

philosophers stands out in Foucault's thinking precisely because of its public value as a bodily manifestation of truth and a denunciation of everything that is inessential in our behavior – thus overlapping with what Foucault calls a «historical ontology of ourselves». From a similar point of view, Colapietro redefines self-care as a historically situated and collective practice, where subjectivity is constituted through somatic, cultural, and relational pathways, without presupposing a solitary, sovereign subject. Finally, Jay proposes – against Shusterman's theory of *soma* – to maintain the duality between the lived body (*Leib*) and the physical body (*Körper*) in order to establish a new politics of life and vulnerable corporeality that rejects both the redemptive logic of sacrifice for a greater good and the biopolitical management of death.

As this brief overview shows, the volume opens rich and compelling directions for further inquiry. It not only presents fresh contributions to the often-saturated field of Foucault studies, but it also brings Shusterman's somaesthetics into productive dialogue with Foucauldian thought, showing how his pragmatist approach to embodied experience can enrich the political and ethical stakes of philosophical reflection on the body. Pushing the slogan «the personal is political» to its most radical expression, these studies focus on our physicality, our pleasures, and our capacity to act on ourselves and in the world, in the name of an autonomy that is not abstract but rooted in the very fibers and tissues of our being.

Notes

¹ Shusterman notes that Foucault paid little attention to the visual arts, especially painting (p. 132). However, I would argue the opposite: the introduction to *The Order of Things* on Velázquez's *Las Meninas*, the Tunisian lectures on Manet, and his analysis of Magritte's *Ceci n'est pas une pipe* all suggest that painting played a significant role in his thought.

ALESSIO PORRINO
University of Salerno, Italy

SPEAKING WITH NATURE: THE ORIGINS OF INDIAN ENVIRONMENTALISM. By Ramachandra Guha. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2024, 407 pp.

Ramachandra Guha's *Speaking with Nature: The Origins of Indian Environmentalism* is an enlightening narrative of Indian Environmental thoughts, covering a span of one and a half centuries, beginning from the mid-nineteenth century to the last decade of the twentieth century. As a veteran historian and intellectual, Guha reflects upon the thoughts of Indian pioneer thinkers, through a series of essays, whose ideas anticipated the debates of modern environmentalism, pertaining to the past, present and future of human relations with the natural world. Guha aims to offer something distinguished that fills the void of Indian voices in the global environmental debates. In doing so, he challenges both neoliberal developmental ideas and the romanticisation of rudimentary practices, offering a distinct path of critical enquiry, ethical restraint, and a pluralistic approach.

Beginning with Introduction, the book points out that Indian environmentalism, unlike the West (whose environmentalism is rooted in elite aesthetic engagement of naturalist John Muir and wild-life biologist Aldo Leopold), has its basis in grassroot initiatives such as peasants' movement (like the Chipko), tribals' harmonious co-existence with nature, and women's struggles against exploitation of natural resources. Assimilating the key figures of Indian ecological thought like Radhakamal Mukerjee, J.C. Kumarappa, Mahatma Gandhi and others, Guha underlines how their philosophies and activism shaped an ethical and intellectual basis for environmental consciousness, thus invoking a new wave of Indian environmentalism centred around the provoked challenges of climate change.

Chapter One (“The Myriad-Minded Environmentalism”) reclaims Rabindranath Tagore as one of the pioneer environmentalists, placing him before Gandhi. Guha draws attention towards the largely ignored aspect of Tagore’s writings, which are rooted in his immersive life with nature, spanning from his childhood in rural Bengal to his educational establishment at Santiniketan. In this effort, Guha could not resist comparing Tagore’s ‘profound kinship’ with nature to that of American Environmentalist John Muir, a level the world had denied to an Indian writer. The chapter considers Tagore’s immersion trip to native Bengal, majestic Himalaya, forests and mountains of Europe, and the tropical island of Bali; his sonnet collection *Chaitali*; his anthologies such as *Banabani* (The Voice of Forest); and his anti-industrial philosophy, which reclaim his position as one of the earliest environmentalists of modern world. In summation of this chapter, Guha highlights Tagore’s aesthetic aversion to industrialism, which he links with imperialism.

Chapter Two (“Ecological Sociologist”) focuses on Radhakamal Mukerjee’s synthesis of ecology and sociology in colonial India. Guha underlines that Mukerjee’s writings show his keen interest in the ecological basis and economic life, which he used to reveal the narrowness and prejudices of Western sociologists. Mukerjee exposes the Western model of industrialisation, which ruptures the village-centric social order and community life. Mukerjee’s writings in the 1930s and 40s proposed an eco-ethic rooted in regional co-operation and harmony, and he exposed the European education system by iterating that ‘farm life in the country is educative, morally and intellectually’. However, Guha’s observation that Mukerjee’s writings have been more centrally ecological than those of Tagore puts him next to Tagore as a pioneer environmentalist, but far away from achieving his glory.

Chapter Three (“Gandhi Economist”) accounts for J.C. Kumarappa’s ecological vision, rooted in the sustainable practices of rural India. Guha juxtaposes Kumarappa’s ecological ideas with those of Gandhi, who criticised both Western capitalism and Soviet communism, referring to them as a variant of the exploitative production system. His crucial advisory role in the Planning Commission of India (1951) contributed remarkably to forest management, transportation system, and agricultural fertiliser usage. Still, they met with failure due to a lack of a philosophy of life. However, Guha’s critical narrative features Kumarappa’s ecological wisdom for water conservation, fertiliser overuse, forest protection and protection of artisans, relevant in the Anthropocene for sustainable practices in rural India. Though the chapter recaptures the relevance of Kumarappa’s vision in environmental discourse, a closure account of his Christian background could have enriched the narrative.

Chapter Four (“Scottish Internationalist”) considers Patrick Geddes, a scholar of cities and practitioner of urban renewal, whose ecological vision stretched from Scotland to India. Guha appreciates Geddes’s holistic vision for urban planning in India, which aimed at a respectful integration of Indian Nature, Democracy and Tradition. Guha highlights Geddes’s deeply ecological town plans in four respects, which are, the first, the city as defined by its relationship to water; the second, spaces, however small, claimed by trees; the third, minimised city’s dependence on the hinterland; and the fourth, the city’s emphasis on recycling. In other words, Geddes’s central plan was to harmonise town and country, where nature is a means to an end. Having this vision, Geddes wrote his ambitious city plans for Indore, Balrampur, and Dacca. At the same time, his urban ecological vision was marginalised in the major planning discourse and overshadowed by imperial architects like Lutyens. In addition, Guha points out that Geddes’s renewal plans for Indian cities were not a product of his mind but copied from an ancient Indian urban system, especially of Banaras, which had so far not been considered for urban planning.

Chapter Fifth (“Dissenting Scientists”) appreciates Albert and Gabrielle Howard for their efforts to trace the genesis of organic farming through their experiments in India. When critiquing Indian commercialised agriculture, under the rubric of the ‘Green Revolution’, Howards’ experiments provided an alternative to industrial agriculture rooted in colonial agronomy. Their methods are rooted in observation, soil regeneration, and the traditional agricultural wisdom of India. In doing so, they critically comment on Rachel Carson for what she did not say in her groundbreaking book,

Silent Spring. What is common in Carson's and Howards' studies is their critical commentaries on using fertilisers and pesticides in agriculture. Their work also brought forth the global organic movement and inspired many thinkers like Wendell Berry. Though Guha celebrates the Howards' contribution to agricultural sciences and sustainability efforts, Gabrielle Howard's independent effort would have strengthened the feminist dimension of the chapter.

Chapter Six ("Gandhi's Englishwoman") traces the life of Gandhi's adopted daughter and British disciple, Mira Behn (Madeleine Slade). Mira Behn not only provided political aid to Gandhi but also, as a devoted ecological thinker, contributed to rural regeneration, sustainable agriculture, and forest conservation. Her works on the Himalaya foothills are accounts of the early critique of the degradation of the forest ecosystem and growing industrial farming. She tried to bring the Gandhian ideals of ecological practices to the ground, but met with little success. Guha reconstructs her emotional and ideological journey, revealing her romantic ideals about rural life, which needed a more critical scrutiny. However, the chapter examines a woman's environmental legacy, who represented a transitional environmental solidarity. Like Vandana Shiva, her contributions to raising ecological concerns about the biodiversity of the Himalayan forests have placed her among the great Indian environmentalists.

Chapter Seven ("Culture in Nature") explores Verrier Elwin's deep ethnological engagement with tribal ecology. Being a British-born Indian citizen, Elwin documented the forest cultures of Baiga and other tribals and defended their intimate relationship with the forest ecosystem. Guha highlights that the significance of the forests in tribal life is a running theme in Elwin's writings. Elwin contrasts the ethnographic approach with the bureaucratic methods of the colonial officials, and believes in the sustainable ecological cultures, embedded in tribal songs, myths and rituals. Guha successfully portrays Elwin as both romantic and realist, aware of environmental fragility and tribal marginality. Having been appointed Anthropological Adviser to the administration of the North-East Frontier Agency (NEFA), he defended tribals' ecological genius, their rights, and demanded their participation in forest administration. However, Guha does not easily let go of Elwin's paternalism, which complicated his activism.

Chapter Eight ("The First Hindutva Environmentalist") is an unexpected addition to the pantheon of Indian Environmentalists. Guha scrutinises K.M. Munshi's environmentalism, especially the inception of *Vana Mahotsava* (the Grand Festival of the Forest) during his tenure as Minister of Food and Agriculture. Guha sees Munshi's vision rooted more in political opportunity and romantic ideals, promoting tree plantations around sacred Hindu Temples and often quoting Sanskrit aphorisms. Guha disapproves of Munshi for patting himself on the back, who believed that *Vana Mahotsava* would arouse mass consciousness regarding the significance of trees. Both Hindutva proponents and environmentalists later forgot Munshi's fusion of Hindu religiosity with ecological nationalism. Despite this, his attempts to align religious identity with environmental discourse illustrate its significance in the early phase of environmental activism. However, Guha carefully investigates Munshi's legacy to appraise the selective historical imprints in Indian environmentalism.

Chapter Nine ("Speaking for Nature") profiles India's pioneer wildlife writer and photographer, M. Krishnan. Guha presents him as a conservationist who spoke 'for' nature rather than 'with' nature. Unlike other conservationists, Krishnan focused on flora and fauna themselves, urging for their protection irrespective of their instrumental values. Guha appreciates Krishnan's activism for underappreciated landscapes and liminal spaces like shrubs, bushes and wetlands, for recognising the intrinsic aesthetic value of this biodiversity. At the same time, Guha reproaches Krishnan's elitist and exclusionary tendencies, especially his negligence towards tribal and peasants' rights, and his refusal to acknowledge the colonial history of the Indian Forest Department. His distinct representation of wildlife reflects the tension between preserving wilderness and social justice. Nevertheless, Guha appreciates Krishnan for upholding and advocating for the rights of nature, whose legacy contributes to the current discourse on conservation ethics.

Chapter Ten (“Epilogue”) revisits the central question: what usage do past environmentalisms serve in today’s ecological crisis? Guha cautions against romanticising ‘indigenous’ ecological traditions or the uncritical application of Euro–American frameworks to South Asia. Instead, he urges a grounded and pluralistic approach, which is drawn critically from the intellectual history of India. Also, the epilogue successfully portrays the complex, layered nature of Indian environmentalism, rooted in cultural, religious, scientific and political ideas. Guha does not offer detailed answers to the current ecological crisis, but his scholarly restraint allows for a more engaged and meaningful discussion between past and present environmental thoughts.

In conclusion, Guha’s *Speaking with Nature* stresses that Indian environmentalism cannot be understood through the lens of Western environmentalism. Instead, the book calls for a critical synthesis that respects traditional ecological wisdom, subject to critical inquiry and scientific rigour. Its lucid, classy and engaging essays call for participation by both academicians and lay audiences. They are a repository of lesser-known historical details and analysis, but without jargon or abstraction. However, Guha’s documentation cannot go away without critique, because of its focus on elite figures and organised movement, which marginalises undocumented and diffuse forms of ecological resistance. Also, the representation of insufficient marginalised voices limits the book’s claim to be of a comprehensive nature. Nonetheless, as the world confronts the crises of environmental degradation and democratic decline, the book effectively urges us to regain the wisdom of those who spoke with nature out of necessity, solidarity, and hope.

PANKAJ KUMAR VERMA

Woxsen University, Hyderabad, India

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WORSHIP: DIVINE AND HUMAN ASPECTS. By Aaron Segal and Samuel Lebens (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2025. 345 pp.

In the field of the philosophy of worship, one of the most important contributions in recent decades has undeniably been Tim Bayne and Yujin Nagasawa’s 2006 essay, “The Grounds of Worship”. In the years before, the discussion often revolved around faith, but it was not so much its expressions. That is what makes Bayne and Nagasawa’s essay such a seminal one in the field. The authors, in the first half, raise a few points under four larger umbrellas of: “the analysis of worship”; “the *objects* of worship”; the “*epistemology*” of worship; and “the grounds of worship”. Two of them (the analysis and grounds of worship) they addressed in more detail in their work. In the time that has followed, we observe a certain pattern in most academic additions to the field, which is that the points raised by the two authors have largely dictated the direction of most subsequent work to this day. Some direct responses emerged, such as Benjamin Crowe’s “Reasons for Worship: A Response to Bayne and Nagasawa” (2007), and the subsequent “The Grounds of Worship Again: A Reply to Crowe” (2007). And many others emerged that addressed them not so directly. *The Philosophy of Worship: Divine and Human Aspects* (2025) is a bibliography that brings together thirteen entries that fall in the tradition of the former. This is not to say that it was not intended to.

In their introduction, Lebens and Segal draw our attention to “a taxonomy of *problems*” in the field and the so far unaddressed range of questions, and how they reflect in the volume structurally, again, as a response to Bayne and Nagasawa. While in the second introduction, “The Metaethics of Worship”, Elliot Salinger provides “a taxonomy for philosophical *theories* of worship” (Segal and Lebens, p. 6) primarily by distinguishing “A-accounts” (attitude-oriented) and “X-accounts” (action-oriented) and provides us with a comparative-integrative (re)view of the practice. Therefore, as stated