



Ecofeminism for the 99% – Three Theses

IWONA JANICKA

Center for Environmental and Technology Ethics – Prague (CETE-P), Institute of
Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Ecology is fundamental to any form of politics today, including feminism. With the climate crisis, the conditions of human and nonhuman flourishing are under threat: air, water and soil pollution is widespread, extinction chains cause a cascade of harmful effects, biodiversity itself is collapsing. For this reason, ecology can no longer be situated as one concern amongst the range of issues that a community must consider, but must instead be recentred as the key challenge—and opportunity—for the redefinition of our contemporary political order. In this piece—something between a manifesto and a prefigurative gesture—I turn to ecofeminism as a social, political and philosophical movement to help us rethink the basic concepts of our society. One of the crucial features of ecofeminism is that it is anchored in practice as much as it is anchored in philosophy. Rather than merely performing the negative work of critique—that is, diagnosing social ills and denouncing oppressive structures—ecological feminists make an “affirmative” or “constructive” gesture. They construct viable alternatives: they build a different common world with humans and nonhumans alike. They affirm the potential of radically re-envisioned futures in their lived practice-based philosophy, making and remaking society on a daily basis. Whilst critique remains vital, it is no longer, in and of itself, sufficient.¹ A constructive gesture is essential in a world that struggles to imagine alternatives to the current political and economic models that drive climate crisis. Ecofeminism emerged from women’s liberation movement. However, ecofeminist modes of living, organising and theorising are useful not only for specific groups of people (women): they present liveable modes of cohabitation for everyone. This includes thinking about humans and nonhumans as *coarticulated demos* that can engage together in generative and reparative political practices. *Demos* here is not constituted by a specific type of human beings as was the case in the history of Western democracy² but rather it is made up of hybrid human-nonhuman subjects that mutually generate and mould each other. Humans don’t merely represent nature. They are co-constituted—or

¹ See on this, notably, Latour 2004.

² These humans were usually male, European, able-bodied, proprietors. See on the question of political subjecthood in this context, notably, Arneil and Hirschmann 2016; Mills 1997; Okin 1979; Pateman 1988.



coarticulated (Janicka 2024a)—by it. I call this set of ideas and practices *ecofeminism for the 99%*, taking my cue from “feminism for the 99%”, the global anti-capitalist feminist movement that fights for the radical reshaping of society (Arruzza, Bhattacharya and Fraser 2019). 99% stands here for our inherently heterogenous, human-nonhuman collectives, which are in need of solidarity, care and attachment in order to survive and thrive. It specifically includes more-than-human worlds. The 1% marks the attitude of those who can ignore the collapse of ecosystems, biodiversity loss, acidification of oceans, weather extremes, increased pollution and toxicity, rubbish mountains, ocean garbage patches and other environmental and social disasters because they can pay to shield themselves from them. They can afford to deny our interconnectedness with more-than-human worlds. Below, I offer three theses to establish ecofeminism as one of the key theoretical and practical resources for a new political order in an age of climate crisis.

Ecofeminism that is not one

Ecofeminism—as any movement that is both staunchly activist and philosophical—is polyvalent³ and can be best understood in terms of a family resemblance. It is an assemblage of movements that are intimately related but not strictly identical. At its core, it articulates the connection between ecology and feminism and claims that the exploitation of nature is inextricably linked to the intersectional oppression of human beings (across gender, race and class). In order to address the destruction of nature, it is necessary to also address the exploitation of humans. I use “ecofeminism” as an umbrella term for all the various movements that try to articulate this connection both in theory and practice. This includes not only self-proclaimed ecofeminists but also thinkers, movements and initiatives that do not explicitly describe themselves as “feminist” or “environmental” but whose efforts to survive and thrive in the face of mechanisms that destroy their sources of subsistence and their capacity to lead a healthy life can be considered ecofeminist.

The originality and importance of ecofeminism lies in the fact that it has woven together feminism, ecology, anarchism and Marxism, while maintaining a relentlessly anti-capitalist stance from the 1970s to the present day.⁴ In Europe, Greenham Commons provides a notable example of the ways in which ecofeminists can enact a

³ To appreciate the variety of early works exploring the connections between feminism and environmentalism, see d’Eaubonne 2022; Gearhardt 1984; Gray 1981; Griffin 1978; King 1981; McAllister 1982; Ruether 1975. Seminal works in ecofeminism also include Adams 1990; Caldecott and Leland 1983; Cuomo 1997; Diamond and Orenstein 1990; Gaard 1993; Merchant 1980; Mies and Shiva 2014; Plumwood 1993; Shiva 1988; Spretnak 1982; Starhawk 1982; Warren 1996.

⁴ On the history and genealogy of the ecofeminist movement, see Cambourakis 2024; Epstein 1991; Gaard 1998, 2011; Moore 2015; Sturgeon 2008; Zitouni 2014.



different form of doing politics. In September 1981, a small group of women chained themselves to the fence of a military base, Royal Air Force Greenham Common in Berkshire, England, in protest against the storage of nuclear weapons there. A year later, 30,000 women joined hands around the base to protest the housing of nuclear missiles on British soil in the *Embrace the Base* event. Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp was the largest protest movement led by women since the fight for female rights to vote, and certainly the longest. It ended in 2000, with a rare victory: the land was returned to the commons. The movement was explicitly feminist and ecological. It was started by the group *Women for Life on Earth*, and exclusively involved women. These activists used their identity as mothers and carers to legitimise their political action, framing their work as protecting the safety of their children and those of the future generations. From day one, the women set up a camp around the base, and for twenty years inhabited a common space together, organising their life on camp in a prefigurative way. They created a world in which they wanted to live in the here and now. By establishing alternative social structures and inhabiting a common space differently, they questioned traditional gender roles, heterosexism, social conventions, the economic system, the exploitation of nature, the traditional ways of doing politics, violence and war.

In fact, Greenham Common was one of the most visible offshoots of a broader ecofeminist movement. Similar initiatives popped up around the world: notably, the tree-hugging Chipko movement in India (1973–2004), the tree-planting Green Belt Movement in Kenya (1977–present), The Women's Pentagon Action (1980–1981), The Seneca Women's Encampment for a Future of Peace and Justice (1983), the 1993 Peace Camp in Clayoquot Sound in Canada, Women's Voices for the Earth in the USA (1995–present), and more recently, WoMin African Alliance (2013–present), Knitting Nannas Against Gas and Greed (KNAG, 2012–present), Women's Earth and Climate Action Network (WECAN) (2013–present).

The question of the habitability of planet Earth was at the heart of all such endeavours. Women have long been at the forefront of advocating and caring for the planet. Today, faced with multiple ecological and social crises, it is time to ask what we can learn from these women—and from similar feminist ecological movements that are currently taking place across the world—that would help us redefine ourselves as human species and act responsibly in the age of climate crisis. More philosophically, we need to ask how habitability on Earth in the twenty-first century can be wholly reconceptualised, by leveraging feminist ecological thinkers and activists. As intellectuals and academics today, we need to accomplish a constructive philosophical gesture, by proposing alternative concepts and genealogies. The challenge is to *inherit*



*creatively*⁵ from the rich feminist-ecological-anarchist-Marxist tradition of thought and practice and contribute to its future development, not by replicating old ideas but by creating *new concepts* in dialogue with ecofeminism that match our world today. We need to productively rethink ecofeminist tenets in light of recent developments in a wide range of fields—the posthumanities, feminist neomaterialisms, political ecology, postcolonial and indigenous studies, queer studies, disability studies and crip theory, postanarchism—and the newest developments in technology in order to help us inhabit the planet collectively, with humans and nonhumans alike, in the twenty-first century.

The three theses that I propose below have both a descriptive and prefigurative function. On the one hand, they attempt to describe what is currently happening in philosophy and, on the other, what needs to happen in our conceptual infrastructure so that we can create more habitable worlds. Let us start with the broadest philosophical claim.

Thesis 1. We are witnessing a paradigm shift in contemporary thought from philosophy (“love of wisdom”) to ecosophy (“wisdom of the habitat”). The question of *habitability* on our planet has become the central concern of our times: How can we inhabit the planet in a life-affirming way?

Western philosophy is being remapped, with structural shifts radically reshaping familiar conceptual terrain. Traditional philosophical concepts—including any clear dichotomy between object and subject, nature and human, nature and technology, alongside the notion of human beings as radically different from the natural world—have been questioned by various contemporary philosophers in light of the climate crisis and rapidly developing technology. In their place, we find a new emphasis on the fundamentally ecological make-up—interdependent and co-constituted—of our world, and our humanity.

The idea of humans as autonomous beings that come into existence “without any obligation” (Hobbes 1998: 102) to nonhuman worlds has been prevalent in Western philosophy from Aristotle onwards, and developed notably by Kant. The dismantling of this “essential” concept has long been central to the work of feminist and ecofeminist philosophy. Feminists and ecofeminists offer a counter-proposal to the traditional philosophical status quo, elaborating conceptually an interdependent human being, made up of others (human and nonhuman), “inclined” towards others (Cavarero 2016), and always marked by gender, race, class, sexuality and ability. Indeed, many

⁵ On generative conceptual “inheritance” in philosophy, see Stengers 2010, 2015; Stengers and Despret 2015.



ecofeminists have radically departed from philosophy's foundational situation of humans in opposition to nature, in order to define what it is to be a human being in new ways. In the Western philosophical tradition, nature was considered as a mere backdrop to the drama of human action. Ecofeminists decisively challenge such "backgrounding" (Plumwood 1993) asserting that the idea of a pre-given independent subject is a problematic fiction that ultimately drives the destruction of those that find themselves in non-dominant positions (women, people of colour, the poor, the disabled, the queer and transgender people).⁶

We are, arguably, in the midst of a paradigm shift in philosophy. The most insightful contemporary philosophy has been moving away from the metaphysical question of "what is human being?"—focusing on the determination of a human essence that makes us unique and different from the natural world—towards the formulation of an alternative, ecological question: "where is human being?".⁷ The latter approach treats our material situatedness (as a species, as collectives and individuals) as a point of departure for reflections on politics, society, technology, culture and the economy. This includes considering the various environments in which we operate—our natural, technological, social and cultural embeddedness—as building blocks which must be carefully described in order to know what a human being is. Such an "exteriorised" concept of human beings—rather than the usual "interiorised", that is essence-based, approach to the human condition—foregrounds the inherently interrelational nature of human beings. In the twenty-first century, "philosophy"—understood in its original Greek sense as "love of wisdom"—is becoming "ecosophy",⁸ that is the "wisdom of the habitat." Here, "ecology" should be understood less as a term referring to qualified experts in ecosystem sciences or a specific group of people who love nature, but rather refers to entire modes of thinking that are radically different to the ones inherited from traditional Western philosophy.⁹ It is instructive to understand "ecology" etymologically. The term "eco" points to the original ancient Greek sense of *oikos* (οἶκος) and means house, domestic property, natural milieu or habitat. As such, then, the question of habitat and habitability on this planet—not only for humans but for all life forms—is the ecological question *par excellence*. In this light, it becomes clear that ecofeminists propose "feminist ecosophy", an ecofeminist philosophy of habitability.

⁶ This "backgrounding" or "backdrop ontology" (Sloterdijk 1989, 2016) has been increasingly questioned in the twentieth and twenty-first century by various thinkers coming from a wide range of perspectives: poststructuralist scholars (Deleuze 2013; Deleuze and Guattari 2013; Foucault 2018), feminists (Beauvoir 2015; Cavarero 2016; Federici 2014; Irigaray 1985; Merchant 1980; Tronto 1993), postcolonial and critical race scholars (Alcoff 2006; Crenshaw 1989; Fanon 2008; Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981), anarchist (Bottici 2022; Kropotkin 1902; May 1994), queer and trans (Ahmed 2006; Butler 1990), posthuman and neomaterialist scholars (Barad 2007; Bennett 2010; Braidotti 2013; Grosz 1994; Haraway 1991), alongside disability theorists (McRuer 2018), to name only a few.

⁷ See on this shift in philosophy, notably, Sloterdijk 2009.

⁸ I borrow the term "ecosophy" from Guattari 2014.

⁹ Cf. Guattari 2014.



“Habitability” as a term is pivotal in this, launching several philosophical trajectories. While “sustainability” has become the watchword in contemporary discussions on environmentalism, the term, as many scholars have argued, has become problematic. Firstly, sustainability and sustainable development have been co-opted through green capitalism and, in consequence, have contributed to increasing global inequality (Arboleda 2022; Johnston et al. 2006; Kothari et al. 2019; Smythe 2014). Secondly, it is tainted by short-sighted anthropocentrism: sustainability focuses on the preservation of human life to the detriment of other entities. In contrast to sustainability, habitability’s main concern is life: How to ensure that life on Earth—not only human life but also of other entities—continues (cf. Chakrabarty 2021; Janicka 2024b)? Habitability does not depend on human interests alone but hinges on building life-affirming coalitions with the nonhumans that also inhabit the planet. The etymological valence of “habitability” for philosophy should be emphasised. Notably, Bruno Latour draws our attention to the common root of *habitat* (a place where one dwells) and *habit* (a pattern of behaviour). On the one hand, habitability points to a *place*, where an organism operates, to its milieu and, on the other, it points to a *process*, in which life forms continuously impact and shape their life spaces and are in turn impacted by them in a loop. The direct coupling between space (*habitat*) and process (*habit*) is vital because it moves us away from thinking in terms of individuals versus their environments and instead rearticulates our existence as a joint collective venture between humans and nonhumans. In other words, it is a *coarticulation*—a mutual, reciprocal moulding—that happens between human and nonhuman entities (Janicka 2024a). In this framework, it is impossible to understand a living being in isolation from the habitability conditions that allow it to survive.¹⁰ Therefore, “habitability” means both the affordances that a place offers to living beings *and* the actions of living beings that continuously sustain their milieux (cf. Janicka, forthcoming).

Habitability should thus be considered primarily as a life-affirming cohabitability of humans and nonhumans. It is a way to consider how collective *habits* of thought and action impact life spaces (*habitats*). By focusing on situatedness and on the practical outcomes of actions rather than on first principles, the conceptual framework of cohabitability allows us to consider ethics without resorting to dogmatism or absolutism. Cohabitability does not look for a bulletproof ethics. Rather, it defines ethics as a constant negotiation with humans and nonhumans, always taking into account the effects of our decisions (Haraway 2016; Shotwell 2016; Stengers 2011). Furthermore, cohabitability allows us to imagine, and therefore establish, new institutions that would gather publics around issues that have not previously emerged (Dewey 2016; Latour 2013; Marres 2012). It allows us to examine how new ways of conceptualizing the world could be supported through material infrastructures. Finally, the framework

¹⁰ See on this, notably, Latour 2017; Latour and Weibel 2020: 167.



points not only to human habitability on the planet but also to other life forms and the interdependencies, feedback loops and cascade effects between all life. It allows us to articulate on the political plane the interrelations between humans and nonhumans. The challenge, then, is to develop cohabitability practices and concepts that would allow us to reconfigure the political and social fabric to respond appropriately to the current climate crisis.

Thesis 2. Feminist ecological thinkers and activists propose an alternative, life-affirming way to inhabit the world. They offer a unique—and uniquely productive—approach to the practice and theorisation of cohabitation with both humans and nonhumans. The ecofeminist mode of cohabitation operates according to the principles of generativity and subsistence rather than productivity and growth.

We can diagnose our contemporary ecological crisis as a problem of “habitat”: our ways of inhabiting the world are in crisis. Ecofeminist philosophers and activists offer us alternative, more fulfilling and life-affirming modes of inhabiting the world than the familiar ways of capitalist Modernity. They concentrate on the reproduction of life as a whole, giving priority to practices of sustenance, care, communality, repair and healing. Ecofeminists see humans as interdependent with nature: they focus on sustainable forms of living and thriving on our planet, act in mutual aid and cross-species solidarity, embody direct democratic political processes by organising in egalitarian and non-discriminatory ways, and connect means to ends by creating the world in which they want to live in the here and now.

Ecofeminists engage in a *politics of place* (habitat), a place-focused activism, which includes activism oriented towards the local, the daily and the bodily as anchored in human-nonhuman ecosystems. The politics of place—understood as a multispecies habitat—is integral to understanding ecofeminist politics. Ecofeminist initiatives include projects in bioregionalism, degrowth, libertarian municipalism, communalism, voluntary simplicity, community gardens, alterglobalism, democratic confederalism, as well as participation in a wide variety of “disarticulated” political places, such as community gardens, permaculture collectives, autonomous zones, “zones to defend” (ZAD), alternative households and intentional communities, more-than-human commons and cooperative farms.

At the same time, ecofeminists are committed to a *politics of practice* (habits), in which the prefigurative organisation of social life is at the forefront. They create new world(s) by engaging in daily practices. Imagining is achieved through doing: egalitarianism, horizontality, consensus decision-making, direct democracy,



commitment to nonviolence, emotional check-ins, cooperative economy, affinity groups, and “work webs” are routinely practised as viable alternatives to the capitalist, hegemonic status quo. Physical and emotional sustenance practices are emphasised—including permaculture, care work, social reproduction labour, and communing practices—and direct action is prioritised, ranging from guerrilla gardening, to squatting empty gardens, cleaning toxic dumps, blocking mines and nuclear plants, occupying abandoned spaces and defending ecosystems (waterways, forests, fields).

It becomes clear that there is a substantial overlap between anarchist and ecofeminist practices. All such practices prefigure a better society and empower participants in the present (Epstein 1991). We must pay close attention to these initiatives and how they enact politics towards a more habitable world because they constitute a valuable resource for a radical remaking of our society. As academics and thinkers, we must learn from ecofeminists by placing at least as much emphasis on *doing* as theorising, ideally by taking part in ecological projects embedded in our immediate surroundings. What would it mean to rewrite habitability from an ecofeminist point of view and formulate a philosophical framework to articulate an ecofeminist mode of human-nonhuman cohabitation, through concepts of regeneration and subsistence?¹¹

Ecofeminists reinvent both feminism and philosophy for the twenty-first century. They tell us a new story about the interconnected place of human beings on the planet Earth and propose a set of practices to implement this vision collectively. This story—which we could call an ecofeminist grand narrative for the twenty-first century—foregrounds interdependence and generativity. Grand narratives are stories about who we are and what we should do, not only as individuals but also as collectives. They order our knowledge and experience in larger cultural frameworks and thereby give meaning to them. Various feminist, postcolonial and poststructuralist thinkers have rightly criticized metanarratives for marginalizing non-dominant and vulnerable subjects (women, colonized and racialized people). Yet grand narratives are important because they are necessary for collective action. They enable us to effectively pursue a political project of solidarity and cohabitability with more-than-human worlds. Today master narratives operate “underground”, that is, they exert a tacit power because they constitute our conceptual infrastructures for understanding and acting in the world. They serve as our “political unconscious” (Jameson 1984: xii, 1981). It is important to reclaim grand narratives and propose compelling alternatives to the story of capitalist Modernity because if we don’t do it ourselves, someone else will do it for us.¹²

¹¹ See, notably, Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1999; Hache 2024; Pruvost 2021; von Redecker 2020.

¹² Here we can think of, notably, Elon Musk’s SpaceX Mars program with a narrative of abandoning Earth, colonizing Mars and becoming a multi-planetary species or geoengineers’ narratives of climate catastrophe as a merely technical and scientific problem—rather than a social and political issue—that requires a technofix to continue business as usual. In both of these grand narratives, no fundamental transformation of our patterns of thought and action is necessary.



Reclaiming grand narratives is therefore a political decision. Taking up Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's concept of "strategic essentialism" (Spivak and Gross 1985), we can term such new ecological big stories as "strategic master narratives". These narratives recognize the limitations of the philosophical genre of grand narratives but, at the same time, they understand their strategic significance for a collective political action and prefigure the world we wish to inhabit. Today they can help us produce viable ecological futures despite their troubling monolithic past. They can animate us to enact new worlds. While the postmodern era was marked by "incredulity towards metanarratives" (Lyotard 1984: xxiv), it is time to return to grand narratives, as a philosophical format, in order to orient ourselves better in the world today.¹³ This time around, however, we need to create metanarratives differently, with a different concept of universality.

Thesis 3. Ecofeminist philosophy and practice offers invaluable conceptual and practical resources for inhabiting the world of climate crisis. It is beneficial not only for a particular group of people (women) but also provides positive models of cohabitation between humans and nonhumans more generally. *Ecofeminism for the 99%* enacts a new version of universality ("grounded pluriversality") and proposes new forms of politics and political practice (a "politics of cohabitability").

One of the key challenges today is that our traditional political and philosophical concepts such as equality, freedom, solidarity, subjecthood, nature, no longer match the realities that we are experiencing. They account neither for the complexity of our world, nor for the problems that we are facing, such as climate crisis and the rapid development of disruptive technologies. We sorely need new concepts and new political practices. Herein lies the utility, and importance, of *ecofeminism for the 99%*: ecofeminism as a productive intellectual and practical resource not only for women but also more generally for our collective mode of existence in an age of climate change.

Ecofeminism for the 99% claims space in philosophy for ecofeminist ideas. In the tradition of "minoritarian thinking"¹⁴, it dismantles the figure of an independent human, driven by values of productivity and growth. It focuses instead on regeneration and

¹³ See, notably, the work of Peter Sloterdijk, Bruno Latour, Dipesh Chakrabarty for examples of new ecological grand narratives. In contrast to Chakrabarty, Sloterdijk and Latour take up explicitly the format of master narratives in philosophy in order to meet the challenge of conceptualizing climate change in the 21st century.

¹⁴ "Minoritarian thinking" is employed here in a Deleuzian and Guattarian sense as an alternative to "adult-white-heterosexual-European-male speaking a standard language" (Deleuze and Guattari 2013: 122).



subsistence as key principles and concrete ecological practices that can be used for the formulation of an alternative definition of the human subject as fundamentally interdependent. Ecofeminism is not merely a niche subfield in feminist or ecological theories, themselves often relegated to minority debates by their purported fringe interest and lack of universal claims. Thanks to its focus on our collective habitability, ecofeminism is a significant conceptual contribution to philosophy *tout court*.

From its earliest origins, ecofeminism has had a universalist ambition: not only to liberate women from oppression but to liberate all beings, human and nonhuman alike. It reasserts the “ontological fullness” of women’s worlds against the history of alleged female incompleteness that spans philosophy from Aristotle to Freud, and beyond (Beauvoir 2015; Kourany 1997; Lloyd 1984). Equally, it allocates ontological worth to nonhuman worlds by engaging with their modes of existence and by negotiating with them in a non-exploitative way. What is more, because ecofeminism is concerned with our collective survival and flourishing on planet Earth, it presents a universal claim. Yet, it offers a different vision of universality. The traditional universality of Western philosophy (of Aristotle, Kant and Hegel) overcame difference for the sake of unity. It is fiercely, and rightfully, criticised by minoritarian thinkers because it effaces *their* differences (of class, gender and race) in relation to the model of the white European male, a figure posited as class-less, gender-less and race-less. By contrast, ecofeminists operate within a different universality, one that could be termed “grounded pluriversality.”

In the concept of grounded pluriversality, “grounded” points to the ecofeminist assumption of the material situatedness of all being and all knowledge-production including concepts such as freedom, solidarity or equality.¹⁵ What is more, this version of universality works “on the ground” rather than being abstract and disconnected, as was the case in its traditional version. It operates through activism, local engagement with grassroots projects, more-than-human communities and ecosystems as well as, importantly, through an active care for soil through permaculture and agroecology (*politics of place* and *politics of practice*). Universality here is not sublimated to overcome difference, but instead takes fully into account diverse positions and interests, in an effort to bring various beings together. “Pluriversality”, in turn, refers to a multiplicity of worlds. It posits that all beings create worlds with others, human and nonhuman, and that this diversity of worlds, values and modes of existence should be maintained, without one mode adopting a hegemonic position in relation to others. Pluriversality points to what is *in common*—yet not the same—across difference. This means that instead of eschewing difference to find unity among different beings (in the case of humans: becoming gender-less, race-less, class-less), pluriversality looks for something

¹⁵ See on embodied and situated materialism of concepts, notably, Federici 2014; Haraway 1988; Merchant 1980; Mies 1986; Salleh 2017.



we share and value but which does not have to be the same for all. Think of a group of activists who gather because of a specific issue like opposing the deforestation of Amazonia. People do not have to share a singular reason for attending. Some join because deforestation contributes to biodiversity loss and the climate crisis, others because it displaces Indigenous communities and destroys their traditional ways of life, and others still because it disrupts water cycles and increases the risk of droughts and floods, which, in turn, decimates their crops. They gather in order to resist together, to empower each other and to make sense of the situation collectively.¹⁶ Such a version of universality is not an abstract philosophical idea but a lived negotiation, often between radically different beings (humans, plants, animals, soil), towards a life-affirming cohabitation.¹⁷ In this sense, “grounded pluriversality” is a cosmopolitical idea in the vein of Bruno Latour and Isabelle Stengers.¹⁸ Universality, as a concept, is vital because it is directly related to the question of politics: who constitutes a “we”, in other words, who is part of our community. “Grounded pluriversality”, in this way, denotes an ecofeminist “politics of cohabitability”, a combination of politics of place (habitat) and politics of practice (habits) with a focus on a multispecies living “with.”

If we consider politics as a joint collective venture between humans and nonhumans—as a form of coarticulation—we can start thinking about ourselves in terms of *coarticulated demos*. A human would no longer be defined as the only entity capable of politics—an idea first espoused by Aristotle that has reigned dominant throughout the history of modern philosophy—but as an entity that participates, together with nonhumans, in political transformations. This would acknowledge the fact that *demos*—as a political unit—is not only made up of specific humans capable of political action but is composed of human-nonhuman collectives that are always situated and attached to the places they inhabit. Ecofeminists mobilise nonhumans as allies and kin to create more habitable worlds for all. If we start thinking about ourselves as *coarticulated demos*—instead of independent individuals in a society—what would it mean for our political institutions and for the ways we inhabit the planet?

¹⁶ Notably, Isabelle Stengers (2023) writes about this type of “making sense in common” that we can find in grounded pluriversality.

¹⁷ This is in line with Indigenous and other (eco)feminisms and environmentalisms coming from the Global South or being inspired by them, notably, Mies and Shiva 2014; Shiva 2015 and more recently Leinius 2023; Ouassak 2023; Sempértegui 2021. On pluriversality, see, particularly, de la Cadena and Blaser 2018; Escobar 2020; Kothari et al. 2019; Reiter 2018.

¹⁸ Even though there are significant differences in their respective conceptualizations of cosmopolitics (see Janicka 2024c).



Acknowledgements

I would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

This publication is an output of the “Establishing the Center for Environmental and Technology Ethics – Prague (CETE-P)” project which has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe Framework Program under Grant Agreement No. 101086898 / HORIZON-WIDERA-2022-TALENTS-01.

Works Cited

- Adams, Carol J. (1990). *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2006). *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Alcoff, Linda Martin (2006). *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arboleda, Gabriel (2022). *Sustainability and Privilege: A Critique of Social Design Practice*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Arneil, Barbara, and Nancy J. Hirschmann, eds. (2016). *Disability and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arruzza, Cinzia, Tithi Bhattacharya and Nancy Fraser (2019). *Feminism for the 99 Percent. A Manifesto*. London and New York: Verso.
- Barad, Karen Michelle (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika and Maria Mies (1999). *The Subsistence Perspective. Beyond the Globalized Economy*. London: Zed Books.
- Bottici, Chiara (2022). *Anarchafeminism*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Butler, Judith (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Caldecott, Leonie and Stephanie LeLand (eds) (1983). *Reclaim the Earth*. London: The Women’s Press.
- Cambourakis, Isabelle (2024). “Ecofeminism in Europe: A Social Movement from the 1980s.” *Digital Encyclopaedia of European History*. <<https://ehne.fr/en/node/21999>>.
- Cavarero, Adriana (2016). *Inclinations: A Critique of Rectitude*. Translated by Amanda Minervini and Adam Sitze. Stanford: Stanford University Press.



- Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2021). *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1989). "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1.8: 139-67.
- Cuomo, Chris (1997). *Feminism and Ecological Communities. An Ethic of Flourishing*, London: Routledge.
- de Beauvoir, Simone (2015 [1949]). *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Bord and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. London: Vintage Classic.
- d'Eaubonne, Françoise (2022 [1974]). *Feminism or Death. How the Women's Movement Can Save the Planet*. Translated by Ruth Hottell and Emma Ramadan. London: Verso.
- de la Cadena, Marisol and Mario Blaser (eds.) (2018). *A World of Many Worlds*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (2013). *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. London: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari ([1980] 2013). *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Dewey, John (2016 [1927]) *The Public and Its Problems. An Essay in Political Inquiry*. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press.
- Diamond, Irene and Gloria Feman Orenstein (eds.) (1990). *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Epstein, Barbara (1991). *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Escobar, Arturo (2020). *Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible*. Translated by David Frye. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (2008 [1952]). *Black Skin, White Mask*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.
- Federici, Silvia (2014). *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia; London: Pluto.
- Foucault, Michel (2018 [1966]) *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Gaard, Greta (ed.) (1993). *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- (1998). *Ecological Politics: Ecofeminists and the Greens*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- (2011). "Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-Placing Species in a Material Feminist Environmentalism." *Feminist Formations* 23.2: 26-53. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41301655>>.
- Gray, Elizabeth Dodson (1981). *Green Paradise Lost*. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Roundtable Press.



- Griffin, Susan (1978). *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Grosz, Elizabeth (1994). *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Guattari, Félix (2014). *The Three Ecologies*. Translated by Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hache, Emilie (2024). *De la génération. Enquête sur sa disparition et son remplacement par la production*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Haraway, Donna J. (1988). "Situated Knowledges: The Sciences Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14.3: 575-99.
- (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas ([1642] 1998). *On the Citizen*. Ed. R. Tuck and M. Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irigaray, Luce (1985 [1983]). *This Sex which Is Not One*. Translated by Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jameson, Fredric (1981). *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London and New York: Routledge.
- (1984). "Foreword" in Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press, vii-xxi.
- Janicka, Iwona (2024a). "Coarticulation: Mutual Transformation in Human and Nonhuman Relations." *SubStance* 53.2: 38-58.
- (2024b). "Habitability: Planerarity vs Cosmopolitics." *Migrating Minds: Journal of Cultural Cosmopolitanism* 2.1: 4-25.
- (2024c). "The Janus Face of Cosmopolitics. The Concept of Universality in Isabelle Stengers and Bruno Latour." *Philosophy Today* 68.1: 129-45.
- (forthcoming). "What Is a Revolution in Political Ecology?" *On Revolt, Rebellion and Revolution: Navigating the Challenges of Human Conflict*. Ed. Dominik Kulcsár, Dmytro Tomakh, and Jon Stewart. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 404-24.
- Johnston, Josee, Mike Gismondi and James Goodman (2006). *Nature's Revenge: Reclaiming Sustainability in an Age of Corporate Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- King, Ynestra (1981). "Feminism and the Revolt of Nature." *Heresies #13: Feminism and Ecology* 4.1: 12-16.
- Kothari, Ashish, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta (2019). *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary*. New Delhi: Tulika Books.
- Kourany, Janet A. (1997). *Philosophy in a Feminist Voice: Critiques and Reconstructions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.



- Kropotkin, Peter (1902). *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. London: Heinemann.
- Latour, Bruno (2004). "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam. From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30: 225-48.
- (2013). *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- (2017). *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Polity.
- Latour, Bruno and Peter Weibel (eds.) (2020). *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. Karlsruhe: ZKM/Center for Art and Media and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Leinius, Johanna (2023). "In Defence of Life: The Existential Politics of Relating Body and Territory." *Neextractivism and Territorial Disputes in Latin America: Social-Ecological Conflict and Resistance on the Front Lines*. Ed. Penelope Anthias and Pabel C. López Flores. Abingdon: Routledge, 192-206.
- Lloyd, Genevieve (1984). *Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Lyotard, Jean-François (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Marres, Noortje (2012). *Material Participation: Technology, the Environment and Everyday Publics*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- May, Todd (1994). *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- McAllister, Pam (ed.) (1982). *Reweaving the Web of Life*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- McRuer, Robert (2018). *Crip Times: Disability, Globalization, and Resistance*. New York: New York University Press.
- Merchant, Carolyn (1980). *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*, London: Wildwood House.
- Mies, Maria (1986). *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed Books.
- Mies, Maria and Vandana Shiva (2014 [1993]). *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Mills, Charles W. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Moore, Niamh (2015). *The Changing Nature of Ecofeminism: Telling Stories from Clayoquot Sound*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa (eds.) (1981). *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller (1979). *Women in Western Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ouassak, Fatima (2023). *Pour une écologie pirate. Et nous serons libres*. Paris: La Découverte.



- Pateman, Carole (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Plumwood, Val (1993). *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Pruvost, Geneviève (2021). *Quotidien politique: Féminisme, écologie, subsistance*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Reiter, Bernd (ed.) (2018). *Constructing the Pluriverse: The Geopolitics of Knowledge*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford (1975). *New Woman, New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Salleh, Ariel (2017 [1997]). *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern*. London: Zed Books.
- Sempértegui, Andrea (2021). "Indigenous Women's Activism, Ecofeminism, and Extractivism: Partial Connections in the Ecuadorian Amazon." *Politics & Gender* 17: 197-224.
- Shiva, Vandana (1988). *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Shiva, Vandana (2015 [2005]). *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
- Shotwell, Alexis (2016). *Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sloterdijk, Peter (1989). *Eurotaoismus. Zur Kritik der politischen Kinetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- (2009). "Talking to Myself about the Poetics of Space." *Harvard Design Magazine* 30: n.p.
- (2016 [2004]). *Spheres. Volume 3: Foams. Plural Spherology*. Translated by Wieland Hoban. South Pasadena, CA: Semiotext(e).
- Smythe, Kathleen R. (2014). "An Historian's Critique of Sustainability." *Culture Unbound* 6.5: 913-29.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty and Elizabeth Gross (1985). "Criticism, Feminism and the Institution. An Interview with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak." *Thesis Eleven* 10-11.1: 175-87.
- Spretnak, Charlene (ed.) (1982). *The Politics of Women's Spirituality*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- Starhawk (1982). *Dreaming the Dark: Magic, Sex & Politics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stengers, Isabelle (2010 [1997]). *Cosmopolitics I and II*. Translated by Robert Bononno. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- (2015 [2009]). *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism*. Translated by Andrew Goffrey. London: Open Humanities Press, Meson Press.
- (2023 [2020]). *Making Sense in Common: A Reading of Whitehead in Times of Collapse*. Translated by Thomas Lamarre. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.



- Stengers, Isabelle and Vinciane Despret (2015 [2011]). *Women Who Make a Fuss: The Unfaithful Daughters of Virginia Woolf*. Translated by April Knutson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sturgeon, Noel (2008). "Ecofeminist Movements." *Ecology: Key Concepts in Critical Theory*. 2nd ed. Ed. Carolyn Merchant. Amherst, NY: Humanities Books, 237-49.
- Tronto, Joan C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.
- von Redecker, Eva (2020). *Revolution für das Leben. Philosophie der neuen Protestformen*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag.
- Warren, Karen J. (ed.) (1996). *Ecological Feminist Philosophies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Zitouni, Benedikte (2014). "Planetary Destruction, Ecofeminists and Transformative Politics in the Early 1980s." *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements* 6.2: 244-70.