**READING DIARY:**

**Bruno Vindrola-Padrós: Outline of a theory of breakage**

* Reaserach in archeology- effects of humanism to nowadays world
* Un human others and their role, decentralization of the human as soverign and the only one that rule
* Theoretical approaches and the critique of the humanism as the only and the most influential+ anthropocentrism
* How and what for is things using- deconsturction
* Objects in space
* What is it, what is it using for, what does it mean, can we use it other way, object as constructed by thoughts – is it what we think i tis, is it existing other way too?
* Boundaries, entities, stabilioty, function, representation- the need of understanding the world we are in, the urge of racionalisation
* Contionuity, fracture, using - continuous nature of the things
* Breakage – what do we know about breakage and ho do we respond- avoiding the breaking (INSURANCE- social construct, institution) – reproduction .. both intentional and unintentional actions are part of the larger process of social reproduction'- Robb 2010 -- (SZZ!!) – learning, history, shared imagination, practise, avoid the risk
* How does the artefact (breakage) affect the way we think and behave - it makes us aware of the creative ways in which broken materials inadvertently affect our daily lives. It is not hard to argue that what we encounter most as archaeologists are fragments and it is highly likely that this was the same for people in the past
* Materiál x culture, need of knowing how does the materiál world work – then we can develop and understand an use it

**Rommetveit, Kjetil , Roger Strand, Ragnar Fjelland, and Silvio Funtowicz. 2013. What can history teach us about the prospects of a European Research Area? edited by A. Saltelli: Joint Research Centre, Institute for the Protection and the Security of the Citizen.**

* The history of the Scientific Revolution is also often told as one of increased mastery and control over Nature. (page 5)
* Science beholds nature, nature as objectification? Technological (new, modernity) x nature (old, base, oldfashion? Traditional?)
* experts should recognize the limitations of their knowledge and avoid creating policy-based evidence, how does the values influence the knowing x the research?
* diverse perspectives in research policies to challenge the dominant industrial growth paradigm
* how to do the research? – make critical analyses of European Research Area (ERA) policies to ensure they genuinely integrate research across borders
* Western societies relied on science for a cohesive worldview, but today, science is seen as fragmented and sometimes internally contradictory
* universalism, democracy, public knowlege, diversity, tolerance, renaissance – reasonable, european values; core
* "Bios" emphasizes the necessity of innovation, growth, and technological advancement, particularly in life sciences and biotechnology
* "Geos" focuses on the limits to growth, the finite nature of natural resources, and the need for behavioral and civilizational changes due to human impact on the Earth's ecosystems and climate
* Deep Innovation- societal involvement in creating new ideas and solutions
* imits of scientific knowledge, avoiding the pretense of certainty
* european agency – what to do- strategies (the Lisbon agenda and inovation 2020, , horizon 2020 – connection and co work n the problematic areas (environmental issues), inklusive strategies

**The Bible. Any translation. Genesis 1:28-31.**

* „god“ make human soverign
* Western mindset- human can rule, own, expliot
* We are mean to bet he „one“
* Justification? power

**Hoelle, Jeffrey, and Nicholas C. Kawa. 2021. "Placing the Anthropos in Anthropocene." Annals of the American Association of Geographers 111 (3): 655-662. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/24694452.2020.1842171.**

* Anthropocene. Discussions about the environment and the future, anthropos- man, relations between human and nature
* Old ( early human activities such as fire manipulation, food production, and agriculture, indicating human impact thousands of years before the industrial era) and new ( ndustrialization and increased greenhouse gas emissions, or even later, with nuclear bomb )anthropocene // both : significant human impact began with early agriculture, supported by archaeological and climatic evidence showing increased CO2 and CH4 levels linked to early farming practices
* Text challenges the traditional separation between nature and culture, prompting a reevaluation of human relations with the world
* Can humans positivelly affect politics that adress to the environmental crisis?
* Quastioning the human, anthropocene should not be taken as given
* Western view of humans x broader, more inclusive understanding of anthropos
* Structural changes
* Wolds with diverse sociaties – plurality, not only western point of view, alternative
* New way of picturing the anthropocene?what to conquer next ? spacial colonization, go to the space /universe / logical step? Research- transformation of the space according out own pespectivity (point of view) – shaping and reshaping fo us – colonialism and capitalism
* How do we see anthopos – how do we understand the strategies
* Tendency for change (technological research and development) x society and environmentally attached and knowing the collective history
* What does happen to the Earth (and the society) is new just from the point of view of western white man xxx the struggles are real for many decades, just for the „other“ people – now it affect „us“ and that is when it became the „real“ struggle

**Bonneuil, Christophe, and Jean-Baptiste Fressoz. 2016. The Shock of the Anthropocene: The Earth, History and Us. London: Verso. Chapter 3, Clio, the Earth and the Anthropocenologists (pages 47-64).**

* "Anthropocene" was coined by scientists not just to describe data about the state of our planet and its future but also to offer a historical narrative explaining how humanity arrived at this point
* global environment and its management x environmental, systems of global domination
* hegemonic worldview that frames the planet as a totality to be governed
* stages of anthropocene:
  + 1st: industrial revolution to WWII: begins with the invention of the steam engine in 1784, rise in energy consumption and economic growth, fossil fuels
  + 2nd: post WWII, great acceleration: rapid growth, increase of human impact on environment
  + 3rd: 2000: we are aware of the impact to the planet made by human, human driven climate change, global governance, climate change as an issue, environmentalism
* post-WWII, scientists sought to integrate ecosystem and cybernetic theories, moving beyond Cartesian reductionism
* James Lovelock's Gaia hypothesis (1974) posited that living beings actively maintain Earth's habitability
* WWII and the Cold War promoted new knowledge, Spaceship Earth
* Human footprint, all humans as equally responsible oversimplifies complex socio-cultural processes., power, hegemony, capitalism
* environmental crises to universal human actions fail to account for differentiated impacts and responsibilities – political responsibility : policies should be able torecognise and effect social and economic inequalities in contributions to ecological problems
* environmental issues
* "Oliganthropocene" to reflect the disproportionate impact of a small fraction of humanity
* humans as a dominant force, capable of shaping the Earth, socio-environmental injustices
* new look onto human and nature relation \_ "anthropo-nature"
* concept of geoengineering as a form of geopower illustrates a significant shift towards controlling the Earth's environment through technological means

**Braun, Robert, and Richard Randell. 2023. “The Political Ontology of Automobility.” Mobility Humanities 2(1): 07-22.** [**https://doi.org/10.23090/MH.2022.07.1.2.007**](https://doi.org/10.23090/MH.2022.07.1.2.007)

* Yugoslavia that „fell apart“; transformation in the conceptualisation and memory of Yugoslavia’s end comes about
* Spacial and teritorial aspects, driving as part of the memory
* Falling apart – abandoning, forgetting x by human act // ROADS OF YUGOSLAVIA
* the destruction of symbols reveals the public secrets that those symbols often conceal
* how did the war affect the behaviour by automobility – hyper automobility to avoid the war /bombs/ - movement
* urbanism and the spacial effect, where to live, work, trade x coming back x going further
* safe to move x make new indentity (role) by movement (automobility)- knowing who you are by number plate
* closing an entering roads, boudaries – political x everyday effects
* ideological artefacts in the unpopulated (blank) space, occupation
* infrastructure as hegemony, practises of society, common and shared, consturction of the future – go beyond the diference and share the common – one state one „religion“- utopy, new régime, politcal approach – forget the tension and celebrate the universal and shared
* what is the reason of the destruction?
* monuments symbolizing Yugoslav unity have become targets of vandalism in post-Yugoslav states due to persisting ethnic-national tensions – once they were symbols of unity, nowadays target of vandalism and anger / new thinking abou the monuments
* „yuagosklavicans“- nostalgia hits hard, longing for the past order? - recognition of Yugoslavia's systemic issues, which were previously overlooked or denied
* Automobility and the roads – fragments that tells the history and the actual

**Barad (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. Signs , Vol. 28, No. 3, Gender and Science: New Issues (Spring), pp. 801-831**

* Language matters. Discourse matters. Culture matters.
* Language x matter, materiality
* Belief in language- who does the language shape the way we think?
* Nietzsche warned against the mistaken tendency to take grammar too seriously
* Xxx how do we think in different languages? Xx as many languages as many persons (roles, personalities, way of thinking)?
* Categorization by language, representation of beliefs, social constructivism? Paradigmatic issues- in what paradigma are we standing when talking about something and why does it matter – why is it important, ONTOLOGY
* preformace
* individuals, mass, society – shared ideas (forms of beliefs)
* representations (scientists) and entities to be represented (society, individuals)- two different entities – positionalism, the subject of interes tis represented by (political) systém, thet focuses on it and represents it by its own point of view
* how human bodily contours are constituted through psychic processes but how even the very atoms that make up the biological body come to matter and, more generally, how matter makes itself felt – materiality, dicsours
* nonhuman x human; agential realism
* J. Buttler, M. Foucalt
* How to describe, look onto reality? - “knower (the one thet describes)” does not stand in a relation of absolute externality to the natural world being investigated—there is no such exterior observational point--- (sociologists are not out of the reality they are seeking on, we are part of the systém, reslity, ontology – know this), to be „out there“ is not the key for objectivity – one can be objective while standing in – hm? – to share the „standing point“
* epistemology must take account of the fact thatwe are a part of that nature we seek to understand
* against this: nature is a container and people are in it – not the way anthropocene goes (but it is easy to imagine and understand), see there : If I say ‘this is Nature itself,’ an expression that usually denotes a prescriptive essentialism and that’s why we avoid it, I’ve actually animated this ‘itself’ and even suggested that ‘thinking’ isn’t the other of nature.

**Kearney, Amanda. 2018. “Violence in Place: Reading Violence through Kincentric Ecology.” International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV) 12:a632–a632.**

* understand the effects of violence through a model of kincentricity, a methodology inspired by Indigenous epistemologies of place
* relations
* nested ecology is one in which interrelations between realms are defining
* violence and its effect, context and target
* effects of violence are understood through the principles of interrelation and interconnection of distinct, irreducible, and interrelated components; people, place, and place elements
* violence as multi layered and culturally constructed phenomenon – imapct people and places (by people) – most visible manifestation is place destruction, ruination, social disorder, and environmental decay. Or when comes to social sphere then restriction
* violence as a part of human „nature“ – base
* dont see violence as an isolated or external "thing," because it is considered a socially and culturally constructed dimension of existence
* constitute violence (J. Galtung) – dimensions --- physical and psychological forms, the negative and positive influences, the necessity of context, and the presence of a hurt object and an acting subject xx multiple effects
* describtion of each effects
* new way how to percieve and think about violence (not only as „war“ and/or „conflict“)- how to think of voilence and what dimensions can it také- other way how to see the world – as violent (not only in negative way of meaning)- world is made by violence and it is the „entity“ that construct the world
* harm and struggle, violence has perserving character

**Kearney, Amanda. 2022. Keeping Company: An Anthropology of Being in Relation. New York: Routledge. (Introduction)**

* relations
* self and non self/other – how aret they in realtion and how do they affect themselves
* keeping company and its consequencies (citize, neighbour, friend, colleague, stranger)
* not all society concstruct the same way as others
* reserch, Australia, Aboriginals- Yanyuwa territory
* madality of relations
* making meaning by manifestation, cultural representation- this is performing through living people and their performance and actions
* relation to the space and spacial representation
* systém of knowing, structuralized systém of rules (law?), must be „kept company“ to show to the „others“ – not allowed to b ethere as foreigner
* need for „looking sfter the country“- must follow the rules (xx Nort Korea- visitors/ traveler/ to have vacation there)
* can other get there?
* How do people make sence of self and non self/ other – what does it mean in this specific culure (society), how does it imply on others ----- can we see (as others) just what they (self) allows us to see?—can the other fully understandt the „self“ when comes from different context?
* How difference is percieved- know the positon from whith are we looking onto something

**Hamilton, C. 2020. "TOWARDS A FIFTH ONTOLOGY FOR THE ANTHROPOCENE." Angelaki 25 (4):110-119. doi: DOI: 10.1080/0969725X.2020.1790839**

* Descola contrasts naturalism unfavourably with three other ontologies that have characterised pre-modern societies – animism, totemism and analogism
* How to find the problém of current global society – is it going back to „the roots“ the answear for the current problems (emissions, global warming – environmental threads)?
* Naturalis as an answear to the current enviro struggless?
* Compilation of the goods of the ontologies- how to apply the practises? – pre modern practices are not sustainable and does not apply to current situatuon- different methods and onthology
* One cannot invent a new ontology and then promote it as a way of changing society; elieving one can do so is a modern conceit.; onthological revolution (alchymy, chemistry)- new incidents, new epoch, new precedents, anthropocene, Earth systém as whole complex – one affect others, i tis all connected (“the human imprint on the global environment has now become so large and active that it rivals some of the great forces of Nature in its impact on the functioning of the Earth system”)
* People knows but does not cere, does not have the power to influence it? Who has the power?
* Shift in how do we think of a man (has power to affect, affect all)
* Man x humanity x nature x affection- rapacity of the Earth?
* Natura (and mother nature) as passive influenced by mean humans
* Rethinking of the time- the way anthropocene is performing- unpredictable events, who to think about the future? What will happen? Is it even relevant to think about it?
* New epoch, new struggles, is it the end? – thinking beyond the limits- looking for the future that brings death and end of the civilization?
* Change of thinking?
* at its base, an ontology is the philosophical articulation of an emotional orientation towards the world, a disposition or attunement that is not a passing affective state, but is a sense that possesses the whole person and makes possible a certain range of emotions – emotinos that brings ut to the action (manifest of the emotions? We need to „do“ somethig!?) – reaction?
* Green politics, justice? Fail x recovery? faith x Collapse? Responsibility, who is to blame? Self destructive tendencies of humanity – finding the meaning (xxx self destruction of individuals – antology to psychology and its phenomena?)

**Schmitt, Carl. 2006. The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum. London: Telos. Part I, Chapter 1, (pages 42-49).**

* anticonstitutionalist, one of those respectable intellectuals of the Right who offered their services as an ideological clarifier to the Nazi regime, only to find that the Nazis really were not much interested in clarity or at least not in any clarity that Schmitt was equipped to provide
* earth as mother of law (law and justice)- space, growth, division
* reward for labor, fixed boundaries, sign of order: This is what the poet means when he speaks of the infinitely just earth:justissima tellus.
* Earth vs sea,: Originally, before the birth of great sea powers, the axiom "freedom of the sea" meant something very simple, that the sea was a- no law on the sea – pirates, who disrupted the law, appropriation of the sea- colonization of the space – long agter colonization of the space on earth
* Norms; appropriation as the primeval act in founding law
* How we district the land, ownership
* Sea without owner.- free
* Where the private come from, law perspective, land souverrenity, authority and power, agrarian laws
* Ownershio – domination
* Modern an locked in medieval feudalism? Fundamentalism
* Ownership, law, space, land – interesting, how do we see it nowadays? What changes did we make in „thinking about the land (ownership, to whom does it belongs and what does it mean)“
* Global order, at first land (earth) order, age of Discovery, spacial and time management, industrial revolution
* Space owning, space usage as base for the society (family life), onwership as normative structure

**Garfinkel, H. , M. Lynch, and E. Livingston: The Work of a Discovering Science Construed with Materials from the Optically Discovered Pulsar.**

* How is science made? – conversation that is recorded when there was discover the optical pulsar at Steward Observatory – the article is about how is science made in „predent“ time
* „night work“ – how was it dicover
* Discovering work of scientists are accompanied by absurdities – such as distinction that appear in the works that follow the theoretical basis of some work – relationship between mathematics and theoretical physics
* Social sciences are nor discovering sciences
* Some of absurdities of science work
* The work of them (the science) is made by redoing and collecting observations and then comparing them – identifying the phenomena – the collection of previous try – just by the evidence (collecting the data) there is science work and new pehnomena described
* The article is describing the science in real time- optically discovering of astronomical phenomena

**Urry, John. 2004. “The ‘system’ of automobility.” Theory, Culture & Society 21: 25-39**

Interesting, read again

* Automobility culture- all states around the globe- specific technology that affect everyday life (power structure- how and why), capitalism, product of performing power, fordism (evolving), consumption, status performance- what does it mean to own and use car, everyday usage (porduct of need?)- complexity of meaning, leisure time, work, necessity?
* Car vs driver, materialism, constructivism
* System of organization, not only car but all the things it affect - everything that is used as a unit by the system is produced as a unit bythe system itself. – reconstucting of space and time by it, infracsctucture
* Culture and cultural appropriation
* Imaginationary systém of freedom? Auto space, are we free in the space and time? How does it affect the concept of time ( it is far 2hours by car/ 5 on bike / 10 by walking)- social structure, practices that structure space (private, semi private, shared)- how cities are structured – post automobility and pre automobility – how did the space of the city (populated area) changed due to automobility--- find other work about urbanism and the way automobility affected it- interesting topic!!
* Compressing the lives and the imagination – can I go there by car? Is it comfy? What does public mean
* Driver vs others in the public – how does the role of individual change- routine is affected, routine is changed all the time, space is not for everyone- it diverse and structure – making rules that are ubder power of bigger player (transport rules- can I freely go to highway- no, not for everyone)- path depence - locking
* 20th century, what we might call the centuryof the car
* How is society structured – phenomenon of suburbanism---- Social institutionssuch as suburban housing, oil companies, out-of-town shopping centres, canhave the effect of producing a long-term irreversibility that is ‘both morepredictable and more difficult to reverse’ according to North
* Changes – pictures of the space with roads then tendency to bring the city back to the people (walking people , not driving)- it is reversable
* Society without automobility? – restrictions, revision of the idea, political tendencies, environmental tendencies, public mobility, automobility without cars, when and will we reach the tipping point, are w ethere yet?

**Lynch, Michael: Ontography as the Study of Locally Organized Ontologies." ZMK Zeitschrift für Medien- und Kulturforschung: Ontography**

* ontology - reaction asociated with social constructionism in the sociology of scientific knowledge
* ontological distinction: artifacts (man made) x things of nature
* neuroscience (brain plasticity)
* how ontological distinctions constitutiute and consequence in the production of social and natural order.
* Law example of how ontological distinction constitute the social order – in law cases there are using the phylosophy of science- how to decide if there should be an equal time for learning about the religion and about the science- there is phylosophical basis of the jurys decisions
* Falsification of some doctrines – what is the basis o fit, where does the beliefs (the law) come from
* Science and non science

**Philipp Berghofer, Philip Goyal, Harald A. Wiltsche: Husserl, the mathematization of nature, and the informational reconstruction of quantum theory**

* Husserl (he Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology): crisis of our culture and the role here ascribed to the sciences- science is not entangled wuith reality nowadays – we cannot find one „truth“ abot the rality and there are different approaches
* perspectival character of perception- he not only stresses that perception is incomplete but also that physical objects in perception always appear from a certain point of view
* experiences are not windows to the world through which we see how the world is in itself thoroughly objectively – it just present the reality in certain way (does not mean that i sis objective) – it is dependent on subjective factors and previous experiences, our social background and the way we were upbring- throught our subjective understanding we are creating the reality (we constitute the sense) - phenomenology
* sense : is something that is ‘constituted’ or put together by us due to our particula attitudes, presuppositions, background beliefs, values, historical horizons etc
* Galilean ideal x Husserl perception
* Reality is objective x reality is constructed
* Phenomenology and quantum mechanics – connection, how the knowlege about the physics and our way of thinking correspond with sociological (onthological) perception of reality
* Multidisciplitanory approach – how to describe and understand the complexity of the world?

**MALOU JUELSKJÆR AND NETE SCHWENNESEN: Intra-active Entanglements – An Interview with Karen Barad**

* How is any individuality constructed and what is shaping him/her,
* Derrida: autobiography is not a telling of a past that is present, but the ongoing openness of the narrative to future retellings
* Apparatus
* phenomena do not occur at some particular moment in time; phenomena are specific ongoing reconfigurings of spacetimemattering
* feminism, critique- feminism and science, method, foundation of feminist science studies
* etics and justice
* the colonialist science USA imaginary has served to attract a sizeable population of scientists who have embraced careers in science and technology with the explicit purpose of helping to make a better world
* the science thy do affect the world- how to change the world throught the science
* what is a good science
* political issues
* analogies between the „physical world“ and „social world“; macro and micro – there is no such destinction
* radical feminism: Queer is a radical questioning of identity and binaries, and quantum physics, like queerness, displaces a host of deeplyheld foundational dualisms (no dualism, no distinction); quantum physic as queer: neoliberal individualist appropriation, no macro and micro world, no binarities
* there’s a sense in which even molecules and particles remember what has happened to them
* critique of dualism
* all time reconfiguration of „myself“ that is entangled in the real

**Anna Jurkevics: Land Grabbing and the Perplexities of Territorial Sovereignty**

* land grabbing as a practice of territorial alienation; alienation of territorial sovereignty.
* Agribussiness, Indonesia, palm oil landscape- monopolization, land grabbing
* permanent and exclusive authority over any natural resource blocks efforts to address environmental crises – if there is wolrdwide political need to participate on the sustainability, if the land is owned by private subject- no need to participate? Who will force the subject to participate?
* Landcape and man made object in nature (that affect landscape and its surroundings) have effect not only on the land or region that i tis in, but also on the sorrounding region and countries – forrest, rivers, dams, fields, resource extraction- maybe even global effects
* Global envuironmental issues caused by land grabbing and the resources extraction- what the land grabbing conducct- it is not „just“ about the landscape but has effect on people, politics, labour etc.- how the power is spread (colonization, how does the dominant culture exclude the „others“ - where is the power taken?)
* Capitalism, privatization, power, authority – new human right?

**John Law: What’s wrong with a one-world world?**

* Nature, natural x culture, cultural : Western society distinction: dominant culture that „know“- strategies of hierarchy – who is better than other
* Native people(Australian Aborigines), colonization – reformation of beliefs and cultural incorporation – dominant culture intercorporate the others
* The white western man perpective on other cultures – when they are not doing what we do, they are „less“ and not as worthy as we are- their perception of reality and how they behave dont make sence to us
* „we“ x „others“ – different ways to see the world that exists in one universum; terra nullius ; respect x colonization
* Is it simply **that people believe different things about reality**? - beliefs, perspectives, and epistemologies x Or is it that there are **different realities being done in different practices**?- ontology
* New approach to understndt he reality and the world around us
* Examples; different realities, different points of views
* Mol: sometimes the different realities do not overlap so there is no negotiation. Instead the different realities are simply held apart in different places
* Technoscience – on reality; one world as imaginatory statement that we are tend to believe – the reality as a comlex of different pespectives – cumulative process
* Transmission between realities
* Choosen ones (authorities) are ale to pronounce on the real (scientists describe the world, sociologist describe the society, doctor indicate the diseases) – society (culture?) x nature , qualification x disqualitification – only scientists can descrebe the world, not „disqualified“ man – relevance of interpretation of the real
* Domination and subordination (woman rights, minorities, qualification, royalty, authority, teacher- student)
* Eurobarometr – can we structuralise the reality by „forced“ answears?
* Is there objective real?

**John Law: On sociology and STS**

* Technology and science is relevant for sociological studies (e.g. how the labor is performer)
* Science as a method- how sociology was born – what is relevant sociological study? – classical sociologist concern to develop sociology and its method- scientific method- take natural scientists method and apply it on social world- objctive
* Inovation and technology (how war changed the world – research)
* Science as a form of culture (science does not quarantee the truth – its consequencies are based on cultural approaches; what do scientists study is based on political needs and approval) ,
* as practise (theory of practise- interpretation of what we are doing and why)
* as case study ( nothig exists within the social relations)
* Latour ethnography, ethnomethodology
* Scientist jus see the outside world and reality and by scientific method can describe it as objective and truth x acceptance of located character of truth claims (political yet critical)- we are aware of positionality
* New sociological approaches - focus groups and citizen’s juries, a range of versions of discourse analysis, methods for tracking and tracing electronic realities – performative approaches that discovers the reality (not just describtion)
* As method of sociology develop, will we find the truth?

**Mario Blaser: POLITICAL ONTOLOGY Cultural Studies without ‘cultures’?**

* What does it mean to be „modern“
* Distinction between cultures in hierarchical order
* Critique of euro-centrism and its urge to understandt the modernity – we (as people of modernity) can understand the phenomena of mdernity self image – we can see that there is „other“ worlds/cultures
* Distinction – nature/ culture
* Euro-modernity – narration how we percieve the reality
* Tracionalism / modernity
* „In other words, these misunderstandings happen not because there are different perspectives on the world but rather because the interlocutors are unaware that different worlds are being enacted (and assumed) by each of them.“
* Exclusion x inclusion – fist we wclude the non modern, then we demand on reformation ( try to be modern, baceuse „we“ already are), e.g. minorities, James Scott (1990):‘hidden transcript.’
* Dominant discourses – effect on the „others“, revision of religion during the centuries
* Latour (1993) : Great Divide between Nature and Culture : human (subject) x non-human (object)

**Paul J. Crutzen and Eugene F. Stoermer: The “Anthropocene”**

* Holocene as an geological epoch
* Holocene human aktivity – hom man modifed the Earth- „new human force“
* How scientists started to think of „human affect on the Earth“
* How man affect the „nature“, and the world by human activity (influence of the surrounding and lanscape throughout the thoughts and technology; tools)
* More people, more humankind activity – changes of the Earth – usage of the resources
* Era of huge changes (clima, ecosysterms, resource usage, population growth, CO2) in the planet that was caused by human activity – anthropocene era
* An owerview of why we nowadays live in the „anthropocene“ era and what does it mean according to scientists
* How human activity changed the planet Earth and why now the world is unstable
* Great future tasks – how to save the planet- thinking of how to solve the problém humankind made- by human was made the problém and now we are struggle to find the solution to this – will new technology save the planet?
* Tha artuicle assume thet human will develop strategy that leads to sustainability of ecosystems- but many years scientists know what to do and what couses the problém but there is no political force to make it stop – even if there are „green“ or sustainable policies, there is no social agreement and even people and political forces that underestimate the problém…