

Nicholas Anastasopoulos
(National Technical University of Athens)

Buen Vivir is a relatively new and rather elusive concept specific to Ecuador and other South American countries with its roots in ancient Andean traditions. It draws inspiration from an antecedent term in Quechua known as Sumak Kawsay, which is best understood as *life in harmony* (Walsh, 2010).

At a theoretical level, *Buen Vivir* proposes reshaping all aspects of contemporary life in new sets of relationships between societies and nature, at the levels of production, economy, social relationships, education and community. It has been argued that *Buen Vivir* relates to aspects of some contemporary western theories such as the commons, degrowth, political ecology, and ecofeminism among others (Anastasopoulos 2017). These various strands of contemporary theories in the West, as well as practices such as *circular economy*, *permaculture* and *the Transition Movement*, to name a few, attempt to address the contradictions and offer alternatives to the dead ends of our times. Yet, research in each of these areas doesn't always take into consideration other fields of research or practices with similar goals and remains scattered. Furthermore, in order to be effective, theories and practices tend to oversimplify aspects of reality characterized by dynamic behavior and complexity, downplaying or ignoring the whole picture. Therefore, taking seriously a comparative study between these disparate theories and examining their possibility to influence strategizing and designing urban environments represents a significant challenge.

Based on existing research this paper attempts two things:
It will attempt to reiterate whether “life in harmony” within nature and in community can be compatible in *Buen Vivir* and in Western alternative theories. It will also begin to examine the conditions for implementing the above in a western contemporary, urban and highly complex society context.

Keywords: *Buen Vivir*, Urban complexity, Western alternative theories

Utopia in the Anthropocene: a New Harmony or Destruction

Nicole Pohl
(Oxford Brookes University, UK)

Ulrich Beck, in his article, 'Climate for Change' of 2010, suggested that in the face of 'climate breakdown' (George Monbiot), 'something historically new can emerge, namely a cosmopolitan vision in which people see themselves ... as part of an endangered world...'. George Monbiot, as well, in his latest book, *Out of the Wreckage: A New Politics for an Age of Crisis*, also hopes for a transformation of politics and cooperation in the face of large scale social inequality and climate breakdown.

This paper will reflect on the possibility and impossibility of utopianism in the anthropocene and ask the question if utopia is possible in the anthropocene or if we have to imagine a new form of utopianism for a world without humans.

Keywords: climate change, transformation of politics, anthropocene

Noa Cykman
(Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil).

The quest for a new social harmony requires changes in the way change is done. Countless historical insurrections against dominating systems have maintained positions and strategies based on the dualism of classical social theories: considering the sovereignty of society as an external, coercive and pre-individual structure (Durkheim, 1895), to be taken in the form of the state in order to institute revolution (Marx, 1867), in contrast to the idea of the individual as an autonomous agent whose actions make up the course of society (Weber, 1922). The critique of this dichotomy also serves to ponder such revolts, toward a relational prism and a distinct conception of social life and its reinvention.

The socialist movement, prominent in the history of revolutions, is an exemplary object. In their attempt to take over the overpowering system, the revolutionary enterprises of socialism tended to maintain (perhaps, to glorify) existing structures, keeping them as an unquestioned basis of social order as well as of symbolic and cognitive principles underlying actions and thought. From the origin of the Modern State to the attempts of its appropriation, fundamental subjective aspects have been preserved relatively constant – protected by the fact that they are themselves a product of the symbolic power of the State (Bourdieu, 1996).

In addition to the practical reorder of society, or as its absolute complement, there is something immaterial, invisible that needs to be transformed. Minor, micropolitical, interstitial shifts. From institutions to the core of being, to change is to change relations, to reshape the form of their constitution and the nature of association. By blurring the image of a central, fixed power, a fabric of subjectivities appears and its points and connections form transformation scopes. Changing our ways of thinking, acting and living together is a daily task.

Keywords: Revolution. Social change. Relational paradigm.