FROM ONTOLOGY TO TOURISM ECOSOPHY: LOVINGNESS AND (SELF)TRANSPOIESIS FOR TOURISM- PLOT OF THE NEW WORLD

DA ONTOLOGIA Æ ECOSOFIA DO TURISMO: AMOROSIDADE E (AUTO)TRANSPOIESE PARA O TURISMO-TRAMA DO MUNDO N'OVO

DE LA ONTOLOGÌA A LA ECOSOFÌA TURÌSTICA: AMOROSIDADE Y (AUTO)TRANSPOIESIS PARA EL TURISMO-TRAMA DEL MUNDO N'OVO

Maria Luiza Cardinale BAPTISTA
e-mail: malu@pazza.com.br

How to reference this paper:

BAPTISTA, M. L. C. From ontology to tourism ecosophy: Lovingness and (Self)Transpoiesis for Tourism-Weaver of the New World. Rev. Educação e Fronteiras, Dourados, v. 13, n. 00, e023014, 2023. e-ISSN: 2237-258X. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30612/eduf.v13i00.17779

| Submitted: 15/08/2023 |
| Revisions required: 11/10/2023 |
| Approved: 19/11/2023 |
| Published: 20/12/2023 |
ABSTRACT: The essay presents reflections on the urgency of epistemological-theoretical-practical development of an Ecosophy of Tourism, given contemporary demands in the scenario of chaosmosis multiple wars, pandemics, climate collapse, and challenges of overcoming the Anthropocene. The theoretical foundation is transdisciplinary and holistic, involving the Epistemology of Science and Tourism, in the composition of Tourist-Communicational-Subjective Ecosystems; Complexity, Ecology of Knowledge and Ecology; Love, Knowledge, and Cultural Biology. The Cartography of Knowledge and Rhizomatic Matrices methodological strategies are procedural, complex, and multi-methodological at the operational level, involving dimensions: epistemological, theoretical, methodical, and technical. As a result, the text presents reflections on tourism and its historical drift. Between pragmatic developmental functionalism and the intensification of criticism of the capitalistic character, the Ecosophy of Tourism can help us find signposts for Tourism-Weaver – Tourism in its complex, ecosystemic, holistic dimension – for New World, the World that we need to help build.


RESUMO: O ensaio apresenta reflexões sobre a urgência de desenvolvimento epistemológico-teórico-prático de uma Ecosofia do Turismo, diante das demandas contemporâneas no cenário de caosmose, de guerras múltiplas, pandemias, colapso climático e desafios de superação do Antropoceno. A fundamentação teórica é transdisciplinar e holística, envolvendo Epistemologia da Ciência e do Turismo, na composição de Ecossistemas Turístico-Comunicaçãois-Subjetivos; Complexidade, Ecologia dos Saberes e Ecologia; Biologia Amorosa, do Conhecimento e Cultural. As estratégias metodológicas Cartografia dos Saberes e das Matrizes Rizomáticas são processuais, complexas e plurimetodológicas, no plano operacional, envolvendo dimensões: epistemológica, teórica, metódica e técnica. O texto traz, como resultados, reflexões sobre o Turismo e sua deriva histórica. Entre o funcionalismo pragmático desenvolvimentista e o acirramento da crítica do caráter capitalístico, a Ecosofia do Turismo pode nos ajudar a encontrar sinalizadores para o Turismo-Trama – o Turismo em sua dimensão complexa, ecossistêmica, holística – para o Mundo N’Ovo, o Mundo que precisamos ajudar a construir.


RESUMEN: El ensayo presenta reflexiones sobre la urgencia del desarrollo epistemológico-teórico-práctico de una Ecosofía del Turismo, dadas las demandas contemporáneas en el escenario de caosmosis, múltiples guerras, pandemias, colapso climático y desafíos de superación del Antropoceno. La fundamentación teórica es transdisciplinaria y holística, involucrando la Epistemología de la Ciencia y el Turismo, en la composición de los Ecosistemas Turístico-Comunicacionales-Subjetivos; Complejidad, Biología del Conocimiento, Biología del Amor y Biología Cultural. Las estrategias metodológicas de la Cartografía del Conocimiento y las Matrices Rizomáticas son procesuales, complejas y multimetodológicas, en el nivel operativo, involucrando dimensiones: epistemológica, teórica, metódica y técnica. El texto trae, como resultados, reflexiones sobre el Turismo y su deriva histórica. Entre el pragmático funcionalismo desarrollista y la intensificación de la crítica del carácter capitalístico, la Ecosofía del Turismo puede ayudarnos a encontrar señales para el Turismo-Trama –el turismo en su dimensión compleja, ecosistémica y holística– para Mundo N’Ovo, el mundo que necesitamos ayudar a construir.

Initial Reflections

This text is written in a scenario of wars in the broadest sense and a world war in the literal and specific sense. It is difficult to say this, but it is also necessary to understand the magnitude of the consequences of events of mutual violence that aggravate and complicate, even endanger life, not only human life but that of all living beings, in a logic that encompasses several species.

The armed conflict between Russia and Ukraine, which officially began on February 24, 2022, has affected a large part of the world's countries, which are called upon to take a stand and promote actions that clearly express this position. On that day, Russian President Vladimir Putin declared a "special military operation" in the Ukrainian region of Donbas, and on the same day, the United Nations Security Council appealed to him not to go ahead with his plans, in vain.

What followed was a sea of horrors, reported daily for more than a year, which brought to light the specter of world war as a concrete, perverse, and cruel expression, drastically exacerbating a scenario that was no longer gentle, in which numerous internal and interstate conflicts broke out in bilateral logic, which also gave rise to phenomena of large migrations with streams of refugees trying to escape death in all its dimensions.

The different treatment of refugees from Ukraine and refugees from Africa has shown that even in the case of disasters, such as wars, there is no uniform treatment in the sense of receiving beings of the same kind. The Ukrainian and African refugees have shown that people are not ‘in the same boat’. The ships are very different, and the type of reception and level of hospitality is also very different.

The current scenario has also been called post-pandemic, given the reduction in the number of deaths resulting from the pandemic caused by the COVID-19 virus, which generated, between 2020 and 2022, dramatic consequences on a planetary scale, in all areas of life, including and especially in the development of Tourism.

Deaths from COVID-19 have decreased, but the consequences continue to be felt, such as the consequences of contracting the disease. Multiple sequelae, resulting from variants of a health tragedy, which decimated part of the planet's population, almost immediately, created an avalanche of deaths of human beings, as well as the closure of companies, and enterprises, the bankruptcy of life projects and businesses, also and particularly in Tourism. There was no way to travel, the airports were largely closed.

Unbelievably, when we think about it today, it would be impossible to believe in the occurrence if the event had been glimpsed previously. During the pandemic, the advice was not to move. So, what would become of Tourism after that? It was one of the big questions, associated
with others of heightened drama: “Who would survive to do tourism after that?”.

The resulting scenario is even more serious when we understand that the two *phylums* of approach so far – war and the pandemic – have turned the world inside out, exposing deep wounds, suffocation, and deaths, in a literal and figurative sense. They also exposed evidence of the ecosystemic, holistic character (CREMA, 1989) and the interdependence of the conditions and possible chances of survival of all beings, of humans among other beings. We were also subjected to gusts of storms with the actions of government officials, publicly demonstrating, loud and clear, the disregard for the collective. More than that, we saw the emergence of mediocrity, selfishness, and the emergence, from the catacombs of the facades of a hypocritical society, hordes of people taking advantage of the dramatic moment to profit, to sell, to exploit, to expropriate.

Capitalism by spoliation is injected into the vein, with evidence spilled everyday through the media and personal experiences in everyday relationships and in the quest to obtain minimum conditions for survival. “The cruel pedagogy of the virus”, as Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2020) called it, but also the cruel pedagogy of capitalism, generating and aggravating times of contemporary barbarism. The cruel pedagogy of inhuman humanity, in the sense that the species has long since broken with the intrinsic characteristics of the groups composed of the first representatives of human animals on the face of the earth. The ancestral family, as Maturana (2004) taught us, was collaborative, loving, and without prejudice and hierarchies. He lived according to the matristic logic, guided by the coexistence between beings, not just humans, in a logic of loving and harmonious multispecies coexistence. As I said in another text, unfortunately, we have already realized that, as a collective project of a species of living beings, humanity has not worked (BAPTISTA, 2020). We walk towards abysses, pitifully created cliffs of our own making.

As humanity, we should be clear, in the face of these grandiose manifestations, that either we all survive and contribute to the restoration of the planet, or we are doomed as a species of living beings. In this condemnation, we seriously compromise the lives of other beings, who, by the way, have demonstrated more intelligence, in a broad sense, than humans. I say this because the inconsistencies and contradictions of a being that calls itself intelligent, for thinking, for having consciousness – “I think, therefore I am”, as the Cartesian cogito taught us - and at the same time and despite this, builds conditions and apparatuses that can destroy life on the planet in seconds, such as the atomic bomb, for example.

We are therefore, faced, here with the results of what has been called the Anthropocene, a geological era characterized by the impact of human actions. This is a new geological epoch that
follows the Holocene, the period with warmer temperatures after the last glaciation. The concept "anthropocene" etymologically derives from the Greek *anthropos*, which means human, and *kainos*, which means new. It was popularized in 2000 by Dutch chemist Paul Crutzen, winner of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1995. It has been widely discussed by contemporary thinkers, such as Massimo de Felice, a researcher at the University of São Paulo, among many other authors. Among the factors that mark the Anthropocene, we can highlight: the technological progress that accelerated after the First Industrial Revolution, exponential population growth (NARDY; DI FELICE, 2021), and the multiplication of production and consumption. They all inspire care and lead to deep reflections, with what can be called “planetary risk” or, more appropriately, I think, “risk to life on the planet”.

Ultimately, we live in a time called the “time of catastrophes” by Isabelle Stengers (2015), a Belgian chemist, philosopher, and historian who contributed excellently to the philosophy of science. She has partnered with Russian chemist Ilya Prigogine (2001) in discussions about chaos and other contemporary themes that help to understand the planet’s dramatic moment and the human role in building this scenario. The two authors, by associating concepts from Chemistry to the Philosophy of Science, allow us to understand signs of how to deal with the instabilities of ecosystems and the turbulence of substances that concentrate and dissipate, showing that there is no possibility of total control, but there is at least the possibility of recognizing the “We”, also what I have been calling We Interlaces (BAPTISTA, 2021), which help us to strengthen ourselves minimally so that we can expand the chances of (over)living. In this sense, the discussion is aligned with the signposts brought here in this text, as glimpses of epistemic guidelines for building the New World: Lovingness and (Self)Transpoiesis (BAPTISTA, 2022).

Likewise, to advance in glimpses of possibilities of existence, ecosophy, as a proposition of an ecological philosophy, of an episteme guided by the cultivation of conditions of possibility of coexistence, (GUATTARI, 1981) proves to be interesting and urgent. Therefore, this text constitutes a proposal for an association between Ecosophy and Tourism, considering the significant power inherent to the matrices of meaning and the meaning-generating core of tourism.
The Ontology of Tourism

Here, the basic features of tourism, a kind of zero degree of significance, are directly related to processes of generation and production of life. Thus, Tourism itself can be enhanced, from the inside out of its weaver, which is why it is referred to here in this text and in my studies as Tourism-Weaver (BAPTISTA, 2018). It is this tourism that I will reflect on from now on.

Ontology is a word formed by elements from the Greek lexicon: óntos, equivalent to a living being, and -logía to logos, which refers to knowledge or science. It corresponds to the science that studies being and is treated by Aristotle as the first philosophy, implying admitting a principle from which it is possible to understand the diversity of what exists, and if this is possible, it is because there are differentiating elements of being itself. In this case, we can associate ontology here, therefore, with a core of meaning regarding what we are dealing with, that is, Tourism.

Therefore, the proposal is to talk from the ontology of Tourism, about contemporary challenges and conditions. To this end, I now present, in summary, the rescue of the historical drift of the core of meaning that generates Tourism, as well as some marks of this universe of knowledge production, which I have been referring to as Tourist-Communicational-Subjective Ecosystems (BAPTISTA, 2020). It is important to consider bases of epistemic biases, which guide dynamics, processes, practices, theories, and methodologies, associated with the universe of Tourism, at different times. The processualism of historical drift results in what we experience, in the everyday occurrences of Tourism and the multiple directions of approaches. Therefore, it seems essential to reflect on what Tourism is, how it arises in historical drift, and how its understanding was constructed.

Here I rescue the beauty of Jorge Drexler's verses (2017), which poetically summarize aspects that I have reflected on in my studies in recent years: “We are a species on a journey. We have no belongings, only baggage”.
Movimiento
Apenas nos pusimos en dos Pies
Comenzamos a migrar por la sabana
Siguiendo la manada de bisontes
Más allá del horizonte, a nuevas tierras lejanas
Los niños ala espalda y expectantes
Los ojos en alerta, todo oídos
Olfaeteando aquel desconcertante
Paisaje nuevo, desconocido
Somos una especie en viaje
No tenemos pertenencias, sino equipaje
Vamos con el polen en el viento
Estamos vivos porque estamos en movimiento
Nunca estamos quietos
Somos trashumantes, somos
Padres,hijos, nietos y bisnietos de inmigrantes
Es más mío lo que sueño que lo que toco
Yo no soy de aquí, pero tú tampoco
Yo no soy de aquí, pero tú tampoco
De ningún lado del todo y, de todos
Lados un poco
Atravesamos desierto, glaciares, continentes
El mundo entero de extremo a extremo
Empecinados, supervivientes
El ojo en el viento y en las corrientes
La mano firme en el remo
Cargamos con nuestras guerras
Nuestras canciones de cuna
Nuestro rumbo hecho de versos
De migraciones,de hambrunas
Y así ha sido des de siempre, desde el infinito
Fuimos la gota de agua, viajando en el meteorito
Cruzamos galaxias, vacio,milenios
Buscábamos oxígeno,encotrarnos sueños Apenas nos pusimos en dospies
Y nos vimos en la sombra de la hoguera
Escuchamos la voz del desafío
Siempre miramos al río,pensando en la otra rivera
Somos una especie en viaje
No tenemos pertenencias, sino equipaje
Nunca estamos quietos, somos trashumantes
Somos padres,hijos,nietos y bisnietos de inmigrantes
Es más mío lo que sueño, que lo que toco
Yo no soy de aquí, pero tú tampoco
Yo no soy de aquí, pero tú tampoco
De ningún lado del todo y, de todos
Lados un poco
Los mismo con las canciones
Los pájaros,los alfabetos
Si quieres que algo se muer
Déjalo quieto

We are alive because we are in motion. This is the point. Nomadic matrix of a species, which, in its origin, related harmoniously with other beings, the other beings, representatives of the biotic and abiotic universe. Nomads who moved and, in movement, were reborn, reinvented, and reproduced themselves and each other, in an (self)transpoietic logic that characterizes the species in constant transversalizations with the ecological niche, in a recursive relationship of constituent former. The human being is a constituent and constituted, a product in and a producer of the ecological niche, a logic of natural and spontaneous coexistence (MATURANA; D’AVILA, 2015). There is, therefore, a direct relationship between (Self)Transpoiesis and the generation of life, just as there is concerning Tourism. Tourism is a (self)transpoietic device that generates life, in the same ontological logic corresponding to travel, communication, talks, and “con-versações”.

The movement, deterritorialization, as Guattari and Deleuze called it in the last century, activates the agency power of (self)transpoiesis, of the (self)production of oneself in transversalizations with the ecological niche. Maturana taught us molecular self-poiesis, as a generating matrix to produce living beings. Even though he, at the end of his life, reiterated that the conceptual proposition of self-poiesis concerned only living beings, since Biology, the conception of the word, as a crystallization of meaning, as I usually define words, released to the four winds the combination of the meaning “self” (relative to oneself) and “poiese” (production) which, in the understanding of other listening subjects, readers and producers of knowledge, began to be used for other universes of knowledge and production of life. Before this phase, referred to in his studies as Cultural Biology, when the author began to produce more directly together with Ximena D’Ávila, the previous paths had reflections referred to as Biology of Love and Knowledge (MATURANA; VARELA, 1997) when it was produced especially with his former student and partner, fellow biologist Francisco Varela. Both helped me understand self-poiesis and the importance of the concept that represents the synthesis of the self-production of living beings, also in transposition to other universes.

In summary, I am associating here the origin and the natural process of production of life, with movement, and deterritorialization, an inherent and characteristic feature of the zero degree of meaning of Tourism, since a time when the name itself – Tourism - did not exist. “We are a

---

1 “Com-versações” (Conversations), expressed like this, proposed by me, intends to signal the set of transversal actions between beings, also between subjects and places.
2 The authors do not refer to deterritorialization as a departure from geographic territory, but to a condition of loss of connection with the known existential universe. This is the first movement of the lines of desire in which the subject is empowered by the movement. Hence the connection in this text (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2004).
traveling species.” Thus, the travel metaphor seems emblematic, like a deep groove that marks the basic feature of tourism. I remember that the word travel derives from the Latin *viaticum*, “journey”, originally “provisions for a journey”, derived from *via*, “path, road”. We can think, then, of the composition with “*agem*”, action, where we have “journey is action on the path”. Yes, we are also on the path of understanding more deeply the Tourism that interests me, Tourism from the deep grooves, the innards of the concept, its reverse, the Tourism-Weaver.

I remember Luís Carlos Restrepo (1998), a Colombian psychoanalyst who, many years ago, in a beautiful book, taught me the Old Testament term, *splacnisomai*, literally, “feeling with your guts”. I keep thinking: “That’s it!” I literally like to feel the concepts with my gut too. That's what I'm after when I dive into words, in this case, this “on love”, falling in love with the concepts of travel and tourism. For this reason, I have also called investigations themselves, actions of investing in a direction, that is, “investigative trips”, certainly one of my greatest passions, more than that, much more than passion, a full and absolute love, both in terms of actions and knowledge.

The same occurs with the term Communication, also characteristic of my studies, whose matrix of meaning allows us to encounter the idea of building bridges, giving way, “*com-partilhar*” (sharing). The Universe that I deal with, therefore, in Tourism, Communication and Subjectivity studies is loving par excellence, from the depths of the paths and detours of meaning. This is the keynote of the proposition of Ecosophy, Lovingness, and (self)transpoiesis for Tourism, which I present in this text, as a synthesis of “*com-versações*” that I have made more broadly in my projects and various publications for more than 10 years in Tourism, more than 30 years in other areas, and almost 60 years of life.

I emphasize here, also using an etymological approach, that the word Turismo derives from the term *tourism* in English, which, in turn, derives from the French *tour*, which means “to take a walk”. Its remote origin, however, is related to the word *tornus* in Latin, which means movement or return (ORIGEM DA PALAVRA, 2023). I notice and highlight how there are connections between our interests, and between our loves, which are also conceptual. The concept “*com-versações*”, expressed in this way, proposed by me, intends to signal the set of transversal actions between beings, also between subjects and places. For several years, I have been working with the proposition associated with Tourism, with research projects and national and international partnerships, in the production and investigation of (self)transpoietic narratives, which are characterized by “*com-versações*” places and subjects. This proposition also aligns with the thinking of Maturana (1988), when he rescues the Ontology of Conversation and says that
conversing is “going around with”, as well as that this dynamic is at the basis of human relationships and corresponds to our intrinsic loving trait. According to the author, we are *homo-amans-amans*, by nature of the species, and this is what makes us have the selfpoietic power, to be produced in the recurrence of conversation, in the “returns with”, in movement. See the connection with the same matrix of meaning as Tourism, ontological connections.

- *Turismo* (Tourism) - derives from the term *tourism* in English, which, in turn, derives from the French *tour*, which means “to take a walk”. Its remote origin, however, is related to the word *tornus* in Latin, which means movement or return.
- *Conversar* (Talk), go around with, in the movement (MATURANA, 1988).
- “*Com-versações*” (Conversations), expressed like this, proposed by me, intends to signal the set of transversal actions between beings, also between subjects and places.

I recall here the reasoning I discussed in a dissertation on Communication (1995), later published in a book (1996). Following the Communication ontology, the communicational moment can mean the moment of ‘meeting’, in which informational flows are shared, in their materialities and immaterialities. This logic necessarily implies a willingness to move, in the sense of meeting, dislodging ourselves, deterritorializing ourselves, towards the Other (which is everything that is not me, not necessarily another human), and towards transformation, meeting of bodies. Thus, communication, in its ontology, is also aligned with the inherent character of travel, tourism, conversations, “*com-versações*”.

**Lovingness: what trip is this?**

I decided to talk here about Lovingness, although, as we will see, there are also confluences with the concept of Communication. So, I start by saying that this is a long journey, talking about love concerning Science, relating it to the most diverse existential and knowledge universes with which I have been involved and in which I have produced, as is the case of Tourism, with the proposition of Lovely Tourism (BAPTISTA *et al.*, 2020). I often say that lovingness is not a concept, but it is my life orientation. Lovingness, condition “*em-amor*” (“on-love”), condition
“em- a-morada” (“in-dwelling”), a condition enamorada (enamored) with what I do, study, with the beings I live with, with my existential places and also with my travels, all – the geographical deterritorializations, the imaginary, existential, and communicational, in “com-versações”, without it being possible, for sure, to differentiate to what extent I am in one or the other.

Throughout my life, I have given new meaning to the word Love, understanding that the core meaning of this crystallization of meaning only makes sense in an expanded condition and is disconnected from the romantic capitalistic logic of possession and appropriation of the other as “my” love. Thus, the loving condition was showing itself to me, as the very condition inherent and intrinsic to the possibility of remaining alive, in pulsations generating micro-movements of reinvention of myself, in power, in joy, for the simple, simple and at the same time gigantic condition of love. The meeting with Maturana, then, was emblematic, and overwhelming, initially due to the text entitled Emotions and Language in Education and Politics (1998), and then with the incessant contact with her texts, videos and even taking two courses at the School Matristic of Santiago de Chile, between 2020 and 2021. As happened with several other thinkers, whom I consider kind of loving accomplices, of my proposition “for a more loving world” (BAPTISTA et al., 2020). Roland Barthes (1986), Paulo Freire (1987; 1996), Edgar Morin (2020), Rubem Alves (2002), among others. That's why I've been saying that I talk about love concerning Science and I'm not alone; on the contrary, I am very well accompanied.

In a recent interview, the thinker Edgar Morin (2020), for example, summarized from the height of his knowledge of 101 years of life: “Egocentrism must be reduced to the vital minimum of conservation. Fraternity is something capital.” In this sense, the love I speak of is love as a loving condition for humanity, as an ethics of relationship and care. Love is compassion and fraternity. The love that empowers us to produce ourselves and live harmoniously with other beings, of all species, human and non-human beings, elements of the environment, subjects, and places, from this and other planets or spiritual dimensions like me I have called.

Later, in the Amazon, in a lecture opening the academic year for postgraduate courses at every institution, in 2015, I remember saying that lovely, far from naivety, is our only chance of survival as a planet. The statement remains valid for me. The period of encounters with the Forest, after 2010, represented for me a great transformation and expansion of knowledge, of learning from the exuberance of the Amazon biome, from the nature of strong and simple people, in the same proportion, who make contrasts, differences and challenges their passage boats to the other side of the river (FARIAS, 2017), presenting the Amazon as an epistemic matrix, which can be thought of as a teaching for us to relearn how to be a world (COLERAI, 2014).
Well, I study what I propose. I think the world needs more lovingness, such as ethics of care and relationships! It is necessary to be lovely, from the details of everyday life, seeking to welcome others and make this the food of life! Tourism also needs to be like this, careful, loving, ecosystemically responsible³! May we all always have “our daily love”, as a source of joy, to continue our journey, in research, in life, and in texts with our investigative reports! And speaking of which, let's move on.

For an Ecosophy of Tourism

To talk about the proposition of an Ecosophy of Tourism, it is important to share a synthesis of my “com-versações” with Ecosophy in recent times. Thus, it starts from the ontology of the concept, so as not to lose the custom and general orientation of this article and my productions. The remote origin of the term takes us back to 1973, when the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess proposed it, in his article, Deep and Long-Range Ecological Movements: A Summary and deep ecology: a summary. The etymological matrix of ecosophy corresponds to the union of the Greek word οἶκος (oikos), which means house, and σοφία (sofia), which is translated as knowledge or wisdom (CAPRA, 1991). From this matrix comes Naess's understanding of ecosophy as ecological philosophy. The same scientist is a reference for the proposition of Deep Ecology, which has been the substrate of major transformations in the assumptions that transversal investigative universes from Biology, Chemistry, and Physics are advancing to broader universes such as the so-called Human and Social Sciences. Adopting an ecosophical stance, which is consistent with a vision of deep ecology, has been highlighted as a contemporary urgency to face major emergencies, such as the environmental, climate, health crisis, population growth, hunger, and poverty.

Capra and Luisi (2014, p.448), in this sense, mention the environmental thinker Lester Brown, commenting on his book entitled Plan B, released in 2008, which demonstrates the “[...]] vicious circle of demographic pressure and poverty [which] leads to the depletion of resources – reduction in the volume of groundwater, shrinkage of forests, the collapse of fishing industries, soil erosion”. The depletion of resources has led us to dramatic conditions, as worsened by climate change it generates “deficient states, our governments can no longer guarantee the safety of their

³ I presented the Ecosystem Responsibility proposal, in 2016, at the Master Conference at the Ibero-American Congress of Tourism and Social Responsibility (CITURS), in La Coruña, Spain. This is not a simple semantic issue, in relation to Social Responsibility publications, but an epistemic issue, of decentering the logic of the Anthropocene, inviting the responsibility of the whole for the whole.
citizens, some of whom, in desperation, turn to terrorism”. Thus, we are heading towards existential cliffs, in an individual and collective sense, the result of which is also what we are finding and which I have been highlighting since the beginning of this text: war, the pandemic, environmental and social catastrophes, hopelessness, despair, death in a literal and figurative sense, for beings whose economically empowered representatives still believe they are intelligent, at the same time that they follow conditions of their deaths and of a species that sprouted spontaneously in the drift of transformations of living beings, as a loving species, guided by matristic logic of coexistence between all beings, multispecies coexistence, recognizing oneself as part of nature.

I remember, in this sense, an episode with which I came into contact, as a journalist, and general editor of the Jornal O Vale Paraibano, in the interior of São Paulo, based in São José dos Campos. This is a city with a strong arms presence, where the weapons industry developed strongly, as well as the aeronautical industry. Among the stories of this city is the record of suicide by the son of one of the large arms industries, who left a note for his father with the information: “Dad, guns are made for this!”4. According to the rules of Journalism, there are no official records of the event, but the story was occasionally remembered in the Paper’s Newsroom, where I worked for more than two years, especially when the contradictions of an arms industry that generates employment, generates resources, but also generates death, literally “lives off it”. I also remember, for example, the strangeness it caused me, when businesspeople in the sector, in interviews, lamented about the economic crisis, and the difficulties in marketing and used the argument: “We are in the off-season! [of wars!]”.

All of this leads me to the question, which I have summarized with a phrase from Caetano Veloso’s well-known song, entitled Cajuína: “Existirmos, a que será que se destina?” (“Exist, what is it intended for”). This goes for me, for you, for Science, Journalism, and Tourism. For this very reason, we are here, in this essayistic reflection, which is summarized in the proposition of an Ecosophy of Tourism. As a complex transversal universe of knowledge production, Tourism has developed, in its knowledge and practices, with a thread of life sewn to other timelines, such as the interfaces with which I have been working especially – Communication and Subjectivity Studies – but, in an even broader sense, aligned with the development timeline of Science, in its complex holistic weaver, and Capitalism, also capable of being glimpsed as a complex and rhizomatic ecosystem, which concentrates and dissipates from points of confluence and in

---

4 According to the rules of Journalism, there are no official records of the event, but the story was remembered from time to time.
passing, infecting, contaminating everyone and everything, capitalism par excellence, capitalism by plunder, as David Harvey taught us (2005; 2008).

Thus, it seems crucial to rescue Arne Naess's initial proposition, when he referred to ecosophy, as a philosophy of harmony with nature or ecological balance, signaling, already in the last century, to challenges that we now face on the edge of many existential abysses. In this sense, the term, for me, represents a kind of synthesis of the epistemological assumptions with which I have been working in science, which I define as ecosystemic, complex, chaosmotic, holistic, and guided by deep ecology. There is an ecosophical confluence between these views. The holistic view is broader and presupposes that knowledge needs to consider the whole and multiple conjunctions (CREMA, 1989; GOSWAMI, 2008). There are different emphases.

While holism is the whole, the complex prioritizes understanding the complex relationships of the web-weave of systems, in a continuous movement of organizational recursions, which teaches us that chaos is not disorder, but leads us to patterns of organizations about which we do not know total control (MORIN, 2003). These systems, in turn, only make sense if they are “places that generate life”, ecosystems, which, by the way, only exist in complex connections. Deep ecology, in line with these other visions, also draws attention to the connection and alignment of values of all beings, breaking with the supremacy of the human, which characterizes the geological era of the Anthropocene. In this way, deep ecology would be the opposite of ecology, in the sense in which I have been working with the reverse, as the expression of the web-weave of complex life, where the knots and interweaves that support the Façade are shown, with its materialities and emphases of capitalistic gear.

I also emphasize that my contact with Ecosophy has also been marked by a schizoanalyst bias, by my continuous “com-versações” with the texts of Félix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze (2004). Guattari, in a lean but dense and fruitful text, summarizes his proposition of ecosophy, in a book entitled The Three Ecologies (1981), when he proposes: mental (subjective) ecology, social ecology, and environmental ecology. In this text, the author already brings signs of in-depth discussion about the major contemporary global problems and the urgency of ethical-political stances, to avoid planetary collapse in several senses. It is interesting, in this sense, the author’s emphasis on what he calls a “searing paradox”:

[...] the continuous development of new technical-scientific means potentially capable of resolving the dominant ecological problems and determining the balance of socially useful activities on the surface of the planet, and the inability of organized social forces and constituted subjective formations to appropriate of these means to make them operative (GUATTARI, 1981, p. 12, our translation).
We then reach a crucial point, with Guattari’s reflection, which demonstrates the urgency of an Ecosophy of Tourism. In the historical drift of the development of Tourism and its corresponding knowledge, towards the consolidation of a consolidated universe of investigation – I do not call it the Science of Tourism, because that would be inconsistent with a holistic vision – we recognize intrinsic and profound values in their transversal, plural, condition, transdisciplinary, relevant to everything and everyone.

Tourism, in its activities and knowledge, concerns us all. In one way or another, Gaia, Planet Earth, is deeply and constantly marked by Tourism, whether in its ontological traits or its idiosyncrasies derived from the historical coupling with the bias of Integrated World Capitalism. Thus, we went through a long process of theorizations from the administrative perspective, of tourism management, with abundant production; passing through a critical vision, already contributing to understanding the limits and deceptions of a developmental logic of tourism, which is supported by facades with the veneer of commercial hospitality, with banners of sustainability; to reach the systemic vision, which also allows us to move forward to understand the connections and relationships of interdependence.

The ecosophical proposition, presented here, does not deny knowledge but proposes expansions of views and connections, guided by an epistemology that combines a holistic vision, with assumptions of complexity, of deep ecology, comprising contemporary chaosmosis (GUATTARI, 1992) – of chaos, osmosis in the cosmos – as challenges for the survival of all ecosystems, as well as the Tourism ecosystem, which I call Trama. In this sense, in reflections on phenomena such as tourismphobia, touristification, and gentrification, which expose in 'living flesh', 'out in the open' the existential, social, and economic wounds, in all instances of life, produced by thoughtless tourist practices, aimed at Capitalism's main objective, which is to generate and accumulate Capital.

During the pandemic, Edgar Morin (2020) offered us a reflective, guiding synthesis, in a book entitled “It’s Time to Change Paths. The Lessons of the Coronavirus”, in which he defends the emergence of a regenerated humanism. I think, in this sense, that the Ecosophy of Tourism invites us to also think about regenerated Tourism. Maturana, in his last book, proposed a “Reflexive Revolution”. Your constant questioning, in texts and seminars, leads us to reflect: what are we doing so that we can continue producing ourselves in harmony with our ecological niche? I can slide the reflection into our investigative universe and ask: what tourism are we going to continue producing, teaching, and building scientifically? What do we want with our productions and how can we make them lovely, ethically responsible, and agents of (self)transpoiesis power?
In other ways of asking: are we going to continue with practices that lead to hatred of Tourism, and tourists, practices that lead to the destruction of ecosystems, heritage, and subjectivity? Are we going to continue sowing precariousness of work, with the fading of taste, of the enjoyment inherent to the desirous deterritorializations of tourism, in its ontology of movement, of travel, of the intrinsic condition of nomads in peaceful and harmonious coexistence with the environment?

**Towards an Ecosophical Tourism-Weaver for the New World**

After the reflections presented here, I imagine that challenges, urgencies, and glimpses of our time have already been highlighted – in summary, as an outline – resulting from the theoretical-conceptual-existential coupling, expressed in the composition *Amorous and (Self)Transpoietic Ecosophical Tourism-Trama for the N'Ovo Mundo*. However, I return in summary. **Tourism** is a *weaver* because it is produced in complex subjective ecosystems that are transversal, in dynamics and processes of deterritorialization, reinventing worlds, reinventing beings, productive practices, relationships, technologies, procedures, “*com-versações* of places and subjects” (BAPTISTA, 2018; 2020; 2021).

**Tourism must be Ecosophical and Loving**, guided by the ethics of relationship and care, guided by public policies committed to the interaction between the three ecologies, recognizing that these are transversalized by others, in a grand and complex web of bundles, attracting flows, ritornellos, us, subjects, places, intertwining us, in short... **Tourism needs to be generator and generated by N'Ovo Mundo**, what is about to be born, in a recursive logic inherent to the very condition of budding life.

Tourism ontologically *has direct links with the production of life* and, in this sense, doing justice to this ontology, it needs to align itself with the dimensions of ecological wisdom, in order, and only thus, to contribute to its (self)transpoiesis, as well as to the (self)transpoiesis of places and subjects. In other words, the self-production of the planet, of humanity, involves interactions, connections, and deterritorializations with the founding devices of the existence of life.

Ontologically, travel, tourism, communication, and “*com-versações*” make up the generating potential of (self)transpoiesis, of production in and from ecological niches. The activation of ecological wisdom, of ecosophy, offers powerful signs of where we can follow, as well as the ecology of knowledge and the connection with the wisdom of native peoples.

In this sense, aligned with James Lovelock's Gaia Theory, Aiton Krenak (2020), one of
Brazil's many indigenous sages, teaches us: “We are microcosms of the Earth organism, we just need to remember that” (p. 72, our translation). He issues a warning, presenting a crucial equation: “Either you listen to the voice of all the other beings that inhabit the planet, or you wage war against life on Earth” (p. 73, our translation). There would be much more to say, many other theoretical and existential partners of ecosophical “com-versações” to mention, but the text, as a dated inscription, corresponds to marks in a certain communicational territory. This one will stop here. I end with Krenak's speech about hope because I think that, amid the hardships of bad weather, disasters, and catastrophes, we must continue cultivating the verb “to hopeful”, which Paulo Freire taught us. This is also why I propose and defend an Ecosophy of Toúrism, which can also be inferred in the words of Ailton Krenak (2020), in a text written during the pandemic, entitled Life is not Useful:

When we think about the possibility of a time beyond this, we dream of a world where humans will have to be reconfigured to move around. We will have to produce other bodies other affections, and dream other dreams to be welcomed by this world and be able to inhabit it. If we look at things this way, what we are experiencing today will be a crisis and a fantastic, promising hope (KRENAK, 2020, p. 47, our translation).
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