

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 titled *"Culture and the Climate Crisis: An Emotive Transformation of Openness Art as a Foundation for Reconceptualising the Anthropocene"* explores a compelling intersection of philosophical aesthetics, environmental thought, and artistic practice. The author presents a sophisticated critique of the Anthropocene and offers an ontologically rich alternative framework based on the aesthetics of "Openness Art." This approach introduces a novel conceptualisation of how art can function as an ethical and sensorial response to planetary crises. The writing is intellectually ambitious and draws upon a well-curated corpus of contemporary philosophical and artistic references.

One of the most commendable strengths of the manuscript is its integration of continental philosophy with artistic practice. The use of theorists such as Derrida, Haraway, Rancière, and Heidegger provides a dense but thought-provoking foundation for the argument. The theoretical coherence is impressive, and the articulation of "sensitivity" as an ethical mode of being is original and timely. Moreover, the conceptual move from representational art to relationally generative and affectively engaged art marks a significant contribution to emerging discourses in eco-aesthetics and post-anthropocentric cultural theory.

The case studies—Forensic Architecture, Cooking Sections, SUPERFLEX, and various community-based micro-practices—are well chosen and effectively illustrate the main thesis. Each example serves as a concrete manifestation of the theoretical propositions. The author's analysis reveals the ethical underpinnings and affective dynamics of these artistic practices in a compelling manner. The discussion

is particularly powerful in emphasising art as a tool not of escapism or reproduction, but of ontological empathy and delayed responsiveness in the context of environmental suffering.

Nevertheless, the paper would benefit from greater clarity in its structure and argument development. While the ideas are intellectually rich, the narrative occasionally becomes too dense, relying heavily on philosophical jargon. This may limit accessibility for a broader interdisciplinary readership, including those in environmental humanities, arts education, and climate policy. Could the author consider simplifying or unpacking some of the more abstract concepts—such as “différance,” “ontological entanglement,” or “presencing”—for non-specialist audiences without sacrificing depth?

The section on “Openness Art” is conceptually intriguing but lacks a clear delineation of its criteria and boundaries. What distinguishes Openness Art from existing movements such as socially engaged art, new media art, or eco-art? The manuscript could benefit from a more systematic definition or typology. Additionally, the educational implications discussed in the final section are suggestive but remain underdeveloped. How might these ideas translate into actionable pedagogical models or curriculum design in contemporary arts education?

While the manuscript critically deconstructs the Anthropocene and gestures toward alternative frameworks like the Chthulucene and Capitalocene, it stops short of fully articulating how these alternatives materially reshape art practice or institutional engagement. Would a more detailed comparison of how each conceptual framework might influence artistic strategies or aesthetic choices provide additional depth? A deeper engagement with how these ontological shifts manifest in curatorial practice or public art policy could enrich the discussion.

The manuscript is largely theoretical, and while this is justified by its philosophical orientation, a more explicit methodological section would enhance scholarly transparency. How were the case studies selected, and what analytical framework was applied to them? Were there criteria for inclusion or thematic coding used? Including a brief methodological rationale would help ground the analysis and make the argument more replicable and academically robust.

Stylistically, the manuscript is elegant and lyrical, embodying the very ethos of “sensitisation” it advocates. However, this poetic tone occasionally impedes analytical precision. Could the author consider balancing lyrical expression with moments of direct exposition to ensure that key arguments are not obscured by rhetorical flourish? For instance, restating central claims in plainer terms at the end of complex paragraphs could guide the reader through the layered argumentation.

In terms of scholarship, the manuscript would benefit from a clearer articulation of its original contribution. Is its novelty located in its reconceptualisation of the Anthropocene through the lens of Openness Art? Or in its synthesis of philosophical and artistic practices into a unified ethical aesthetic? Explicitly stating the unique contribution would strengthen the manuscript's academic positioning and clarify its value to the broader field of climate humanities and contemporary art theory.

In conclusion, this manuscript is a thoughtful and conceptually ambitious contribution to emerging discourses at the intersection of art, ethics, and environmental crisis. It succeeds in demonstrating the affective and philosophical potential of art as a site of ethical dwelling and delayed response. With greater clarity in structure, a stronger methodological foundation, and more precise articulation of its educational and institutional implications, the work holds the potential to make a substantial impact across several academic and artistic domains. The author is encouraged to expand on these dimensions to fully realise the manuscript's promising intellectual vision.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.