**Alma Benešová**

**3. What does it mean to address environmental conflict as political ontology? How does this facilitate a pluriverse (a world of many worlds) rather than a universe?**

At first we should define the conflicts is about too early. The so called environment has another meaning to the participants of the involved parties. For one, it can be a cultural heritage, ancestors our a place to make money of the resources. We don't know the meaning before. In the second part we should differentiate that not all conflicts involving indigenous people are ontological conflicts. *“Performance, not group ascription, is the key process we must attend to in evaluating whether we should treat a conflict as ontological or not. In effect, treating conflicts as cultural or*

*resource-distribution conflicts might in many cases very well be the most productive*

*and politically sensitive way to intervene.”* (pp. 24)

At third the political ontology should be opening up possibilities that can lead to the commitment to the pluriverse. We should respect all parties and not stand on the viewpoint that culture is just acceptable and “real” if it comes from an western standpoint. If we would do so, we would be dichotomising these conflicts into “higher” and “lower” culture, “real” and “unreal” culture.

If we use Descolas delineates four basic ontological armatures (pp. 22), we can see how different the perception of the same thing is. (As well described by the atherosclerosis example in the hospital) The different parties have different perception based on the different realities they were experiencing, living and formed through they life. Each experience should be having the same value. Therefore the theory of political ontology supports the idea of a pluriverse rather then an universe, that is build for now on hierarchical, western epistemology.