

**For other ways of life: cosmopolitics in regulations, utopias and spiritualities**

**Pedro Henrique Azalim Cunha**

PhD student in Architecture and Urbanism, UFMG, Brazil  
pedroazalimcunha@gmail.com

**Roberto Luís de Melo Monte-Mór**

PhD Professor, UFMG, Brazil  
robertoluismonte.mor@gmail.com

#### SUMMARY

This article critically approaches our anthropocentric relationship with the planet and raises alternatives to think about cosmopolitical regulations and utopias as potentialities for the reestablishment of the planet's equilibrium. To do so, it is necessary to understand the Earth as a living organism, Gaia, as in fact various peoples and cultures already recognize it. We try to imagine how other worlds, other ways of living and relating to other beings and natural elements would be possible. We thus aim to think about, question, and eventually regulate the rights of nature and its relations with health and spirituality in the appropriation and production of social space, of living spaces. In spite of the advances observed in Latin America in the regulation of society/nature relations, Brazil is still characterized by an anthropocentric legislation that references human domination over other beings and elements. The apparent advances in the line of ecological modernization, or 'green stamps', in fact do not address the issues and causes that determine or contribute to the destruction of the planet, or even to the threats posed today to all organisms, including Gaia herself. Cosmopolitical regulations and utopias can be empowered to achieve other ways of life, changing the hegemonic anthropocentric perspective to an ecocentric approach, and perhaps even changing the dominant materialist paradigm to a new paradigm that recognizes the spiritual-materialist dialectical relationship and the necessary sacralization of everyday life.

**KEY WORDS:** Cosmopolitics, Regulation, Spiritualities.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In a context of hegemonic and anthropocentric globalization, where extensive urbanization gains planetary dimensions, mostly predatory, it seems necessary to think of other ways of life, integrating not only humans, but all beings of Gaia, in search of an extensive naturalization<sup>1</sup> globalized.

Sometimes I say the word planet and sometimes I say world, and I'm always talking about different things. The planet is Gaia, this organism that we are literally eating. The world is this complex of imagination, visions, perspectives, all this production of ideas that institutes a humanity. We built it. The world is a creation of humans. The planet is not. It created us, and continues to maintain us for a while. When we become unbearable, this wonderful planet has its own devices, its own intelligence, its own capacity to dispense us from here. (KRENAK, 2020a, p. 10)

The institutional regulation of environmental issues has advanced, but has proven insufficient to curb the destruction of the planet, the increase of inequality, the concentration of wealth, and the deepening of poverty. However, considering the Gaia hypothesis, which understands the planet as a living organism, health and nature must be understood as an integral part of each other, and the health of the earth is directly linked to the collective health of the beings on the planet.

Would it be possible to regulate/protect/potentiate the rights of nature? To deal with environmental aspects of collective life taking into account issues that involve non-human beings and nature itself as a totality? Is it possible to consider that traditional peoples already experience the spiritual rights of nature as an integral part of their rituals, ways of life and daily practices? Is it possible to learn from these peoples, as well as from oriental peoples, where spirituality seems to permeate daily life?

In Brazil, there is still an anthropocentric perspective that only validates the rights of human beings in relation to nature. In Ecuador and other countries, differently, the rights of

---

1 The idea of extensive naturalization is proposed by Monte-Mór as a dialectical and centripetal movement from nature towards the city, necessarily contrasting with the idea of extensive urbanization, the centrifugal movement of the urban fabric that starts from the city towards the entire social space. For discussion of the concepts of 'extensive urbanization and extensive naturalization', see Monte-Mór (1994, 2018).

nature are already recognized by the Constitution, while in Bolivia the Andean ancestry and spirituality is recognized through the notion of Pachamama (superficially translated as Mother Earth)<sup>2</sup>.

A shift in the socionatural paradigm towards an ecological model, where the "ecocentric" would take the place of the "anthropocentric," would imply a cosmopolitical perspective<sup>3</sup> that integrates all natural elements and life forms. A complementary dimension to be thought of would involve considering the spirituality inherent in each being, and in Gaia itself.

In a cosmopolitical perspective, the rights of nature should constitute potency for the integration of social-nature through an extensive naturalization taken as a (cosmo)political transforming of reality, as an alternative and complementary movement to extensive urbanization, extended to the whole social space and generating new forms of coexistence between nature and the diverse societies that redefine the contemporary globalized world.

## 2 CRISES, EXPLOITATION AND REGULATION: PERSPECTIVES

Can't buy wind Can't buy sun  
 Can't buy rain Can't buy heat  
 You can't buy the clouds You  
     can't buy the colors  
 You can't buy my joy  
 You can't buy my pain[...]  
     (Let's walk!)  
 Here's where the struggle is  
 You can't buy my life  
*Calle13 -Latinoamérica.*<sup>4</sup>

In the song *Latinoamérica* by the band Calle 13 from Puerto Rico, the critical reflection about capitalist processes sings of what cannot be bought, as resistance to capitalism. However, large corporations and states, through capital, industrial and urban processes continue to exploit mountains, rivers, animals, plants, and threaten nature and the planet as a whole.

One materialization of these modes of domination that generate crises and exploitations are the cities, and about them Krenak (2020a, p. 10-11) states: "they are a kind of bruise on Gaia's organism and must be called into question. They are dark holes in our planet. But enlightenment, positivism, made us think of the city as resplendent, fantastic places." These bruises, wounds, injuries that plague the living organism that is the Earth are not restricted only to the cities; in the countryside, in rural areas there are also predatory practices with the natural beings and elements. In other words, it is not the place that is defined as a bruise, but the practices experienced in these territories. "Agroforestry and permaculture show forest peoples that there are people in cities enabling new alliances, without that idea of countryside on one

---

2 According to the UN, 37 countries already recognize in an institutional way the rights of nature, while in Brazil some municipalities have already legislated on this issue and others are discussing it in their town halls. (BARBOSA, 2022)

3 For a first approximation to the concept of 'cosmopolitics', see Stengers (2018), who emphasizes: "[...] the distinction and inseparable character of political and cosmopolitical propositions."(p.443)

4 Tú no puedes comprar el viento / Tú no puedes comprar el sol / Tú no puedes comprar la lluvia / Tú no puedes comprar el calor / Tú no puedes comprar las nubes / Tú no puedes comprar los colores / Tú no puedes comprar mi alegría / Tú no puedes comprar mis dolores / (¡Vamos caminando!) / Aquí se respira lucha / No puedes comprar mi vida...

side and city on the other." (KRENAK, 2020b, p. 11). There are possibilities of integration and ways to reduce unsustainability and thus "from within the concrete, there arises this utopia of transforming the urban graveyard into life." (IDEM).

The natural beings and elements that formerly inhabited these territories were killed, expelled, or subjugated, and with the expansion of the urban-industrial fabric, these forms of life still resist through the resilience of nature and the actions of some humans who, united in search of ecological balance, create environmental regulations in order to legislate, implement, and supervise human relations with the environment. Such regulations, even though they have many implementation and enforcement flaws, are some of the legal means we have to deal with these issues. Still, capital captures almost everything, imposing its utilitarian value.

However, as stated above, the Constitution of Ecuador already recognizes the rights of nature and Bolivia, the ancestry and spirituality of Pachamama. In this context, nature comes to be seen as a subject of rights and not just an object of rights, with rights in itself and not as a function of human utilities.(GUDYNAS, 2019).

Unlike Ecuador, Brazil has a perspective that only validates the rights of human beings in relation to the environment/nature. According to Costa (2015), this is already a great advance in our legislation due to the fact that previously not even this aspect was taken into consideration. Only after the 1988 Federal Constitution did it become a duty of the political-administrative organization of the country to preserve natural elements and environmental restoration to provide human beings with healthy environments for their lives. In other words, progress was made, even if only in the purely anthropocentric framework, implying several processes of urban-environmental regulation.

Regarding regulation, at first "it was defined as an ability to maintain a balanced environment, from a set of adjustments. However, in the nineteenth century, biologists began to conceive regulation also from a new reference: as adaptation". (OLIVEIRA, 2014, p. 1200). Equilibrium, adaptation, regulation: attempts to unite society, culture and nature in the face of exploitations and transformations of the natural environment, regulation "as a function of adaptation is that of dynamic equilibrium, because it aims at the possible improvement of systems of transformations." (IDEM).

The manifestations of dynamic equilibrium involve several levels of integration between societies and natural environments forming contemporary spatialities. The balance, in constant modifications, also encompasses the processes of regulation. Costa (2015) states that urban-environmental regulation arises in the context of the intersection between scientific knowledge and the idea that the State is able to correspond to collective interests. The author further adds:

In the current period of neoliberalism, state and capital interests are so amalgamated that it is difficult to discern each of them, pointing to a renewed scenario of struggles and reconquest of the credibility of the public sphere, or at least of the state sphere, or, in a more pessimistic scenario, to total disbelief in the historical role assigned to the state, making alternatives associated with communal, collective, community-based forms of regulation emerge. (COSTA, 2015, p. 104)

Some of the legal processes exercised by the public power are based on the concepts of regulation, and these conceptualizations are wide-ranging and their conceptual definitions articulate with various disciplinary fields. The concept of regulation has references with "the

concept of homeostasis (biology), of control (mechanics), the idea of power and domination (political sciences), self-regulation (economics)." (OLIVEIRA, 2014, p. 1199).

In the relationship between conceptual definitions and practical performances, regulation proposes to establish guidelines for the relations of human beings with territory, natural elements, and other beings. In the political sciences, "it appears as a synonym for order, balance, that is, from a foundation in the normative function of regulation. This notion of regulation is confused with the definition of political power, because this is a way of regulating conflicts." (OLIVEIRA, 2014, p. 1204).

Interests, norms, regulations, financial, political and natural aspects articulate and imbricate themselves to the urban and environmental reality, along with the ecological modernization process that Costa (2015, p. 103) makes explicit:

[...] both capital and the State assume and internalize procedures, modifications in productive processes, new restrictions and criteria that internalize the concern with nature, seeking to regulate access to material resource bases in such a way that the development model and its expanded reproduction can take place on a more lasting basis.

Some examples of ecological modernization are the sale and use of metal straws, bamboo brushes, among countless other techniques that are in fact positive, but are mitigating means that do not solve the causes of the problems and only deal with superficial symptoms of the relationship of human beings with nature. In other words, they are means of maintaining the productive forces and the exploitation of nature that receive or call themselves with a "green" or "sustainable" label<sup>5</sup>, only to feed the illusion that they will solve the problems; in fact, they are only on the surface of integration with nature and behind have the intention of raising more funds and increasing the process of political, economic, environmental and urban-industrial domination. Recycling is a positive aspect, but it does not solve the issue of subjugation of nature to satisfy human needs:

A mountain is made into laminates to make cars and appliances, pots, pans, stoves, refrigerators, which no longer become a mountain. It is one less mountain in the earth's organism. The metals and all the other materials that are used do not come back. The idea of recycling is to recycle for another consumption. It is not a return to nature. The oceans are exhausted from all the things we take from them, and from all the garbage we throw away. There are fossils in the ocean that have mountains of plastic in them. That is, we are disappearing with natural mountains on the surface, and creating artificial mountains in the ocean fossa. (KRENAK, 2020a, p. 09)

In addition to these factors, there are others, as Steinberger (2001, p. 23) states, that are "basis for reconstructing and deconstructing myths about the urban space: the environmental quality of urban life, the environmental management instruments and the conflict of interests among actors". These myths influence the imaginary and the praxis relationship of beings with urban space and, still according to the author, are some of the causes of the environment-urban dichotomy, strengthening the rigid thinking that urban spatiality cannot be sustainable. Therefore, the need to be undone, as they formulate a limited and

---

<sup>5</sup> It is also known as greenwashing, in which manipulation and distortion techniques are used that are called sustainable, but in practice do not actually have this characteristic.

generalized view of the urban environment. It is not the space itself that is sustainable or not, but the practices and experiences that are established in its territory, as well as the ideologies, thoughts, and principles that are adopted and permeate the imaginary of beings. It is not something fixed, but constantly changing and becoming.

Swyngedouw (2009, p. 102) explains: "Social relations operate by metabolizing the 'natural' environment, through which both society and nature are transformed and new social-natural forms are produced. This produced, modified, experienced, and also commercialized social-nature involves human and non-human beings, natural elements, political, economic, cultural relations, and a wide range of aspects of contemporaneity. The same author adds: "While nature provides the foundation, social relations produce the history of nature and society. (IDEM).

All this complexity, history, and diverse interests that make up the urban-environmental scenario are theoretically managed, planned, and administered by the public power with influences from the capital owners, through the environmental regulation processes.

Environmental regulation in urban space is a broad conceptual and thematic field, involving a complex set of social agents with diverse and often conflicting interests, rights and objectives, as well as a wide range of contexts and situations subject to regulation; it is also a challenging field, as it refers to the possibility of building a fairer and more lasting social, territorial and environmental order, for this very reason fraught with contradictions and disputes. (COSTA, 2015, p. 99)

Observing this *modus operandi* of environmental regulation immersed in capitalism and the Anthropocene (there is also talk of a "capitalocene"), it seems necessary to review its mode of operation and also that of the system in which it is inserted; environmental compensations, environmental impact studies, and other tools, which in theory are made for preservation, allow the exploitation and maintenance of this *modus vivendi* in which only human beings have importance, disregarding other beings and natural elements. While this absolutely hegemonic anthropocentric status is maintained, there may be some changes, but the structure will remain the same, with processes of crises, exploitation, and inequality.

### 3 COSMOPOLITICAL REGULATIONS: UTOPIAS, METAMORPHOSES, REVOLUTIONS

The cosmopolitical utopia integrates the entire cosmos into its processes  
The metamorphosis of the universe in becoming accompanies  
The spiritual revolution of every being and element  
And everything at the same time  
It all started with the OM Sound of the universe and reverberates towards infinity<sup>6</sup>

For desirable and structural changes to occur, it would be necessary to change the rationality that surrounds capitalist and anthropocentric processes since, in most cases, these paradigms are based on economic value. Steinberger (2001) suggests breaking the instrumental logic that underlies the theories and concepts of each area of knowledge that approaches the relationship between human beings and nature as a utilitarian bias of the natural environment.

---

6 Authorial poetry

It also involves breaking the idea that planning is the supra-summary of this type of instrumental rationality, and especially urban planning. According to the author, only in this way will there exist a logic of urban space itself, transgressing the planning prescriptions, that overcomes itself and (re)establishes other ways of coexistence between society and nature. About utilitarianism, Gudynas (2019, p. 23) states that:

The consequence is a Nature divided into elements, in which those considered useful and valuable to nourish certain economic circuits come to have a value, above all economic. In this way, the tree becomes cubic meters of wood; it is the planks of wood that acquire a value, while the foliage or the roots become invisible because they lack utility: the tree, as a living being, or the ecosystems have no values of their own, nor rights. On the contrary, a utilitarian vision is imposed, which fragments Nature, separating it into useful (or potentially useful) resources and non-useful ones.

In order to change this logic, studies of alternatives in urban, architectural, socio-environmental, political and legislative planning are needed, which imply seeking a deeper relationship between bodies, consciousnesses, urbanities and the utopias that are experienced and constructed on a daily basis. In counterpoint to the dichotomies fruit of modernity and unsustainable hegemonic practices, it is necessary to reinforce the idea that "the contemporary revolution may be more profound, because it implies a radical change of course on a planetary scale imposed by the Anthropocene (and its consciousness)." (MONTE-MÓR, 2018, p. 235).

From the interaction between cosmopolitical utopias, interspecific metamorphosis and spiritual revolutions it is possible to think about other realities. Cosmopolitical utopias here are understood as social-spatial organizations, with a focus on sustainable architectural practices and ecological urban practices aimed at the development of human consciousness and integration with nature. The knowledge of different society/nature relations and how these relations are configured in the cities, in the countryside, in the urban, in the planned spaces and in the concrete utopias<sup>7</sup> and experimental<sup>8</sup> can potentiate other relations, other practices and ways of life that will inspire a greater transformation of reality.

These socio-spatial, cosmopolitical, and utopian organizations aim to create harmonious interactions between societies and natural issues, fostering a spiritual revolution in levels of consciousness that can have repercussions on the quality of living spaces and their inhabitants, both human and non-human. Human beings who seek transformations in their levels of consciousness can be helped by daily spiritual experiences to reduce environmental damage, but they can also problematize and change the process of nature devastation by seeking healthier practices in society/nature/territory relationships.

Cosmopolitical utopias aim to develop other socioeconomic, environmental, and integrative relations, and can, in our view, be articulated with Emanuele Coccia's (2020) idea of "interspecific metamorphosis", which sees the formation of space as a process of permanent transformation through integration among species, where each being and natural element plays its role in maintaining equilibrium.

Steinberger, in turn, points to the following as necessary for urban environmental quality:

---

7 Bloch, 2006; Münster, 1993; Löwy, 2016.

8 Lefebvre, 1976

[...] four main aspects: spatial (well-being, urban design, land use and land cover); biological (physical health, mental health, safety); social (organization, personal fulfillment, contacts, activities, professional fulfillment, access and options), and economic (opportunities, productivity, diversity). (2001, p. 23)

These aspects, associated with the integration between human beings, non-human beings, and the natural elements, enhance the possibility of achieving other possible realities in the relationships between society and nature, reason and emotion, materiality and spirituality. "When, [...], I am told about imagining another possible world, it is in the sense of reordering relationships and spaces, of new understandings about how we can relate to what is admitted to be nature, as if we were not nature." (KRENAK, 2019, p. 67).

The study of ancestral practices inspired by the cosmovisions of indigenous and Hindu societies, as resistance to colonizing processes and mercantile transformations, becomes the basis for the referring inquiries at theoretical, practical and methodological levels. Can spiritual practices and cosmopolitical utopias, both in body and consciousness dimensions and in constructive and spatial aspects, generate other territorial experiences? How to experience and analyze the city/urban/nature relationship through spirituality?

How are these issues articulated in the relationship of human beings with private properties and common goods? These processes are intrinsic to the experience of beings in the territory. The relationships between common goods and private property are in many cases factors that increase the processes of inequality and exploitation. About the regulation of private property, Costa (2015 p. 105) states that the private property right "becomes directly linked to the fulfillment of its social function, facilitating the adoption of instruments to control the use and occupation of the soil and the use of natural resources guided by collective interests.

The social function of property places the common good as more important than the private issue; however, it only addresses the human society. With the complexification of this conceptualization, the idea of cosmopolitical functions emerges, functions that aim to value all living beings and natural elements in the same way as humans, in order to solve the society/nature dichotomy. In order to create a planning based on the balance of the relationship of natural elements with human and non-human societies, these ideas must also articulate with the ideas of interspecific architecture and urbanism, following Coccia's (2020, p. 135) metamorphosis process:

Thus, architecture is not only the active relationship between a species and the world, but the necessary relationship between them. It is as the architect of the world that each species is in relation to the others. Architecture is not just a human affair, not just a cultural fact, not even the relationship between a species and space, a life form and its world. It is the paradigm of interspecific relationship.

From these cosmopolitical relations, Krenak (2020a, p. 01) notes that life is wild, and argues, "Unlike a moral appreciation between civilized and wild, I have observed the wild as life. The expression of life is wild. [...] Life does not seek our species, it crosses our species."

Based on the rights of nature and cosmopolitics as a framework for guidelines for the creation of sustainable human and non-human settlements, other ways of life and other post-pandemic worlds must be identified and empowered. The rights of Nature, recognized as a subject and not only as an object of rights, would sustain transformations in various ranges of



relationships in environmental policies and their management. This is a bold demand, but inevitable to be considered, given the degradation that occurs on the planet. There are small improvements in ecological aspects and the promotion of laws, but one must be aware of their ineffectiveness to stop the destruction of the environment and biodiversity. (GUDYNAS, 2019).

With a deeper understanding of the rights of nature, one can think of the spiritual rights of nature, or at the limit, the spiritual rights of Gaia, in order to recognize the spirits that inhabit and compose the planet itself, taken also as a living organism. This entire spiritual dimension interrelates in the natural and material environment associated with the essential right to be alive of all humans and non-humans and the natural elements, thus promoting a reduction of human ingenuities in their understanding of the totality of life on the planet, de-alienating and (re)sacralizing life spaces, and potentiating an extensive naturalization as a public policy to combat the society/nature dichotomy.

#### 4 FOR COSMOPOLITICAL TERRITORIES: RIGHTS OF NATURE AND SPIRITUALITY

To the rivers the right to flow naturally  
without human intervention  
The mountains the right to exist  
without being exploited  
To the air the right to be pure as well as the waters  
To animals the right to exist for themselves  
without serving humans  
To the spirits, of the planet, the natural beings and elements  
The right to flow in harmony with the universe  
And to have the same importance as matter That all beings recognize  
The Spiritual Rights of Nature<sup>9</sup>

The hypothesis that spirituality is one of the factors that drives human beings not to extract everything from the planet for profit is based on the possibilities of feeling the spirit of the earth, the animals, the plants, the rivers, the air, and the mountains. Everything is alive and without the spiritual side it is not possible to feel these different subtle levels that affect the subjectivities and life of all the elements of nature. "Every body and thing is a cyborg, a mediator - part social and part natural, but without delineated boundaries - and internalizes the multiple contradictory relations that redefine, rework every body and every thing." (SWYNGEDOUW, 2009, p. 105). Just as in the relationship between body and spirit it is not possible to delimit the boundaries of each other, reality has no boundaries, the various beings and elements are imbricated with each other. However, unlike the Yin Yang image, which expresses two opposite and complementary elements in continuous and intrinsic interrelation, reality does not present binary outlines and delimitations, but rather several gradations of colors that do not separate, but complement each other, and it is difficult to distinguish them.

"Society is presented [...] as a living being, a social organism. The Hippocratic expression relies on the idea of an immanence of organic norms, of a health proper to bodies, be they biological or social bodies." (OLIVEIRA, 2014, p. 1204). If we understand societies as beings living on a planet, Gaia, which is also a living organism - that has other beings in its body such as animals, plants, rivers, mountains, air, water, fire, and earth, and that all these

---

<sup>9</sup> Authorial poetry

interrelated beings are also endowed with spirits, experiencing energy exchanges and mutual imbrications at different levels - we realize the immense complexity of life that surrounds us. Thus it becomes clearer to recognize and defend the rights of nature and its spiritual implications. Oliveira adds that the "idea of health, of a norm intrinsic to the organization, finds correspondence with certain uses of the terminology of regulation in sociology and political science, as well as in physiology itself" (IDEM). How to achieve health at various levels of bodies, consciousnesses, spaces, and social and spiritual relationships?

Spirituality is a theme that potentially should be taken into consideration for the configuration of living spaces and their potential health.

spirituality - [is] this feeling of experiencing contact with what is around you, with a mountain, the river, the forest, a bird. I believe in spirituality as the interdependence of everything that is alive. The same life that is in me is in the rock, in the river, in the tree. This does not take anything away from my uniqueness. On the contrary: it brings expansion of the senses. Coming to this relationship with nature is not a learning experience that happens like turning the page of a book, but it points to an opposite path to returning to normal and suggests a possibility of creating a new narrative about humanity. (KRENAK, 2020c, p. 04)

Spiritual relationships, considered holistically as an integral part of matter, as in the worldviews and lifestyles of oriental, ancestral, and native peoples in Brazil and around the world, strengthen the connections between society and nature as vital energies and as living organisms, ranging from subtle to dense levels. The Western and rationalist perspective sees society and nature in a non-integrated and even dichotomized way, and therefore implies the distancing and objectification of nature, consequently promoting its exploitation for profit.

Life is this crossing of the living organism of the planet in an immaterial dimension. Instead of thinking of the Earth organism breathing, which is very difficult, let's think of life crossing mountains, galleries, rivers, forests. The life that we have trivialized, that people don't even know what it is and think it is just a word. Just as there are the words "wind", "fire", "water", people think there can be the word "life", but there isn't. Life is transcendence, it is beyond the dictionary, it does not have a definition. (KRENAK, 2020b, p. 13)

Swyngedouw (2009, p. 100) adds: "In the city, society and nature, representation and being are inseparable, mutually integrated, infinitely linked and simultaneous; this hybrid socio-natural 'thing' called 'city' is full of contradictions, tensions and conflicts. These paradoxes of socio-nature in and of the city are regulated by legal and informal devices that, interrelated, dictate contemporary dynamics.

How to regulate such subtle issues that directly interfere in material relations? Would it be possible to regulate environmental aspects, such as the rights of nature, taking into account the spiritual issues that involve these beings? According to Costa (2015, p. 100), the concept of regulation is a grouping of "agreements, rules, behaviors, values, habits, representing instituted collective contracts, characteristic of a given moment in time and space."

Before it is possible to reach the spiritual levels and be able to place equal importance to matter and spirit in regulation, as in the Tantric philosophy, for example, which provides the

foundation for Traditional Indian Yoga, a shift from the anthropocentric perspective to a cosmopolitical integration is necessary. According to Visvanathan (2010, p. 496):

In India, civilization was associated with the forest, [...]. Such an intellect sought spiritual harmony with nature, whereas the city mind aimed to subjugate it by extending its walls around its acquisitions. The wise hermit who inhabited the forest was not interested in acquisition and domination, but in understanding and broadening his consciousness as he grew with and in his environment.

This spiritual harmony with nature is experienced in some common aspects among Hindus and traditional and native peoples. According to Costa (2015), this balance with nature has always been part of the indigenous principles, their customs, practices, and precepts. For them, nature is part of the community and common goods, just as culture is considered collective, and therefore, these values associated with continuous care provide ample renewal of existence.

However, within the environmental regulation processes there are contradictions, and in the case of the category of integral preservation unit, it is assumed that there are no humans in the area. Because of the belief that human activity is inherent to environmental degradation, it is considered that humans should not be in that territory. Even if these regulatory processes have protected several areas, one must take into account the differences between the practices that degrade and those that maintain the territory (COSTA, 2015).

Most of the time the native peoples make possible the preservation, management, and interspecific and cosmopolitical relations, having respect for the spirits of the natural elements, be they animals, rivers, mountains, the air, etc., in short, the very maintenance of life.

Seen another way, a shift from the dominant social paradigm to an ecological paradigm is needed, in other words, the "ecocentric" taking the place of the "anthropocentric" one. These changes of different rationalities involve various processes: ecological rationality that tends to see the impossibility of sustainable processes in the city; economists' need to see that externalities are not only economic but also environmental; rationality that involves geographers in looking for the nature hidden in cities and urban processes; urbanists' rationality that believes that the natural environment replaced by humans generates a new human ecology, and that the city is the stage for problems but also for solutions. (STEINBERGER, 2001).

Not just a human ecology, but a cosmopolitical perspective that integrates all natural elements and life forms from the spirituality inherent in each being and the planet itself, Gaia. "The dialectic between nature and society becomes external, that is, a conflicting relationship between two separate fields, nature and society, and mediated by ideological and representational practices." (SWYNGEDOUW, 2009, p. 105).

This separation and conflicting relationship is intensified by ideas of dominance and control of humans over nature, with an anthropocentric thinking that understands them as the only protagonists and center of nature, relegating the natural and non-human elements to objects, or at most, supporting actors. However, one can even argue that humans are much younger on the planet and should respect their ancestors and the materiality and spirituality intrinsic to them.

Looking from political ecology, Costa (2015, p. 102) points out:

Seen from the contribution of political ecology, [...] it is necessary to add a critique of socio-territorial inequalities, as well as to consider the centrality of asymmetrical power relations that, as a rule, threaten, invade, overlap, dominate, usurp, and radically alter the regulation mechanisms of traditional populations and territories.

In fact, beyond a political ecology that still privileges human beings, a cosmopolitical spiritual ecology is necessary so that, through spiritual practices and other ways of life more integrated with nature and its multiple manifestations, there is the possibility of expanding the mentality and consciousness of human beings towards other worlds.

With the failures of regulatory mechanisms, most natural elements, human and non-human, are at the mercy of capitalist tools, increasing exploitation, inequality, and degradation practices. Swyngedouw (2009, p. 110), regarding political ecology, states that it is a "process-based episteme in which nothing is fixed or, more accurately, fixity is a brief moment that may never be grasped in its entirety, as flows perpetually destroy and create, combine and separate." Like the mythological dance of Shiva, creator of Traditional Indian Yoga, who destroys the old to build the new.

In a cosmopolitical ecology, Gaia's rights of nature can be considered as potencies for practices of integration of social-nature in the processes of extensive urbanization and naturalization, implying a cosmopolitical management of territory, necessarily transformative of the current hegemonic, anthropocentric, capitalist reality. These practices are intended to remove alienations, but also to contribute to the sacralization of the living space, functioning as links between society and nature, and their respective materialities and spiritualities.

The insistence on the "social production of nature" suggests the "ultimate determination" of social relations in the production process and can easily fall into the trap of subsuming processes of nature under the umbrella of a solely socially produced and controlled nature and, consequently, the idea of a manageable, subordinate, external nature whose metabolism remains "outside" the social and discursive sphere. (SWYNGEDOUW, 2009, p. 104)

This produced and controlled nature remains subordinated to human exploitation. The idea of a subordinated nature is what is proposed here to rethink through the cosmopolitical question, seeking a balance between the spiritual and material levels in order to reach a degree of harmony, justice, respect, and integration among beings, natural elements, and social-natural practices in the creation of other worlds and other ways of life.

## **5 CONCLUSIONS**

Nature is now recognized as central to life on the planet. Here, we argue that the rights - material and spiritual - of human and non-human beings, of nature, and, in the limit, of Gaia herself, must be taken into consideration if we intend to build a new paradigm that integrates cosmopolitical ideas and practices that (re)establish levels of balance and harmony that combat the real and virtual crises we experience today.

This thing that the political and economic sciences call capitalism has metastasized, occupied the entire planet and infiltrated life in an uncontrollable way. If we want, after this pandemic, to reconfigure the world with this same matrix, it is clear that what we

are experiencing is a crisis, in the sense of a mistake. But if we see that we are going through a transformation, we have to admit that our collective dream of the world and the insertion of humanity into the biosphere will have to be done differently. [...] Suddenly it will become clear that we need to change equipment. And - surprise! - the equipment we need to be in the biosphere is exactly our bodies. (KRENAK, 2020b, p. 20 and 21)

Can we achieve collective health, on a global level? Is it possible that each being, each element, nature, and even the planet, can experience this balance? Would daily constructions, paradigm breaks, deconstructions and reconstructions, having utopias (cosmopolitics) as goals and guidelines for the journey of daily life, in short, would cosmopolitical utopias be possible to be experienced globally? What means and processes would be necessary for the diffusion and implementation of its philosophies and practices?

The study of the urban, in its concentrated and extensive manifestations, at various scales from global to local, associated with new and old forms of socio-spatial organization (ecovillages, indigenous territories, among many others) can be reflected in other ecologies, other economies, other ways of thinking and living, other political and socio-environmental relations. It can also be present in urban-architectural utopias experienced in an experimental and concrete way, in ideas and practices that can work as transformation processes in the search for new society/nature relations, that can be intensified and encouraged by other modes of cosmopolitical regulation, and thus put into practice at various levels, in these new worlds and ways of life.

## 6 BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

BARBOSA, Vanessa. **Dia da Terra: a natureza e o direito de existir, prosperar e seregenerar**. [https://umsoplaneta.globo.com/].2022.Acessoem:02,junhode2022.Disponível em:<https://umsoplaneta.globo.com/sociedade/noticia/2022/04/22/dia-da-terra-a-natureza-e-o-direito-de-existir-prosperar-e-se-regenerar.ghml>.

BLOCH, Ernst. **O Princípio Esperança**. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ: Contraponto. 2006.

Calle13. **Latinoamérica**. Trujillo Alto, Porto Rico: Sony BMG: 2011.5:42 min.

COCCIA, Emanuele. **Metamorfoses** / Emanuele Cocia; desenhos de Luiz Zerbini; tradução Madeleine Deschamps e Victoria Mouawad. 1.ed. Rio de Janeiro: Dantes Editora, 2020.

COSTA, Heloisa Soares de Moura. **Regulação ambiental no espaço urbano**. In. Fernandes, E.e Araújo, R.P.Z.(Orgs.).Entre o Urbano, o Social e o Ambiental: a Práxis em perspectiva. Belo Horizonte: Gaia Cultural, 2015, p.97-109.

GUDYNAS, Eduardo. **Direitos da natureza: ética biocêntrica e políticas ambientais** / Eduardo Gudynas; tradução Igor Ojeda.São Paulo: Elefante, 2019.

KRENAK, Ailton. **Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo**/ Ailton Krenak.-1ªed.-São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_. **A vida é selvagem**.Série'CadernosSelvagem'.DantesEditoraBiosfera,2020a.

\_\_\_\_\_. **A vida não é útil**-EditoraSchwarczS.A.-São Paulo-2020b.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Espiritualidade e natureza**- <https://www.uol.com.br/ecoa/2020c>.Disponível em: <<https://www.uol.com.br/ecoa/reportagens-especiais/o-mundo-pos-covid-19-15---espiritualidade-e-natureza-por-ailton-krenak/#cover>>. Acessoem:23,junhoe2022.

LATOURE, Bruno. **Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics?** Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich Beck. *Common knowledge*, v. 10, n. 3, 2004, p. 454.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. **De lo rural a lo urbano**. Buenos Aires: Lotus Mare. (1976[1970]).

LÖWY, Michael. **Utopias**. Ensaios sobre Política, História e Religião. (organização JoséNeves). Lisboa: Ler Devagar: Edições Unipop. 2016.

MONTE-MÓR, Roberto Luís. Urbanização extensiva e lógicas de povoamento: um olharambiental. In: SANTOS, Milton; SOUZA, Maria Adélia A.; SILVEIRA, Maria Laura. (Org.) **Território, Globalização, Fragmentação**. SãoPaulo: Hucitec/Anpur. p.169-181. 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. Utopias Urbanas e Outras Economias. In: Viegas, M. &Albuquerque, E. **Alternativas para uma crise de múltiplas dimensões**. Cedeplar/UFMG, e-book,Coleção PopulaçãoeEconomia. 2018).

MÜNSTER, Arno. **Ernst Bloch. Filosofia da práxis e utopia concreta**. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.1993.

OLIVEIRA, Robson Rocha. Dos conceitos de regulação às suas possibilidades. In. **Saúde e Sociedade**. São Paulo, Volume23. No. 4. 2014. p.1198-1208.

STEINBERGER, Marília. A (re) construção de mitos sobre a (in) sustentabilidade do (no)espaço urbano. In. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais**, No. 4/ Maio, 2001.P.9-32.

STENGERS, Isabelle. A proposição cosmopolítica. **Revista Do Instituto De Estudos Brasileiros** (69),442-464. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2316-901X.v0i69p442-464>.2018.

SWYNGEDOUW, Erik. A cidade como um híbrido: Natureza, Sociedade e “UrbanizaçãoCiborgue”. In. In. Acselhad H. (Org.) **A Duração das Cidades: sustentabilidade e risco naspolíticasurbanas**.Rio deJaneiro: LamparinaEditora,2009. p. 99-120.

VISVANATHAN, Shiv. **Encontros culturais e o Oriente: um estudo das políticas do conhecimento**. In SANTOS, B.S.; MENESES, M. P. (Org.).*Epistemologias do Sul*. Porto São Paulo: Cortez, 2010, p. 487- 507.

"The present work was carried out with support from the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Funding Code 001.