




You have downloaded a document from  
**RE-BUŚ**  
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice

**Title:** Foreword

**Author:** Thomas Dutoit, Aleksander Kopka, Katarzyna Szopa

**Citation style:** Dutoit Thomas, Kopka Aleksander, Szopa Katarzyna. (2020).  
Foreword. "The Polish Journal of Aesthetics" (2020), nr 58, cz. 3, s. 9-11.  
DOI: 10.19205/58.20.1



Uznanie autorstwa - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Ta licencja zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu zarówno w celach komercyjnych i niekomercyjnych, pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI  
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka  
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki  
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

**Thomas Dutoit\***, **Aleksander Kopka\*\***, **Katarzyna Szopa\*\*\***

## ***Foreword***

Jacques Derrida begins his book *Specters of Marx* with an avowal “I would like to learn to live finally” (Derrida 1994). To live, however, is not something one learns from oneself or from life as such. Rather, it is a challenge for heterodidactics concerned with what happens between life and death in their most implicit complication, namely, with what carries life beyond present life toward a living on, or in other words, toward survival. From that point of view, one learns how to live only “from the other and at the edge of life” (ibidem, xvii). Ultimately, one has to learn how to *live (on) together* with the other *otherwise*, that is, more justly: “No *being-with* the other, no *socius* without this *with* that makes *being-with* in general more enigmatic than ever for us” (ibidem, xviii). The obligation of justice has to be therefore addressed to others “who are not present, nor presently living, either to us, in us, or outside us” (ibidem, xviii), which not only means that justice has to be thought in terms of inheritance and generations, but must also attest to an irreducible dissymmetry between the self and the other. Specifically, this obligation must be concerned with those who are not taken—not yet, no longer—into account: those unrecognized, unacknowledged, excluded, exploited, deprived of dignity, worth, or conditions to sustain their lives. Can therefore the question of justice be thought today apart from deterioration of the conditions of *living (on) together*, and thus, apart from climate injustice? And should not we have to pose the question about togetherness in view of climate crisis?

---

\* University of Lille  
Centre for Civilization Studies, Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Email: thomas.dutoit@univ-lille.fr

\*\* University of Silesia in Katowice  
Institute of Philosophy  
Email: aleksander.kopka@us.edu.pl

\*\*\* University of Silesia in Katowice  
Institute of Literary Studies  
Email: katarzyna.szopa@us.edu.pl

Although climate crisis is ultimately regarded as a universal condition shared by all inhabitants of the Earth, vulnerability to its ramifications nevertheless varies across the globe and is shaped accordingly to the degree of (economic) privilege in its different forms: while some people can still enjoy access to shrinking natural resources and relatively clean environment, others witness, and very often become victims, of destruction and extinction of whole ecosystems. That is why in these turbulent times of pandemics, recurring droughts and fires, an out of control pollution of air and water, we cannot turn a blind eye to social, economic, transgenerational, interspecies and environmental exigencies of justice.

Furthermore, we are obliged not only to act in the spirit of solidarity and both communitarian and singular responsibility, but also to address the issue of deepening economic inequalities between peoples and communities, driven by the insane accelerationist logic of economic growth. This logic has to be interpreted as an attempt against life and health, or more precisely, against conditions of life's reproduction and survival. As Luce Irigaray argues, capitalism only imitates a true growth while actually carrying through a lethal extraction of natural resources, biodiversity, our bodies and minds (Irigaray 2020, 99). Its delusive assurance of constant "progress" is, as Maria Mies puts it, always violent and contradictory: "progress for some means retrogression for the other side; 'evolution' for some means 'devolution' for others; 'humanization' for some means 'de-humanization' for others; development of productive forces for some means underdevelopment and retrogression for others. The rise of some means the fail of others. Wealth for some means poverty for others" (Mies 2014, 76).

Striving for justice would therefore have to involve challenging and transforming those norms which have facilitated or remained numb to exploitation and destruction of all signs of life in their diversity. This, in turn, would demand to address the question of sustainability of life in general and the conditions of its survival: "The quite simple answer, which nevertheless we always neglect, is: we just need breathable air, drinkable water, sunlight and sun heat favorable to life, and an earth both fertile and on which it is possible to live" (Irigaray 2020, 95).

One of the most alarming symptoms of the capitalistic reality obsessed with the (im)possibility of its own demise is the collapse of our collective imagination. Silvia Federici identifies this conjuncture with the current state of global affairs and warns that "the emergence of a world in which our capacity to recognize the existence of a logic other than that of capitalist development is every day more in question" (Federici 2019, 188). Fanning

the flames of the looming catastrophe induces us to clutch to not so time-distant reality because we are unable to imagine a different, possibly better scenario for a more just world. The latter however would require fundamental transformations of social and economic conditions. As Federici points out, “[s]ocieties not prepared to scale down their use of industrial technology must face ecological catastrophes, competition for diminishing resources, and a growing sense of despair about the future of the earth and the meaning of our presence on it” (Federici 2019, 189). Thus, the paralysis of our collective imagination and language places before us both a threat and a challenge. On the one hand, it urges upon us a necessity of an opening for the emergence of new intellectual and political projects; on the other, it exposes our failure to think of climate crisis in terms of social injustice.

The following interventions attempt mainly to respond to the problem of the paralysis of our imagination. Through the exploration of diverse philosophical perspectives, but also of literature and poetry, the authors search for new ways of insight, comprehension, and expression, which would allow us to activate our collective imagination and release its potential and richness. The revival of these abilities requires us to develop a new language in order to confront our intellectual inertia, protest the existing state of affairs, and propose new actions and solutions.

#### References

1. Derrida Jacques (1994), *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, The Work of Mourning & the New International*, London: Routledge.
2. Federici Silvia (2019), *Re-enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*, Oakland: PM Press.
3. Irigaray Luce (2020), “How Could We Rescue the World Today?”, *Environmental Philosophy*, 1 (17), pp. 93-100.
4. Mies Maria (2014), *Patriarchy and Accumulation On A World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*, London: Zed Books.

