

Peer Review

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

Jonas Michel Wolf¹

1. Hospital Moinhos de Vento, Porto Alegre, Brazil

The manuscript presents a philosophically rich and aesthetically compelling reimagination of the Anthropocene through the framework of "Openness Art." One of its strongest contributions lies in its intellectual ambition: integrating ontological inquiry, ecological discourse, and artistic practice into a unified reflection on art's ethical role in the climate crisis. The paper succeeds in articulating a conceptual shift from representational aesthetics to art as a sensorial and ethical practice of responsiveness. It draws from continental thinkers—Derrida, Haraway, Rancière, Heidegger—with fluency, grounding its theoretical propositions in complex yet resonant ideas.

A major strength is the original conceptualisation of "delayed responsiveness" as a counter-narrative to the urgency-driven affective economy that often dominates environmental discourse. Framed through *différance*, this notion shifts art from an expressive tool to a dwelling site—one that invites ethical patience and ontological pause. The author's insistence on art as a medium of ethical attunement, not problem-solving, is refreshing and intellectually mature. The paper's resistance to positivist or prescriptive models grants it both critical and poetic depth.

The selection and analysis of case studies—Forensic Architecture, Cooking Sections, SUPERFLEX, and community-based micro-practices—are both strategically sound and methodologically illuminating. These examples provide grounding for the philosophical arguments, demonstrating how art can reconfigure sensorial structures and foster ecological empathy. However, a more explicit rationale for case selection and a clearer methodological framework (e.g., criteria for inclusion, thematic analysis) would enhance scholarly rigour and replicability.

That said, the paper's structural clarity could be improved. While the ideas are elegantly expressed, the argument occasionally becomes diffuse, particularly in sections 2 and 4. The transitions between subsections could be reinforced with linking sentences or thematic bridges. For instance, a clearer connective thread between the reconceptualisation of the Anthropocene and the ontology of responsiveness would guide the reader more effectively. Could each section explicitly reference the three guiding research questions throughout, to create a more cohesive narrative arc?

The paper's poetic style is largely a strength, embodying the very ethos of "sensitisation" it advocates. However, there are moments where lyrical expression overshadows argumentative clarity. For example, terms like "presencing" and "ethical deployment of affect" might benefit from operational definitions or restatements in more accessible language. Balancing poetic cadence with analytical directness could expand the paper's reach beyond a specialist readership while preserving its philosophical integrity.

Conceptually, the notion of "Openness Art" is compelling but somewhat underdefined. How does it differ from relational aesthetics, eco-art, or socially engaged practice in operational terms? What are its formal characteristics or institutional implications? A clearer typology—or even a comparative chart—could solidify its theoretical contribution. Furthermore, the brief mentions of Haraway's Chthulucene or Moore's Capitalocene, while insightful, remain peripheral. A deeper engagement with how these paradigms specifically inform aesthetic strategies or artistic epistemologies would strengthen the discussion.

The educational implications introduced in Section 5 are promising but underdeveloped. The idea of shifting from skill-based training to "sensory literacy" is thought-provoking. Yet the reader is left wondering: what would a curriculum based on delayed responsiveness look like in practice? Could the author propose pedagogical models, classroom interventions, or assessment tools aligned with this ontological shift? This would translate philosophical insight into actionable frameworks, potentially informing both policy and practice.

Moreover, the manuscript would benefit from a final synthetic section—perhaps a Section 6—that revisits the three guiding questions directly and provides tentative responses or interpretive conclusions. While the paper wisely resists the impulse to finalise or resolve its inquiry, scholarly writing demands some form of closure, however provisional. Revisiting the opening questions would create conceptual symmetry and elevate the argumentative strength of the work.

Finally, while the manuscript elegantly critiques the Anthropocene as a homogenising and politically vague term, it risks treating artistic practices as uniformly resistant or redemptive. Are there risks of co-

optation or institutional sanitisation within these practices? How does Openness Art navigate the potential commodification of ecological aesthetics within neoliberal cultural industries? Addressing these tensions would inject a necessary layer of critical realism and underscore the stakes of the argument.

In sum, this manuscript is a visionary contribution to environmental aesthetics, art theory, and ontological ethics. Its ambition is matched by its philosophical sophistication, though its structure, accessibility, and pedagogical implications require further elaboration. With refinement, this paper could become a landmark in contemporary debates on art's role in reconfiguring our shared planetary condition—not by solving, but by sensing, dwelling, and co-becoming.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.