ACADEMIC REVIEW OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Vol.: 7 Issue: 2 Year: 2024, pp. 87-103

ARHUSS
ISSN: 2636-7645

INTEROBJECTIVITY FOR HARMONIOUS COEXISTENCE*

Canberk YURT[1]

Received Date (Başvuru Tarihi): 28/03/2023
Accepted Date (Kabul Tarihi): 11/11/2024
Published Date (Yayın Tarihi): 30/12/2024

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Object-oriented Ontology
Anthropocentrism
Ecocentrism
Ecology
Interobjectivity

The concept of culture has been formed through the conjectural superiority of humans over nature. Following anthropocentrism, humans have imposed humanly meanings into every object around them, whether they are tangible or intangible, and perceived them through their limited and directed cognition. Because of the manipulation of human interpretation, objects have been suspended from their essence. Humankind has ignored the natural interaction among objects and their own identity as presences. The notion of living in harmony with cultural and natural objects has been lost. This research criticizes anthropocentrism by analyzing the concepts like ecocentrism, effective altruism and interobjectivity. With this study, the interaction among humans, the positioning of culture and the notion of ecology have been evaluated from the object-oriented ecocentrism mindset. As a result, an alternative vision has been proposed for activating the harmonious coexistence of presences and interobjective structure among them.

AHENKLİ BİRLİKTE VAROLUŞ İÇİN NESNELERARASILIK

ÖZ

Anahtar Kelimeler

Nesne yönelimli ontoloji
İnsan merkezcilik
Eko-merkezcilik
Ekoloji
Nesnelerarasılık

Kültür kavramı, insanın doğaya varsayımsal üstünlüğü üzerinden şekillenmiştir. İnsan merkezciliği takiben, insanlar çevrelerindeki somut veya soyut her nesneye insani anlamlar yüklediler ve onları sınırlı ve yönlendirilmiş bilişsel kapasiteleri aracılığıyla algılamışlardır. İnsan yorumunun manipülasyonu nedeniyle nesneler özlerinden uzaklaştırılmıştır. İnsanoğlu, nesneler arasındaki doğal etkileşimi ve nesnelerin birer varlık olarak kendi kimliğini görmezden gelmiştir. Kültürel ve doğal nesnelerle uyum içinde yaşama anlayışı kaybolmuştur. Bu araştırma eko-merkezcilik, etkili özgecilik ve nesnelerarasılık gibi kavramları analiz ederek insanmerkezciliği eleştirmektedir. Bu çalışma ile insanlar arasındaki etkileşim, kültürün konumlandırılması ve ekoloji kavramı nesne yönelimli eko-merkezcilik zihniyetinden değerlendirilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, mevcudiyetlerin ahenkli birlikte varoluşları ve aralarındaki nesnel yapıyı harekete geçirmek için alternatif bir vizyon önerilmiştir.

Citation: Yurt, C. (2024), Interobjectivity For Harmonious Coexistence, ARHUSS, (2024), 7(2): 87-103.

**This study has been partially presented at the 14th 4T International Design and Design History Symposium.*

[1]*Öğr.Gör., İzmir Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, canberkyurt@iyte.edu.tr https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1691-5083*

1. INTRODUCTION

The view of a bay, over a cliff, through some tree branches that obstruct the vision, the tickling sound of falling water drops over some leaves to the ground, the comforting smell of wet soil, dozens of different types of timid warbles of birds, the light show of fireflies around the bushes, floating albatrosses over the smooth sea, the aesthetic harmony of randomly shaped islands, the dissipating dance of peaceful clouds, curvy lines of the shoreline and poetically swinging abstract forms that shape landscape are existing in harmony. And, the interrupting image of a cargo ship, the disturbing noise of traffic jams that block birds' singing, grey smoke clusters from factories that interfere with white clouds, disordered residents and buildings that are created with Cartesian geometry, complex electric poles that do obviously not belong to the environment, a fire that destroys the beauty of the wise forest are ruining the ecological harmony.

Each entity, each presence in the universe, has been re-evaluated by human vision, even before the era that they existed when humans have not existed. This effort of re-evaluation and definition through a singular perspective is named culture. Culture is an unnatural value creation system that is consisted of offering alternative ideas and visions about the dynamics of the ecosystem. It is a collective programming of the human mind (Hofstede, 1994) by the interpretations transferred from previous generations to following generations (Avruch, 1998). These interpretations can be formed under knowledge, tenets, art, ethics, law, habits, and such as parts of some value systems (Tylor, 1871) that are going to be transmitted through some tangible and intangible reflections while enlarging through the contributions of each generation (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). The reflections can be perceived through the visions, value systems, beliefs, common acceptances, and mutual actions of a particular group of humans (Matsumoto, 1996). Plus, as a transgenerational concept, culture is the product of these actions, which are the fundamentals of future human development decisions (Adler, 1997).

Humankind has been creating culture through the timeline by manipulating all living and non-living presences with limited cognitive abilities. All these catastrophic manipulations over the ecosystem are for just the advantage of one species (Albert, 2007). The destruction of the ecosystem is the consequence of human development, which is named civilization. Opposing the main aim of creating civilized societies through culture (Spencer-Oatey, 2008), the real-life outcomes have been proving the misleading results of

culture by disregarding non-human entities. For the sake of civilization, all tangible and intangible presences are the toys of the culture (Harari, 2014).

However, this problematic vision through the manipulation of basic symbolic forms (Zerzan, 1994) is also being used for misunderstood or misdefined entities. As a result of that, the limited cognition of humanity has tried to fill these gaps through the superior attitude of humanity by ignoring some natural values of the ecosystem. This mentality has occurred as anthropocentrism throughout the civilization of humanity.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Anthropocentrism: A Vision for Homemade Manipulative Culture

Since the existence of humankind, the world has been changed through an alternative vision (Harari, 2014). This vision has a self-prioritized and clustered ego-centric mindset that eventually eliminates the holistic and circular goodness (Naess, 1988) and the order of ecognosis (Morton, 2016).

Anthropocentrism is the answer to this definition. The word 'anthropocentrism' comes from the union of two words. Etymologically, the term 'ánthrōpos', which refers to the human being, and 'kéntron' from Ancient Greek, defines the centrism of humankind as anthropocentrism (Jones, 2003), which is the vision that emphasizes human beings are the most important entity in the universe. Anthropocentrism is defined by Merriam-Webster dictionary (2021) as the interpretation or consideration of the world in terms of human values and experiences. It is a hierarchically structured vision that ignores and patronizes non-human entities, natural processes and non-human tangible and intangible value chains by prioritizing cultural values and artificial systems.

With the constant dominance of humankind, this anthropocentric mindset has gained more privilege that even started to ignore other presences' natural rights and benefits. We are now experiencing the wicked consequences caused by the Neolithic grey temporalities (Morton, 2019) and the preferred period of the monocultural anthropocentric era. As a result, embracing an anthropocentric vision has caused some environmental, economic, cultural and social disorders (Norton, 1994) that constantly harm all living and non-living creatures and the ecosystem that consists of these presences (Iyer, 1999). The politics, social systems, nation-based ambitions and capital

concerns have caused non-sustainable relations among all systems (Albert, 2007). Briefly, through civilization, humanity chose culture over nature (Zerzan, 1994).

The main dynamics of anthropocentrism are about the manipulation of the existing harmony. Of course, some of the negative outcomes of human actions are unintentional; however, in the long run, the irresponsibility of humans to the whole ecosystem and the ignorance of non-human entities causes unsolvable and unsustainable, ecological problems. For instance, one of the most significant realizations of humans' choice of culture over nature is the Agricultural Revolution. Through the Agricultural Revolution, humanity has shifted the direction of civilization and changed the ecosystem's ongoing order and balance (Morton, 2016). With the emergence of sedentary lifestyles and the decreasing food sources against the increasing population, agricultural production has been increased through some developed methods and common experiences. Parallel to agricultural development, the average quality of life improved, the lifespan was extended, and the human population increased dramatically compared with hunter-gatherer societies. Following the increasing population and the need for food, humans cut down forests and turned them into farmlands and residential territories. Humanity has accelerated scientific research and innovative processes to compete with other groups of people and reach superiority and dominance over other presences (Diamond, 1987). Also, the integration of agrilogistics caused more environmental problems like; unsustainable transportation of goods, incompatible food production by crossbreeding over climates, drought, hunger and poverty through economic manipulations, and so on (Morton, 2016). In the long term, the direct and indirect consequences of agriculture have disrupted ecological balance and degraded the ecosystem by neglecting non-human entities. Over time, this process of re-evaluation has led to a transformation of the ecosystem and shifted the conception of the world from home for all presences towards a human-centric and anthropocentric habitat.

The manipulation of humanity is the bundle of conscious and subconscious efforts for changing everything's meaning through human interpretations (Harman, 2018). To perceive and understand the surroundings, natural phenomena, and systems that are hard to internalize, humans choose to reify for defining something over another defined object through their limited cognitions (Morton, 2013). In the process of agriculture, growth is the keyword for human civilization rather than development. Through the

growth, the anthropocentric mentality has directed humans to civilize for their own benefit. Utilitarianism has become the primary common consideration for humanity (Zerzan, 1994). Anthropocentrism has enabled scientific explorations and technological advancements by prioritizing humanity's utility and maximum profit. That is why, through the timeline, none of the scientific developments could have been capable enough to explain the origins of life and the absolute ecosystem of the universe. The biased scientific explanations also served humankind and prioritized the superiority of humans (Harman, 2017). From this problematic utilitarian vision, humans shaped the ecosystem through some anthropomorphic objects and concepts, as parallel to the development of culture (Garcia, 2014). As a result of these sensory manipulations of anthropomorphic human-made objects, the destruction of the ecosystem becomes perceivable. It is the most desperate way of being aware of the preponderance of culture over nature.

Contrary to the common anthropocentric vision of humanity, an alternative centric vision is being created, which is ecocentrism. Rather than prioritizing one kind's benefits, ecocentrism provides a better understanding and mentality to perceive and maintain a more harmonious ecosystem. Over the common vision of ecocentrism, some evaluations have been made from the perspective of object-oriented ontology.

2.2. From Naturecentrism to Object Oriented Ecocentrism

In consideration of analyzing ecocentrism, it is crucial to understand the etymological roots of ecology. The word 'ecology' is generated by the conjunction of two words: 'oikos' and 'logos'. Unlikely the general sense of the direct link between ecology and nature, oikos refers to concepts like 'house', 'home' and 'domicile' (Morton, 2016). So, ecology can be considered 'the study of the common living environment'. When considering the etymological roots, ecology represents a holistic point of view to define habitatus. At first, this definition creates a plausible sense of why ecology directly links with the natural environment (Morton, 2013). However, because of the anthropocentric mentality of humans, there is a problematic gap between these two concepts that break the equation. Humans have to surpass the ethical dilemma of what humans are going to be and what humans are supposed to be for the continuity of the ecosystem (Fry, 2019) to fill the problematic gap.

For detecting the gap between ecology and nature, it is critical to evaluate the concept of ecocentrism – which is a response to the anthropocentric vision. Contrary to

anthropocentric approaches (Shoreman-Ouimet & Kopnina, 2016), ecocentric approaches accept the importance of all living forms and objects to the use-value accorded to nature in other ecological perspectives (Eckersley, 1992). The basic premise driving the ecocentric philosophy is that the value of the nonhuman world is independent of its utility to the human world, as the nonhuman world is valuable for its goodness (Naess, 1988). According to Rowe (1994), ecocentrism is a misperception of the understanding that assumes all materiality is for humankind. It starts with the acceptance of the idea that 'the extinction of humankind is not equal to the apocalypse' (Moynihan, 2020). Ecocentrism activates absolute ethical norms that concern about the ecosphere (Rowe, 1994) and prioritizes the equalized conditions of ecognosis (Morton, 1996). To activate this ethical point of view, ecocentrism tries to go beyond humanism and biocentrism (Frim, 2017) and consider non-living objects by accepting them as the other entities of the ecosystem (Rowe, 1994). Through that understanding, more than considering other living creatures' sake, ecocentrism also values non-living presences because of their inevitable roles in ecological togetherness.

Unfortunately, even if the ecocentrism mentality goes beyond biocentrism, it could not be able to go beyond the nature-centric vision, so far. In the nature-centric vision, all living and non-living entities are singular ecosystem members. However, the interactions among these presences are discarded (Harman, 2017). Naturecentrism ignores the earlier stages of a dynamic presence, the raw materials that transform into different objects or the mutuality among organisms. However, the interrelational harmonious togetherness of living and non-living and tangible and intangible presences in the ecosystem could be analyzed through unseen and unperceivable bonds and functionings rather than their sole existences (Morton, 2016).

Object-Oriented Ontology comes up with the idea of the essence of ecology (Morton, 2013). The essence of ecology is not just directly related to nature and habitatus. The concept of ecology is the holistic system that enables each presence to survive in harmony. The essence is much farther away than the humanly embodied or conceptualized presences (Morton, 2016). All entities in the ecosystem are connected through some mesh structures and define interrelational processes through the nods and imperceptible intersectional value clusters (Harman, 2017). These nods are more characteristic, identical and vital than what they connect. They create the main aspects of

interobjectivity. Also, the mesh structure of objects is more than the nods. The conceptual spaces between nods create permeability, which is ignored by human vision. With the ignorance of permeable objects, the manipulation of human cognition shaped the ecological contexts into cultural productions (Harman, 2018). At this point, the misconception of ecocentrism happens. Through the limited cognitive abilities of humans and the grounded mentality of anthropocentrism, humans directly link the concept of ecology with the concept of nature (Eckersley, 1992). So, as they degrade ecocentrism to nature-centrism.

For instance, humans propose some solutions to sustain the ecosystem and solve unsustainable problematic processes, which are defined by the anthropocentric view. However, these solutions are not different enough from the other artificial objects made to fit the ecosystem. Humankind tries to sustain without absolute environmental consciousness and without having enough idea about what to sustain or what is supposed to be sustained (Morton, 2013). Ecological consciousness is just limited by the borders of human mental abilities.

From an anthropocentric – even from a nature-centric point of view, all entities in the ecosystem are just like one of the gears in a complex mechanism. Each gear has a function and duty in order to operate the mechanism. The orderly and designed togetherness of those gears provides a well-functioning system. However, a gear, solely, does not have enough importance if it is not integrated into the mechanism. On the other hand, if the mechanism does not work, the instant value of the whole decreases. A common phrase explains this anthropocentric mentality; 'The whole is *greater* than the sum of its parts'. This ontic mindset engenders biased and undesirable outcomes, which result from the privileging of a specific kind.

Unlikely anthropocentrism, from the object-oriented perspective, 'The whole is *lesser* than the sum of its parts' (Harman, 2018). Because, while creating a whole, the sole value and immanent data of a singular entity are being disregarded through the manipulation of humans. Humans think that each part of the whole is replaceable with another same-functioning part. However, from an object-oriented perspective, because of the interobjectivity among parts, creating whole disregards the singular existence of parts and decreases their importance in the whole. Also, another problematic issue about this human-centric vision is that humans assume that they have a superior right to organize

the ecology and manage the whole ecosystem. As a result of considering all living and non-living presences are the servants of humanity (Zerzan, 1994), self-centered humanity seeks to dominate the ecosystem, decide about the future of other presences and manipulate them for human benefit through the operation of complex mechanisms. This superior utilitarian perspective can even be observed in humans' nature-centric vision. In order to save the planet from unsustainable outcomes or prevent a species from extinction, the nature-centric vision serves for humanity to prove its dominance and absolute monarchy over other presences in the ecosystem. Humanity claims itself as an absolute authority and a final decision-maker for determining the future of non-human species. With limited mental abilities, humans try to help other species and create a positive impact on ongoing processes (MacAskill, 2019). Unfortunately, the ongoing problems, unsustainable processes, and dysfunctional ecological solutions prove that anthropocentrism and nature-centrism are not sufficient and efficient enough to maintain harmonious coexistence among all presences in the whole ecosystem.

That is why it is crucial to define a new alternative ecocentric vision that embraces whole presences and their interrelational togetherness. It is possible by eliminating human superiority and prioritizing ecological egalitarianism. By considering interobjectivity between presences and relating the interactions through the mesh structures, absolute harmony could be analyzed in the ecosystem. The optimization of balanced common benefits among presences could be only achieved through simulating the interobjectivity of each interrelational cybernetics between entities (Pangaro, 1996). For reaching those goals, activating object-oriented ecocentrism rather than nature-based ecocentrism is crucial. Object-oriented ecocentrism is the possible answer to tolerate conflicting notions and deficits of anthropocentrism and nature-based ecocentrism. From the perspective of object-oriented ecocentrism, the methodology of interobjectivity could be defined to reach harmonious coexistence.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. Towards Harmonious Coexistence

In the footsteps of anthropocentrism and nature-based ecocentrism, humans try to maintain justice and absolute harmony by activating benevolent behaviors and devoted attitudes. As a result of these endeavors, humans assume that they obtain useful solutions that create remarkable differences in non-human presences' lives. However, this "self-

superior, ego-centric" approach is not capable of obtaining absolute egality and sustainable mechanisms in the ecosystem. The way of interaction with and the level of interference in the ecological processes is the problematic issue from the human perspective. Does the way of reaching the absolute ecocentric vision rely on creating a considered vision about helping non-human entities let them survive better than before? Is it about asking questions to determine the most effective ways to benefit others (MacAskill, 2019)? How can a human or the whole humanity decide what is the best thing to do, individually or collectively (Singer, 2015)? Through these ethical considerations, is it possible to find out the common vision to cover altruism for the whole (Parfit, 1984); or by ignoring some of the presences in a particular altruist action, is it still going to be an anthropocentric interference that puts another brick on the pile of injustice?

As humans, we reify (Harman, 2017), define and classify objects by grouping their comparable and common specifications with other objects defined again by human cognitive abilities. Objects are correlated with the bundle of qualities embodied between pre-defined borders (Hume, 1973). However, this bundle of qualities may misrepresent an object's actual context and content. That is why defining these qualities as an apple is how to manipulate that object. Also, ignoring the interactive mesh structure (Harman, 2017) and cybernetic communicational network systems (Pangaro, 1996) between objects creates a misconception about the essence of an object. Defining objects without reducing their value makes them free (Morton, 2013). Giving objects their essential and existential qualities without putting them into some molds is the starting point to defining interobjectivity (Harman, 2017). The interaction among all entities could be defined by giving autonomous attributions, and interobjective relations could be characterized through the equalization of these entities (Morton, 2013). Desisting self-superiority is the critical factor for humans to integrate themselves into the interobjective ecosystem of entities. The possibility of reaching object-oriented ecocentrism may be reached by changing anthropocentric and nature-based ecocentric vision into interobjectivity vision.

As following Derek Parfit's (1984) self-defeating vision, reaching interobjectivity among all living and non-living presences is possible by reducing human interference to the natural interactions and loops. The perspective of ignoring self-existence and widening impersonality (Parfit, 1984) can provide an inactive stance across each entity in the whole ecosystem. However, even though self-defeating and effective altruism

approaches have directed mentalities and are capable of creating a good impact on numerous presences and ecological mechanisms, they do not have enough holistic approaches to ensure harmonious coexistence and ecological egalitarianism. Without obtaining a holistic and sustainable coexistence methodology, it is not possible to reach absolute self-defeating, altruism, and ethical and harmonious ecological mechanisms. Instead, the interobjective approach is about operating an even more passive existence than the idea of 'zero negatives, more positive human impact' of effective altruism mentality (Singer, 2015). Object-Oriented Interobjectivity is possible by creating a humbler approach than optimizing goodness.

There are two requirements for reaching absolute interobjectivity to maintain the harmonious coexistence of all presences:

a. Conscious retreat

The conscious retreat is a quiescent human approach to interspecies interaction systems that promote ecological egalitarianism. In order to tolerate the catastrophes humanity has caused through civilization and recover the damage that has been given to the ecosystem, humankind has to retreat from the focus points of the ecological mechanisms. Decentralization of humankind from the focal point of humans and non-humans will offer possibilities to reach co-existence (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017). Minimizing human interference in the ecological mechanisms could maintain harmony and egality across the presences. The dysfunctional and unsustainable human-caused catastrophes could be neutralized with the contribution of resilient and self-healing aspects of ecological mechanisms.

Even this withdrawal of humankind through object-oriented ecocentric positioning is a passive process in the first place, it is a conscious intervention, and it requires some regenerative actions. With the emergence of the total conscious retreat of humans, the balance across presences will be changed into an alternative harmonious atmosphere from the human-dominant ecosystem. Some unexpected problems would occur through this change because of the gradually evolving ecological equilibrium. Eventually, error suppression previsions have to be made to prevent these problems. According to this precautionary analysis, some actions have to be planned and applied by following the ongoing changes in the ecosystem. Also, this analysis and action plan

outcomes will guide the whole humanity to follow through this complex retreat process in harmony and balance.

As a result of this gradually occurring process, with the help of a well-designed cybernetic dialogue system (Balint & Pangaro, 2017), there will be some palpable and imperceptible outcomes that provide feedback and signs of change. In consideration of imperceptible outcomes, there will be no direct references to the sensible qualities of existing presences. Instead, there will be comparable data about the changing outcomes through contextual togethernesses with other minor mechanisms or presences. This comparable data will enable us to evaluate the abstruse impacts of the chained reactions in the ecosystem. It is possible to perceive the change with the human senses through palpable outcomes. The change in the morphological level and the reflections of the prevailing egalitarian, ecological form language could be perceived directly. By recovering the tangible manipulations on the ecosystem because of anthropomorphism (Garcia, 2014), a harmonious sensible ecosystem could be maintained.

However, while recovering and regenerating the ecosystem by conscious retreat and object-oriented ecocentric positioning of humankind, a crucial turning point is sustaining the instantly balanced and harmonious coexistence. To sustain these gradually improving harmonious mechanisms, some self-steering methodology has to be generated synchronously. As the past has its own futurality (Morton, 2019), the contextualization of particular periods of change needs constant updates and adaptational responses. For that, interobjective collaboration has been defined as a second requirement to reach absolute harmonious coexistence.

b. Interobjective collaboration

Parallel to the conscious retreat of humanity, interobjective collaboration is defined to enrich and perpetuate the equilibrium of the ecosystem as a complementary process. It mostly concentrates on the interobjectivity of presences and the possible balanced connection between new value clusters. Following the gradually changing newnesses through the conscious retreat of humankind, naturally defined ecological interactions and object-oriented mesh structures have to be activated to sustain and improve the inner mechanisms in the ecosystem.

For reaching this aim, the critical nods in the mesh structures interobjectivity network have to be defined. The nods as intersections of the network define the crucial

interaction among presences. Unlikely anthropocentric perspective, these nods will be defined as mutual existence centers for interacting presences. Defining the presences that create these nods by considering their interrelational aspects and not undermining or overmining them into human cognition (Harman, 2018) enables preventing misconceptions and fitting objects into molds. Also, defining mutual togethernesses of the presences that create nods as their characteristics ensures the shared values through intersections. Also, these nods can be considered safety lock systems in the interobjective collaboration system. The presences interacting with each other and connected through nods will be signed as the stakeholders of a collaborative process in action. Each group of presence can define interrelational inner structures to define sub-systems. This sub-system will behave as another presence to make a safe collaboration sustain itself. Through this chained reaction, each sub-system and each presence that creates them will be connected with the others to create a harmonious collective ecosystem. To ensure the sustainability of the interobjective collaboration system, each nod will be sealed by natural interdependence. Because of the need for collaboration to survive, each presence in each nod will be dependent on the mutual partner. As a result, the possible manipulation of humans in the system will be prevented by the self-regulating safety mechanism of the ecosystem. This collaborative interdependence will ensure collective coexistence harmoniously.

From the perspective of non-human presences - whether they are living or non-living presences – the interobjectivity could be defined, and the ecological mechanisms function naturally by the laws of the ecosystem. However, the integration of humankind as a conscious species has to be a regulatory control mechanism to prevent anthropocentric manipulations. Again, because of being one of the most successfully evolved species at the consciousness level, humans – or their capable technological advancements have to organise the interobjective interactions between each pulsing mechanism that humans are interfering with. Humans' cultural productions and technical possibilities could be reconsidered and redesigned to serve to construct the interobjectivity simulation.

For instance, non-biased strategy creation could be possible when considering artificial intelligence technology. For eliminating the anthropocentric manipulation possibilities to the harmonious and coexistable ecosystem, artificial general intelligence

and artificial consciousness may provide non-prioritized ecological dynamics. Through simulating the mesh structured network among the presences and defining the roles and the critical points of the natural interactions by artificial intelligence, interobjectivity could be conceptualised. Through this conceptualization, the mutual relation between entities could be defined by guaranteeing the optimum profit of the whole ecosystem. Through this collaborative togetherness, each network creates its own inevitable interaction that will shape the collaborative rules and regulations of the harmonious and coexistable ecosystem. Also, an uncommitted controller could track the harmonious ecosystem's constant motion.

On the other hand, strategize an egalitarian, ecological system with a current human-dominant common worldview. With limited human cognition, it is not possible to perceive absolute harmonious coexistence in action. So, the assumption about AI-based interobjectivity and many more assumptions like this could be inefficient to strategise the inexperienced ecological theory. For that, the conscious retreat movement may inspire and inform humankind to have absolute ecological awareness and sensitivity. From that point, related strategies and approaches to the interobjective ecosystem could be designed more precisely. But still, no matter what is the most appropriate way to bring interobjective collaboration to life, its outcomes will provide mutual togethernesses among all living and non-living presences.

As a result of successfully applied interobjectivity by following the methodologies of two requirements, the absolute equilibrium could be achieved. Ecological contexture will be maintained rather than the reification of objects and the choice of activating the interobjective evaluation mentality. Embracing the exact aspects and functionings of objects, by the definition of interrelational bonds with other presences, will enable humans to perceive and internalize the holistic and inclusive common world vision. All presences will be regarded with their sole values and immanent data to be sure about the collaborative capabilities. Besides, object-oriented ecocentrism will be the key factor to digesting the idea that ecology is more than nature and the parts are more than the whole. Through the leadership of well-understood mesh structures between presences, egality across the ecosystem will be achieved by integrating a more sustainable concept than effective altruism. Rather than anthropocentric utilitarianism, absolute mutual and collective utility across the ecosystem will be maintained. Without prioritizing any

species, ethical, harmonious coexistence could be reached with the guidance of interobjectivity.

4. CONCLUSION

Through civilization, the anthropocentric vision of humanity and the reflections of manipulative culture has caused the current catastrophic problems and broken ecological harmony. Contrary to the ecocentric approach, monocentric human dominant strategies have ended with some hierarchical and biased outcomes that strengthen one species' superiority over other living and non-living entities. As a result of common activities of anthropocentrism, the ecology breaks down and turns into an unsustainable ecosystem.

As a response to this dysfunctional order and in the light of object-oriented ecocentrism, the vision of interobjectivity provides an alternative approach by considering each object's priorities without prioritizing them hierarchically. By defining some interlinked relations between objects - covering all living and non-living entities – there is a possibility of activating harmonious systematics that considers any particle in the ecosystem. For reaching absolute interobjectivity, there are two main requirements to be achieved. The first requirement is the conscious retreat of humankind. Eliminating existential anxiety and human ambitions is one possible key to reaching the interobjective harmony of the "oikos". Reducing human interference in ecological loops and retreat as a conscious activity will be both retroactive compensation and regenerative trigger factors for interobjective harmony. Following the first requirement, the second requirement is activating interobjective collaboration among all entities to ensure the common benefits in inner loops under the common ecosystem. By starting the interobjective collaboration, it is possible to optimize harmonious interpretation levels of objects and reach non-hierarchical, non-prioritized and non-manipulative interrelationships among harmonious loops in the ecosystem.

By applying these two requirements as recovery and regeneration tools, the aim of reaching better functioning sustainable loops in the newly regenerated ecosystem is achievable. In order to maintain the harmonic coexistence of all objects in the ecosystem, the steps of absolute interobjectivity are critical. In further studies, some research could be conducted from the perspectives of object-oriented ontology and absolute interobjectivity to determine possible improvement points of existing efforts to reach harmonious coexistence. Through the outcomes of these further studies, it is possible to

extend two requirements and their pathways in detail for the implementation level. Also, with the help of some case studies in the future, it is feasible to figure out some concrete conclusions to ground the theory of interobjectivity for harmonic coexistence.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. (1997). *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. 3rd ed. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.

Albert, M. (2007). *Practical Utopia: Strategies for a Desirable Society*. PM Press.

Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Balint, T. and Pangaro, P. (2017). Design Space for Space Design: Dialogs Through Boundary Objects at the Intersections of Art, Design, Science, and Engineering. *Acta Astronautica*, 134, 41-53.

Diamond, J. (1987). Agriculture: The Worst Mistake in the History of the Human Race. *Discovery Magazine.* pp. 64–66

Eckersley, R. (1992). *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach*. SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

Fry, T. (2019). Starting at the End: A Journey in Time. *Journal of Futures Studies,* 23(4), 159–164. Retrieved March 14, 2022, from https://jfsdigital.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/18-Fry-Starting_at_the_End.pdf

Garcia, T. (2014). *Form and Object.* Edinburg University Press Ltd.

Harari, Y. N. (2014). *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. Vintage.

Harman, G. (2017). *Object-Oriented Ontology: A New Theory of Everything.* Pelican Random House.

Harman, G. (2018). *Speculative Realism: An Introduction*. Polity Press.

Hofstede, G. (1994). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* London: Harper Collins Business.

Hume, D. (1978). *Treatise of human nature* (L. A. Selby-Bigge, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Iyer, G. R. (1999). Business, consumers and sustainable living in an interconnected world: A multilateral ecocentric approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20, 273-288. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006095304996

Jones, D. (2003). [1917] In Peter, R., James, H., & Jane, S. (eds.). *English Pronouncing Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN 978-3-12-539683-8.

Kroeber, A. L. and Kluckhorn, C. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Peabody Museum, Cambridge, MA, 181.

Frim, L. (2017). Humanism, Biocentrism, and the Problem of Justification. *Ethics, Policy & Environment.* 20(3): 243–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/21550085.2017.1374008

Macaskill, W. (2019). The Definition of Effective Altruism. In Greaves, H., & Pummer, T. (eds.). *Effective Altruism: Philosophical Issues*. Engaging philosophy. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 10–28. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198841364.003.0001

Matsumoto, D. (1996). *Culture and Psychology.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Merriam-Webster (2021). *Anthropocentric.* In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved January 6, 2021, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anthropocentric

Morton, T. (2013). *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World.* University of Minnesota Press.

Morton, T. (2016). *Dark Ecology: For a Logic of Future Coexistence.* Columbia University Press

Morton, T. (2019). You Never Know How the Past Will Turn Out. *Journal of Futures Studies*. 23(4): 97–100. https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201906_23(4).0009

Moynihan, T. (2020). Existential risk and human extinction: An intellectual history, *Futures,* 116, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.102495

Naess, A. (1988). *Deep Ecology and Ultimate Premises*, *Society and Nature*. 1, 108–119.

Norton, B. (1994). Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an ecocentric approach. *Ecological Economics*, 10(3), 266-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8009(94)90114-7

Pangaro, P. (1996). *Cybernetics and conversation. Communication and Anti-communication.* Retrieved March 9, 2007.

Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press. ISBN13: 9780198249085

Puig de La Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds*. University of Minnesota Press.

Rowe, S. J. (1994). Ecocentrism: the Chord that Harmonizes Humans and Earth. *The Trumpeter*, 11(2): 106-107.

Shoreman-Ouimet, E., Kopnina, H. (2016). *Culture and Conservation: Beyond Anthropocentrism*. Oxon: Routledge. pp. 8–9. ISBN 9781315858630.

Singer, P. (2015). *The Most Good You Can Do: How Effective Altruism Is Changing Ideas About Living Ethically*. Castle lectures in ethics, politics, and economics. New Haven: Yale University Press. ISBN 9780300180275.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally Speaking. Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. 2nd edition. London: Continuum.

Tylor, E. (1871). *Primitive Culture: Research into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom.* New York: J. P. Putnam's Sons.

Zerzan, J. (1994). *Future Primitive and Other Essays.* Autonomedia.