

## INTRODUCTION

---

NICOLÁS MENESES ÁLVAREZ, TADEO GONZÁLEZ WARCALDE

When we speak of the earth we speak of the ground we inhabit. We speak of a material substrate, of our land as the site of relevance, and we speak of the Earth as the planet we inhabit. With this Earth we also speak of the water, the air, the multiple elements and geographical features that compose it, and we also speak of us: the Earthbounds. At the same time, we speak of territories to refer to the demarcation of the earth that allows us to differentiate a place, a space, a property, etc. Territory is determined by the notions of limit and frontier, which will also determine ethnicities, peoples and nations. We can say that territorial demarcation separates different modes of existence and the environment in which they move.

Now then, the climate crisis, which threatens to destroy an enormous variety of modes of existence, shows that the human cannot be thought of independently of the earth and the territory as a condition of possibility of its very existence. Similarly, the accelerated development of capitalist modernity has brought irreversible consequences for the earth and the living to such an extent that the earth itself is no longer thinkable as a category independent of the consequences of human activity. The climate crisis is in this perspective a conceptual crisis that demands a profound questioning of our conceptions of the world, the earth and the human.

On the other hand, land exploitation has not been the only condition and result of modernity. Modernity also finds its condition of possibility in the subjugation of large portions of the world's population and the will of power that lead to colonization campaigns and territorial appropriation. The famous Cartesian formula, symbol of the philosophical modernity – *cogito, ergo sum* – can be understood, as Enrique Dussel suggests, as the ontological result and transcendental

condition for the first kind of modern subjectivity and its expansionist aspirations of colonialism: the conqueror – *conquiro, ergo sum*. Thus, not only are the irreversible traces of modernity to be found on earth, but on the history of modern philosophy itself, marked by the hidden face of modernity: coloniality.

Thus, the categories of earth and territory are fundamental to think not only about the place from which our practices of life and thought emerge, but also about their condition of possibility. These categories are fundamental to understand the political and epistemic crisis we are going through, but also a necessary occasion to propose different perspectives. In this issue of AUC Interpretationes – *Terres et territoires* – we seek to bring to the foreground a necessary orientation of philosophical thought around a set of problematics that has gained great importance in academia in recent decades but that extends far beyond the present time (from other geological epochs and other calendars towards different possible futures or the absence of one), beyond philosophy (into anthropology, biology, art, ethology and other disciplines), and beyond academia itself (thinking in and with other cosmologies, forms of life and thought).

The contribution by **Carrer** takes as a starting point the words of Davi Kopenawa and Bruce Albert – both known as main references for the Yanomami studies: Kopenawa as a renowned shaman and political leader and Albert as the ethnographer who lived for more than thirty years among them –. This article aims to understand how the Yanomami organise their intercultural relationship system, emphasising the role that the *napë thë pë* (usually translated as “enemies” or “outsiders”) play within this system. The article begins by outlining a taxonomy of the concept of enemy in the Yanomami culture. Together with taxonomy, the author analyses the mythical history of the Yanomamis, paying particular attention to the myths that portray enemies, and later on to the dangers involved in aggression against enemies, and the rituals needed to pacify the spiritual and physical consequences of killing. Following this, the author analyses the changes brought upon by contact with outsiders, and how the epidemics that came with them, changed their environment shifting their concept of outsiders from other amerindian groups, to exclusively white outsiders. The article finishes by reflecting on the Yanomami’s notions of violence, analyzing it through Gilles Deleuze’s reading of Michelle Tournier concept of Other.

**Lünser’s** contribution carries out an aesthetic-political analysis of the concept of frame through a phenomenological perspective, working with a wide variety of sources including Kant, Simmel, Derrida, Butler, Panourgia, and Husserl. The article proposes that there’s a link between perception and politics that can be made visible through the analysis of the concept of frame, which he pursues through

a phenomenological investigation, and the study of three extrapolations of the concept of frame: the map, the nation and the footnote. First off, the author analyses perception with particular attention to the concept of horizon in the work of Husserl to better understand the concept of frame. He then follows through a thorough study of both Simmel's understanding of the concept of frame, and of Derrida's understanding and critique of this concept as it is understood by Kant, paying attention to the paradoxical externality of the frame in relation to the image it frames. This paradoxical condition of the frame in relation to the image is further supported by Butler's analysis of the concept in relation to war photography. The author goes on to expand the previous analysis through the previously mentioned extrapolations. The author analyses these phenomena through the lens of the frame to further elucidate its characteristics, while also better understanding the proposed extrapolations. Finally, the article seeks to both open the space to further investigate the ways that frames present themselves, and to emphasize the political significance of this concept.

The paper by **Soldinger** aims to elucidate the complex relationship between life and human finitude by taking Jan Patočka's critical confrontation with Edmund Husserl's concept of 'life' as its guiding thread. The author proposes that both philosophers seek a path to 'transcend' the 'natural' life, which they understand as a life of finite interests and mere self-preservation, but their approaches diverge significantly. The article will first explore Husserl's position, particularly as articulated in his *Vienna Lecture*, which posits a 'rational teleology' as the means to overcome this finitude. Following this, the author will turn to Patočka's alternative developed in his *Heretical Essays*. Here, it will be shown that Patočka's 'life in truth' is not a rational solution but is instead grounded in a "shaking" confrontation with crisis, problematcity, and finitude itself. Finally, the discussion will conclude by demonstrating how this movement proposed by Patočka, this grounding of existence in mortality, is precisely what opens up a new "political" dimension that remains inaccessible from within Husserl's framework.

The article by **Schmitz** examines the concept of "world" not as an objectively given reality but as a relational phenomenon that both grounds and is shaped by human existence. Through a focus on the concept of *in-between*, it situates worldhood as an open, ethical field rather than a fixed or dualistic entity. The discussion draws on phenomenological perspectives to reconsider how the *world* is constituted, while also highlighting the relevance of decolonial practices in resisting universalizing or hegemonizing conceptions of reality. In dialogue with thinkers such as Arendt, Henry, and Freire, the paper explores how freedom, dialogue, and attentiveness to human needs might reconfigure our relation to the world and to

one another. The investigation does not aim to close itself to a definite answer, but rather to open a space for rethinking world, boundaries, and coexistence as central problems for phenomenology, ethics, and political practice.

The notion of freedom, argues Brazilian philosopher Vladimir Safatle, is based on the principle of autonomy and presupposes fundamental property relations (a mode of relationship based on radical asymmetry between the object and the subject). Paradoxically, the concept of freedom is based, as a condition of possibility, on principles that are contrary to what it seeks to produce: emancipation. Drawing on the thesis of philosopher Vladimir Safatle, Nicolás **Meneses Álvarez** asserts that the freedom of the subject is based on an exclusive relationship of domination (ownership) with his subjectivity, but also with its effects and needs in the world, since the fruit of labour, as an exercise of human action, belongs to the humans every human is owner of themselves. The fundamental aim of the text is to contribute to seeking an alternative to this model of freedom. The author draws in particular on Andean communalism (Alfredo Gomez-Müller) and the thinking of the Misak people of Colombia to consider, with Safatle, heteronomy without servitude as a coherent alternative for a freedom whose emancipation is only possible through relationality with otherness. The author draws in particular on the relationship between the Andean peoples and the land to show that the absence of property relations in favour of relationships based on harmony and balance can be considered as the strength and the major metaphysical presupposition for thinking about freedom in terms other than autonomy.

Examining the political experience of the Misak indigenous community in south-western Colombia, Alejandro **Martínez Cortés** establishes an important conceptual difference between land and territory, questioning the fundamental separation between humans and nature that informs Western political thought. Indeed, while from the second half of the 20th century onwards the indigenous movement in Colombia followed the line set by the peasant movement in the struggle for land ownership, the movement took a different path after the founding of the CRIC (Regional Indigenous Council of Cauca). The author asserts that this can be explained in part by the type of relationship to the inhabited place that is specific to indigenous communities and distinguishes them from the peasant relationship to land: the indigenous movement fought to establish a balanced relationship with the territory and not only to gain possession of the land. The understanding of territory drawn from indigenous political experience distinguishes it from land, understood as ownable space, because it expresses the deep intertwining of social and political life with the natural cycles of the inhabited space.

Laura **Trujillo** analyses the case of *Doña Juana*, the largest landfill of Bogotá (Colombia), as a clear and concrete product of environmental injustice where both a crime against life and earth is being committed, as well as the reproduction of the discriminative and neo-colonialist logics of capitalism. Laura distinguishes the environmental justice movement from the classic environmentalism where only the interests of the privileged social groups are taken into consideration (*Cult of wilderness, etc.*); to highlight how the environmental damages derived from capitalistic development disproportionately affects the social groups of people in Bogotá. If the Landfill of Doña Juana continue to reproduce, up to the present, the environmental injustice of a capitalistic cost-benefit model transforming the land into *sacrifice zones* where population can be considered as *replaceable victims*; Laura shows that a movement of anticapitalistic resistance is arisen, asking for alternatives to capitalistic practices as those carried out by the Landfill of Doña Juana that are transforming life and land into garbage as the result of cultural practices of western civilisation.

**Breuer's** article examines the concept of world in Aristotle and Husserl as cosmic oikos, that is, as the totality of an inter-subjective experience comprehending both the context of objects or elements and the possibilities for perception and action. Breuer shows that in Aristotle and Husserl, this ontological twofold concept is to be understood as horizon and place, both as a boundary offering resistance to movement and limitation by constitution (as for the body); and a link between the inner and outer experience of the world, but also to otherness (here and there, I and you): contact, interaction, kinesis. Furthermore, the earth understood as a system of places, is to be grasped, following an interesting parallelism drawn by Breuer between Husserl and Aristotle, as a primordial home (Ark or Cosmos) both as the proper place –*Topos Idios*– (where actualisation of the form or essence takes place) and a common place (where the subjective experience of the world is mutually constituted by otherness).

Ekaterina **Shashlova** analyses the importance of the spatial turn as foundation of the decolonial critique, and the possibility it opens to overcome what she calls the trap of recognition theory, which legitimises cultural, economic and social practices based on asymmetrical power relations. For the author, the use of the category of space and the spatial language in the historical disciplines, makes it possible to unveil the economic and legal relations of domination that underlie Western history, as a discursive and material practice. From this perspective, following Mignolo, modernity as Western history turns out to be the other side of colonialism. For Shashlova, central concepts of decolonial critique such as the

geopolitics of knowledge (Dussel) or epistemic disobedience (Mignolo) are supported by Foucault's critique of power-knowledge and the notion of heterotopia, where space reveals the power relations presupposed by history, constituting for this reason an important critical resource for rethinking the foundations of ethics.

Lastly, we count with four text reviews on this issue. Firstly we have **Bastidas Bolaños'** review of Rafael McNamara's work *La ontología del espacio de Gilles Deleuze* (2022), which emphasizes the contributions of Latin American scholars to the study of Gilles Deleuze's work, while critically engaging with the main arguments of the text, presenting in clear manner the originality of McNamara's approach about the importance of the concept of space in deleuzian philosophy. Following that, we have the review by **Defo Nzikou** of the work *Les stratégies du Cogitamus. Essai sur le concept de réticularité* (2021) by Jacques Chatué, which analyzes the notion of territory in relation to the state and the nation. We then have the review by **Gorosito** of the collection of articles called *Posnaturalismos* (2023) compiled by Pablo Pachilla, in which he goes over the concept titling the book, as well as outlining the key arguments in each of the articles, that range from post-colonial studies, to ontology and anthropology. Lastly, we have the review by **Magel** of the book *Der „Grenzgott der Moral“* by Christian Rößners, in which he outlines the structure of main arguments of Rößners' work about the complex intertwinings of Levinas' and Kant's ethical philosophy.

With this issue we expect to bring attention to the importance of the categories of *land* and *territory* as well as *place* or *world* to draw alternatives to the multiple crises linked to the way different kinds of humans and non-humans inhabit the world we live in. The Yanomami perspective shed light on the way in which the idea of territory is profoundly linked to the constitution of a common enemy of the community and hence linked to the constitution of borders. Borders can be understood, from a different perspective, as connected to the concept of frame as a political space of visibility extrapolated into the concepts of map, nation and footnote where the horizon of existence takes place into the image of the political community.

But this political space should be able to shelter the existence-in-mortality as the ground where life is confronted to finitude and to the conditions of constitution of the world itself not as an objective reality but as a relational phenomenon: the world as an open ethical field grounded in the very possibility of *in-between*. Indeed, the world as a complex concept refers at the same time to the horizon of existence, the common and the proper place, or the earth as the primordial home and the system of all places. From this perspective, the category of space has a major importance for the constitution of subjectivity itself. Modern subjectivity,

for instance, is deeply rooted in the places where it was conceived but more importantly within the power relations these places have had historically with other places: colonialism, domination and injustice.

Thus, the history of domination is not only a history of social injustice but a history of environmental injustice. This concept shows the need for a different understanding of the land and the territory comprehending the deep intertwining of social and political life with the cycles of the inhabited space. If this understanding is possible, as demonstrated by the thought, social organization and history of the indigenous communities, then asymmetrical relations of property to the land and to the subjectivity are hardly justifiable, opening the necessity for a different foundation of ethics and philosophy itself.

We would like to deeply thank all the contributors for their work, but also for their patience and understanding in the publication of this issue, which despite all efforts took longer than we would have desired. We would also like to express our gratitude to Julian Lünser, the Chief Editor of this journal, for his support during the whole edition and publication process. Lastly, we'd like to thank the professors, authorities and personnel involved in the former Europhilosophie programme, without whom this Journal would not have been possible.