

國家科學及技術委員會人文社會科學研究中心
補助學術研究群暨經典研讀班結案報告

Taiwan in the Anthropocene

類別：學術研究群 經典研讀班

計畫編號：MOST 110-2420-H-002-003-MY3-GB11101

執行期間：111年1月1日至111年12月31日

計畫召集人：貝格泰

執行機構及系所：台灣師範大學英語學系

中華民國 111 年 12 月 30 日

國家科學及技術委員會人文社會科學研究中心
補助學術研究群暨經典研讀班結案報告

Taiwan in the Anthropocene

類別：■學術研究群 □經典研讀班

計畫編號：MOST 110-2420-H-002-003-MY3-GB11101

執行期間：111年1月1日至111年12月31日

執行機構及系所：台灣師範大學英語學系

計畫召集人：貝格泰

計畫成員：(共9人)

貝格泰(台灣師範大學英語學系教授)

莫家俊(台灣師範大學地理學系助理教授)

何重誼(輔仁大學法國語文學系助理教授)

洪廣冀(台灣大學地理環境資源學系暨研究所助理教授)

張君玫(東吳大學社會學系教授)

彭保羅(中央研究院社會學研究所其他且兼任副研究員)

萬壹遵(東吳大學德國文化學系副教授)

蔡晏霖(陽明交通大學人文社會學系副教授)

吳考甯(中興大學民族學系助理教授)

邀請講員名單：(共3人)

梁一萍(台灣師範大學英語學系教授)

張瓊惠(台灣師範大學英語學系教授)

許立欣(政治大學英國語文學系副教授)

兼任助理：

陳柏儒(台灣師範大學英語學系研究生)

中華民國 111 年 12 月 30 日

補助學術研究群暨經典研讀班成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

本案申請規劃辦理 _ 12 _ 場會議，實際執行 _ 8 _ 場會議

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明）

說明：原定規劃舉辦 12 場會議 12 個講題，因疫情之故，其中有 4 場合併集會，因此實際執行 8 場會議 12 個講題。

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）

論文：已發表 尚未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專書：已出版 尚未出版之書稿 撰寫中 無

其他：

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）。

說明：

本研究群以量化言，已出版國內外期刊/專書論文共 17 篇、國內英文專書 2 本，共計 19 筆。

以質而言，國內期刊論文計有《英美文學評論》1 篇(THCI Core)、《臺灣史研究》2 篇、《同心圓：文學與文化研究》1 篇，“*Ex-position 47*” 1 篇等共 5 篇。

國外期刊有 *Studies in American Fiction* 1 篇(A&HCI), *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 1 篇, *Climate and Development* 1 篇, *Regional Environmental Change* 1 篇, *Sustainability Science* 1 篇，等共 5 篇。

已出版的國外專書論文計有 4 篇。

分別是愛丁堡大學出版的 *Romantic Environmental Sensibility: Nature, Class, Empire* (2022)，專書論文有 1 篇，及 Routledge 出版的 *Air Pollution Governance in East Asia* 以及 *Rethinking Post-Disaster Recovery: Socio-Anthropological Perspectives on Repairing Environments*，專書論文共計 2 篇，以及 *Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism* 專書論文有 1 篇。

預計出版的國外專書論文共計有 3 篇。

分別是 *Handbook of American Poetry*，專書論文有 1 篇，及 *Rethinking Identities Across Boundaries - Genders/Genres/Genera*。專書論文有 1 篇，以及 *Pacific Gateways: English Literature and the Pacific Ocean, 1760–1914* 專書論文有 1 篇

國內英文專書有 2 本：

其一是 Taipei: Bookman 出版的 *Diving into Nature: Literature and Ecocriticism in the Anthropocene*，由梁一萍老師擔任共同主編，已於 2023 年一月出版。

其二是 Taipei: Socio Publishing 出版的 後殖民的人類世：生命的展演政治，由張君攻老師擔任主編，已於 2023 年一月出版。

One thing that happened over the course of the semester was a realization that larger theoretical questions needed to be clarified before we could begin to really address the primary question that had motivated this group, namely that of Taiwan's place in the Anthropocene. This is reflected in some of the changes of reading material in the latter half of the funding period.

We also learned quite a lot about how to effectively organize and conduct the sessions for the reading group, settling during the second half of the semester on a rhythm where we bundled several talks into a single weekend session lasting for half a day, rather than having individual talks at shorter intervals. This turned out to be much more conducive to fruitful discussion, and will be the pattern we adopt should our follow-up application be approved.

國科會人文社會科學研究中心

補助學術研究群暨經典研讀班成果彙整表

計畫召集人：貝格泰		計畫編號：MOST 110-2420-H-002-003-MY3-GB11101				
計畫名稱：Taiwan in the Anthropocene						
成果項目		量化	單位	質化 (說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等)		
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文	5	篇	請附期刊資訊。	
		研討會論文				
		專書	2	本 章	請附專書資訊。	
		專書論文			請附專書論文資訊。	
		其他			篇	
國外	學術性論文	期刊論文	5	篇	請附期刊資訊。	
		研討會論文				
		專書		本 章	請附專書資訊。	
		專書論文	7		請附專書論文資訊。	
		其他			篇	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	教授	4	人次	貝格泰、張君玫、張瓊惠、梁一萍	
		副教授	3		萬壹遵、蔡晏霖、許立欣	
		助理教授	4		莫家俊、何重誼、洪廣冀、吳考甯	
		博士後研究員	1		彭保羅	
		兼任助理	1		陳柏儒	
		其他				
	非本國籍	教授				
		副教授				
		助理教授				
		博士後研究員				
		兼任助理				
其他						
其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)		無				

“Taiwan in the Anthropocene” 研究學術研究群成果出

版細項說明一覽表

	序號	出版說明	數量
期刊論文 (國內)	1	Chang, Joan Chiung-huei. “Examining Biopolitics and Thanatopolitics in Chang-rae Lee’s <i>On Such a Full Sea</i> .” <i>Review of English and American Literature</i> . 41(2022): 63-94. (THCI Core)	5
	2	Hong, Kuang-chi. 出版中 洪廣冀〈「林務局之惡聲狼藉，布於全島」：二二八事件前後的臺灣林業〉，《臺灣史研究》，與張嘉顯合著。	
	3	Hong, Kuang-chi. 2022 〈建設新臺灣：黃維炎與戰後臺灣的林業接收〉，《臺灣史研究》29: 3: 149-199; 與張家綸合著。	
	4	Hsu, Li-shin. “Mechanical Precision and the Cosmic Sublime in Thomas De Quincey’s Writing.” <i>Ex-position</i> 47 (June 2022): 7-33 (MLA & THCI & ProQuest).	
	5	Hsu, Li-shin. “My “Byron’s foot”: Chou Meng-tieh’s Buddhist-Romantic Quest in Country of Solitude” — <i>Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies</i> 48.1 (March 2022): 115-142. (A&HCI)	
期刊論文 (國外)	1	Bayrak, Mucahid M., L.S Hung, and Y.Y. Hsu. “Living with typhoons and changing weather patterns: Indigenous resilience and the adaptation pathways of smallholder farmers in Taiwan.” <i>Sustainability Science</i> (Nov. 2022). Online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01247-3 . (SCI)	5
	2	Bayrak, Mucahid M. (second author), D. Marks (first author), S. Jahangir, D. Henig, and A. Bailey. (2022, Feb). “Towards a cultural lens for adaptation pathways to climate change.” <i>Regional Environmental Change</i> 22.22 (Feb. 2022). Online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-022-01884-5 . (SSCI)	
	3	Bayrak, Mucahid M., D. Marks, and L. T. Hauser. “Disentangling the concepts of global climate change, adaptation, and human mobility: a political ecological exploration in Vietnam’s Mekong Delta.” <i>Climate and Development</i> (Jan. 2022). Online at: https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2022.2028596 . (SSCI)	

	4	Hsu, Lishin. "Settler Colonialism and Harte's Frontier EcoGothic in 'Three Vagabonds of Trinidad'". <i>Studies in American Fiction</i> (April 2023). (A&HCI)	
	5	Work, Courtney, Ida Theilade, and Try Thuon. "Under the canopy of development aid: illegal logging and the shadow state." <i>The Journal of Peasant Studies</i> (2022). Online at: DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2022.2103794	
專書論文 (國外)	1	Bergthaller, Hannes. "Romanticism, Transcendentalism, Environmentalism: The Ecological Poetics of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Margaret Fuller." <i>Handbook of American Poetry</i> , edited by Sabine Sielke. Berlin: DeGruyter. Forthcoming.	7
	2	Bergthaller, Hannes. "Posthumanism and the Anthropocene." Co-authored with Eva Horn. <i>Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism</i> , edited by Stefan Herbrechter, Ivan Callus, Manuela Rossini et al. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022. 1-20.	
	3	Hsu, Li-shin. "I've always thought that we are living on the cowhide": Chen Li's Edge as Method and Border-Queering in <i>The Edge of the Island</i> , <i>Rethinking Identities Across Boundaries - Genders/Genres/Genera</i> . Palgrave Macmillan, 2023. Forthcoming.	
	4	Hsu, Li-shin. "Romantic Gateway: Transpacific (Dis)continuity in San Francisco Chinatown in Bret Harte's 'Wan Lee, the Pagan.'" <i>Pacific Gateways: English Literature and the Pacific Ocean, 1760-1914</i> , edited by Laurence Williams and Tomoe Kumojima. Palgrave, 2023. Forthcoming.	
	5	Hsu, Li-shin. "Ecogothic Chinatown", <i>Romantic Environmental Sensibility: Nature, Class, Empire</i> , edited by Ve-Tin Tee. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2022. 60-77.	
	6	Jobin, Paul, Jheng Shih-Hao, and Ying Chee Wei. "China's transboundary pollutants and Taiwan's air politics." <i>Air Pollution Governance in East Asia</i> , edited by Kuei-Tien Chou, Koichi Hasegawa, Dowan Ku and Shu-Fen Kao. London: Routledge, 2022. 51-83.	
	7	Paul Jobin. "The Economy of Compensation and the Struggle for Reparation: The case of Formosa Plastics in Taiwan." <i>Rethinking Post-Disaster Recovery: Socio-Anthropological Perspectives on Repairing Environments</i> , edited by Peter Burgess, Laura Centemeri and Sezin Topçu. London: Routledge, 2022. 25-48.	

專書 (國內)	1	Liang, Iping, editor. <i>Diving into Nature: Literature and Ecocriticism in the Anthropocene</i> . Taipei: Bookman, 2023.	2
	2	Chuang, Chun-Mei. 後殖民的人類世：生命的展演政治. Taipei: Socio Publishing, 2023.	
總結			19

國科會人文社會科學研究中心

1. 中文或英文摘要及關鍵詞

Over the past decade, the Anthropocene has emerged as a key concept for new research not only in the natural sciences, but also in the humanities and social sciences. Even though it denotes a shift in the state of the entire Earth system, most of this scholarship examines the subject from an implicitly “Western” perspective, focusing on the global spread of ideas and material practices who have their origin in Europe and the Americas. At the same time, it is widely acknowledged that the economic dynamism of Asia also played an important role in this history and will only become more important in the 21st century. There is thus an urgent need for more Asian perspectives on the Anthropocene. The members of this group met on a regular basis to discuss recent work on the Anthropocene from their respective fields and discussed how it contributes to a better understanding of Taiwan’s place in the Anthropocene. The transformation of Taiwan from a primarily agrarian into a highly urbanized and industrialized society over the course of a few short decades, unfolding during the take-off phase of the “Great Acceleration” (i.e., after 1950) which is generally considered to mark the beginning of the new geological epoch, makes it a paradigmatic example of the changes that ushered in the Anthropocene. Furthermore, Taiwan’s colonial history since the seventeenth century and the mixed success with which its indigenous peoples managed to survive the gradual destruction of their traditional lifeways offer important insights for the Anthropocene. Finally, Taiwan is a place where the proposition that the defense of individual liberties and democratic government is indeed compatible with the kinds of social changes that may be required to allow humanity to thrive on an increasingly unstable planet.

Keywords: Asia, Earth System, environmental humanities, social transformation, transdisciplinarity

2. 目錄 (Table of contents)

	Page
總表/ Overview of sessions	5
貝格泰 / Defining the Anthropocene I – <i>Homo</i> and <i>Anthropos</i>	7
許立欣 / Anthropocene Poetics I – Genre and Mode	8
張君玫 / Deep Time I – Material Hospitalities	9
彭保羅 / Geopolitics of the Anthropocene I – Democracy and Warfare	10
洪廣冀 / Anthropocene Poetics II – Figures of the Planetary	12
梁一萍 / Defining the Anthropocene II – Before the Great Acceleration	13
張瓊惠 / Universality and Difference I – Race, Species, Biopolitics	14
何重誼 / Universality and Difference II – Green Orientalism	15
吳考甯 / Universality and Difference III – Islands	16
莫家俊 / Geopolitics of the Anthropocene II – Adaptation	18
蔡晏霖 / Deep Time II – Geosocial Formations	19
萬壹遵 / Universality and Difference IV – A New Human Condition?	20
Afterthoughts and Feedback	20
Bibliography	21

3. 報告內容

總表：

1	03/11	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Defining the Anthropocene I – <i>Homo and Anthropos</i> Text under discussion: Dipesh Chakrabarty, <i>The Climate of History in a Planetary Age</i>, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.</p>	貝格泰	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
2	03/25	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Anthropocene Poetics I – Genre and Mode Text under discussion: Tobias Menely, <i>Climate and the Making of Worlds: Toward a Geohistorical Poetics</i>, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.</p>	許立欣	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
3	04/08	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Deep Time I – Material Hospitalities Texts under discussion: Karen Barad, “After the End of the World: Entangled Nuclear Colonialisms, Matters of Force, and the Material Force of Justice,” <i>Theory & Event</i> 22.3 (2019): 524– 550. Karen Barad, “What Is the Measure of Nothingness: Infinity, Virtuality, Justice: 100 Notes,” <i>100 Thoughts: Documenta Series 099</i>, Kassel: Hatje Cantz, 2012. Thomas J. Meyer et al., “Endogenous Retroviruses: With Us and against Us,” <i>Frontiers in Chemistry</i> 5.23 (2017), doi:10.3389/fchem.2017.00023</p>	張君攻	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
4	04/22	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Geopolitics of the Anthropocene I – Democracy and Warfare Text under discussion: John S. Dryzek and Jonathan Pickering, <i>The Politics of the Anthropocene</i>, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2020.</p>	彭保羅	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
5	05/13	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Anthropocene Poetics II – Figures of the Planetary Text under discussion: Veronica della Dora, <i>The Mantle of the Earth: Genealogies of a Geographical Metaphor</i>, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2020.</p>	洪廣冀	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室

6	09/26	5:00-7:30pm	<p>Defining the Anthropocene II - Before the Great Acceleration</p> <p>Text under discussion: Nils Bubandt, Donna Haraway, Ishikawa Noboru, Scott F. Gilbert, Kenneth Olwig, and Anna L. Tsing, “Anthropologists Are Talking – About the Anthropocene,” <i>Ethnos</i> 81.3 (2016): 535-64. doi:10.1080/00141844.2015.1105838</p>	梁一萍	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
7	11/19	10:00-15:00	<p>(1) Universality and Difference I – Race, Species, Biopolitics</p> <p>Text under discussion: Rachel C. Lee, <i>The Exquisite Corpse of Asian America: Biopolitics, Biosociality, and Posthuman Ecologies</i>, NY: New York UP, 2014. Shirly Geok-lin Lim, <i>In Praise of Limes</i>, Santa Barbara: Sungold Editions, 2022.</p> <p>(2) Universality and Difference II - Green Orientalism</p> <p>Texts under discussion: Haydn Washington, et al., “The Trouble with Anthropocentric Hubris, with Examples from Conservation,” <i>Conservation</i> 1.4 (2021): 285-98. https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7159/1/4/22. Samuel Alexander and Peter Burdon, <i>Death for Gaia: Ecocide and the Righteous Assassins</i>, Looking Glass press, 2020</p> <p>(3) Universality and Difference III - Islands</p> <p>Text under discussion: Walter Mignolo, <i>The Politics of Decolonial Investigations- Geopolitics of Knowing, the Question of the Human, and the Rise of Third Nomos of the Earth</i>, Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.</p>	張瓊惠 何重誼 吳考甯	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室
8	12/03	10:00-15:00	<p>(1) Geopolitics of the Anthropocene II – Adaptation</p> <p>Texts under discussion: Arturo Escobar, “Construction Nature: Elements for a Post-Structuralist Political Ecology,” <i>Futures</i> 28.4 (1996), 325-43. doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(96)00011-0 Kasia Paprocki, “Threatening dystopias: development and adaption regimes in Bangladesh,” <i>Annals of the American Association of Geographers</i> 108.4: 955-973. doi: 10.1080/24694452.2017.1406330</p>	莫家俊 蔡晏霖	台灣師範大學 英語學系 7 樓第三會議室

			<p>(2) Deep Time I - Geosocial Formations Text under discussion: Tania Li and Pujo Semedi, <i>Plantation Life: Corporate Occupation in Indonesia's Oil Palm Zone</i>, Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.</p> <p>(3) Universality and Difference IV - A New Human Condition? Text under discussion: Hannah Arendt, <i>The Human Condition</i>, Chicago: Chicago UP, 1998.</p>	萬壹遵	
--	--	--	--	-----	--

場次一

講題：Defining the Anthropocene I – *Homo* and *Anthropos*

主講人：貝格泰 日期：111.03.11 時間：17:00-19:30

Text under discussion: Dipesh Chakrabarty, *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.

Original abstract:

Ever since the publication of his seminal essay “The Climate of History” in 2008, the historian Dipesh Chakrabarty has been one of the most important voices in the debates over the Anthropocene. Central to these debates is the question of defining the “anthropos” – what exactly do we mean when we say that “humans” have brought about the Anthropocene? Critics of the term have accused the Earth system sciences of obfuscating the differences between human groups, suggesting that the human species as a whole is to be held accountable when it was in fact only a small subset of people (namely, those in the industrialized countries) who have engaged in the sort of activities that are negatively affecting the planet. In response to these critiques, Chakrabarty has proposed that a distinction be drawn between two different conceptions of the human, which he designates as *homo* and *anthropos*. *Homo* describes the human as a being which acts purposefully, with reference to goals expressed and contested in language, a being concerned with “issues of justice” and which can thus be blamed, praised, or admonished. This is the human of traditional humanism as well as of the contemporary humanities insofar as they conceive of humans as historical creatures differentiated by culture, economic status, gender, or race, but at the same time as unified in terms of an abstract equality based on some notion of universal rights. *Anthropos*, on the other hand, describes the human as a geohistorical force – a force which acts blindly, not in terms of consciously held purposes but by way of cumulative effects and, as it were, behind the back of *homo*. In 2021, Chakrabarty published *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age*, which presents a kind of summation of his contributions to the Anthropocene debate over the past decade. This talk will examine the book in light of the larger trajectory of Chakrabarty’s thought and try to draw some conclusions regarding Taiwan’s place in the Anthropocene.

Description:

The actual event remained very close to the intentions outlined in the original application. What emerged as a key question during the discussion was Chakrabarty's partial defense of modernity in chapter 4 of the book, "The Difficult of Being Modern." We discussed the question whether the modernization project pursued by Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China during the 1950s and 60s constitutes an example of the kind of anticolonial modernization described by Chakrabarty and found both similarities and divergences. There was also a fair amount of controversy over whether modernity could be defended in the terms offered by Chakrabarty.

場次二**講題：Anthropocene Poetics I – Genre and Mode**

主講人：許立欣 日期：111.03.25 時間：17:00-19:30

Text under discussion: Tobias Menely, *Climate and the Making of Worlds: Toward a Geohistorical Poetics*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.

Original abstract:

One of the key problems which the Anthropocene raises for humanists is to find compelling ways of bridging the conceptual gap between the temporal and spatial scales at which they usually operate with the much larger scales of the planet and geological deep time. Bringing together literary and geological history, Tobias Menely's *Climate and the Making of Worlds* is an ambitious attempt to think across scales in precisely this sense. Menely seeks to show how shifts in the dominant genres and modes of poetry in England between the Early Modern (John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, 1667) and the Romantic period (Charlotte Smith's "Beachy Head," 1807) reflect both social and climatic changes instigated by the Little Ice Age and the Industrial Revolution. The book's combination of "traditional" close readings within a broadly interdisciplinary framework, this talk will argue, make it a prime example for how to do literary studies in the Anthropocene.

Description:

Prof Hsu Li-hsin's presentation discussed chapter four of Menely's book. *Climate and the Making of Worlds* focuses on the impact of climate change on English poetry, and how poetry as a literary form inscribes and reserves the geo-historical process of the time in a subtle and concise way. The chapter under discussion focused on three Romantic poets and how their works respond to the Little Ice Age, and how the pastoral tradition, landscape writing, and poetic ideals of the time employed by those writers reflect the attempt of English poetry to address the issues of energy, climatic uncertainty, and the anxiety of industrialization. The discussion then focused on the effectiveness of the author's incorporation of geo-historical evidence into his close reading of poetry, and how literary representation remained a potent way to shape people's environmental attitude. The workshop also touched upon the relationship between Romantic writing and environmental movements, and the potentiality of alternative narratives to address the urgency of Anthropocene crises.

場次三

講題：Deep Time I – Material Hospitalities

主講人：張君玫 日期：111.04.08 時間：17:00-19:30

Texts under discussion:

Karen Barad, “After the End of the World: Entangled Nuclear Colonialisms, Matters of Force, and the Material Force of Justice,” *Theory & Event* 22.3 (2019): 524–550.

Karen Barad, “What Is the Measure of Nothingness: Infinity, Virtuality, Justice: 100 Notes,” *100 Thoughts: Documenta Series 099*, Kassel: Hatje Cantz, 2012.

Thomas J. Meyer et al., “Endogenous Retroviruses: With Us and against Us,” *Frontiers in Chemistry* 5.23 (2017), doi:10.3389/fchem.2017.00023

Original abstract:

In the Anthropocene, questions of justice raise themselves within a larger horizon than that usually considered in the context of postcolonial critique. Karen Barad’s essay “After the end of the world: Entangled nuclear colonialisms, matters of force, and the material force of justice” is a powerful and theoretically sophisticated attempt to tackle this challenge, focusing on the nature and problematics of hospitality in its materiality. It begins and ends with the Marshall Islands, at the crossroads of two great destructive forces: nuclear colonialism and the climate crisis. In the aftermath of sixty-seven US nuclear bomb “tests” visited upon the Marshall Islands, the concrete “dome” built on Runit Island by the US government was an act of erasure and a voidance—an attempt to contain and cover over plutonium remains and other material traces of the violence of colonial hospitality that live inside the Tomb (as the Marshallese call it). Taking the physicality of the hostility within hospitality seriously, and going into the core of the theory that produced the nuclear bomb, Barad argues that a radical hospitality—an infinity of possibilities for interrupting state sanctioned violence—is written into the structure of matter itself in its inseparability with the void. Barad reminds us of the intimate relationship between quantum physics and atomic bombs, as well as the catastrophic event when the United States detonated two nuclear bombs over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, before the end of World War II. There have been endless nuclear energy disasters since then. Quantum physics and atomic bombs are directly and deeply entangled. Indeed, “the theory and the bomb inhabit and help constitute each other. Just like the ontology (hauntology) it suggests, quantum theory is shot through with the political” (Barad 2019: 528).

Both quantum physics and atomic bombs challenge our understanding of scale and temporality. The smallest nuclear fission creates tremendous energy and spatiotemporal condensations in the earth, air, and inside and outside the victims’ bodies. What is the relationship between science and justice? How can quantum field theory (QFT)—a “mixture of quantum theory, relativity, and field theory”—be responsible for the radical change in the order of things? History tells us these are not idle theoretical curiosities but critical questions of life and death. Science and justice are inseparable, just like the co-construction of meaning and matter. Barad also discusses the problem of nuclear colonialism, as well as the relationship between colonialism and hospitality. “Questions of co-habitation co-exist/co-habit with those of uninhabitability, a strange hospitality” (Barad 2019: 542). The quantum notion of field and void might help us better understand this twisted and entangled mapping of “radical hospitality” without turning our back to responsibility for injustices.

Description:

Through these texts, we discussed the recomposition of the borders between the visible and the invisible and its consequences in the Anthropocene, especially its significance regarding social justice. As Karen Barad asserts, “the theory and the bomb inhabit and help constitute each other.” The double sword of quantum physics provides “useful conceptual tools for understanding the politics of matter and the matter of politics” in our times. Likewise, the discovery of endogenous retroviruses in animals, including humans, reminds us that rethinking and reworking organic boundaries is a paramount issue in the age of pandemics.

場次四**講題：Geopolitics the Anthropocene I - Democracy and Warfare**

主講人：彭保羅 日期：111.04.22 時間：17:00-19:30

Text under discussion: John S. Dryzek and Jonathan Pickering, *The Politics of the Anthropocene*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2020.

Original abstract:

John Dryzek (University of Canberra) is one of the world's most famous advocates of environmental democracy. In his last essay co-authored with Jonathan Pickering, *The Politics of the Anthropocene*, Dryzek offers a good pattern to take politics seriously in the Anthropocene and avoid a depoliticization of environmental issues for the sake of coping with emergency. After clarifying the differences between “the bad” and “the good Anthropocene”, the authors revisit now relatively old notions such as environmental governance, environmental justice, sustainability and dependence paths, before offering clues to “redeem democracy in the Anthropocene” and promote “planetary justice”. Departing from technocratic solutions such as the governance of experts and the model of environmental authoritarianism as advocated by countries like China, the authors resolutely reaffirm the legitimacy of deliberative democracy. Given the planetary dimension of the ongoing disaster, Dryzek and Pickering emphasize the need for effective transnational solutions. Although I basically agree, I have a couple of caveats. If mobilizations for environmental justice may span a country, they are always embedded in and shaped by local and national boundaries. Similarly, so-called “global issues” always start with people from specific locations, before they are gradually scaled up. The “global actor” is a myth, and if the catchphrase “think globally, act locally” might remain inspiring for environmental activists, it does not help in the sociology of transnational mobilizations, for what we need is to closely analyse the linkage between different scales of collective action. These questions are of particular importance in the context of Taiwan. Taiwan is the best place in the world to put the geo back into geopolitics, i.e., paying full attention to the geological and climatic dimensions of national security (Jobin, “The Art of War”). Under tremendous exposure to China’s political warfare and increasing military threats, Taiwan’s democracy is both strong and vulnerable to fake news and political propaganda. Like other democracies, Taiwan must fulfil its obligations to respect freedom of expression, which offers to the enemy many loopholes for aggressive actions. Though liberal hacktivism and innovative modes of government like g0v have strengthened Taiwanese democracy as well as its capacity to respond to political warfare offensives, proximity to China and the fundamental dispute over national sovereignty increase the pressure. It remains to be analysed how China’s slogans of “ecological civilisation” might contribute to this ideological war game.

Description:

Professor Jobin presentation opened by outlining John Dryzek's role as a prominent advocate of environmental democracy, and by pointing out the centrality of this concept to the book under discussion. The authors have a good knowledge of UN mechanisms and global networks of scholars invested in ecological regulations such as Earth System Governance Project and The Resilience Alliance. The book thus addresses the metamorphosis of governance and democracy in the Anthropocene compared to its Holocene version. This includes questions such as the respective role and efficiency of multilateralism (e.g., through United Nations' climate conferences) and decentralized local actions (such as climate litigations).

Regarding the role of international organizations and treaties (such as IPCC, UN conventions on Biodiversity, UN Sustainable Development Goals), do they make a difference to "fix" the huge challenges ahead? Yes and No. The authors argue that they maintain a certain form of orchestration or what they call Hybrid Multilateralism, but they do not sustain enough reflexivity because prevail technocratic approaches, which depoliticize the procedures, without enough accounting and binding goals.

The authors further argue that the defense of democracy sheds new light on long-running debates about whether or not democracy needs to cede to authoritarianism in the face of ecological crisis. This debate first arose in the 1970s. In recent years, eco-authoritarians have looked to China's decisiveness in taking the lead on renewable energy and contrasted this leadership with the paralysis on climate change that we can see in the United States (Beeson 2010). Most of the debate on authoritarianism versus democracy has taken place at the level of problem-solving effectiveness, which assumes we know what the problems are and what needs to be done. But the authors argue convincingly that technocratic systems (e.g., China's implementation of renewable energy) lack the constant reflexivity of the sort that is essential to navigating the Anthropocene.

Against authors such as Clive Hamilton and Dipesh Chakrabarty who tend to deem ethical choices obsolete in the Anthropocene, Dryzek and Jonathan Pickering recycle classical political theorists such as Locke, Rawls, Sen and Nussbaum, or environmental justice scholars (such as Joan Martinez-Alier, David Schlosberg et al.) to deliver ecological and environmental justice, or climate and biodiversity justice beyond national borders, species and generations: planetary justice, but not for "the Earth" or "the Planet".

For this, they identify and give specific roles to three categories of agents: 1) Norm and discourse entrepreneurs such as the Club de Rome, Brundtland et al, Al Gore, Pope Francis; 2) Scientists and other experts from Aldo Leopold and Rachel Carson to IPCC; and 3) the most vulnerable: small island states and low-lying river deltas, people living in the path of cyclones and hurricanes, Indigenous peoples displaced by deforestation, Indians and sub-Saharan Africans who will suffer the most severe droughts and heat stress, etc.

These geopolitical approach of the Anthropocene matters very much for the case of Taiwan, which entangles with particular high level of tension traditional geopolitics (dealing with national sovereignties and military warfare) and the new approach to geopolitics focusing on ecological concerns.

場次五

講題：Anthropocene Poetics II – Figures of the Planetary

主講人：洪廣冀 日期：111.06.03 時間：17:00-19:30

Text: Veronica della Dora, *The Mantle of the Earth: Genealogies of a Geographical Metaphor*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2020.

Original abstract:

The Earth radically exceeds the cognitive capacity of individual human beings. To think about the Earth is therefore always to make a leap from that which is accessible to our senses – that what can be seen, felt, and thus measured – into the realm of the invisible and untouchable. We bridge the gap between the perceptible world and the vast temporal and spatial scales of the planetary with the help of models – be they computational, visual, or linguistic. The geographer Veronica della Dora argues that the “mantle” is the master metaphor which since antiquity has governed how this relationship to the Earth, this dialectic of the visible and the invisible, was imagined in the West: the mantle is the visible side of a body that remains hidden. Della Dora’s book is a transdisciplinary tour de force, linking the history of geography and geology with the history of literature and the arts. The Anthropocene compels us to rethink the human relationship to the Earth and to attain an adequate understanding of humanity’s planetary condition; by explicating how this relationship was conceived in the past, *The Mantle of the Earth* opens up possibilities for reconceiving it in the present.

Description:

Gaia theory is an integral part of recent discussions of the Anthropocene. The theory holds that Earth's surface is covered with a layer of critical zone with a certain self-regulating mechanism that makes Earth habitable for life. Bruno Latour had expanded this concept and called on researchers to study this zone in a series of works in his later years; in his words, ‘down to earth.’

However, when did people start to imagine that Earth is covered with a critical zone? In her book *The Mantle of the Earth: Genealogies of a Geographical Metaphor*, geographer Veronica della Dora made a detailed genealogical investigation of the idea. It turns out that the idea existed as early as the ancient Greek period, and has been endowed with more diverse and substantive meanings with the Age of Exploration, the Enlightenment, the scientific revolution, the rise of mechanism and its reactionary romanticism, the popularity of Darwinism, the global expansion of imperialism, and the cold war geopolitics. The book offers a lesser-known history of the Gaia theory and the concept of the Anthropocene and reevaluates the implications of these concepts in the history of ideas, science, and the world.

場次六

講題：Defining the Anthropocene II - Before the Great Acceleration

主講人：梁一萍 日期：111.09.26 時間：17:00-19:30

Text under discussion:

Nils Bubandt, Donna Haraway, Ishikawa Noboru, Scott F. Gilbert, Kenneth Olwig, and Anna L. Tsing, “Anthropologists Are Talking – About the Anthropocene,” *Ethnos* 81.3 (2016): 535-64. doi:10.1080/00141844.2015.1105838

Original abstract:

The definition of the Anthropocene is contested. Despite the “official” claim by the AWG that the Great Acceleration set off the “age of humans,” I want to examine the “Orbis Spike” as an alternative onset of the Anthropocene in Taiwan—especially in the context of the massive and organized farming performed by overseas Chinese immigrants, making the 1600s the decisive era when humans changed the geosphere of the island, thus marking a tipping point of the Anthropocene in the geological history of Taiwan.

Simon Lewis and Mark Maslin, both being geologists at University College London, claim in their 2015 Nature essay, “Defining the Anthropocene” that “the arrival of Europeans in the Caribbean in 1492, and subsequent annexing of the Americas, led to the largest human population replacement in the past 13,000 years, the first global trade networks linking Europe, China, Africa and the Americas, and the resultant mixing of previously separate biotas, known as the Colombian Exchange. . . . The cross-continental movement of dozens of other food species (such as the common bean to the New World), domesticated animals (such as the horse, cow, goat and pig, all to the Americas) . . . contributed to a swift, ongoing, radical reorganization of life on Earth without geological precedent” (174). In the context of the geographical “discovery” of the Americas, the landing of Europeans also contributed to the genocide of millions of Indigenous peoples, which led to the expansion of reforestation in North America thus leading to an eventual drop of CO₂. Lewis and Maslin suggest “naming the dip in atmospheric CO₂ the ‘Orbis spike’ and the suite of changes marking 1610 as the beginning of the Anthropocene, the ‘Orbis hypothesis,’ from the Latin for world, because post-1492 humans on the two hemispheres were connected, trade became global, and some prominent social scientists refer to this time as the beginning of the modern ‘world-system’” (175). Most importantly, it was also what geologists have identified as the “Little Ice Age” that went roughly from the 16th to the 19th centuries in the Northern Hemisphere.

In the context of Taiwan, I argue that the year 1610 would resonate with the presence of the Dutch East India Company in Asia—being established in 1602 and trading East Indian spices, Indonesian coffee, and Formosan sugarcane, etc. in the “globalized” seventeenth century—thus making itself the engine of an early modern period of “great acceleration” in Asia. In addition, the fact that the first colonial warfare—the Mata Battle (麻豆社之役), which crushed the resistance of Indigenous peoples and set the Dutch regime over Taiwan—broke out in 1635 seems to coincide with the European conquest of North America. (I have the Pequot War, 1636-1637, in mind.) Most importantly, it opened the door for massive recruitments of Chinese immigrants and paved the road for the “colonial plantation system” (Horn &

Bergthaller 150) on the island. In this paper, I will read Yu Yonghe's Small Sea Travel Diaries (《裨海記遊》 1697) as an example of 17th-century Sinophone anthropogenic narrative of Formosa. I will also compare and contrast my hypothesis with Hudson (2014), Simangan (2019, 2021), Charterjee (2020), Jobin/Ho/Hsiao (2021), etc.

Description:

Discussions during the Spring term had raised numerous basic questions about the Anthropocene concept, its usefulness for the humanities and the various criticisms that have been lodged against it. For that reason, we decided to change our designated reading to one of the earliest and most incisive critiques: a 2016 dialogue between Nils Bubandt, Donna Haraway, Ishikawa Noboru, Scott F. Gilbert, Kenneth Olwig, and Anna L. Tsing where one finds most of the lines of critique against the term already outlined at least *in nuce*. The essay provides a useful entry-point to the debate over naming the new geological epoch as well as the different attempts to conceptualize it. We concluded that the notion of the “plantationocene” – first proposed here, later elaborated on by Tsing and arguably illustrated by the more recent work of Tania Li and Pujo Semedi (see below) – might be especially useful to understand Taiwan's place in the Anthropocene.

場次七

講題：

- (1) **Universality and Difference I - Race, Species, Biopolitics**
- (2) **Universality and Difference II - Green Orientalism**
- (3) **Universality and Difference III - Islands**

主講人：(1) 張瓊惠 (2) 何重誼 (3) 吳考甯

日期：111.11.19 時間：10:00-15:00

(1) Universality and Difference I - Race, Species, Biopolitics

Text under discussion:

Rachel C. Lee, *The Exquisite Corpse of Asian America: Biopolitics, Biosociality, and Posthuman Ecologies*, NY: New York UP, 2014.

Shirly Geok-lin Lim, *In Praise of Limes*, Santa Barbara: Sungold Editions, 2022.

Original abstract:

One of the central issues raised by the Anthropocene is the relationship between the human species as an abstract universal and its manifold concrete instantiations – always local, gendered, racialized, divided by social status and cultural identity. From this perspective, the problem of “human survival” becomes legible as a problem of biopolitics: it is concerned with the question how particular forms of life are to be preserved, while others are allowed to perish. Biopolitical theory has also played a key role in literary studies over the past two decades or so. In this session, we will read one of the most acclaimed works of literary scholarship to draw on the notion of biopolitics, Rachel C. Lee's *The Exquisite Corpse of Asian America: Biopolitics, Biosociality, and Posthuman Ecologies*. We will focus on a chapter in which Lee teases out the preoccupation with human fragments and posthuman ecologies in the context of Asian American cultural production and theory. Adopting an interdisciplinary approach, Lee inaugurates a new avenue of research on biosociality

and biopolitics within Asian American criticism and establishes an intellectual alliance and methodological synergy between Asian American studies and Science and Technology Studies (STS), biocultures, medical humanities, and femiqueer approaches to family formation, carework, affect, and ethics.

As race studies has typically understood biopower in terms of ethnics', natives', and subalterns' occupying the position of zoe (or bare animal and cellular life) as opposed to bios (politically recognized life, narrated life lived by a historical organism), this chapter, "How a Critical Biopolitical Studies Lens Alters the Questions We Ask vis-à-vis Race," uses the examples of Ruth Ozeki's *My Year of Meats*, Greg Bear's *Blood Music*, and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*, to outline these authors' own puzzling out of whether the chromatic schema of the five races will become displaced by the non-isomeric categories of bios/zoe or whether a transliteration between the two is more likely. With enlightenment from biopolitics, Rachel Lee observes: "Race studies has typically understood biopower in terms of ethnics', natives', and subalterns' occupying the position of zoe (or bare animal and cellular life) as opposed to bios (politically recognized life, narrated life lived by a historical organism)" (Lee 28). In Lee's account, bios refers to politically worthy life, and zoe to bare, unprotected animal life (Lee 47), and any human who "is reduced to the insect, rodent, bird, or microbe" is undergoing a process of "zoe-ification" (48). This notion of zoe-ification can be helpful trying to understand the human condition in the Anthropocene.

Description:

After discussing the underlying argument of Lee's *The Exquisite Corpse of Asian America* as outlined above, Prof. Chang presented readings of several poems from Shirley Geok-lin Lim's recently published volume *In Praise of Limes*. She demonstrated how Lim's poetic explorations of Californian immigrant lives contain a call to rid ourselves of discrimination against non-human creatures, and advocate for rights for creatures in our planetary ecology, for inter-racial collaboration and trans-species empathy. They can be seen as a plea to resist "zoe-ification" in all of its forms.

(2) Universality and Difference II - Green Orientalism

Texts under discussion:

Haydn Washington, et al., "The Trouble with Anthropocentric Hubris, with Examples from Conservation," *Conservation* 1.4 (2021): 285-98.

<https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7159/1/4/22>.

Samuel Alexander and Peter Burdon, *Death for Gaia: Ecocide and the Righteous Assassins*, Looking Glass press, 2020

Original abstract:

Much of the critical literature on the Anthropocene locates the roots of our planetary predicament in Western modernity, and suggests that we must look towards non-Western and non-modern ways of being in the world in order to come to terms with it. Ironically, such arguments often end up conceiving of these alternative traditions merely as inverted mirror-images of the Western modernity that they wish to critique, and thus remain beholden to the very tradition that they seek to shake off. Eric S. Nelson's *Daoism and Environmental Philosophy: Nourishing Life* (2020) is a paradigmatic instance of a Western philosopher offering up a non-Western spiritual tradition as a remedy for the ecological woes of the present. In this session, we will

discuss Nelson's book with a view with a specific focus on the problem of universality and cultural difference that were also addressed in earlier sessions.

Description:

In this session, too, we decided to adjust the readings to the course of previous discussions. Professor Heurtebise opened his talk by outlining his concept of "Green Orientalism," whereby Asian writers adopt Orientalist accounts of their own cultural traditions which play them against the environmental depravity of the West. He then proceeded to sketch to complementary concept of "Green Occidentalism," wherein Western cultural traditions as a whole are indicted for their supposed anthropocentrism and ecocidal tendencies. The two texts we examined more closely in the session are especially clear examples of this latter tendency, and Professor Heurtebise laid out a strong argument why such an "Occidentalism" account is both at odds with empirical data from environmental history and ethically incoherent or implausible.

(3) Universality and Difference III - Islands

Text under discussion: Walter D. Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations - Geopolitics of Knowing, the Question of the Human, and the Rise of Third Nomos of the Earth*, Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.

Original abstract:

Many Anthropocene scholars provide us with the key take home message that they are writing 'after the end of the world'. Not because they are writing about apocalypse, but because they are engaging the Anthropocene after the profound crisis of faith in Western modernity which has swept across academia in recent decades. Here the dominant problematic of contemporary Anthropocene thinking has rapidly turned away from modernity's human/nature divide to that of 'relational entanglements.' Thus, Anthropocene scholarship is taking a particular interest in geographical forms and cultures which are held to bring this problematic to the fore for more intensive interrogation. In their essay *Anthropocene Islands: Entangled Worlds*, Jonathan Pugh and David Chandler examine how the figure of the island as a liminal and transgressive space has facilitated Anthropocene thinking, working with and upon island forms and imaginations to develop alternatives to hegemonic, modern, 'mainland', or 'one world' thinking. Thus, whilst islands, under modern frameworks of reasoning, were reductively understood as isolated, backward, dependent, vulnerable, and in need of saving by others, the island is being productively re-thought in and for more recent Anthropocene thinking. The authors explain how islands have shifted from the margins in a number of international debates, becoming key sites for understanding relational entanglements, enabling alternative forms of thought and practice in the Anthropocene.

This book does not focus on Taiwan, nor on any particular collection of social, political, economic, geological, biological, hydrological, meteorological, cosmological processes of historical 'island.' Rather, it works with the premise that new ways of thinking about interactive life are exemplified by the island. Thinking with an island, or thinking like an island, makes space for understanding alternative approaches to being (ontologies) and knowing (epistemologies) that pointedly disrupts modern reasoning, stable boundaries, and rational actors. This is an exploration similar to our own that posits the social sciences and humanities as crucial to the

ontological and onto-epistemological framing and tools with which the new epoch of the Anthropocene is being grasped. The authors suggest that islands are “key sites” for understanding “relational entanglements” that can not only generate a rich understanding of the complexity, flexibility, and diversity of relational entanglements, but “pulverizes imperial and Anthropocene relationality” (Colebrook, 2021).

The island is a liminal place that reveals the ways that the traces, hauntings, and legacies of modernity and colonialism are not over, but constitutive of the present. To draw out the power of island thinking the authors lean on four different analytical strands of Anthropocene thinking: Resilience, patchworks, correlation and storiatio. Through resilience, the top-down linear governance of development and progress that frames islands as not-modern, vulnerable, and in need of aid to adapt can be thoroughly dismantled. Resilience is not something created by the development industry. Resilience is immanent. It emerges out of the powers of complex adaptive systems manifest in islands. Patchworks remind us that the process is uneven, non-linear and unpredictable. Correlation describes the direct relation or registration of effect, and storiatio places those effects into their historical circulations where their specters haunt modernist constructions of linear time and space.

This is not a perfect book and there is much to critique, but also much to work with and I suggest that grounding it empirically in Taiwan will be productive for thinking both about and beyond the Anthropocene in Taiwan. It can help to understand Taiwan as an island of “relational entanglements” among geopolitical and geological forces. Islands or micro-states such as Singapore, New-Zealand or Iceland are sometimes framed as models of resilience in the Anthropocene (cf. Schneider-Mayerson 2017), in other words refuges for a happy few. By contrast, other islands such as Tuvalu, Kiribati and the Marshal Islands are already threatened by sea level rise, and Taiwan is also vulnerable to climate change related disasters such as floods, or droughts. But both Singapore and Taiwan have a heavy ecological footprint, i.e. an ecological debt to the global community.

Description:

Again, the text chosen for this session diverged from the original plan, and addressed questions that had been preoccupying the group during earlier sessions, namely broad questions about the relationship between the Anthropocene and the history of colonialism, as well as about modernity and scientific knowledge in relation to indigenous traditions. One of the most prominent scholars who has addresses such questions in recent years is decolonial theorist Walter D. Mignolo, so we decided to examine his most recent book, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*. Professor Work’s talk focused on the final chapter of this book, “The Rise of the Third Nomos of the Earth.” Mignolo’s main point there is that we need to use ideas from different knowledge systems to find solutions to the problems of our current era. He considers this era the Third Nomos of the earth. Carl Schmitt coined the ‘Second Nomos’ as coming out of the colonial experience when the planet was divided by european powers. The first Nomos was the era of the kings that european colonial hubris conquered, which contrary to Schmitt and other euro story tellers never disappeared. The third Nomos is the one being enacted now decolonial projects and the rise of other-than-euro-american power.

Professor Work argued, by contrast, that the third Nomos is also being enacted by the planet. She also critiqued Mignolo’s uncritical assessment of kings and the consequential creation of a hegemonic West that he attempts to deconstruct, but winds up valorizing Asian banks and centers of sovereign power as somehow decolonial.

He does offer an important element of indigenous, sentient world thinking as a decolonial paradigm. This is useful, but gets somewhat overshadowed by his hegemonic West and the valorization of non-euro extraction systems.

場次八

講題：

- (1) **Geopolitics of the Anthropocene II – Adaptation**
- (2) **Deep Time I - Geosocial Formations**
- (3) **Universality and Difference IV - A New Human Condition?**

主講人：(1) 莫家俊 (2) 蔡晏霖 (3) 萬壹遵

日期：111.12.03 時間：10:00-15:00

(1) Geopolitics of the Anthropocene II – Adaptation

Text under discussion:

Arturo Escobar, “Construction Nature: Elements for a Post-Structuralist Political Ecology,” *Futures* 28.4 (1996), 325-43. doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(96)00011-0

Kasia Paprocki, “Threatening dystopias: development and adaption regimes in Bangladesh,” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108.4: 955-973. doi: 10.1080/24694452.2017.1406330

Original abstract:

Vulnerability to climate change is relational. This means that people who are vulnerable to the impacts of global climate change are not just vulnerable because they happen to be “unlucky” to be at the wrong place at the wrong time, but we should see their vulnerability as an outcome of unequal socio-economic and historical processes and power inequalities. While policymakers like to provide 'technical' solutions for these communities and households to “adapt” to climate change, seeing adaptation and vulnerability from an apolitical lens often exacerbates the aforementioned inequalities. Those who cannot “adapt” are often blamed for their own shortcomings, as those in power claim to have provided them ample opportunities and know-how to realize “adaptation.” Adaptation in this sense is thus a very neoliberal idea. It disregards pre-existing social relations and inequalities, and expects the individual to adapt. Those we cannot adapt, lack “adaptive capacity” or “will” to change their dire situation. They should either be provided help or they need to be taught to “build” resilience. In order to understand the Anthropocene, one needs to carefully disentangle concepts such as ‘vulnerability,’ ‘resilience,’ the society/climate dichotomy, ‘adaptation’ and pre-existing relational vulnerabilities. While current discourses make it seem that ‘humanity’ entered into a new phase to influence global processes, we should critically examine this concept from a political lens. Marcus Taylor’s *The Political Ecology of Climate Change Adaptation: Livelihoods, Agrarian Change and the Conflicts of Development* does exactly that. It argues that “climate is not something ‘out there’ what we adapt to.” It forces us to critically rethink our relationship with ‘climate change’ from a political economy, historical, empirical, and biophysical perspective. This framework politicises the environment as a product of unequal social relations across multiple scales, heavily affected by power relations and access or lack thereof to resources, particularly land and water (Robbins 2011). Consequently, certain people are in certain places not

accidentally but as a product of political, economic and sociocultural power, thereby causing certain groups to be in spaces of higher risks while others are at less risk (Collins 2010; Marks 2015). Therefore, scholars in the Anthropocene need to rethink our pre-existing ideas on climate change as a simply 'natural' phenomenon affecting 'us' all. This book makes a very strong case, both theoretically and drawing upon case studies in Asia, why this is so.

Description:

As in previous sessions, Professor Bayrak substituted the originally suggested readings with texts that were linked more directly with preceding debates in the group. He discussed Arturo Escobar's 1996 paper "Construction nature: Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology" as well as the more recent paper "Threatening Dystopias" by Kasia Paprocki. Both articles provide critical notes on the concepts of "sustainable development", "environmental management" and "climate change adaptation". As these concepts lie central in the Anthropocene discourses, it is important to reflect, both ontologically and epistemologically, on how they have been developed and what implications they have for development from a local and Indigenous community perspective. Therefore, discussions on Taiwan in the Anthropocene need to take scholarship from more critical studies, such as political ecology, more comprehensively into account.

The most important points that were raised in the discussion afterwards included the fact that the paper of Escobar has been written in 1996, but his points are still very relevant today. The discussion members disagreed with each other about whether aforementioned concepts were still relevant, considering the ideologically implications that have shaped these concepts. Points were also raised on how and why these papers were relevant to the case of Taiwan.

(2) Deep Time I - Geosocial Formations

Text under discussion:

Tania Li and Pujo Semedi, *Plantation Life: Corporate Occupation in Indonesia's Oil Palm Zone*, Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.

Original abstract:

Ecological thinking has long suggested that society cannot only be conceived in terms of human-to-human relationships, but must also take into account the relationships between and among humans and other living creatures. But the Anthropocene raises the further challenge of thinking the social in its relationship to geological processes: the formation of ores, the weathering of rocks (which, we now understand, plays a pivotal role in the global carbon cycle) and the movement of tectonic plates – sometimes slow and sometimes rapid, both fostering and destroying life. Gisli Palsson and Heather Ann Swanson have argued that the Anthropocene requires is to think in terms of "geosocialities" (2016). In this session, we will read Richard Irvine's *An Anthropology of Deep Time: Geological Temporality and Social Life* (2020), which attempts to develop a theoretical framework for geosocial formation in this sense, and discuss how his ideas can be applied to Taiwan.

Description:

In light of an upcoming lecture by Tania Li in Taiwan, and also based on the centrality which the subject of plantation agriculture has assumed in earlier debates among the group, Professor Tsai chose Li and Semedi's recent book *Plantation Life* for this session. Methodologically, this book is especially interesting in how it juxtaposes the worker's "lay" understanding of what a plantation is with various attempts to conceptualize their historical development and socioecological impact. After laying out the book's core's arguments, much time was spent discussing how Li and Semedi's insights could be applied to the case of Taiwan, and Professor Tsai outlined how they also dovetailed with her own research about farming communities in Yilan Country.

(3) Universality and Difference IV - A New Human Condition?

Text under discussion: Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 1998.

Description:

In this instance, not only the topic of the session, but more importantly the speaker changed: Professor Chou, who was originally scheduled to hold this session, had to leave the reading group for personal reasons. To take her place, we invited Professor Julius Wan from the German Department of Soochow University, who prepared a talk on Hannah Arendt's seminal 1958 book *The Human Condition*. Intriguingly, Arendt not only addresses many of the key biopolitical aspects of the Anthropocene almost half a century before the latter emerged as a distinct concept, she also provides a trenchant argument for why the humanities must play a key role in spelling out the new epoch's implications, not just in terms of its political effects but even more fundamentally with regard to our understanding what it means to be human. Prof. Wan's talk thus provided a fitting capstone to the debates we had conducted over the course of this year.

Afterthoughts or Feedback:

This reading group accomplished all of the goals we had set for ourselves in the application: it gave us an opportunity to learn about recent approaches to the Anthropocene from out various home disciplines and to develop a broad, transdisciplinary understanding of the new geological epoch – not so much in terms of a shared understanding as in terms of shared questions and concerns. It also enabled us to network with each other and begin to develop a range of collective activities that will last beyond the funding period, such as the newly initiated collective research project on indigenous gardens by Profs. Hong and Work, and the projected special issue of *Concentric* on "Transcultural Thought and the Planetary Emergency" which will be co-edited by Profs. Bergthaller and Tsai. Other projects are sure to follow, and we aim to continue the activities of this group as soon as possible.

4. 參考文獻 (Bibliography)

Alexander, Samuel, and Peter Burdon. *Death for Gaia: Ecocide and the Righteous Assassins*, Looking Glass Press, 2020

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 1998.
- Barad, Karen. “After the End of the World: Entangled Nuclear Colonialisms, Matters of Force, and the Material Force of Justice.” *Theory & Event* 22.3 (2019): 524– 550.
- . “What Is the Measure of Nothingness: Infinity, Virtuality, Justice: 100 Notes.” *100 Thoughts: Documenta Series 099*. Kassel: Hatje Cantz, 2012.
- Bubandt, Nils, Donna Haraway, Ishikawa Noboru, Scott F. Gilbert, Kenneth Olwig, and Anna L. Tsing. “Anthropologists Are Talking – About the Anthropocene.” *Ethnos* 81.3 (2016): 535-64.
doi:10.1080/00141844.2015.1105838
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.
- della Dora, Veronica. *The Mantle of the Earth: Genealogies of a Geographical Metaphor*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2020.
- Dryzek, John S., and Jonathan Pickering. *The Politics of the Anthropocene*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2020.
- Escobar, Arturo. “Construction Nature: Elements for a Post-Structuralist Political Ecology,” *Futures* 28.4 (1996): 325-43. doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(96)00011-0
- Lee, Rachel C. *The Exquisite Corpse of Asian America: Biopolitics, Biosociality, and Posthuman Ecologies*. New York: New York UP, 2014.
- Li, Tania, and Pujo Semedi. *Plantation Life: Corporate Occupation in Indonesia’s Oil Palm Zone*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.
- Lim, Shirly Geok-lin. *In Praise of Limes*. Santa Barbara: Sungold Editions, 2022.
- Menely, Tobias. *Climate and the Making of Worlds: Toward a Geohistorical Poetics*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2021.
- Meyer, Thomas J. et al. “Endogenous Retroviruses: With Us and against Us,” *Frontiers in chemistry* 5.23 (2017). doi:10.3389/fchem.2017.00023
- Mignolo, Walter. *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations – Geopolitics of Knowing, the Question of the Human, and the Rise of Third Nomos of the Earth*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2021.
- Paprocki, Kasia. “Threatening dystopias: development and adaption regimes in Bangladesh.” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108.4: 955-973. doi: 10.1080/24694452.2017.1406330
- Washington, Haydn et al. “The Trouble with Anthropocentric Hubris, with Examples from Conservation.” *Conservation* 1.4 (2021): 285-98.
<https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7159/1/4/22>.