

# Green Marble 2022

ESTUDOS SOBRE O ANTROPOCENO E ECOCRÍTICA / STUDIES ON  
THE ANTHROPOCENE AND ECOCRITICISM

Editores

*João Ribeiro Mendes, Isabel Ponce de Leão,  
Orfeu Bertolami, Maria do Carmo Mendes,  
Rui Paes Mendes, Carmen Diego Gonçalves*



# Green Marble 2022

ESTUDOS SOBRE O ANTROPOCENO E ECOCRÍTICA /  
STUDIES ON THE ANTHROPOCENE AND ECOCRITICISM

Editores

*João Ribeiro Mendes, Isabel Ponce de Leão,  
Orfeu Bertolami, Maria do Carmo Mendes,  
Rui Paes Mendes, Carmen Diego Gonçalves*

**Edição:**  
**INfAST-Institute for Anthropocene Studies**

**Apoio:**



## **FICHA TÉCNICA**

### **Título**

*GREEN MARBLE 2022. Estudos sobre o Antropoceno e Ecocrítica / Studies on the Anthropocene and Ecocriticism*

### **Editores**

João Ribeiro Mendes, Isabel Ponce de Leão, Orfeu Bertolami, Maria do Carmo Mendes, Rui Paes Mendes, Carmen Diego Gonçalves

### **Local**

Braga

### **Data**

2022

### **DOI**

10.21814/1822.81362

### **ISBN**

978-989-33-4221-3

# ÍNDICE

## Índice

INTRODUÇÃO/INTRODUCTION .....	i
≡ LOCUÇÃO DE ABERTURA .....	1
TEMPOS DE ANTROPOCENO, Salvato Trigo .....	3
≡ CONFERÊNCIAS .....	11
WILDFIRES IN THE ANTHROPOCENE, <b>António Bento-Gonçalves</b> .....	13
ENGENHARIA CLIMÁTICA. POLUIR PARA DESPOLUIR, <b>António Gaspar Cunha</b> .....	23
“ANTROPOCÉNICO” – SER OU NÃO SER UM PERÍODO GEOLÓGICO?, <b>Artur Abreu Sá</b> .....	33
RESILIENT COMMUNITIES. A NON-CATASTROPHIC VIEW TO FACE RISKS IN THE ANTHROPOCENE, <b>Carmen Diego Gonçalves</b> .....	37
A GOVERNAÇÃO GLOBAL DO AMBIENTE. CONTRIBUTO PARA O DEBATE SOBRE MODELOS MULTINÍVEL DE GOVERNAÇÃO, <b>Cláudia Toriz Ramos</b> .....	49
VATICÍNIOS DA FICÇÃO CLIMÁTICA CONTEMPORÂNEA SOB A ÉGIDE DO ANTROPOCENO, <b>Delzi Alves Laranjeira</b> .....	63
GEOENGENHARIA DO CLIMA. EMISSÕES ESTRATOSFÉRICAS DE AEROSSÓIS, <b>Filipe Duarte Santos</b> .....	79
A CHARNECA DA VIDA. A PROPÓSITO DE <i>GENTE INDEPENDENTE</i> DE HALLDÓR LAXNESS, <b>Isabel Ponce de Leão</b> .....	101
EXPLORING THE IDEA OF AN ANTHROPOCENE RISK INDEX, <b>João Ribeiro Mendes</b> .....	111
MAN AND THE ANTHROPOCENE, <b>Katarína Podušelová</b> .....	121
« LA PLANETE MISE AU FEMININ REVERDIRAIT POUR TOUS » : FRANÇOISE D’EAUBONNE E O ECOFEMINISMO, <b>Maria do Carmo Mendes</b> .....	137
O ECOCRITICISMO DE <i>LIRISMO RURAL</i> , DE GILBERTO MENDONÇA TELES, <b>Maria de Fátima Lima &amp; Iracema Maria Hidasí</b> .....	147
EXPOSIÇÕES DO ANTROPOCENO. OS MUSEUS COMO VITRINES DE UMA NOVA ERA, <b>Natália Nascimento e Melo</b> .....	169
FROM THE STOCHASTIC WEATHER TO A PUTATIVE CHAOTIC EARTH SYSTEM, <b>Orfeu Bertolami</b> .....	195
LEGITIMATION CRISIS. A FIFTY-YEAR POSTSCRIPT, <b>Paul Lewis</b> .....	207

DEMOCRACY AND ANTHROPIC RISK, <b>Petr Špecián</b> .....	215
DESTINOS TURÍSTICOS SUSTENTÁVEIS: UM FACTOR DE INTERVENÇÃO POLÍTICA E CÍVICA NA MITIGAÇÃO DOS IMPACTOS AMBIENTAIS DO TURISMO, <b>Rui Paes Mendes, Dora Pinto, Sandra Mendes &amp; Aida Ribeiro</b> .....	227
"CLIMATE CHANGE" AS A SOCIAL OBJECT, <b>Wolfgang Wagner</b> .....	241
PROGRAMA DO EVENTO .....	251
CARTAZES DO EVENTO.....	257
FOTOS DO EVENTO .....	259

# MAN AND THE ANTHROPOCENE

*Katarína Podušelová*

Institute of Philosophy SAS v. v. i. in Bratislava, Slovakia  
katarina.poduselova@savba.sk

## **Abstract**

The paper focuses on how the field of philosophical thinking and especially philosophical anthropology critically copes with the issue of understanding of man in a new state of the natural and human world, which scientists in the field of natural sciences called the Anthropocene. The new perspective of man as a geobiophysical force which has the ability to change the environment to such an extent that it becomes a threat to the global environment brings new ways of thinking about man. Not only thinkers from the humanities and social sciences but also naturalists, express the urgent need to change the traditional anthropological discourse. The paper aims to capture the issue of man in the Anthropocene through the basic aspects that are most discussed in the works of authors focused on this issue.

**Keywords:** Anthropocene; Man; Mankind; Philosophical Anthropology.

## **Resumo**

O artigo foca-se em como o campo do pensamento filosófico e especialmente a antropologia filosófica lida criticamente com a reflexão do homem no novo estado do mundo natural e humano, que os cientistas do campo das ciências naturais chamaram de Antropoceno. A nova perspectiva do homem como força geobiofísica, que tem o poder de alterar o meio ambiente a ponto de se tornar uma ameaça, também traz consigo novas formas de pensar a relação do homem com o meio ambiente. Não apenas pensadores das ciências humanas e sociais, mas também naturalistas, expressam a necessidade urgente de mudar o discurso antropológico tradicional. O objetivo do artigo é captar a questão do homem no Antropoceno através da análise das obras de autores selecionados, nas quais é possível identificar um enfoque na questão do homem a partir dessa perspectiva.

**Palavras-chave:** Antropoceno; Homem; Humanidade; Antropologia Filosófica.

## **Introduction**

Scientists in the natural, humanities, and social sciences have been paying attention to the Anthropocene as a theoretical conception for more than two decades. I chose the title of Man and the Anthropocene intentionally because it points to the two most frequent terms in this field. When I searched the internet for these terms in 2022, google showed me 4,770,000 links. After the initial shock of the vast amount of information, it is possible to see that the first sources literally "welcome us to the Anthropocene, the age of modern man."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Age of Man: Enter the Anthropocene (nationalgeographic.org); The Anthropocene: Welcome to the Age of Modern Man (bbc.com).

Without deeper thought and in the first moment, what can we say about this invitation? Who? or what? Is invited where? Why? Where is it located? Is it good or bad? This very simplistic point of viewpoints to the basic questions characteristic of ontology, epistemology, anthropology, ethics, and other philosophical thinking areas. From my point of view, this is primarily an invitation to a discussion, because as philosophers we have a special responsibility for its course and formation.

## 1. Philosophical reflection of the Anthropocene

The theoretical concepts<sup>2</sup> of the Anthropocene work with the hypothesis that humanity has become a driving force within the Earth System<sup>3</sup>. In other words, man<sup>4</sup> is no longer just part of the biosphere and a passive observer but according to ESS scientists, he himself has become a geobiophysical<sup>5</sup> force that

---

<sup>2</sup> I intentionally refer to the plural because there are different interpretations of the Anthropocene, which as stated by Zalasiewicz et al. (2019), are not mutually exclusive. In my point of view, in reflecting on the Anthropocene, we should consider at least the following breakdown of its conceptual statements: a) The Geological Anthropocene is part of the Geological Time Scale (Zalasiewicz et al. 2019). In other words, the Anthropocene is the historical interval of the Earth or a new geological epoch in the history of the planet Earth which is an expression of the geological unit of time processes and layers (Zalasiewicz et al., 2019, Subramanian, 2019). b) Anthropocene as a concept of the new Earth System (Steffen et al. 2020; Hamilton, 2015; Kotchen & Young, 2007). This concept is based on the assumption that «the whole Earth operates as a single, complex, adaptive system, driven by the diverse interactions between energy, matter, and organisms» (Steffen et al., 2020, p. 54). c) Concepts of the Anthropocene in the humanities and social sciences. In this area, scientists approach the concepts of the Anthropocene from a much broader perspective which also includes moral-political interests, including different responsibilities for climate change which have future social, economic, and political implications (Nichols & Gogineni, 2018).

<sup>3</sup> Earth System - «suite of interlinked physical, chemical, biological and human processes that cycle (transport and transform) materials and energy in complex, dynamic ways within the system» (Steffen et al., 2020, p. 57). The term geobiophysical force originated from the Anthropocene Working Group (AWG) and Earth systems science (ESS) research.

<sup>4</sup> I will use not only the term man but also the terms human and human being, which I consider more adequate for philosophical considerations in the field of the Anthropocene. I stick to the term man, given the philosophical tradition of the question What is man? and in the traditional dualistic understanding of man-nature. At the same time, I am also aware of the issue of using the term man with regard to Gender-sensitive Communication, so in that part of the considerations that are linked to the connection between human and non-human, I will use the term human being more. I will also use this term where ontological issues are mentioned. In general, I will try to use the term human.

<sup>5</sup> This term is intended to signal a wide range of human activities (chemical, biological, physical) that have an impact on the Earth's system. The first thoughts of man as a geological force date back to the 19th century and developed along with the development of geology as a science. At the same time, it is realized that people are changing the country along their activities, which affects its flora and fauna. It is important to note that the idea of feedback of anthropogenic changes to man himself was still absent in this thinking. In addition, anthropogenic changes themselves have not been included in the field of their research for a long time, given that the time frame of human existence was "absurdly" short compared to the age of the Earth (4,500 million years). As stated by Cronon, «ecology was to try to describe and analyze natural systems in their "pristine state", state, as they would have existed in the hypothetical absence of human activity and long-term historical change» (Cronon, 1993, p. vii). A broader understanding of the need to include the consequences of human activities in the study comes only in the 1980s, along



qualitatively changes the Earth System's regulatory capabilities (Steffen et al. 2020).

From my point of view, this hypothesis created above all an inseparable combination of the terms Man (its various equivalents) and the Anthropocene. The analysis, interpretation, and critique of these concepts and their relationship with each other have acquired a myriad of perspectives in the humanities and social sciences, which are incorporated into the methodology and language apparatus of individual disciplines which still makes transdisciplinary discussion difficult.

It should be noted here that many authors in the humanities and social sciences often ignore the differences in the Anthropocene concepts that I present and create a certain misinterpretation framework in the anthropocene discourse. For example, only the timing of the origin and duration of the Anthropocene is inspiring and I will not be able avoid it, but it should be noted in mind as stated by Zalasiewicz et al., «The geological Anthropocene is not a diachronous unit of human cultural history like the Iron Age and Palaeolithic, which unfolded in mosaic fashion across the planet, or like the Renaissance.» (Zalasiewicz et al., 2019, p. 3). The reason for such a claim is that the geological Anthropocene also includes basic natural processes that are not anthropogenic in nature (Zalasiewicz et al., 2019). On the other hand, in the temporal aspect of the Anthropocene, even scientists in the field of natural sciences do not avoid philosophical questions such as: "Should one invest greater significance in the beginning of a process or the beginning of its discernible impact?" (McNeill, 2019, p. 253).

In this paper, I will not deal with the geological concept of the Anthropocene or the Anthropocene as a concept of the Earth System. My intention is rather to point out selected problems that we encounter in the philosophical reflection of the Anthropocene, while I focus more on anthropological aspects in this area. I understand the Anthropocene rather as an inspiration, idea, thought, platform, horizon, or similarly to Latour I see in it «common ground for the natural sciences and the humanities that we all share» (Latour, 2017, p. 13). The question arises as to whether and how philosophical anthropology can link individual knowledge about man. In my opinion, the discourse on Anthropocene in this sense could have the potential to integrate knowledge about individual aspects of man from both research areas in a new way, and thus influence philosophical anthropology.

### **1.1. Connection problem and Integration problem**

---

with the development of Earth system science (ESS), in which human influence began to be considered geologically significant.

Philosophical reflection on concepts of the Anthropocene contains a large number of questions. Many of these problems are related to the problem of different types of connection or connections between man and the global environment. In my opinion, I could call the term "connection problem". This problem points to the fact that the sciences are trying again to tie up the Gordian knot<sup>6</sup> of Earth's history and human history. As reported by Zalasiewicz et al., «The Anthropocene represents a new phase in the history of both humankind and of the Earth, when natural forces and human forces became intertwined, so that the fate of one determines the fate of the other» (Zalasiewicz et al., 2010, p. 2231).

Has man mutated to a new state along with the entire global environment? ESS scientists work with "global aggregates" because, from an Earth System perspective, it made sense to treat all of humanity as a single entity in terms of its activities and their consequences for the Earth System (Steffen, 2019, p. 258). How to explain and justify human being incorporated into humanity as an aggregate that the ESS considers to be the cause or driving force within the Earth System? Is humanity as an aggregate a human or non-human entity?

Does this mutation require a paradigm shift in ontology, epistemology, and anthropology? I understand paradigm-shifting in the traditional sense as explaining the same phenomena in a different way. Hypotheses within the concepts of the Anthropocene, however, say that we have found ourselves in a new state of the world, in which there are new unreflected phenomena. We even encounter claims about the non-analogue state of the world. As reported by Steffen et al., «[t]he nature of changes now occurring simultaneously in the Earth System, as well as their magnitudes and rates of change, are unprecedented. The Earth System is currently operating in a non-analogue state» (Steffen et al., 2020, p. 57). Hamilton claims, «that the Earth sciences are undergoing a paradigm shift, from environmental science to Earth System science» (Hamilton, 2015, p. 5). The question is: will it be enough to change the paradigm?

I could call the second set of questions as the "integration problem". An approach to this problem is illustrated by Latour's position that the altered state of human being in the Anthropocene conceptions represents a third dimension in anthropologies. Until now, these anthropologies have moved in the dichotomy of "physical" versus "social." The third dimension brings to the anthropology in general what has not been available in it so far. As Latour says, «to claim that the human agency has become the main geological force shaping the face of the earth is to immediately raise the question of "responsibility"» (Latour, 2017, p. 38). Latour's requirement is based on the assumption that «[g]lobal change cannot be understood in terms of a simple cause-effect paradigm» (Steffen et al.,

---

<sup>6</sup> I used Latour's metaphor about cut the Gordian knot modern from the essay *We have never been modern* (1993).

2020, p. 57). Therefore, even human being cannot be regarded as a passive entity subject to natural causes.

In addition, the responsibility of scientists for their research methods and results should be reflected. This area also includes the issue of legal responsibility, which does not distinguish between human and non-human, as Raffnsøe (2016) says, and last but not least, moral or political responsibility for maintaining the basic preconditions for life and many others. The question of responsibility was the impetus that led to the first critiques of the Anthropocene concepts from the natural sciences by historians, philosophers, anthropologists, and many others. I think Latour summed up this problem enough when he said:

(...) that there was no sense whatsoever in lumping into one undifferentiated "Anthropos" all the human agents responsible for shaping the planet. (...) But who is at the origin of that mutation? So, as soon as the "Anthropos" became the center of the collective attention of geochemists, economists, political scientists and many others, the idea of One Human in charge of that geostory exploded into pieces (Latour, 2017, p. 39).

The concepts of the Anthropocene as I mentioned are closely related to the issue of human being, its role in the Earth system and its relationship to the global environment. Philosophical anthropology thus faces a huge challenge. It will either be pushed into the background as an exhausted form of humanism, or it will be able to connect and integrate various forms of being (Descola, 2013). The role of philosophical anthropology will be to understand anthropoceneic discussions as opportunities. To pave the way for understanding why and how one finds oneself in a situation of endangering one's own existence, which is caused by them. To answer the question: How do notions of human being combine with the need to maintain and preserve the basic preconditions of life on Earth? It must also reconsider its current positions and include in its area the crucial question of the responsibility of the human being for himself. In this area, too, he will have to allow the integration of knowledge from other disciplines.

Philosophy and especially philosophical anthropology should enter into discussions about the Anthropocene because the Anthropocene as a phenomenon that integrates the world of human being and the whole Earth requires the attention of philosophy. The task of philosophical thinking is not only to provide a critical reflection on individual efforts to interpret the relationship of man to his past, present but especially future assumptions for life but also to contribute to efforts to theoretically grasp individual concepts in this area and help create a new conceptual apparatus.

## **2. Basic problems in Philosophical Anthropology**

In addition to the range of questions I have raised for philosophy, there are issues that are also addressed in philosophy as such, but I have rather included them in philosophical anthropology. These are issues that re-address the position of human being in the new state of the global world and its relationship to that world.

The focus on philosophical anthropology is based on my belief that, throughout human history, images of man have implicitly or explicitly shaped culture, socio-political order, and man's relationship to himself and the environment. Many philosophical concepts and methods have supported and endorsed the accelerated ability of humanity to analyze and change its living, social and cultural environment (Zalasiewicz et al., 2019). On the contrary, any common worldview or change had a retroactive effect on how man created an understanding of himself. Many of these consequences were not necessarily immediately apparent or visible (Raffnsøe, 2016). Their gradual course and delayed consequences can only be seen over a longer period of time. Anthropocene is an example of this. For example, scientists across scientific disciplines still cannot agree on the origins and course of the Anthropocene.

According to the Anthropocene concepts, the traditional understanding of man is no longer sustainable. The question is, can the hypotheses of these concepts lead to specific theories of human being and thus allow its mutation into a state of environmental sustainability?

If theories about the human make it possible to create a human world and shape the various relationships of human being to the global environment, then to reconsider the traditional question What is man? need to be approached with caution. On the one hand, it is still necessary to keep in mind that the definition and self-understanding of the human with regard to the hypotheses of the Anthropocene concepts can lead to a strengthening of the affirmation of exploitation, oppression and inequality. Furthermore, it could strengthen the position of already privileged groups on environmental resources (clean land, air, and water), which are a prerequisite for all human beings to live. On the other hand, we get into a stalemate because we cannot avoid a certain human self-understanding in the Anthropocene.

The Anthropocene returns the question of man, *as if back in the game*, but in a changed and as yet unreflected form. If we have not yet had a clear idea of human being, the anthropocene discourse has covered it even more. The fact that human being has become a major player in climate change in the Anthropocene to such an extent that scientists in the field of natural sciences have identified it as a geobiophysical force<sup>7</sup> does not mean that it has become

---

<sup>7</sup> Latour says: «The human agent has grown to the dimension of a natural phenomenon (comparable, if you count in terawatts, to plate tectonics), but it has not become more natural for all of that» (Latour, 2017, p. 38)

more natural (Latour, 2017). According to Latour, «There is nothing natural in the telltale signs left by this human agent in the sediments recorded by stratigraphers» (Latour, 2017, p. 38).

The statement about the human being that it can be compared to the forces of nature does not really mean that scientists have uncovered the fundamental dispositions and characteristics of human being, but rather have allowed questions to return: What is human nature? what does it mean to be human? Nor does it mean returning man to the natural world. From my point of view, the above so far represents another challenge for philosophical anthropology, which confirms or refutes Raffnsøe's assumption that as the role and character of man in the Anthropocene changes, so should the new role and position of the human sciences (Raffnsøe, 2016). An integral part of anthropocene debates has become the problem of anthropocentrism, which is being criticized more and more. Raffnsøe says:

This anthropocentric approach is currently being challenged, not only as an epistemic basic condition for scientific thinking and human knowledge at large but also as an ontological basic condition for how one has conceived of the human being and its position in a wider context, which has itself decisively influenced how human beings have related to the world (2016, p. 60).

Retrospectively, it is possible to see in Western culture that due to the theological and philosophical interpretation, man became a center, the so-called microcosm in the cosmological sense. These interpretations of man subsequently affirmed his actions in a hierarchically arranged and linearly flowing human world. His superiority over all living things allowed him to conquer not only nature but also members of his own kind.

The critique of anthropocentrism is closely linked to the critique of various dualisms, such as body and mind, man and nature, human and society, and others. Perceiving and designating human being as a center that is isolated from the natural world and superior to everything has enabled the human to understand the world of nature primarily as an object of its practical interests. In other words, «the dividing understanding of humans as extra-natural and nature as extra-human, has triggered and reproduced the very stage for a systemic appropriation and exploitation» (Küpers, 2020, p. 4). In particular, economic, political and power interests make it possible to understand nature as a raw material. These interests continue to prevail and support what Descola said, «It was decreed, but with exemplary discretion, that our way of dividing up beings and things was a norm to which there were no exceptions» (Descola, 2013, p. 10). The ambition of human and social scientists to criticize anthropocentrism and dualism through the Anthropocene concepts is to change just that. The Anthropocene provides an opportunity to do so. As a concept, it arose against

the background of holistic interpretations<sup>8</sup> of the world, which sought to remove the traditional dualistic view of the relationship between man and nature world. All human and non-human entities have become part of complex relationships and ongoing processes on Earth.

The "connection problem" in the Anthropocene leads to efforts to create new ontologies, which would be characterized by bridging the gap between human and nature, which we "inherited, especially in the Western world from Platonian-Cartesian-Newtonian paradigms and the Enlightenment and Modern eras, as foundations of 'humanism'" (Küpers, 2020, p. 4). But is it possible to abandon anthropocentrism and dualism? Biocentrism in environmental thinking has attempted to do so but has come across similar criticisms of the Anthropocene concepts that link humanity as a homogeneous entity to the entire natural world. As stated by Stáhel, according to Kučírek, an important Slovak environmental thinker:

Biocentrism hasn't really been able to abandon the anthropocentric position, because it, despite its proclaimed biotic equality of all living, attributes to man a unique position among all living creatures. This follows from the requirement that a person or mankind should take responsibility for preserving life on the planet (Stáhel, 2021, p. 74).

The question of responsibility, which re-emerges here, points out that thinkers who accentuate the integration of responsibility into anthropological thinking and at the same time demand a departure from anthropocentrism will have to rethink their positions very precisely. The attitude of recognizing the equality of human and nonhuman from a philosophical point of view, "practically excludes the possibility of taking responsibility for non-human life or even for the preconditions of life on the planet in general" (Stáhel, 2021, p. 77).

This points out that in reflecting the concepts of the Anthropocene, care must be taken with regard to the dichotomies they contain. On the one hand, they draw attention to man, on the other hand, they show an effort to question human exceptionalism. Raffnsøe also tried to deal with this problem through the so-called "Human turn".

### **3. Trying to think again**

There is still relatively little work devoted exclusively to the philosophical reflection of the Anthropocene, especially focusing on anthropological issues. One of the authors who caught my attention is the Danish philosopher Sverre Raffnsøe and his book *Philosophy of the Anthropocene: The Human Turn* (2016). In his work, it is possible to find the basic set of questions that I pointed out. It

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, the Gaia hypothesis

looks at man, the “connection problem”, but also integration. He also points to the unsustainability of anthropocentrism.

Raffnsøe encourages constant research because he realizes that we are in a process of change and we can no longer look at a person's relationship with his environment from a single static point, but we have to work with multiple viewpoints and perspectives. His effort to open discussion and reflection on man and his grasp in the Anthropocene<sup>9</sup> is characterized by capturing the basic aspects of the critical turn that affects man, his own self-reflection, and his relationship to the Earth as a whole (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xii). He considers the critical turn to be another turn in a row of Copernican turns in human history. According to him, it is again a shift in the centering of the universe. To describe the complexity of this shift, and to enable the author to work with the complexity of a topic such as the role of man in the Anthropocene, he introduces his own concepts. The effort to enrich the conceptual apparatus in the Anthropocene discussion is characteristic of philosophical thinking and we meet it with many other authors.

One of the aspects that define this critical turn is the term that Raffnsøe himself introduces – “Human turn”<sup>10</sup>. On the one hand, he compares this turn to Latour's term “turn”, which is to emphasize the decisive change in the relationship between man and the environment and the requirement to redefine these relationships and traditional concepts (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xiv). On the other hand, it does not clearly state the meaning of this term. He captures it only in outlines, frames, and different views, while deliberately avoiding clear definition.

The human turn can be understood as: «turn towards the human, and the turning of the human in new directions» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xv), because a turn towards the human also means the turn of the person himself (turn within the person); return to man; awareness of disproportions in human understanding; it represents a pervasive and profound shift; a new state of man – linked to a change in the state of the world, a change in the relationship to the world in a local as well as a global dimension; the requirement of overcoming anthropocentrism; a shift in the human situation and in the very quality of human

---

<sup>9</sup> On the one hand, Raffnsøe works with the geological concept of the Anthropocene, which he understands in terms of Zalasiewicz's definition as “the current global environment in which human activity dominates” (Zalasiewicz et al., 2008). On the other hand, he considers the Anthropocene to be an overarching framework that characterizes the overarching significance of the human species (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xii). In addition to the term “human turnover”, Raffnsøe introduces the term the Anthropogene into his reasoning. For his part, I consider the introduction of this term to be the realization that in grasping the issue of the human in the Anthropocene, he cannot work exclusively with the geological concept of the Anthropocene. According to Raffnsøe, The Anthropogene «describes the condition that development (meaning not only what transpires, but also the consequences of what transpires) extensively and decisively, although not exclusively, comes about as a result of human activity. The Anthropogene epoch recognizes that the human factor has become a decisive element in the Anthropocene» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. 26). This expression also allows him to avoid the issue of dating.

<sup>10</sup> He considers this expression to be unprecedented and a bit mysterious (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xiii).

existence; background for the open and key question: «How can we even turn towards and speak of the human element and its role?» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xiv); a statement that captures man again in the position of becoming the measure of all things, but relative with a close connection to the environment (Raffnsøe, 2016). Raffnsøe further captures the complexity of grasping human turnover as follows:

Not only is the human turn immensely complex and comprehensive. What is more, it still remains unresolved and is so ambiguous a phenomenon that anyone seeking to describe and articulate what it involves is obliged to recognize that they are unable to distance themselves from it, seeing that they themselves are implicated in this turn (2016, p. xix).

Anthropocentrism Raffnsøe criticizes precisely through the prism of human turnover. First of all, if we understood anthropocentrism as a static positioning of the person in the center, the human turn disrupts this stable framework. Secondly, the traditional dialectic of the absolute and the relative no longer works in human turnover. Man remains the relative measure of all things, but in human turnover, the relationship to the ontological character of the absolute is changed. Hypothesis of the Anthropocene concepts about the change of a person's condition, through his, so-called "Connection" disrupts the traditional ontological structure of reality (being). Anthropocene arguments should then result in a change in the relationship and understanding of "unconditional" and necessity and, above all, independent. From Raffnsøe's point of view, the Anthropocene, together with human turnover, changes not only the shape of the world but also our traditional ways of trying to understand it (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. 51).

Like Latour, Raffnsøe brings a human sense of responsibility to the anthropological debate, while extending it to the dependence and insecurity that come from human turnover. At the same time, it connects these categories with the concept of crisis in all its forms (Raffnsøe 2016). By comparing the two legal processes, Savigny, which took place between human and non-human, and L'Aquile, which was concerned exclusively by human beings, points to a shift in understanding of responsibility and to the essence of man having primarily responsibility to himself. «Bearing responsibility in this strict sense and having to suffer punishment in the event of misconduct has become a specific human prerogative and a curse» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xi). Closely related to the problem of responsibility is the criterion of globalization, which raises new issues in terms of sustainability (Raffnsøe, 2016). Raffnsøe does not deal with a specific critique of anthropocentrism. Rather, it points out that it is not possible to understand the "human turn" from an anthropocentric position.

### **3.1. The requirement to redefine human**



I will now turn my attention to how Raffnsøe responded to the demand for human redefinition that began to emerge in the Anthropocene concepts. He does not consider this request to be something new and unexpected. The effort to redefine man is a requirement that keeps coming back and always emerging, precisely in the background of crises. The critical turn within the Anthropocene is no exception. As Raffnsøe states:

A critical turn affecting the human condition is thus still in the process of arriving. Within this landscape, issues concerning the human – its finitude, responsiveness, responsibility, maturity, and relationship to itself – appear rephrased and re-accentuated as decisive probing questions, not only for humans but also for the Earth at large (2016, p. xii).

According to him, there is a need to focus not only on the ways in which we redefine man but also on the redefinitions themselves (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xiv). The redefinitions and redefinitions are based on the current requirement of the geological concepts of the Anthropocene and the claim that «[w]e have begun to live under man-made or humanly affected conditions radically different from those the earth has offered us so far to such an extent that we seem to begin to inhabit some other planet» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. xv).

The demand for redefinition is related to the way Raffnsøe wants to deal with anthropocentrism. He recognizes that a person must, in a sense, remain at the center, but in a way that keeps him and at the same time keeps him on the sidelines. The problems of connection and integration contain categories of dependence and uncertainty. Tu Raffnsøe says that «it might be fruitful to picture human beings as situated beings within a topography and to examine humans as beings in the middle of the world, on the verge of affecting and redefining themselves» (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. 61).

Redefining human being in the Anthropocene and the Anthropogene epoch could be closely related to what we mean by human nature. Raffnsøe considers the Anthropocene and the Anthropogene to be an unintended consequence of human activity. Zalasiewicz et al., «to crystallize the growing realization that human activities – or, more often, the unintended consequences of human activities - had fundamentally changed the Earth System» (2019, p. 2). The Anthropocene and the Anthropogene are definitely not something we want or plan for (Raffnsøe, 2016, p. 32). If so, what a light, this statement would cast on human understanding to date. For example, the generally accepted definition of man as a rational animal. Would a creature with rationality allow the destruction of its own preconditions to survive? In this sense, Raffnsøe's position would be different from the idea inherent in many anthropocene debates that

Anthropocene is the result of human nature. We find a similar attitude in Moore<sup>11</sup>, who is critical of a selected part of anthropocene discourses<sup>12</sup>. According to him:

The Anthropocene (and before that, Spaceship Earth) tells us that planetary crisis is more or less a natural consequence of human nature – as if today's climate crisis is a matter of humans being humans, just as snakes will be snakes and zebras will be zebras (Moore, 2019, para. 3).

Then there is the impression that there is something destructive in human nature. According to Royle, the anthropocene narrative is also very problematic. If the Anthropocene is the result of human activity, then there is something perverse in human nature, and it was necessary that we get into the Anthropocene. Since there is very little we can do with human nature, this paves the way for drastic measures or measures that can have unintended consequences, such as geoengineering (Royle, 2016, p. 71).

Rather, both views of the problem of human nature in the Anthropocene tend to ask the question: Have we defined human nature correctly so far? Is there human nature? Can we determine human nature now? Until now, we have not lived in conditions that would include such a huge number of individuals representing the human species; we did not even have knowledge of a global nature. Today we have all this, will this knowledge open the way to the determination of human nature? or to answer the question: What is man? Anthropocene so far creates questions rather than answers, but from a philosophical point of view, the question itself is often more important than the answer.

## Conclusion

In my work, I tried to point out selected aspects of the Anthropocene concepts, which should be reflected in philosophy and philosophical anthropology. The enormous use of terms such as the Anthropocene and man should attract more attention in philosophy. Philosophy should want to know why the idea of human influence on the global environment became viral only after the emergence of the term anthropocene. When we know that the idea of the “problem of interconnection” and human influence on global nature has been here long before. Philosophy should want to know the levels of meaning of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Jason W. Moore is an environmental historian and professor of sociology. He supports the concept of the Capitalocene.

<sup>12</sup> It is important to note that Moore builds his concept of a capital area as a critique of the so-called the popular concept of the Anthropocene, not the geological the Anthropocene. His critique then does not focus on the concept of Geological the Anthropocene. Moore considers this concept of the Anthropocene to be literally a useful formal concept for the scientific community (Moore, 2016b). His critique focuses on the concepts of the Anthropocene, which he calls the term popular.

term anthropocene. Philosophical anthropology should want to know what statement about man is captured by the idea of the Anthropocene. Why is the question What is man? urgent again?

I also pointed out the problems, some of which are new and some of which are returning as an unresolved issues of humanity. The request made by many famous philosophers is returning: we must rethink it! One such problem is traditional anthropocentrism and ontological as well as epistemological dualism. By introducing the terms “connection problem” and “integration problem”, I wanted to frame the areas in which this issue can be considered in a way. This gave me easier access to the ideas in Raffnsø's work and an understanding of why he introduced the term “human turn.”

The complexity of the Anthropocene and the fact that the Anthropocene is still in the process discourage philosophers from entering this area. The aim of my work was therefore to highlight the need to involve philosophy and philosophical anthropology in the discussion of the Anthropocene.

## References

- Cronon, W. J. (1993). Foreword: The Turn Toward History In: *Humans as Components of Ecosystems: The Ecology of Subtle Human Effects and Populated Areas* (pp. vii-x). Springer Verlag.
- Descola, P. (2013). *Beyond Nature and Culture*. US: the University of Chicago
- Hamilton, C. (2015). Getting the Anthropocene so wrong. *The Anthropocene Review*, 2(2), pp. 102-107.
- Kotchen, M. J. & Young, O. R. (Eds) (2007). Meeting the challenges of the anthropocene: Towards a science of coupled human–biophysical systems. *Global Environmental Change*, 17(2), pp. 149-151).
- Küpers, M. W. (2020). From the Anthropocene to an “Ecocene”—EcoPhenomenological Perspectives on Embodied, Anthrodecentric Transformations towards Enlivening Practices of Organising Sustainably. *Sustainability*, 12, 3633.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*. Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2017). Anthropology at the Time of the Anthropocene: A Personal View of What Is to Be Studied. In Brightman, M. & Lewis, J. (Eds), *The Anthropology*

*of Sustainability Beyond Development and Progress* (pp. 35-49). Springer Nature.

McNeill, J. (2019) The Industrial Revolution and the Anthropocene. In J. Zalasiewicz, C. Waters, M. Williams & C. Summerhayes (Eds), *The Anthropocene as a Geological Time Unit: A Guide to the Scientific Evidence and Current Debate* (pp. 251-254). Cambridge University Press.

Moore, W. J. (2016, October 9). Name the System! Anthropocenes & the Capitalocene Alternative. Jason W. Moore. <https://jasonwmoore.wordpress.com/2016/10/09/name-the-system-anthropocenes-the-capitalocene-alternative>.

Moore, W. J. (2019, November 4). Who is responsible for the climate crisis – It's not the failure of species, it's the failure of a system? *Maize*. <https://www.maize.io/magazine/what-is-capitalocene>

Nichols, K. & Gogineni, B. (2018). The Anthropocene's dating problem: Insights from the geosciences and the humanities. *The Anthropocene Review*, 5(2), pp.107-119.

Raffnsøe, S. (2016). *Philosophy of the Anthropocene: The Human Turn*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Royle, C. E. (2016). Marxism and the Anthropocene. *International Socialism*, 151, pp. 63-84.

Steffen, W. (2019). Mid-20th-Century "Great Acceleration" In J. Zalasiewicz, C. Waters, M. Williams & C. Summerhayes (Eds), *The Anthropocene as a Geological Time Unit: A Guide to the Scientific Evidence and Current Debate* (pp. 254-260). Cambridge University Press.

Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Schellnhuber, H. J., Dube, P. O., Dutreuil, S., Lenton, T. M. & Lubchenco, J. (2020). The emergence and evolution of Earth System Science. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1, pp. 54-63.

Šťáhel, R. (2021). The roots of Slovak critical environmentalism. *Pragmatism Today* 12(1), pp. 73-89.

Subramanian, M. (2019, May 21). Anthropocene now: influential panel votes to recognize Earth's new epoch. *Nature*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01641-5>.

Zalasiewicz, J., Williams, M., Smith, A., Barry, T.L., Bown, P.R., Rawson, P., Brenchley, P., Cantrill, D., Coe, A.E., Cope, J.C.W., Gale, A., Gibbard, P.L., Gregory, F.J., Hounslow, M., Knox, R., Powell, P., Waters, C., Marshall, J., Oates & Stone, P. (2008). Are we now living in the Anthropocene? *GSA Today* 18(2), pp. 4-8.

Zalasiewicz, J., Williams, M., Steffen, W. & Crutzen, P. (2010). The New World of the Anthropocene. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 44(7), pp. 2228-2231.

Zalasiewicz, J., Waters, C. N., Williams, M. & Summerhayes, C. P. (Eds) (2019). *The Anthropocene as a Geological Time Unit: A Guide to the Scientific Evidence and Current Debate*. Cambridge University Press.

This article is part of VEGA project 2/0072/21 *Tasks of Political Philosophy in the Context of Anthropocene*.