should be added that the causal link highlighted starting from anthropogenic actions is a further fact on which it is reasonable to fully agree. My intervention aims to philosophically question the relevance of the environmental issue in terms of human rights. More precisely, I wonder if it is possible to trace in the most recent legal production something like a trajectory that might prompt us as philosophers and jurists to justify the rights of non-human natural entities on the one hand and the rights of future generations on the other. As can be seen, here climate change is explicitly linked to the concept of environment (we will specify the scope of the term). The aim is to answer a series of questions that straddle the line between political and legal philosophy: they will be made explicit step by step. I intend to pose the two questions together because I believe that in the literature they often get confused and overlap. In order to sustain a critique of human ecological exploitation, it is essential to distinguish between rights to the future, rights of future generations, and rights of the ecosystem. The latter two constitute the object of this work: if national constitutions tend, in general, towards a protection of the latter, international charters also underpin the existence of the former. The comparison will be illustrated through a study of the most recent international human rights charters and the latest environmental protocols on the one hand and an assessment of the specific case of the constitutional revision of the Italian Republic on the other.

Alessandro Volpi

(University Vita-Salute San Raffaele, Milan)

Problematizing the Top-down Dichotomy in Climate Action and Policymaking. Or: How we Learned to Distrust Sovereignty and Love Grassroots Climate Action

Abstract:

*While environmental and climate action gains momentum in the form of bottom-up political movements, top-down policy initiatives struggle to appropriately interpret and implement demands from below. However, is the top-down axis appropriate to comprehend the issue of climate action? Should bottom-up movements aim to directly “change the world” or should they prioritize pushing public powers to act? Moreover, does the form of “folk politics” suit the specific challenges of the Anthropocene? I explore these questions by briefly introducing the recent history of climate governance, problematizing the dichotomy of top-down policymaking (at supranational, international, national and sub-national level) and bottom-up movements, through a critique of multilevel “private” and “neoliberal” environmentalism. I address the relationship between the public interest, sovereignty, and climate change/environmental action, suggesting that we ought not to solely rely on bottom-up, grassroots movements to face climate change, especially if they do not prioritize pushing public regulatory authorities to act. I therefore argue that sovereignty can in many ways be still crucial in the Anthropocene, since it addresses those political-economic constraints which make our climate response inefficient (including, *inter alia*, lack of accountability and democratic control, deregulation, privatization, lobbying, priority to market-based climate solutions and “corporate environmentalism”). Furthermore, I argue that a remodelled, non-nationalistic understanding of sovereignty is needed to revitalize the fundamental distinction between public interest and private gain in climate governance.*

Jan Géryk

(Institute of State and Law of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

From the Self to the World: Anthropocene and De-Psychologization of the Public

Abstract:

Authors like Richard Sennett, Christopher Lasch, or Gilles Lipovetsky, writing at the onset of late modernity, developed concepts such as “psychologization of the public” or “the cult of authenticity”. These phenomena mean that we cease to play our public roles at the expense of expressing our inner nature and spontaneity. However, the public sphere is an area of the common and what helps to integrate it is rather an “actor’s mask”, not our inner psychological traits that differs from person to person. The paper argues that this psychologization weakens the notion of the common world and sidelines our relationship to the material world at the expense of our relation to both individual and collective Self. When the public sphere is occupied by politics of identity, it causes the predominance of non-mediated relations in the public, i.e. those that does not need a material world to endure. On the other hand, the civic care of our common world creates bonds among people that are mediated through our material world. Thus, focusing on our roles – especially the typically public role of the citizen –, instead of our (individual and collective) personalities would be beneficial to our environment and could mute identitarian conflicts.



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Vít Pokorný

(*Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Ústí nad Labem*)

Reconfiguring Human Image: Interdependence as the Core of Posthuman Agency

Abstract:

*In his book, *The Birth of Anthropocene*, Jeremy Davies argues that anthropocene is not an anthropocentric concept, and that humanity is not at the center of our current situation. Instead, we should conceive of our social and personal identities as parts of networks of relations between various human and non-human agents who inhabit and constitute the world together. Human action, or action of any other entities is not, in this respect, independent and autonomous, instead we need to acknowledge the conditions of dependence and heteronomy as the core of our current predicament. As humans, we are embedded within the vast relational networks which are natural and technological at the same time. We live inside media or infosphere, we inhabit vast urban spaces shaped by technology and architecture, so we depend on the infrastructural machineries of our states and cities. We also depend on our conflicted relationships with other living and non-living beings, elements, and landscapes. In my presentation, I want to explore the multifaceted structure of our dependencies and suggest that the concept of dependence might be one the key notions of posthuman ethics.*

Eric S. Nelson

(*Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong*)

Daoist Biopolitics, Anarchy, and Participatory Eco-Democracy

Abstract:

*One prominent tendency in early Daoist discourses from the Warring States period (*Zhuangzi*) to the Wei-Jin period (*Liezi*, *Bao Jingyan*) has been identified by modern interpreters as libertarian or anarchistic due to its emphasis on non-coercive or responsive action (*wuwei* 無為) in relation to the generative self-ordering (*ziran* 自然) of things and peoples. Such interpretations are anachronistic insofar as these discourses do not presuppose either the possessive capitalist individual of laissez-faire libertarianism or the oppressed collective subject of anarchism. Further, these sources do not concern a fixed subject of or identity in agency, whether individual or social, but rather “action” as forms of participation in the transformations of things and the shared nourishing of life (*yangsheng* 養生). In this paper, I will further develop reflections from *Daoism and Environmental Philosophy* (2020) on early Daoist biopolitics and the implications for contemporary ecopolitics by examining the extent to which Daoist models of participation indicate ways to reimagine anarchy, elemental democracy, and ecological praxis in response to the climate and environmental crises of the Anthropocene.*

João Ribeiro Mendes

(*University of Minho, Braga*)

Thinking Planetary Thinking

Abstract:

Elias and Moraru (2015) introduced the expression “planetary turn” to refer to a historical process-event, underway since the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, in which the Human-Earth relationship is being subjected to a profound transformation, without, at the same time, our existing theoretical frameworks providing any understanding for it or without a new theoretical framework being available for guidance. This expression can be defined more specifically as woven by three irreducible and inseparable meanings: (a) the enormous impact of our economic and political activities around the world (=the global) revealed how the Earth System works within some biogeochemical boundaries (=the planetary) is a condition of possibility for its continuity; (b) we built an artificial global sphere, a Technosphere that not only pervaded Earth, but also mingled with the other natural spheres to the point they became codependent, or, in other words, this Technosphere is now the condition for the existence of most human and non-human beings of the planet; (c) the awareness of this “planetarity” is, as Elias and Moraru (2015) say, an awareness of a new «(...) way of being and a way of measuring time, space, and culture (...)», i.e., one revealing a change in the human condition as now a technoscientific condition. The “planetary turn” has been brought about and is bringing about several major changes in our relationship with Earth. I want to address two of them: the fundamental transformation of our existential condition, now a technoscientific condition (arising from the planetarization of Technology); the transformation in the way we think about the situation that has arisen (planetary thinking). We need a new way of thinking to deal with planetary problems that have arisen from a particular way of thinking that cannot be solved with that way of thinking. In other words, we need a planetary thinking that is not confused either with that of the Western philosophical tradition, which is unable to become universally accepted, or with the cultural relativism characteristic of the contemporary era. It is not yet possible to discern the form that this new way of thinking will take, nor the discourse that will give it expression. I’ll draw on some insights from American historian Dipesh Chakrabarty (born in Calcutta, India) and Chinese philosopher of technology Yuk Hui (born in Hong Kong) to begin imagining how this might be possible.



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Daniel Buschmann

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Prospects of an Intercultural Dialogue for Political Philosophy in the Anthropocene

Abstract:

The dawn of the Anthropocene confronts political philosophy with a paradigm shift in how human-nature relations are understood. Clearly, the eurocentric, linear and disciplinary approaches developed by Holocene philosophy do not offer satisfying intellectual tools to comprehend and analyze the global socio-environmental situation, not to speak of providing imaginaries for a sustainable society. Therefore, my presentation explores in how far an interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogue between two dialectic approaches in environmental political philosophy – the critical theory of societal nature relations and the Daoist concept *wu-wei* (無為) – can advance the problematizing of nature domination as a basic driving force of the Anthropocene, and thus indicate how we can imagine non-dominative societal nature relations.

Lorenzo de Stefano

(University of Naples Federico II, Naples)

The Ecological Dimension of the Origin of Western Thought. A Pre-metaphysical Environmental Perspective

Abstract:

The pre-Socratic speculation, according to Aristotle, marks the beginning of western thought and the dawn of the scientific approach. The speculation of Anaximander, Heraclitus, Parmenides inaugurated a new conception of the Being in which *physis* – what we today call nature – is the fundament where every being finds its origin (genesis) and dissolution (phthora). *Physis* is also regulated by an intrinsic and immanent law, that Heraclitus calls *Logos*, regulating the relationship between man and the other beings; such law is harmony and equilibrium as result of the opposition of contraries. In pre-Socratic philosophy man is always considered a part of cosmos, of a larger dimension where he finds his true self and his fundament. Further developments of philosophy as metaphysics have compromised the original mirroring between man (*anthropos*) and nature (*physis*) giving birth to the actual anthropocentric-metaphysical Weltanschauung that is the cultural origin of the environmental problem. According to this perspective, man as animal rationale has the right and the ontological primacy to extend his domination over nature and matter. Aim of the paper is to recontextualize the categories of pre-Socratic thought in the perspective of an environmental and ecological pos-metaphysical perspective that, on one hand provides an ontological nonmetaphysical determination of the world, on the other proposes new values for the technological society in the era of the Anthropocene.

Elise Lamy-Rested

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Deconstructing the Anthropocene with Speculative Cosmology

Abstract:

In a March 2015 article in the journal *Multitudes*, “Sortir de l’anthropocène” (“Get out of the Anthropocene”), Bernard Stiegler, a French philosopher of technology, noted: “the Anthropocene is unsustainable: it is a process of mass destruction, rapid and planetary, whose course must be reversed. (...) getting out of this impasse of cosmic dimension (...) requires a new speculative cosmology in the wake of Whitehead.” It is precisely this path, opened by Stiegler, that I would like to follow here by explaining in what sense Whitehead’s speculative cosmology, also inspired by Bergson’s cosmology, can help us get out of what we call “the Anthropocene”, a concept whose emergence must first be placed in its context before defining it. Indeed, it is by fully understanding its stakes and meaning that we will finally succeed in making speculative cosmology play against the Anthropocene, which Whitehead could not have imagined at the time of writing his first book of cosmology: *Process and Reality* (1927).

Eva Dědečková

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

Cosmological Philosophy and Its Actuality in the Anthropocene

Abstract:

What is cosmological philosophy? What is its potential on a cultural, social, and political level? Alternatively, can cosmological philosophy finally mediate a dialogue between philosophy as such and the natural or technical sciences? These questions move the thinking of Eugen Fink, which has unfairly remained in the shadow of Husserl and Heidegger. Perhaps, finally, the time has come for his cosmological philosophy to receive adequate attention.

Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.

Vitor Pereira

(University of Lisbon, Lisbon)

Ecological Urban Life

Abstract:

Urban life is not worth living because the concept of home is mistakenly understood to fall under the concept of economy. For example, if we intend to buy a house, we typically apply for a bank loan, because the income from our work is intended to be insufficient for us to buy it outright. But on the contrary, it is the concept of economy that falls under the concept of home. The concept of economy derives from the organisation of our lives at home. Without a house, there is no economy. But as things are misunderstood, as the economy is misconceived as coming before the house, the city houses we live in don't have any quality beyond, say, a certain kind of heap of bricks. The city houses we live in are prone to heat waves in summer and cold waves in winter; their humidity and mould are not healthy. In addition to making us sick inside our homes, the typical noise of cities is not just on the streets of the city; it is also inside our homes (and, because it's so difficult for us to sleep, we get sick inside our homes because we don't sleep healthily). However, if the house was conceived before the economy, the city houses we live in would have qualities such as being thermally and acoustically insulated. For example, they could include a rainwater pipeline for sanitary water.

Dominika Janus & Sarah Hicks

(Linköping University, Linköping)

The Threat of Longtermism: Is Ecological Catastrophe an Existential Risk?

Disillusioned Ideals for a Bold, New Future

Abstract:

In a world of rapidly advancing technological innovation, a debate has arisen whether to prioritize the potential long term benefits to future generations over the interests of those currently alive. Longtermists strongly encourage investments in technology, in order to avoid existential risks and save posterity. They claim technology will eventually "solve" climate change, while failing to consider the reduction of our technopower as a potential solution to global environmental catastrophe. Democratic control over which technologies get developed mitigate some of these harms, yet falls short at achieving the authors' proposed level of oversight. In this paper, we consider the ethical hazards of longtermists' stance. Longtermists' vision casting of an idealized future emboldens Capitalists to pursue unfair endeavours for the benefit of future generations. An ethical dilemma emerges from the devastating effect some technological advancements have on the environment and the exploitative practices of tech industries on workers. In this paper, we lay out a principled argument for why governments ought to intervene to prevent techno-optimists' exploitation of present day systems for economic gain. While we recognize the merits of long-term thinking in order to make the best decisions, we argue Longtermists' prioritization is consolidating decision making processes among few technocrats, exacerbating existing inequalities instead of shifting, and redistributing the economic and political power to the communities most affected by the climate change. We posit this trade-off to be unethical.

Tomáš Korda

(Charles University, Prague)

The Problem of Sovereignty in Times of Environmental Crisis

Abstract:

According to the German philosopher Dieter Henrich, Thomas Hobbes was the first modern philosopher, and the concepts of self-preservation and self-consciousness constitute the basic structure of modern philosophy. Although Descartes's reduction of nature to res extensa is widely seen as the spiritual cause of the ecological crisis, the shift to Hobbes confirms rather than dissolves the suspicion that the ecological crisis is rooted in modernity itself. Let us take the emergence from the state of nature into society as the condition of possibility for political philosophy. In order to retain sovereignty, the established political community cannot accept the Earth as a universal methodological horizon and must maintain an instrumental relationship to nature and subordinate the Earth to its purposes. The environmental and political philosophy can overlap as long as the instrumental subordination of nature to human ends does not necessarily imply the destruction of the conditions of life on Earth. In my contribution I would like to show that an environmental political philosophy is not only desirable but also possible. I will show that the solution to the ecological crisis lies not in rethinking the modern (instrumental) relationship with nature, but in consistently fulfilling the promises that this relationship provides.



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Anish Mishra

(Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong)

A Rasa Sensibility for Ecological Aesthetics through a Buddhist Conception of Nature

Abstract:

Based on the premise that an aesthetic experience is inevitably a human one, this paper will argue that it might still be non-anthropocentric in character. It does so by problematising the beautiful in the aesthetic. Rasa refers to the essence of emotion felt in an aesthetic experience. The abhuta rasa refers to the feeling of wonder and astonishment, created by experiencing what is amazing. I argue that what we might find amazing in nature is not only the picturesque, but rather the ecological interconnectedness of nature. Relying both on a sensory immersion in the natural world that allows an engulfment in it, and a cognitive reflexive analysis of such a relishing of the abhuta, we conceive of an experience that finds aesthetic value and appreciation beyond anthropocentric categories of the beautiful. Just as the abhuta can move one to a tasting of ānanda (pure bliss) in Indian aesthetics, here one is moved to a relishing of the wonderous in the ecological design of nature. This design is further understood through the Buddhist notion of pratityasamutpada (dependent origination) and the resulting non-hierarchical interconnected view of the world. It is such a conception, that might overcome the egocentrism of the Anthropocene.

Břetislav Horyna

(Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava)

First Reasons for the Transformation of Political Philosophy into Environmental Political Philosophy

Abstract:

Defining the problem: how political philosophy becomes environmental political philosophy. It is assumed that political philosophy is not represented by a purely conceptual analysis of basic political categories (justice, equality, freedom, etc.), but by everyday and habitual political decisions and the actions that follow them. The aim of transforming political philosophy into an environmental political philosophy is to articulate it as an instrument of change in the management of society. It can be understood as a project for the management of society. At the present time (Anthropocene), cultural action based on given social relations is always perspectival. Nature cannot exist for them except as a technological program. A closed, clear, obvious and unambiguous ontological determination of nature is not admitted in its specifically capitalist construction. Context triumphs over nature, and it is only the context of the appreciative economy that puts the terms "nature" and "value" in context. The movement of Western society is carried by negative emotions. They resonate socio-economic problems, the loss of life perspectives, the exposure of the fact of total uselessness or even excess, militarism and the permanent military threat without the concept of peace and self-discipline as a basic form of social self-assertion and individual self-determination. In this situation, environmentalism becomes the common life form of partners in danger.

Loghman Kazem Pour

(Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin)

Challenges of Environmental Problems to the Philosophy of Education

Abstract:

We live in an age in which the destruction of the environment has become a major concern. However, until recently, environmental problems have not become a major issue for the political philosophy. The reason for this is that for a very long time the philosophy of politics was intimately related to the concept of nature as the foundation and the model of human activity. We can see such an understanding of nature not only among the philosophers of Ancient Greece, but also among the modern philosophers. If we consider this situation, we may understand the challenge the environmental problem poses to the philosophy of politics. Nature in this age of environmental problems cannot function as the foundation upon which an edifice of politics can be built. It has become clear that nature is vulnerable to human intervention. Political philosophy has responded to this turn of events by not paying attention to the concept of nature. This has sometimes taken an anti-foundational and anti-traditional form that is typical of postmodern thinking. This contemporary trend to exclude or ignore a metaphysical or ontological consideration of nature is too narrow. On one hand, it separates us from tradition, in which a consideration of nature played an important role. On the other hand, it excludes us from the experience of the whole that the Greeks called the cosmos. In this paper we will look for a third way of understanding this problem: one that shows due respect for ontology without falling into the error of considering nature as the foundation that serves as an absolute norm. In turn, this requires a balanced understanding of the dethroning of nature in the modern age.



Institute of Philosophy

Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.



Rangga Kala Mahaswa

(Gadjah Mada University, Sleman)

Re-Accelerationism on the Anthropocene: A Speculative Geophilosophy

Abstract:

Nowadays, the Anthropocene is widely being a new political discourse and a possible world paradigm for several scientific disciplines, particularly philosophy. Basically, the Anthropocene is altering the Earth into terra incognita event, a circumstance that we never face before, new entanglements of human and inhuman worlds. However, planetary crisis-based anthropogenic will always silently interrupt us from romanticizing harmonious humannature, good adaptation, stability, and sustainability for the bright future of civilization. Also, critical anthropogenic rifts, such as climate change and mass extinction, are inevitable and irreversible, so it is impossible to reverse everything like before. It means that a strange and unsettling concept force us to rethink our experiences in-between the end of the world and a new more sustainable ways of living in the world. Facing this situation, I suggest that we turn to embrace and accelerate everything based on technological and social changes in new impact of new understanding under post-humanistic reposition. Fundamentally different from the geo-ontological we know today, I argue that the world has never been attached from the legacy of enlightenment modernity. Being a 'realist' to experience this epoch, I argue that we can examine this Anthropocene by bringing about a speculative turn in geo-philosophy. Not only speculative, but accelerationists also argue for accelerating concerning a radical transformation in society. Of course, we cannot prove that everything in terms of 'radical' will always resolve the futurity issue, like planetary rift and sixth mass extinction. Rather than dreaming of radical transformation, I suggest that we should re-accelerate our speculative dimension to broadly empower more potential roles for unspoken spectrality ways of relation in the Anthropocene.