

## THINKING PLANETARY THINKING

JOÃO RIBEIRO MENDES, Department of Philosophy, University of Minho; Centre of Studies in Geography and Spatial Planning (CEGOT); Institute for Anthropocene Studies, Minho, Portugal

MENDES, J. R.: Thinking Planetary Thinking  
FILOZOFIA, 78, Supplement, 2023, pp. 24 – 37

The term “planetary turn” was coined in 2015 to describe a significant and ongoing shift in the relationship between humans and the Earth, which has been unfolding since the late 20th century. Despite its profound significance, this transformative process lacks a comprehensive theoretical framework, necessitating the development of a new perspective. The planetary turn has brought about substantial changes in our connection with the Earth, particularly in terms of our existence and our efforts to understand it from a planetary standpoint. Addressing the challenges posed by planetary issues requires a distinct mode of thinking. This article begins by offering a concise explanation of the concept of the “planetary turn,” followed by an exploration of a significant consequence of this shift: a profound transformation in the human condition. Additionally, an argument is presented, asserting that this transformation unfolds within the crucial context of liminality characterizing the Anthropocene era. The final section delves into Chakrabarty’s ideas on the development of planetary thinking, that can provide guidance as we navigate the transition from the Anthropocene to the post-Anthropocene era, aiming to surpass the current state of liminality in the human condition.

**Keywords:** Planetary Thinking – Global Thinking – Planetary Turn – Anthropocene – Human condition – Liminality – Dipesh Chakrabarty

### I. The Planetary Turn

The significant influence of human activities on the Earth System, ranging from local to global levels, prompted Paul Crutzen, a Dutch atmospheric chemist, and Eugene Stoermer, an American limnologist, to declare the end of the Holocene epoch and the dawn of a new era known as the Anthropocene (Crutzen – Stoermer 2000).

According to several scholars, the transition from the Holocene to the Anthropocene, where humans have become a geological force, has unfolded in multiple stages (Crutzen – Steffen 2003; Steffen – Crutzen – McNeill 2007). The first stage commenced during the mid-eighteenth century with the advent of the Industrial Revolution, coinciding with the belief in the possibility of the complete mechanization of the world. The second stage emerged in the mid-twentieth century with the onset

of the Great Acceleration, a period characterized by human activities driven by the global economic system, becoming the primary catalyst for changes in the Earth System. In the third stage since the mid-last decade, there is global recognition of the significant impact of human activities on the Earth System. This has created an urgent need for regulation, mitigation, and rectification of these effects.

The increasing recognition of the alarming transformations unfolding in the Earth System and their implications for human civilization(s) has gained considerable traction, often referred to as the “planetary turn.” This term signifies an unforeseen and abrupt shift in our comprehension and relationship with the planet. Initially, our focus was predominantly on the global aspect, but the planetary dimension has unexpectedly taken on greater importance.

In the preface of their co-edited book titled *Planetary Turn*, Amy Elias, professor of U.S. English studies at the University of Tennessee, and Christian Moraru, professor of U.S. English studies at the University of North Carolina, provided the following description of the concept:

Insofar as they can be traced back to the voyages, “discoveries,” and displacements of the early Renaissance, our intellectual challenges, no less than the world realities generating them, are not new; their pervasiveness and intensity are. ... In the thick of things at the dawn of the third millennium, we have no unobstructed view of where we stand. What is apparent to many, however, is ... [that] something is happening. Something is afoot. And this something seems to fit neither the global, neocolonialist models of modernity nor Marxist teleological diagnoses of capitalist globalization ... This is what, critically and theoretically speaking, the planetary turn strives for: a decisive reorientation toward the unfolding present and its cultural paradigm. (Elias – Moraru 2015, vii – viii).

The excerpt uses the expression “planetary turn” to describe the complex situation we have been facing since the late twentieth century and the early twenty-first century, characterized by a profound and transformative shift in our relationship with the Earth. Despite this significant historical process, we lack a theoretical framework that can help us comprehend and navigate this transformation. As a result, we find ourselves in a state of disorientation and uncertainty about the future. In essence, we lack the necessary intellectual tools to fully grasp the implications of the planetary turn.

Over time, we have regarded the planet as an enduring and inconspicuous backdrop, accommodating our activities and enabling the construction of our human world. However, this perception is no longer tenable. The escalating exploration and depletion of Earth’s resources on a global scale have unveiled the active nature of the

planet, almost as if it possesses a certain agency, thereby posing substantial threats to our very existence. In essence, the Earth System has become an unpredictable terrain that surpasses our ability to control it.

## II. The New Human Condition: Living in Liminality

### A. On the Notion of the “Human Condition”

The term “human condition” typically denotes a set of prerequisites that enable individuals to live a uniquely human existence, encompassing a range of experiences that set them apart from animals and other non-human entities. However, it was not until the advent of existentialist thinkers that the term truly became a category in philosophical discourse. Jean-Paul Sartre, in particular, employed it in his essay *L’existentialisme est un humanisme* as a substitute for the concept of “human nature,” which the existentialists regarded as a detrimental fabrication (Sartre 1946, 67 – 68). Sartre not only distinguishes the human condition from human nature but also from the historical context. According to him, irrespective of specific historical circumstances, there exist certain unalterable limits for human beings. In essence, these limits define our humanity in any historical setting: existing in the world, engaging in productive activities, interacting with others, and being mortal. These “limits” can be seen as the horizons of existence, without which human existence would be impossible. They are the elements that give meaning to our existence.

Undoubtedly, the essay *The Human Condition* by German philosopher Hannah Arendt remains the most important and influential philosophical work on the subject. While it is impractical to delve into the intricacies of her arguments here, I will offer only a few concise remarks. According to Arendt, the most general condition of human existence is to be transient, inevitably marked by birth (natality) as its beginning and death (mortality) as its end. She asserts that these three activities have a crucial role in maintaining this condition: (a) labor, ensuring the survival of the species beyond individual life; (b) work, securing the permanence and durability of the material world; and (c) action, preserving memory and history (Arendt 1958, 7).

Arendt draws a distinction between the vital condition that we share with other living beings, enabling us to inhabit Earth, and the existential condition that involves living in a world shaped by human agency.<sup>1</sup> In a way, the notion of the human condition encompasses both the vital and existential aspects of our existence. But as she also asserted:

---

<sup>1</sup> For Arendt, the “world” is a constructed and embedded reality imbued with meaning. What I am trying to emphasize is that we have a vital condition (what we do to stay alive) and an existential condition (what we do to build a meaningful life, even if we adhere to absurdism).

The world, the man-made home erected on earth and made of the material which earthly nature delivers into human hands, consists not of things that are consumed but of things that are used. If nature and the earth generally constitute the condition of human *life*, then the world and the things of the world constitute the condition under which this specifically human life can be at home on earth (Arendt 1958, 134).

In Arendt's perspective, the World is thus a human construct formed by utilizing raw materials extracted and appropriated from the Earth, metabolized, and partially returned to it as waste.

Despite this, she consistently maintained the perspective that the Earth (or Nature, i.e., the Biosphere) and the World are fundamentally different and separate in their essence. In her own words: "we changed and denaturalized nature for our own worldly ends, so that the human world or artifice on one hand and nature on the other remained two distinctly separate entities" (Arendt 1958, 148). Therefore, it can be inferred that she placed a primary emphasis on the existential condition while overlooking the significance of the vital condition.

What is novel in the Anthropocene is that the vital condition has undergone a change that poses a threat to the existential condition, or, in other words, it profoundly transforms the human condition. How has this transformation come about? To address this question, I will contend that the Anthropocene represents an age marked by liminality, which has consequently brought about a change in the human condition. This change involves a state of existence characterized by living in liminality.

### **B. The Anthropocene as a Liminal Age**

There are those who view the Anthropocene as nothing more than the final phase of the Holocene (e.g., Davies 2016), while others interpret it as humanity's ultimate era that leads inevitably to extinction (e.g., Haas 2016). Both perspectives may contain elements of truth, but I am inclined to believe that we are currently in a post-Holocene Anthropocene epoch, which is characterized by the significant human impact on the Earth's ecosystems. Moreover, I assert that this era is transitional in nature. As a result, I argue that the Anthropocene can be interpreted as a liminal geocivilizational condition.

Derived from the Latin word "liminaris," which signifies the threshold of a door, the term "liminal" carries the connotation of a space that exists between two places (in a spatial sense) or a phase of transition between two stages of a process (in a temporal sense), as commonly defined in standard dictionaries.

Furthermore, apart from its general connotation, "liminal" also possesses a technical meaning that is particularly relevant to our discussion. This more specialized meaning was initially introduced by the French folklorist Charles-Arnold van

Genep (1873 – 1957) in his influential 1909 publication entitled *Rites de passage*. Van Genep employed this term to describe the intermediate element within the triadic structure of the rites of passage, a subject that he extensively examined and analyzed (van Genep 1969). However, due to various historical circumstances, van Genep’s scientific contributions were largely overlooked and faded into obscurity until the 1960s when his aforementioned work was translated into English and caught the attention of cultural anthropologist Victor Turner.<sup>2</sup>

Turner rediscovered and expanded upon van Genep’s work (Turner 1967). He utilized the concept of “liminality” not only to identify transitional periods in social life but also to comprehend human responses to liminal experiences and how individuals adapt to this state, thereby introducing psychological and existential dimensions. Moreover, Turner extended the application of the concept beyond the restricted context of ritual transitions in small-scale societies to encompass broader contexts, including large-scale societies and even civilizations.

According to Turner, situations of liminality are marked by ambiguity, as individuals no longer identify with their familiar pre-liminal state but have not yet embraced the desired post-liminal state. In addition, there is confusion as individuals struggle to establish the appropriate behavioral norms in this transitional phase. Furthermore, uncertainty prevails as individuals lack certainty regarding the outcome or successful completion of the transition.

More recently, American scholar Gregory Fried, without making any reference to the concept’s past, uses it to describe the anthropocenic situation in which we find ourselves (Fried 2018, 85 – 87). He does so through an interesting analogy. According to him, humanity is currently in a situation identical to that of Odysseus in Ogygia, as described by Homer in the *Odyssey*, when he was on the verge of embarking on a journey back to Ithaca. The dangerous seas between the two islands, the mythical and the real, placed Odysseus in an identical liminal situation to the one we face in the Anthropocene, which can be considered a transitional period between the Holocene and the post-Anthropocene.<sup>3</sup>

### **C. The Liminal Geocivilizational Condition**

We find ourselves positioned within a precarious temporal and spatial realm, straddling the boundaries of different epochs. This transitional state emerges as the familiar and reassuring Holocene era gradually fades away, while the arrival of the post-Anthropocene era remains elusive and undefined.

---

<sup>2</sup> For the vicissitudes of Genep’s career and work reception, see Thomassen (2009).

<sup>3</sup> Literally, it is the epoch that will come after the Anthropocene, assuming we survive the Anthropocene and assuming significant geological changes occur on Earth.

Amidst this phase of transition, ambiguity becomes pervasive. The certainties of the past progressively diminish, leaving us grappling with uncertain and undefined realities of the future. In this era of the Anthropocene, characterized by its liminality,<sup>4</sup> our existence is infused with a feeling of unpredictability and doubt.

Within the realm of liminality, we observe the gradual dissolution of previously stable ecological patterns.<sup>5</sup> Climate change serves as a disruptive agent, unsettling well-established weather patterns and leading to the escalation of extreme weather events such as intensified hurricanes, wildfires, and floods. The alarming rate of biodiversity decline compounds these disturbances, resulting in the destabilization of complex ecosystems that have thrived for numerous generations. As a result, the fundamental underpinnings of our existence – the delicate interconnectedness of life – experience a profound reconfiguration.<sup>6</sup>

At the same time, we confront the repercussions of our own behaviors. Our impacts on the Earth, encompassing sprawling urban centers, transformed landscapes, and industrial infrastructure, leave indelible, enduring marks on our planet's fabric. Our relentless pursuit of growth takes its toll as we face the consequences of pollution, deforestation, and the depletion of natural resources, all of which disturb the delicate balance of nature.

Some scholars draw parallels between our present circumstances and Karl Jaspers' notion of the Axial Age (Jaspers 1949, Jaspers 1953)– a significant period in human history spanning from the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE (e.g., Szerszynski 2017). Jaspers' concept can be interpreted as describing a liminal or transitional age, characterized by profound transformations and shifts in human thought, culture, and spirituality. During this epoch, new philosophical and religious ideas emerged, challenging established beliefs and paving the way for future developments. The (second) Axial Age (if we are going to assume that we are already in it) can be seen as a liminal stage positioned between the old and the new, marking a transition from one worldview to another. It represents a critical juncture of change and reorientation in the course of human history.

---

<sup>4</sup> Some authors do claim that the Anthropocene is part of the Holocene, a late Holocene, a sort of transitional state for something radically different. However, the Anthropocene as a late-Holocene hypothesis seems somehow incoherent because, in that case, we would have to recognize the Holocene as both climate stable and climate unstable at the same time.

<sup>5</sup> There might be an assumption that many features of contemporary Earth-system behavior are rather characteristic of being in the liminal zone between stable regimes, e.g. around tipping points (see e.g. Williamson – Bathiany – Lenton 2016). It is indeed a tempting view. However, the notion of “tipping points” and its implicit irreversibility seem to undermine it.

<sup>6</sup> Even if we are in liminality, there are some hints, e.g. we can no longer assume a stable relationship with the Earth System, or what Chakrabarty calls a “relation of mutuality” with it. That is a major change in our condition.

### **III. The Need for a Planetary Thinking**

The first people to explicitly point out the need for planetary thinking were perhaps Martin Heidegger and Kostas Axelos. Heidegger clearly stated this in the famous interview, “Nur noch ein Gott kann uns retten,” he gave to the magazine *Der Spiegel* in 1966 (only published posthumously in 1976) (Heidegger 1976), when he stated in his characteristically gnomic style: “to the mystery of the planetary domination of the un-thought essence of technicity corresponds the tentative, unassuming character of thought that strives to ponder this unthought [essence]” (Heidegger 1981, 60, my translation). Axelos, in the same vein, and greatly influenced by the former, in the essay *Future Way of Thought: On Marx and Heidegger*, also published in 1966 – composed of texts originally written in German and French – stated that planetary technology requires a new, a future way of thinking that in itself is planetary (Axelos 1966, Axelos 2015 especially part III).

Both Heidegger and Axelos, like Arendt, shared concerns about our increasing uprootedness from Earth caused by the planetarization of technology. However, none of them fully realized the new anthropocenic circumstances we live in, of a highly unstable and increasingly insecure relationship with our planet. Furthermore, while they acknowledged the need for a new approach, they did not offer a comprehensive outline of its specific content.

The Indian historian Dipesh Chakrabarty has taken on a prominent role in his efforts to articulate the key characteristics of planetary thinking. This form of thinking is crucial in addressing the challenges brought about by the Anthropocene and the substantial transformations in the human condition. The subsequent two subsections will be dedicated to a reflective exposition of his ideas on this subject.

#### **A. Globalization is Modernity Becoming Hypertelic**

Chakrabarty put forth two significant assertions within the domain of philosophy of history. The first claim is that the globalization revealed the planetary, indicating that we are not witnessing the conclusion of the capitalist globalization project, but rather “the arrival of a point in history where the global[ization] *discloses* to humans the domain of the planetary” (Chakrabarty 2021, 80). In other words, “[t]he global[ization] discloses the planetary” (Chakrabarty 2021, 207) in a more concise formulation.<sup>7</sup> In this sense, according to him, the planet, seen as an idiosyncratic entity capable of becoming disruptive and threatening to all our vital and existential projects, has always remained latent, yet unexplored in this regard, or has never been fully incorporated into the realm of humanistic thought.

---

<sup>7</sup> The title of the Postscript of Chakrabarty (2021) is “The Global Reveals the Planetary. A Conversation with Bruno Latour.”

The second claim is that we are all living now at the cusp between the global and the planetary (Chakrabarty 2021, 207), i.e., that “[t]he age of the global as such is ending. And yet the quotidian is about both invoking the planetary and losing sight of it the next moment” (Chakrabarty 2021, 85). According to him, the global was the culmination of a historical process that began in the fifteenth century “that includes European expansion and the development of a technology that can make the sphere we live on into a globe for us” (Chakrabarty 2021, 207). The planetary, on the other hand, began in the beginning of the 20th century with the Haber-Bosch process of artificial nitrogen fixation in the biosphere, the main disruptor of the natural biogeochemical cycle of nitrogen.

By considering both of these assertions together, we can infer that Chakrabarty portrays the present era as liminal. This depiction suggests we find ourselves in a transitional space-time, existing between the global(ization) and the planetary. This transitional period acts as a bridge, linking the conclusion of one epoch to the emergence of another.<sup>8</sup>

Chakrabarty’s assertion is that the Anthropocene signifies a transitional phase from the Global(ization) to the Planetary. More specifically, it is a time when these two realms are intricately intertwined in a relationship characterized by mutual endangerment.

This transition is occurring because Globalization (and the Anthropocene) does not signify the fulfillment of the project of Modernity as an emancipatory civilizational process. Instead, it is an unintended and unforeseen circumstance that has surpassed its intended objectives, or as French sociologist Jean Baudrillard would describe it, has become hypertelic. It results from a “fatal strategy” (not a trivial strategy), a strategy that was successful up to a certain moment and to a certain extent, but later generated an unplanned and undesired excess (Baudrillard 1983, 30).

## **B. Prodromes to Planetary Thinking**

“The sense of the ‘end of the world as we knew it’ is intensifying,” declared Hanusch, Leggewie, and Meyer, and “this could be the ‘planetary’ moment that moves beyond the earth – [i.e., the Global] and human-centered ideal of globalization” (Hanusch – Leggewie – Meyer 2021, 7, my translation).

As mentioned in the first part, the absence of a conceptual framework hampers our capacity to understand and navigate the transformative changes that arise from these new, liminal circumstances. As a result, we encounter a sense of ambiguity, confusion, and disorientation concerning the future.

---

<sup>8</sup> The use of the term “cusp” aligns with the notion of “liminal,” indicating a point of transition between two distinct states or the dividing line between two significantly different elements. For instance, when we refer to being “on the cusp of adulthood,” it signifies the phase of moving from youth to adulthood.



To overcome this peculiar and challenging situation, establishing a planetary thinking is imperative. In Chakrabarty's work, specifically in chapter 3 entitled "The Planet: A Humanist Category," we discover valuable insights that provide essential guidance for this undertaking (Chakrabarty 2021, 68 ff.).

Chakrabarty acknowledges that he is not the first to embrace a "planetary turn." He draws inspiration from Gayatri Spivak's concept of "planetary" (Chakrabarty 2021, 71).<sup>9</sup> He embraced in particular Spivak's notion that planetary thinking must be approached distinctively from global thinking, which is characterized as a view from nowhere. Instead, it should be rooted in a perspective that encompasses multiple viewpoints from below, interconnected to attain a more comprehensive comprehension of the state of the planet. In her own words: "The globe is on our computers. No one lives there. The 'global' notion allows us to think that we can aim to control globality. The planet is in the species of alterity, belonging to another system; and yet we inhabit it, on loan" (Spivak 2015, 291).

In furtherance of the examination of the contrasting aspects between planetary thinking and global thinking to comprehend their distinctive nature, Chakrabarty elucidated five more essential characteristics that set them apart, while also acknowledging their complementary nature: "For all their differences, thinking globally and thinking in a planetary mode are not either/or questions for humans" (Chakrabarty 2021, 85).<sup>10</sup>

Chakrabarty argues that our relationship with the planet has undergone a radical transformation. It can no longer be structured in terms of mutuality, as previously suggested by thinkers like Heidegger using the term "Earth" to denote the place we inhabit, or Arendt using the term "World" to represent the existential space, or even the concept of "Globe" embraced by Globalization theorists. He emphasizes, "to encounter the planet in thought is to encounter something that is the condition of human existence and yet remains profoundly indifferent to that existence" (Chakrabarty 2021, 70).

According to Christophe Bonneuil, this "implies an encounter, without a will to power, with a 'radical otherness'" (Bonneuil 2023, 2, my translation). However, it is precisely this viewpoint that we struggle to let go of in our prevalent global thinking – our perception of the planet as a realm over which we have complete dominance and control, spanning across the terrestrial, maritime, and aerial dimensions. In other words, this corresponds to a reform of the project of Modernity and renouncing our attempts to become, as Descartes aptly put it in his *Discours de la méthode*, "the masters and possessors of nature" (Descartes 1966, 168, my translation).

---

<sup>9</sup> The Indian literary theorist and feminist critic originally explored the notion in Spivak (2003).

<sup>10</sup> For this, see also Bonneuil (2023).

As Chakrabarty argued back in 2009 in his well-known article “The Climate of History,” (cf. Chakrabarty 2021, chapter 1) the category of historical understanding must be reconsidered. The emergence of the Anthropocene era has necessitated a shift away from relying solely on short-term perspectives to organize our lives. While individuals generally think in terms of years or decades, professional historians are trained to explore longer timeframes that encompass centuries or even millennia. These longer temporal extensions are inherent to the realm of global thinking.

Nowadays, however, we are regularly confronted with explanations from natural historians that establish connections between current ecoclimatic disruptions and enduring patterns and trends that span millions or billions of years. These explanations delve into temporal scales that go far beyond our typical short-term perspectives, exposing us to the vastness of deep time. “The global,” he said, “refers to matters that happen within human horizons of time – the multiple horizons of existential, intergenerational, and historical time – though the processes might involve planetary scales of space” (Chakrabarty 2021, 86).

In planetary thinking, these different historicities – of individuals, societies, civilizations, and the Earth (and life within it) – can no longer be assumed as separate, but instead need to be integrated. This integration calls for close collaboration between the natural sciences and the humanities, which has yet to be fully realized.

Another aspect identified by Chakrabarty concerns the association of global thinking with a human-centric worldview, specifically that of capitalism and globalization, while planetary thinking reflects an emerging planet-centric worldview. “The globe,” he states, “is a humanocentric construction; the planet, or the Earth system, decenters the human” (Chakrabarty 2021, 3).

Global thinking, as Chakrabarty describes it, is rooted in a humanocentric perspective. It views the world through the lens of human interests, often prioritizing economic growth, human welfare, and technological advancements. In this paradigm, the Earth is seen as a resource to be exploited for human benefit, often leading to environmental degradation and social inequalities.

On the other hand, planetary thinking signifies a shift toward a planet-centric worldview. It recognizes the Earth as an interconnected system where human beings are just one part of a larger, complex web of life. Planetary thinking acknowledges the interdependence of all living organisms and emphasizes the need for sustainable practices that consider the well-being of the entire planet, rather than just human interests.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> One might argue that there is more than the biosphere to be considered. However, I believe that our current aim is to maintain the stability of the biosphere. We have learned from the previous five major extinctions that the planet lacks moral sensibility. We can extend the same concern to the

Global thinking faces the problem of sustainability. In contrast, planetary thinking is challenged and involved in the habitability problem, whose “central concern is life – complex, multicellular life, in general – and what makes *that*, not humans alone, sustainable” (Chrakrabarty 2021, 83). The two problems obviously co-exist, but the second one is not only centered on humans but involves other species and even all life on Earth. “the planetary mode of thinking,” says Chakrabarty, “asks questions of habitability, and habitability refers to some of the key conditions enabling the existence for various life-forms including *Homo sapiens*” (Chrakrabarty 2021, 87).

The connection between these two issues appears to be clear. Sustainability conditions habitability. The extent, intensity and acceleration of the global exploration and extraction of planetary resources, the amount of negative externalities generated by these processes, and the poor recycling and slow renewal of the natural resources provoked the now entangled problems of sustainability and habitability. This is why Chakrabarty stated:

the humanocentric idea of sustainability will have to speak to the planet-centric idea of habitability. For if my proposition that the intensification of the global has made us encounter the planet is true, then the age of the *purely* global that European empires and capitalism created and that theorists have pondered and historians documented and analyzed since the 1990s is now over. We live on the cusp of the global and the planetary (Chrakrabarty 2021, 204).

Devising solutions to these two intertwined problems entails reforming current political and economic institutions, all designed on human-centered assumptions, and ultimately refounding politics itself in a new philosophical understanding of the human condition: “We increasingly see how hopelessly humanocentric all our political and economic institutions still are. The political eventually will have to be refounded on a new philosophical understanding of the human condition” (Chrakrabarty 2021, 196).

An additional aspect to consider pertains to the moral referential associated with these two modes of thinking. Global thinking is driven by a set of values aimed at shaping global existence, forming the basis for geopolitical governance. Conversely, planetary thinking, “has nothing moral or ethical or normative about it” (Chrakrabarty 2021, 90). As clarified by Bonneuil, “since the forms of habitation of our planet by life

---

ongoing sixth extinction. The ecological dimension takes priority. In their excellent book, Clark and Szerszynski (2021) address the crucial question in Chapter 2, “Who speaks through the Earth?” and argue that social thinkers have a significant role in addressing Anthropocene issues. However, at the end of the day, the solutions to major Anthropocene problems must be provided by natural scientists and engineers.

have been multiple, no state of virgin nature, no past geological state (whether it be the Holocene, the Paleozoic, etc.) can be designated as a reference state to be regained” (Bonneuill 2023, 2, my translation).

In the following table, we can depict the distinct aspects of the two forms of thinking: global thinking in recession and planetary thinking in emergence, based on the Chakrabartian conception.

Form of Thinking	Global Thinking	Planetary Thinking
<b>Aspects</b>		
<b>Standpoint</b>	View from nowhere, detached from specific perspectives ( <i>katascopic</i> )	Rooted in multiple perspectives from below ( <i>anascopic</i> )
<b>Relationship with Planet</b>	Views the Earth as a resource to be exploited for human benefit	Recognizes the planet’s indifference to human existence
<b>Historical Understanding</b>	Relies on short-term perspectives and focuses on human-centric historical time	Considers longer temporal scales and the integration of different <i>historicités</i>
<b>Worldview</b>	Human-centric: prioritizes economic growth and human welfare, often leading to environmental degradation	Planet-centric: emphasizes the interdependence of all living organisms and sustainable practices
<b>Problem Focus</b>	Emphasizes the significance of sustainability, primarily directing attention to fulfilling human needs	Places priority on the issue of habitability, taking into consideration the conditions required for diverse forms of life
<b>Moral Frame of Reference</b>	Guided by a set of values shaping global existence and geopolitical governance	Non-existent; yet to be conceived

Global Thinking vs Planetary Thinking: Dipesh Chakrabarty’s conception

I conclude with the words of Yuk Hui, a philosopher of technology from Hong Kong, who has also been engaging in thinking planetary thinking:

The planetary reveals itself as a gigantic force, which is both danger and hope. It remains the task of thinking to analyse it and develop an intimate relation with it. Thinking has to become a *planetary thinking*, one that takes the planetary as its own condition and exposes its limits (Hui 2020, 868).

## Bibliography

- ARENDDT, H. (1958): *The Human Condition*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- AXELOS, K. (1966): *Einführung in ein künftiges Denken. Über Marx und Heidegger*. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag.
- AXELOS, K. (2015): *Introduction to a Future Way of Thought: On Heidegger and Marx*. Ed. by Stuart Elden. Trans. by Kenneth Mills. Lüneburg: Meson Press.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. (1983): *Les Stratégies Fatales*. Paris: Grasset.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. (2007): *Fatal Strategies*. Trans. by P. Beitchman and W. Niesluchowsk. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- BONNEUIL, C. (2023): Le global et le planétaire. (Review of the book *Après le changement climatique, penser l'histoire*, by Dipesh Chakrabarty). [Online.] *La vie des idées*. Available at: <https://laviedesidees.fr/Le-global-et-le-planetaire>
- CHAKRABARTY, D. (2021): *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- CLARK, N., SZERSZYNSKI, B. (2021): *Planetary Social Thought: The Anthropocene Challenge to the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- CRUTZEN, P., STEFFEN, W. (2003): How Long Have We Been in the Anthropocene Era? An Editorial Comment. *Climatic Change*, 61 (3), 251 – 257.
- CRUTZEN, P., STOERMER, E. (2000): The “Anthropocene.” *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, 17 – 18.
- DAVIES, J. (2016): *The Birth of the Anthropocene*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- DESCARTES, R. (1966): *Discours de la méthode*. Paris: Éd. Gallimard.
- ELIAS, A., MORARU, C. (2015): *The Planetary Turn: Relationality and Geoaesthetics in the Twenty-First Century*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- FRIED, G. (2018): Odysseus on the Beach: Humanity between the Anthropocene and the Hubriscene. In: Polt, R. – Wittrock, J. (eds.): *The Task of Philosophy in the Anthropocene: Axial Echoes in Global Space*. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 85 – 105.
- HAAS, B. (2016): Hopeless Activism: Performance in the Anthropocene. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 36 (4), 279 – 296. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10462937.2016.1230678>
- HANUSCH, F., LEGGEWIE, C., MEYER, E. (2021): *Planetar denken: Ein Einstieg*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (1976): Nur noch ein Gott kann uns retten. *Der Spiegel*, May 30, 193 – 219.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (1981): Only a God Can Save Us. Trans. by W. Richardson. In: Sheehan, T. (ed.): *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker*. London: Transaction Publishers, 45 – 67.
- HUI, Y. (2020): Philosophy and the Planetary. *Philosophy Today*, 64 (4), 865 – 869.
- JASPERS, K. (1949): *Vom Ursprung und Ziel des Geschichte*. München and Zürich: R. Piper.
- JASPERS, K. (1953): *Origin and Goal of History*. Trans. by Michael Bullock. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- SARTRE, J.-P. (1946): *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris: Nagel.
- SPIVAK, G. C. (2003): *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- SPIVAK, G. C. (2015): “Planetarity” (Box 4, WELT). *Paragraph*, 38 (2), 290 – 292. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3366/para.2015.0166>
- STEFFEN, W., CRUTZEN, P., MCNEILL, J. (2007): The Anthropocene: Are Humans Now Overwhelming the Great Forces of Nature. *Ambio*, 36 (8), 614 – 621.
- SZERSZYNSKI, B. (2017): From the Anthropocene Epoch to a New Axial Age: Using Theory Fictions to Explore Geo-Spiritual Futures. In: Deane-Drummond, C. – Bergmann, S. – Vogt, M. (eds.): *Religion in the Anthropocene*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 35 – 52.
- THOMASSEN, B. (2009): The Uses and Meanings of Liminality. *International Political Anthropology*, 2 (1), 5 – 27.

- TURNER, V. (1967): *Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in Rites de Passage*. In: Turner, V.: *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 93 – 111.
- VAN GENNEP, A. (1969): *Rites de passage*. Paris: Éditions A. et J. Picard. Reprint of the 1909 ed., enlarged in 1969.
- VAN GENNEP, A. (1981): *The Rites of Passage*. Trans. by Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- WILLIAMSON, M. S., BATHIANY, S., LENTON, T. M. (2016): Early Warning Signals of Tipping Points in Periodically Forced Systems. *Earth System Dynamics*, 7 (2), 313 – 326. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-7-313-2016>

---

João Ribeiro Mendes  
Department of Philosophy  
University of Minho  
Centre of Studies in Geography and Spatial Planning (CEGOT)  
Institute for Anthropocene Studies  
Rua da Tojeira 12  
São Pedro de Este  
4715-572 Braga  
Portugal  
e-mail: [jcrmendes@elach.uminho.pt](mailto:jcrmendes@elach.uminho.pt)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3731-2246>