

Peer Review

Review of: "Culture and the Climate Crisis: An Emotive Transformation of Openness Art as a Foundation for Reconceptualising the Anthropocene"

Sarah Whitehouse¹

1. University of the West of England, Bristol, United Kingdom

This paper presents a layered and philosophically informed inquiry into how art might respond to the existential crises of the Anthropocene, not through solutions, but by cultivating new forms of sensory and ethical awareness. Rather than asking what art can do *about* the climate crisis, the author repositions art as a site for *dwelling*—a place to pause, to feel, and to reconfigure modes of being and relating.

Strengths

The central conceptual innovation of the paper is its articulation of "openness art"—a term that expands on Bourriaud's relational aesthetics by introducing an ecological, non-anthropocentric, and sensorially distributed framework. The author's treatment of openness as not just an aesthetic category but as an ontological condition is compelling.

Equally valuable is the notion of "delayed response," framed through Derrida's *différance*, which challenges the affective economy of urgency often tied to climate discourse. In resisting immediate reaction, the paper suggests that ethical responsiveness is about attunement and duration—an idea powerfully illustrated through its analysis of case studies like Cooking Sections and Forensic Architecture. These examples are well-chosen and effectively demonstrate how openness art becomes a sensorial and ethical practice rather than mere representation.

The section on education is also a strength. By advocating for a shift from skill-based training to "sensory literacy" and affective learning, it poses challenges to normative arts education.

Areas for Development

While the philosophical scope of the paper is broad and nuanced, at times this breadth risks becoming abstract. For example, the discussion of "ontology" is central but could benefit from tighter conceptual distinctions—particularly between aesthetic, ethical, and ontological registers.

Additionally, while the case studies are insightful, they could be further contextualised through comparative analysis. For example, how might openness art differ in institutionalised Western contexts versus Indigenous or community-led ecologies of art-making? The paper hints at these distinctions but does not fully explore them.

Lastly, the educational proposals, while provocative, would benefit from concrete examples. What does a curriculum look like that prioritises delayed participation? What role do assessment, institutional constraints, or policy play in realising this vision?

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.