

Enacting small justices: Education, place and subjectivity in the Anthropocene

Abstract

The concept of the Anthropocene signals both a growing awareness of the negative impact that humans have had on the abiotic and biotic systems of the earth, as well as reflexive opportunity to interrogate how humans might live differently. It is in relation to the reflexive opportunity that the concept of the Anthropocene offers, that I consider the relationship between place, subjectivity, and education. To do this, a conceptual overview of the Anthropocene is provided after which place, as emergent, relation and agentic, is discussed. By drawing on the Guattarian concept of ecosophy, the relationship between the Anthropocene and place is considered to highlight the subjectivities this relationship might give rise to. Based on the forms of subjectivities highlighted, an argument is made for enacting ‘small justices’ (Rousell 2018) that would enable the practice of a more affirmative politics of subjectivity within the field of education in response to the Anthropocene.

Keywords: Anthropocene, place, ecosophy, subjectivity, small justices

Introduction

The Anthropocene is the name given to the new geological age that acknowledges that humans have become global agents that affect the biogeophysical and biogeochemical conditions of the earth (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000; Crutzen 2002). As global agents, the impact of humans on the earth systems is largely one of destruction; of the “scarring of the earth” (Saldanha and Stark 2016, p.429). It affects everything, everywhere on earth (Ulmer 2019, p.65). This is evident in such things as anthropogenic climate change and global warming, biodiversity loss and increased rates of species extinction, ocean acidification, and warming, destruction of forests, etc., as reported on in the assessment and special reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2018, 2019a, 2019b). This impact is, however, not limited to the environmental concerns as it has been argued that global warming, associated with anthropogenic climate change, is likely to impact negatively on basic human rights such as the right to water, healthy food and life, as well as on democratic institutions in the future (UNHR 2019). Furthermore, based on current modelling, the ecological and social impact of climate change, and specifically global warming, affect vulnerable communities disproportionately

(see for example Weber et al. 2018) and is thus rightly as Sefa Dei (2010, p.89) remarks “interlinked with questions of power, social difference, equity, and justice”. At stake, then, is a question of justice as it relates to the human and the more-than-human.

However, present within the notion of the Anthropocene is the possibility of difference. Through urgent and collective action, the future of humans and the more-than-human could yet be different than from the past actions by which the Anthropocene became constituted in the present (cf. Yusoff, 2019), as well as how it could unfold in the future. It is this difference, which Haraway et al. (2015) identify as the schizophrenic promise germane to the concept of the Anthropocene, which enables a radical rethinking of what the relationship *might* be between the more-than-human and human. One may ask what opportunities for difference this schizophrenic promise is generative of, and if it would not be productive if we, as educators and educational philosophers, take up the concept of the Anthropocene as a means to experiment with practising a different politics of subjectivity within the fold of education. Put differently, how can the Anthropocene enable us to rethink “human subjectivity and personhood, and their relationship to the greater world that they inhabit, and of which they are a part” (Bonnet 2017, p.334) in imaginative and creative ways within the field of education without restaging a humanism that seek “to install Man as the measure of all things” (Snaza 2018, p.339)?

In this paper, I explore the generative possibilities the Anthropocene offers to think about the relationship of place, education, and the production of subjectivity. I am in particular interested in how reading place, education, and subjectivity through one another by drawing on the Guattarian concept of ecosophy, allows for a consideration of enacting ‘small justices’ (Rousell, 2018) and practising a more affirmative politics of subjectivity within the field of education. Such a politics of subjectivity concerns connecting education with the political (*le politique*) and not only politics (*la politique*). Whereas politics entails the management of (educational) life, the political involves “transformative experimentations with new arts of existence and ethical relations... [that] requires the circular time of critical praxis” (Braidotti 2016, p.30-31). In what follows, I briefly describe the Anthropocene, before considering place as emergent, relational and agentic. This is followed by a discussion of the concept of ecosophy (Guattari 2014) to explore the potential thereof for rethinking the relationship between education and place in the Anthropocene. I conclude by proposing that collective critical praxes informed by the notion of doing small justices (Rousell 2018) could contribute toward

practising an affirmative politics of subjectivity within the context of education in the Anthropocene.

Conceptualising the Anthropocene

The Anthropocene¹ was here, is here, and still to come. Its presence is evident in the irrefutable impact of humans on the earth systems, biota, materiality, and humans and as Gildersleeve and Kleinhesselink (2019 p.3 and p.5) argue, “the Anthropocene’s potential consequences grow progressively distressing...[given our] precarious relation to the world(s) that co-constitutes us”. Lewis and Maslin (2015) have argued the start date for the Anthropocene to be 1610 CE (Orbis spike). They associate this date with the European colonisation of the Americas from 1492 onwards and the genocide of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas that followed. This process, they argue, was significant as it signalled a significant decline of global carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere as a consequence of reforestation that occurred over large pieces of land due to a lack of farming and hunting activities by indigenous communities. Since global carbon dioxide levels started to increase after 1610 CE due to global population growth and associated socio-economic activities, Lewis and Maslin propose this as a starting date for the Anthropocene. The European colonisation of the Americas resulted not only in the first global trade networks that linked the Americas, Africa, large parts of Asia and Europe, but also “the largest human population replacement in the past 13,000 years... that contributed to a swift, ongoing and radical reorganization of life on Earth without geological precedent” (Lewis and Maslin 2015 p.174). Thus for Lewis and Maslin (2015), the Orbis spike foregrounds the social consequences associated with colonialism, and specifically how these relate to the unequal distribution of power between different groups, the impact of globalization and the centrality of economic growth that is reliant on fossil fuels.

In both a critique and development of the argument for a start date of the Anthropocene to be associated with the European colonisation of the Americas, Yusoff (2019) argues that the grammar of geology and geopolitics is made possible through a grammar of extraction and

¹ The problematics of this concept is recognised (see for example LeCain, 2015; Moore, 2017; Haraway, 2015, Saldanha and Stark, 2016; Ulmer, 2019; Yusoff, 2019). I retain the use of the concept as the focus of the paper is on the potential this concept offers for thinking about the (re)production of subjectivity in education in relation to place rather than on the genealogy of the concept itself. Furthermore, Simonette (2019) notes that for the Anthropocene to be formalised within the geological sciences signals need to petrify in stratigraphic sequences, and as such is unlikely to occur in the near future. Thus, although the Anthropocene is signalled by the anthropocentrically induced changes to the biogeophysical and biogeochemical conditions of the earth, at present it serves rather as a proposition for imaginative socio-political action than as a formalised geological epoch.

biopolitics. This is the case since the European colonisation of the Americas signals when “humanity was borne as an exclusionary construct” (Yusoff 2019, p.53) given that it emerged from the oppression, enslavement and genocide of those communities racialised as Indigenous and black (cf. Jackson 2020). Aimé Césaire (1972, p.21) aptly puts it as “colonisation = ‘thingification’” since through colonisation “societies [were] drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, extraordinary *possibilities* wiped out”. The arguments of Yusoff and Césaire are important to consider, for if one takes the colonisation of the Americas as the inception date of the Anthropocene, it follows that to explore the schizophrenic promise inherent in the Anthropocene would necessarily entail exposing and dismantling the logic of coloniality/modernity² that informed the colonial project at large. This logic was productive of specific relations of power and human and more-than-human subjectivities that profoundly influenced the manner in which humans relate to one another and with the world around them (Quijano 2007; Maldonado-Torres 2007). This ‘imperial attitude’ (of which capitalist anthropocentrism is a consequence) involves, according to Maldonado-Torres (2007), not only questioning the very humanity of the colonised peoples but also their cosmologies, histories, knowledge systems, cultural practices, and so on.. Furthermore, for Maldonado-Torres, the anthropological colonial difference as expressed through *ego conquistador* and *ego conquistador*, enabled the emergence of “the Cartesian idea about the division between *res cogitans* and *res extensa* (consciousness and matter) which translates itself into a divide between the mind and the body or between the human and nature ” (Maldonado-Torres 2007, p.245). It is this historical constituted and anthropocentric relationship premised on bifurcation of human/nature, coloniser/colonised, as well as the continuation thereof in the contemporary world (Quijano 2007, Maldonado-Torres, 2007), that becomes potentially significant in exploring the relationship between place, subjectivity and education.

Yet, within the distress of the Anthropocene lies the potential of difference through imaginative socio-political action, since it exists both in the past, in the present *and* the future. This is the case since we experience and are shaped by the consequences thereof while at the same time

² The concept of coloniality/modernity was proposed by Quijano to illustrate how the project of modernity served as the epistemological frame for European colonialism. In developing this concept, Mignolo (2007) asserts that coloniality is constitutive of modernity. Coloniality/modernity can furthermore be understood in terms of coloniality of power to refer to “the interrelation among modern forms of exploitation and domination (power)”, coloniality of knowledge that concerns the historical and continued colonization of knowledge production, and coloniality of being as a means to interrogate “the effects of coloniality in lived experience” (Maldonado-Torres 2007, p. 242).

contributing towards constituting it through our socio-economic and political practices and, in so doing, shaping *a* future earth. The Anthropocene is thus not only an external condition but germane to our subjectivation – to who we are, how we came to be, and what we may become. An aspect then of the schizophrenic promise that Haraway et al. refer to, is of reconsidering subjectivity and the relation of the human to geographies of place. For Saldanha and Stark (2016, p.432) humanity has reached a critical moment as it pertains to the production of subjectivity given “humans with an immense and unprecedented agency in their relationship to the earth”. Humans, thus, are inextricably bound up with/in the earth’s systems and the myriad of life it hosts. What the concept of the Anthropocene makes clear is that life is a matter of relation – of “giving-on-and-with” [*donner-avec*] – and a capacity for variation (cf. Glissant 1997, pp.141-157). This relation furthermore allows one to question and critique conceptual dualities such as culture/nature, coloniser/colonised, human/nonhuman, etc. (Gildersleeve and Kleinhesselink, 2019). In this moment there thus exists an opportunity to generatively engage with how we conceptualise the production of subjectivity in relation to the earth given our relational embeddedness with/in it. In this sense, I employ the concept of the earth as a critique of the predicative logic that informs thinking about the relationship between the human and the more-than-human world in terms of Territory. Whereas my use of earth signals a generative relationship informed by the virtual and immanence, Territory signals a specific actualization of this relationship based on *potestas*, hierarchies of existence, exclusion, and transcendence.

In considering how the concept of the Anthropocene informs my unfolding thinking about education, place and subjectivity, I draw on Ulmer (2019) and Braidotti (2019) to position the Anthropocene not as a strategic plan, but rather as a question that invites a response. The concept of the Anthropocene is thus taken up here as a means to enter into dialogue with the earth. It offers, to paraphrase Biesta (2017), turning towards the earth and desiring to be with/in the earth. Conceptualised as a question, the concept of the Anthropocene gives recognition to its multi-layeredness and the manner in which it impacts “the environmental, socio-economic, and effective and psychic dimension of our ecologies of belonging” (Braidotti, 2019, p.32). Furthermore, conceptualising the Anthropocene as a question offers one a chance to reflect on one’s daily practices and beliefs that inform such practices, as well as how these are connected to larger-scale events that provide the context for how and why we educate (cf. Ulmer, 2019, p.73). Thus, this concept does not offer us a blueprint of exactly *how* we should respond to the legacies and projections of extraction, exclusion, and death (in short necropolitics) associated with the concept of the Anthropocene and capitalist anthropocentrism, nor with the unfolding

social, political and ecological conditions associated with it. Rather, what the concept of the Anthropocene offers is the possibility *for* responding to it differently than that which has brought us to where we find ourselves at present and the manner in which we relate to the earth and to each other. In offering a response, one's entangled embeddedness with/in the earth becomes foregrounded, and as such, considering how one conceptualises place is important.

Place as emergent, relational and agentic

Since the Anthropocene is *everywhere*, all the time, it implies that it must be *somewhere in-time*. It is in this *somewhere in-time*, in other words, the places we live and work, teach and learn, that we experience the Anthropocene and where the temporal, material, and affective flows of the global, social, and existential meet. As such, it is crucial to consider this *somewhere in-time* as it has been theorised in the concept of place since this is the location from which we respond to the conditions of the Anthropocene. The multiple meanings associated with the concept of place makes it difficult to define. Yet, we should not conceive of the places we inhabit as a static background against or surface upon which human agency plays out, nor as being dependent and holding no power in itself. Rather, for the purposes of my argument, place is conceptualised as agentic, relational and emergent, and a particular articulation of time-mattering that possesses political and ethical dimensions (Kruger 2020). My understanding of place is informed by Cresswell (2009, p.169), who posits it as a combination of “materiality, meaning and practice” that gestures in the three directions of environmental materiality, social perception, and individual affect. The relationship between the materiality, meaning, and practice of place is “radically open and non-essentialised” (Cresswell 2004, p.39) and constituted through practice. Such a processual understanding of place is also expressed by Thrift (2008), who posits place to be more than the collection of material objects, structured behaviours, and political technologies. Instead, the affective flows, encounters, practices, and experiences make place to be ever-evolving and ever-mutating. In this sense, place is continuously practiced as the dispersed subjectivity of a “shape called I” (Bennet 2020, p.xi) emerges with/in earth. In conceptualising place, practice here refers to “material bodies of work or style” that have stabilised over time and that “are productive concatenations that have been constructed out of all manner of resources” (Thrift 2008, p.22 and p.23). For Thrift, the stability of practice emanates from socialisation, as well as members of a community holding each other to these practices. Thus, as “corporeal routines and specialised devices [that] reproduce themselves” (Vendler in Thrift 2008, p.22), practice becomes the natural fact to a situation and provides “the basic intelligibility of the world” (Thrift 2008, p.23). The stability

of practices is, however, transitory as they are continually being rewritten as new circumstances and new material bodies arise within a place. It is in the recursive relationship and the potential of change in each iteration of practice that place is experienced and enacted upon, and that enables it to be understood as an event in the Deleuzian sense.

As a Deleuzian event, place is the event of relations; the “instantaneous productions intrinsic to interactions between various forces” (Stagoll 2010, p.89). Such human and more-than-human forces are furthermore scalar, ranging from global to existential flows that move at different speeds and intensities (cf. Deleuze 1988, pp.127-129). These forces and flows should not be confused, however, with the agency of human or more-than-human subjects but are rather pre-subjective affects that become actualised in non-essentialised subjectivity. In following Spinoza, these forces are expressed as affect and refer to a body's potential of acting and being acted upon. For Duff (2010 p.885), “affect, therefore, describes both the distinctive set of feeling states realisable within a particular place as well as the store of action-potential, of expressions, capacities, and practices experienced in that space”. This means that, in becoming actualised, human and more-than-human subjectivities act in and on place based on the lived sensations and experiences thereof and the action-potential circulating therein. In keeping with a Deleuzian inflexion of event, the emergence of place should thus not be understood as constituting a particular happening in itself, but as the potential immanent to a happening. Place is not determined but becomes continuously actualised through the material, discursive and affective forces through which it is composed and the human and more-than-human subjectivities that become actualised and act in, through and on it. It is the unfolding and relational composition, in a word the virtuality, of place that makes it emergent; “forever on the verge of the of the actual” (Ingold 2011, p.69). Furthermore, it is this potential immanent to the non-determinacy of place, and which relations are constituted by and constitutive of, that underlies the vitality of thereof. Place is thus intimately tied-up with action-potential, and as a consequence, possesses political and ethical dimensions.

Ruitenbergh (2005 p.215) argues that places are constituted by configurations “through which power and other socio-politico-cultural mechanism are at play”. Such configurations emerge from the interactions with flows of environmental materiality that includes the human and more-than-human, social perception and meaning, subjective affect, and practice. Drawing on Derrida's motif of *destinerrance*, Ruitenbergh (2005) points to the fact that locality, or place, is contaminated by globality and cannot be understood other than existing in a permanent

dynamic relationship with it. One's place it thus "in fact a collection of *destinerrant* traces of actions initiated elsewhere" (Ruitenbergh 2005, p.216). Yet, given how the "topologies of globalisation" (Tuck and McKenzie 2015, p.131) informed by a logic of coloniality/modernity are emerging in the Anthropocene and the political and ethical consequences these hold, we have to interrogate the "interrelationships between social practices and the eventful unfolding of places in relation to particular social contexts of power" (Mackenzie and Bieler 2016, p.63). Thus, we have to remain attentive to the potential spatial and temporal universalisation of the Anthropocene by giving recognition to the "'already here' worlds" through attending to the plurality of knowledges that emerge from the constitutive webs of life found, both historically and presently, in *in-place* (cf. Jackson 2020, p.3). Interrogating the social practices and the unfolding of place in relation to power would necessarily entail considering the subjectivities these relationships make possible and (re)produce. We may, for example, ask what human and more-than-human subjectivities the global flows associated with the Anthropocene are productive of and how these subjectivities may manifest within particular places in the field of education? At the same time, and given that human and more-than-human subjectivity does not only emerge from and with place but are also productive of it, one may ask how emplaced practices within localised contexts contribute towards global flows and the anthropogenic (and settler-colonial capitalist) foundations of the Anthropocene. It is in considering the interplay between globality and place particularness, as well as how these relate to the production of subjectivity, which allows for offering a response to the question of the Anthropocene, and in a sense, to enter into dialogue with the earth. In offering one possibility of what such a response may be, I turn to Felix Guattari's concept of ecosophy.

Ecosophy and practising a different politics of subjectivity

Arguably, a central concern in the field of education at present given the conditions of the Anthropocene is as Bonnet (2017 p.334) argues "the nature of human subjectivity and personhood, and their relationship to the greater world that they inhabit, and of which they are a part." I have argued that the schizophrenic promise of the Anthropocene offers us the chance to respond to the prevailing political, social and ecological conditions given the potential thereof to shock us "out of anthropocentric complacency and the accustomed ways of thinking which situate the human apart from nature" (Saldanha and Stark 2016, p.431; cf. Snaza 2018). Any such response would occur *in-time* and *in-place*, where the discursive, material, and affective flows of the global and particular meet. In what follows, I draw on Felix Guattari's (2014) concept of ecosophy to overlay my discussion of place and the Anthropocene with one

another. I do this to consider the potential that ecosophy engenders to (re)think the relationship between place, education, and subjectivity in offering a response to the question of the Anthropocene and to practise a different and more affirmative politics of subjectivity within the field of education.

In *The Three Ecologies*, Guattari (2014) proposes that Integrated World Capitalism - “the international integration of national economies on an increasingly world scale, and their subordination within a polycentric and rigorously planned project of control” (Guattari and Negri 2010, p.48) - is increasingly impacting on subjectivity (mental ecology), social relations (social ecology), and the environment (environmental ecology). This impact is largely negative and intimately entangled with coloniality/modernity. For Guattari, subjectivity is desingularised, homogenised and universalised, losing its uniqueness, as individuals increasingly become immersed in mass media and its sedative discourses that create a “pervasive atmosphere of dullness and passivity” (Guattari 2014, p.47). Integrated World Capitalism is thus productive of an inward-directed subjectivity causing “people to remain fixated on themselves” (Guattari 1984, p.18) and to “become trapped in a cycle of deathly repetition [*répétition mortifère*]” (Guattari 2014, p.26). Social relations are strained as we see, for example, in the increase in nationalist, chauvinist and ethnic rhetoric contributing towards hatred of immigrants and communities perceived as ‘Others’. The environment is similarly impacted, as is evident in such phenomena as biodiversity collapse, the acidification of oceans, global warming, etc. (IPCC 2018, 2019a and b), and that are recognised in the concept of the Anthropocene. Importantly for Guattari, the mental ecology, social ecology and environmental ecology are not three ontologically separate domains but interlocking registers that are inseparably intertwined. Thus, the mental ecology (subjectivity), social ecology (social relations), and environmental ecology are bound up with one another, with a disequilibrium in one ecology necessarily being transferred and reflected in the other two ecologies. This means that the domestication of the mental ecology, through the “standardisation of behaviour” (Guattari 2014, p.17) and infantilisation of the relationship between subjectivity and exteriority, is similarly reflected in the breakdown of social relations, as well as environmental collapse and consequential ecological crises. This breakdown is furthermore a result of “fatalistic passivity” and the decline of “social and psychological praxes” (Guattari 2014, p.27) given that “capitalism seek to gain power by controlling and neutralising the maximum number of subjectivity’s existential refrains” (Guattari 1989, p. 139).

To respond to the insidiousness nature and destruction of Integrated World Capitalism, Guattari (2014) argues that one has to not only give recognition to the entanglement of the mental, social and environmental ecologies but also find ways to resingularise³ these ecologies through engaging in new universes of reference and new possibilities for becoming(-other). To achieve this would mean one needs to think transversally about the mental, social, and environmental ecologies and to recognise how they are bound up with one another. Since the self becomes constituted through dynamic and shifting relations in the social ecology, and the social ecology, in turn, form part of the natural and cultural interrelations in the environmental ecology, it follows that “active processes of subject-formation necessarily involved an effort to manage the social [and environmental] ecology by creating, encouraging and seeking” (Bignall, Hemming and Rigney 2016, pp.463 and 462) affirmative connections that increases one’s existential powers. For Guattari (2014, p.29) to participate in such active processes of subject-formation requires an eco-logic that “captures existence in the very act of its constitution, definition and deterritorialisation”. It is through such an eco-logic that one practices transversality.

Transversality concerns both ethical and political matters, of *why* and *how* we choose to act. It is this ethico-political articulation that Guattari (2014) refers to as ecosophy. Ecosophy enables one to exercise creative autonomy through which one can start to renew “humanity’s confidence in itself” (Guattari 2014, p.47) by participating in active processes of subject-formation. The eco-logic that underlies ecosophy thus allows for qualitatively increasing the possibilities of what life may be by breaking habitual patterns of engagement that is productive of an inward-directed subjectivity. This politics of renewal should begin at the micropolitical level; in other words, with ourselves and our communities, in-time and in-place. Creative autonomy, then, entails participating in a micropolitics – a politics of “soft subversions and imperceptible revolutions that will eventually change the face of the world” (Guattari 2009, p.306). Arguably, such soft subversions should be informed by an ethics that responds to the event of place by “attending to ecological [ecosophical] principles underscoring the complex patterns of connectivity” (Bignall, Hemming and Rigney 2016, p.466) in-place and as a means to engage with humans and the more-than-human in a manner that is life-enhancing.

³ In this instance, singularity does not refer “to individuality, although it is about being singular” (Pindar and Sutton 2014, p.9). Rather, “singularities preside over the genesis of individuals and persons; they are distributed in a potential which admits neither Self nor I, but which produces them by actualisation or realising itself” (Deleuze 1990, p.103).

Furthermore, such an ethics would necessarily work toward exposing and dismantling the logic of coloniality/modernity that are productive of the socio-economic and political framework that created the conditions for the Anthropocene to emerge. Yet, although the micropolitical “begins with very immediate, daily, individual preoccupations... [it] remains connected to what happens at the social level and even... at the cosmic level” (Guattari 2009, p.138). Creative autonomy is thus a practice that starts on an individual level but extends toward the social and global. Creative autonomy should not, however, be understood from an anthropocentric position that endows only the human with agency and promotes human exceptionalism since the human “is fully immersed in and immanent to a network of nonhuman (animal, vegetable, viral) relations” (Braidotti 2011, p.94). Such immanence foregrounds the ontological inseparability of the human and more-than-human, and is arguably made evident and expressed in the very idea of the Anthropocene. Rather, creative autonomy should be informed by (post)humanist sensibilities that foregrounds the relational nature of agency. In considering how creative autonomy and the micropolitical may inform our thinking about education, Le Grange (2018, p.884) argues that “an education that cultivates (post)human sensibilities is one that opens up the pathways for learners to expand their powers of enhancing life, where knowledge becomes concerned with the development of capabilities that expand the powers of enhancing life”. Arguably, such (post)human sensibilities could be practiced at the level of the micropolitical, and through such practice, create the conditions for creative autonomy. It is this aspect of change at the micropolitical level that is fundamental, for it is in the places of teaching and learning that we can respond, through transversal thinking and creative autonomy, to the question that the Anthropocene asks of us. It is also in such places that we can enter into dialogue with the earth. What such a response may entail could, however, never be prescriptive or pre-determined but should remain experimental yet pragmatic. Such pragmatism would require careful place-particular analysis of how specific discursive, material and affective arrangements coalesce(d) to create *a* place, the human and more-than-human subjectivities that become actualised and act in, through and on it, and the manner in which the Anthropocene finds expression in it.

I argue that what is called for is a pedagogy resingularisation that works ecosophically in informing *what* we choose to do and *how* we choose to do it as we work toward being responsive and acting with care in light of the question posed by the Anthropocene. Such a pedagogy of resingularisation would be informed by heterogenesis. Pindar and Sutton (in Guattari, 2014) state that heterogenesis entails micropolitical dissensus; a process of

adaptation, transformation and modification in relation to the environment that work toward deterritorialising homogenising macropolitical consensus. Dissensus furthermore involves the “collective production of unpredictable and untamed ‘dissident subjectivities’” (Pindar and Sutton in Guattari 2014, p.10). Importantly, informed by an ethics of the event, micropolitical dissensus should be orientated toward dismantling the manner in which topologies of globalisation and a logic of coloniality/modernity (cf. Tuck and McKenzie 2015; Maldonado-Torres 2007) find expression in-place. This would mean attending to the particularness (including histories of settler colonialism) of a place as well as experimenting with how marginalised and indigenous philosophies of existential interconnectivity in such places could potentially inform practicing an affirmative politics of subjectivity (cf. Acosta and Abarca 2018; Bignall et al 2016; Jackson 2020; Le Grange 2012).

A pedagogy of resingularisation would be aimed toward being generative of collective praxes that is composed of “effective practices of experimentation, as much on a micro-social level as on a larger institutional scale” (Guattari 2014, p.22). Evans, Cook and Griffiths (2008, p.330) similarly argue that what is required are “forms of education that are inherently radical and active, that equip students with an understanding that quite literally ‘places them within the world’”. It is through transversal thinking and creative autonomy that we can respond to the event of place and the question posed by the Anthropocene. Given the emplacement of teaching and learning – the mind, body, material nexus (McKenzie and Bieler, 2016) – such transversal thinking and creative autonomy allow for the cultivation of ‘doing little justices’ (Rousell 2018) to address the injustices associated with the Anthropocene, and as it manifest in both the human and more-than-human realms and across different scales by starting *in-place* and *in-time*. This is because the micropolitical “has to come from within, in the thick of things... There is no situation of being outside situation” (Massumi 2015, p.71). It thus has to start in-place and in-time – in the *places* we live and work every day.

The concept of doing little justices is put forward by Rousell (2018, p.2) to consider how the “a movement, a word, an image or an idea” may enable bringing “care and attention to the fragilities, entanglements, and uncertainties of life in the Anthropocene”. As a reading of justice in the minor key, little justices entail becoming “attuned to this situation of mutual immanence...[and engaging in] speculative experimentation that produces new forms of togetherness” (Rousell 2018, p.2 and p.8). It is thus a concept that proposes participating in a micropolitics in-place and fostering “little practices that work differently for tomorrow,

beginning with today” (Ulmer 2019, p.65). Importantly, doing little justices resides in our becoming with/in the earth, and should not be based on *a priori* and a universalised blueprint of what justice should entail. Rather, I propose that as a practice that emanates from a pedagogy of resingularisation, doing little justices could inform a social praxis that responds to the event of place and work against “a stupefying and infantilising consensus [by] cultivating a *dissensus*” (Guattari 2014, p.33). For as Rousell (2018, p.2) argues, doing little justice “is a concept of immanence to the extent that it proposes an ethics that is located inside material encounters, events, socialities, and actual occasions of experience”. Furthermore, transversal thinking and creative autonomy may inform the practice of little justices as a particular articulation of the action-potential of place and as a means to respond to the “topologies of globalisation” (Tuck and McKenzie 2015, p.131) and logic of coloniality/modernity and the majoritarian human and more-than-human subjectivities that these are productive of. It is by engaging in affirmative and a generative micropolitics in-place and in-time that one can start to rewrite the practices that provide “the basic intelligibility of the world” (Thrift 2008, p.23), and in so doing, begin to experiment with “new practices of the Self in relation to the other, the foreign, the strange” (Guattari 2014, p.46) that respond to the question of the Anthropocene in a generative and affirmative manner. If particularness, as expressed in place, is contaminated by globality as Ruitenberg (2005, p.216)) avers, it follows that globality is similarly contaminated by particularness and is constituted by a collection of “actions initiated elsewhere”. This means that thinking ecosophically and engaging in little justices, and as these find expression in attunement and immanent responsiveness to one’s place of becoming with/in the earth, potentially allows for subverting the macropolitics of the Anthropocene and the homogenising subjectivities associated with it. Moreover, being attuned to the place of our being with/in the earth necessarily means being open to it, and being open to place enables one to be changed by it while at the same time transforming it (Kruger 2020). In other words, to experiment with “continuity of becoming across all scales, planes, and modes of existence” (Rousell 2018, p.5).

Concluding remark

In responding to the event of place as it unfolds in the Anthropocene, we should take heed to “‘stay with the trouble’ of today and the histories from which those troubles emerge” (Ulmer 2019, p.67). We could do this by offering a response in the places we find ourselves by turning to the “immediate event of encounter, [and] as conditioned by the immanence of the past and the future in the present” (Rousell 2018, p.6). In keeping with the ethico-political inflexion of

a pedagogy of resingularisation, opportunities should be created in conceptualising and practising education to allow for cultivating attunement and openness towards the places we inhabit and how these are emerge from the knotting of the temporal, material, and affective flows of the mental, social and environmental ecologies. Arguable such attunement and openness would allow for transversal thinking and creative autonomy. Moreover, it is through transversal thinking and creative autonomy that one can participate in a different politics of subjectivity that does not perpetuate the notion of *res cogitans and res extensa* that translates as a divide between humans and nature, nor *ego conquistador* and *ego conquistado* (Maldonado-Torres 2007). Such a politics of subjectivity would necessarily entail fostering a mutuality and participatory reciprocity – learning with, from, and alongside human and more-than-human others (Kruger 2020) – as we venture a response to the question of the Anthropocene.

References

- Acosta A and Abarca MM 2018 *Buen Vivir: An Alternative Perspective from the Peoples of the Global South to the Crisis of Capitalist Modernity*. In: Satgar V (eds.) *The Climate Crisis: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, pp.131-147.
- Benet J 2020 *Influx and efflux: Writing up with Walt Whitman*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Biesta G 2017 *Letting Art Teach: Art Education 'After' Joseph Beuys*. Arnhem: ArtEZ Press.
- Bignall S, Hemming, S and Rigney D 2016. Three Ecosophies for the Anthropocene: Environmental Governance, Continental Posthumanism and Indigenous Expressivism. *Deleuze Studies* 10(4): 455-478.
- Bonnet M 2017 Environmental Consciousness, Sustainability, and the Character of Philosophy of Education. *Studies in Philosophy of Education* 36(3): 333-347.
- Braidotti R 2011 *Nomadic theory: The portable Rosi Braidotti*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti R 2016 Posthuman Affirmative Politics. In: SE Wilmer and A Žukauskaitė (eds.) *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies*. New York: Routledge, pp. 30-56.
- Braidotti R 2019 A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. *Theory, Culture and Society* 36(6): 31-61.
- Césaire A 2000 *Discourses on Colonialism* (Trans J Pinkham). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cresswell T 2004 *Place: A short introduction*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Cresswell T 2009 Place. In: N Thrift and R Kitchen (eds.) *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography* Vol. 8. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 169-177.
- Crutzen P 2012 Geology of mankind. *Nature* 415: 23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/415023a>.
- Crutzen P and Stoermer EF 2002 The 'Anthropocene'. *IGBP Global Change Newsletter*, 41: 17-18.
- Deleuze G 1988 *Spinoza: Practical philosophy* (Trans R Hurley). San Francisco: City Light Books.

- Deleuze G 1990 *The Logic of Sense* (Trans M Lester). London: The Athlone Press.
- Duff C 2010 On the role of affect and practice in the production of place. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28: 881-895.
- Evans J, Cook I and Griffiths H 2008 Creative, group pedagogy and social action: A departure from Gough. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 40(2): 330-345.
- Glissant E 1997 *The Poetics of Relation* (Trans B Wing). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Guattari F 1984 Transversality. In *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics* (Trans R Sheed). New York: Penguin.
- Guattari, F. 1989. The Three Ecologies. *New Formations* 8: 131-147.
- Guattari F 2009 *Soft Subversion: Texts and Interviews 1977-1985* (Trans C Wiener and E Wittman). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Guattari F 2014 *The Three Ecologies* (Trans I Pindar and P Sutton). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Guattari F and Negri A 2010 *New Lines of Alliance, New Spaces of Liberty* (Trans. M. Ryan, J Becker, A Bove and N Le Blanc). London: Minor Compositions.
- Haraway D, Ishikawa N, Scott G, Olwig K, Tsing AL and Bubandt N 2015 Anthropologists are talking – About the Anthropocene. *Ethnos* 81: 535-564.
- Haraway D 2015 Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin. *Environmental Humanities* 6: 159-165.
- Ingold T 2011 *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. London: Routledge.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2018 *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C*. Retrieved from <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/sr15/>.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2019a *Special Report on Climate Change and Land*. Retrieved from <https://www.ipcc.ch/srccl/>.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2019b *Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. Retrieved from <https://www.ipcc.ch/srocc/>.
- Jackson M 2020 On Decolonizing the Anthropocene: Disobedience via Plural Constitutions. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, DOI: 10.1080/24694452.2020.1779645.
- Kruger F 2020 The movement of thought: Mapping knowledge-growing. In: M Crul, L Dick, H Ghorashi and A Valenzuela Jr. (eds.) *Scholarly Engagement and Decolonisation: Views from South Africa, The Netherlands and the United States*. SunMedia, pp. 323-342.
- LeCain TJ 2015 Against the Anthropocene: A New-materialist Perspective. *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity* 3(1): 1-28.
- Lewis SL and Maslin MA 2015. Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature* 519: 171-180.
- Le Grange L 2012 Ubuntu, ukama and the healing of nature, self, and society. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 44 (sup2): 56-67.
- Le Grange L 2018 Spinoza, Deep Ecology and Education Informed by a (Post)human Sensibility. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50(9): 878-887.
- Maldonado-Torres N 2007 On the Coloniality of Being. *Cultural Studies* 21(2-3): 240-270.
- Massumi B 2015. *The Politics of Affect*. Cambridge: Polity.
- McKenzie M and Bieler A 2016 *Critical Education and Sociomaterial Practice: Narration, Place and the Social*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Moore JW 2017 The Capitalocene, Part I: on the nature and origins of our ecological crisis. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44(3): 594-630
- Quijano A 2007 Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. *Cultural Studies* 21(2-3): 168-178.

- Rousell D 2018 Doing little justices: speculative propositions for an immanent environmental ethics. *Environmental Education Research*. DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2018.1517408
- Ruitenbergh C 2005 Deconstructing the experience of the local: Towards a radical pedagogy of place. In: K Howe (ed.) *Philosophy of education society*. Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society, pp. 212–220.
- Sefa Dei GJ 2010 The Environment, Climate Change, Ecological Sustainability, and Antiracist Education. In: F Kagawa and D Selby (eds.) *Education and Climate change: Living and Learning in Interesting Times*. New York: Routledge, pp. 89-105.
- Simonetti C 2019 The Petrified Anthropocene. *Theory, Culture and Society* 36(7–8): 45–66.
- Snaza J 2018 The Earth is not “Ours” to Save. In: j. jagodzinski (ed.) *Interrogating the Anthropocene: Ecology, Aesthetics, Pedagogy, and the Future in Question*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 339-357.
- Stagoll C 2010 Event. In: A. Parr (ed.) *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.89-91.
- Thrift N 2008 *Non-representational theory: Space, politics, affect*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Tuck E and McKenzie M 2015. *Place in research: Theory, methodology and methods*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Ulmer JB 2019 The Anthropocene is a question, not a strategic plan. *Philosophy and Theory in Higher Education* 1(1): 65-84.
- United Nations Human Rights Council 26 June 2019 *Climate change and poverty: Report of the special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, A/HRC/41/39*. Available from <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=24735&LangID=E>
- Weber T, Haensler A, Rechid D, Pfeifer S, Eggert B and Jacob D 2018 Analysing regional climate change in Africa in a 1.5 °C, 2 °C and 3 °C global warming world. *Earth's Future* 6(4): 1–13.
- Yusoff K 2019 *A Billion Black Anthropocenes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.