Piraye Hacıgüzeller

On Critical Hope and ‘Anthropos’ of the Non-Anthropocentric Discourses: Some Thoughts on Archaeology in the Anthropocene

Abstract

In this essay I scrutinise the non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene with the ultimate aim of starting a discussion about their use in archaeology. Specifically, I stress that these discourses inherit the hope for human progress that characterises Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School, i.e. ‘critical hope’. This is a type of hope that renders the non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene self-contradictory. Even when they manage to escape the hold of critical hope, such discourses, I argue, still suffer from ethical failings due to their inherent lack of focus on human-human relations and largely ahistorical nature. I conclude the essay by advocating an Anthropocene archaeology not dominated by non-anthropocentric discourses and making a related call for a slow archaeology of the Anthropocene.

Keywords: Critical Theory, progress, Anthropocene ethics, object-orientated-ontology, new materialism, post-humanism

Critical Hope and This Essay

‘Progress still controls us even in tales of [capitalist] ruination.’

(Tsing 2015:21)

Anthropocene discourses today are varied, incorporating eco-catastrophic anxieties and unduly eco-modernist optimism as much as ‘critical hope’. A major focus in this essay is the emerging theoretical and philosophical reflections that problematize the last. Forming flip sides of the same coin with ‘critical pessimism’, critical hope refers to a specific type of hope in political philosophy that lies primarily embedded within the neo-Marxist ideas of the Frankfurt School (henceforth the Critical Theory) and is explicitly ‘critical of contemporary or modern understandings of progress’ (Chandler

2020, 173; see Chandler 2019). What is interesting about critical hope is that, while it involves severe criticism on how human progress (i.e. improving the lives of humans) is understood and pursued by certain -- mainly capitalist and totalitarian -- interpretations of modernity, it is also the main catalyst for a restless pursuit of that very progress. The key to understanding how such hope for human progress thrives within Critical Theory is the concept of ‘enlightenment dialectics’ which treats the European Enlightenment as containing ‘both the seeds of its own destruction and the potential of an escape route from that destruction’ (Stoetzler 2018, 143). According to Critical Theory, while the progress of rational human consciousness embodies the potential to lead to ‘false enlightenment’, the modern organizing principles of social and political life can always be reworked critically, leading to radical improvements for humanity.

As I lay out below, in current discussions of the Anthropocene, critical hope is incarnated predominantly by non-anthropocentric thinking -- a term which in this essay broadly refers to post-/non-humanisms, new materialisms and more-than-human/object-oriented ontologies. This embodiment, I argue, renders non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene self-contradictory, which is hardly surprising given that critical hope (fixated on human survival, salvation and progress) is inherently anthropocentric. A second point I make is that even when non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene do not depend on critical hope, such discourses still suffer from severe ethical issues. These issues revolve around how to define the ‘anthropos’ in non-anthropocentrism and, more specifically, how assumptions and negligence about its identity might wrongly de-politicise some of the histories and politics of being human. I conclude the essay by proposing an Anthropocene archaeology not dominated by non-anthropocentric discourses. Archaeologists, I also suggest, should stop hastening after Anthropocene theories (and methods) to ‘valorise’ archaeology and, as such, avoid jumping on multidisciplinary bandwagons for the stakes involve misleading re-orientations of humanity’s pasts, presents and futures.

Reuniting Humans and Non-Humans in the Anthropocene: Post-Industrial Hopes for ‘Happy Endings’ and Some Ethical Failures

In *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Horkheimer and Adorno (2002 [1944]), leading philosophers in Critical Theory, portray the antisemitic modern subject as regrettably estranged from his own self and the external world. Like other ‘others’ could also be, nature and Jews are enemies of the subject who lacks conscious self-reflection on his behaviour and thought and, as such, loses touch with reality. The subject is megalomaniac and paranoid, seeking power and domination over his foes for fear of being dominated. He projects *regressive* hostility, unhappiness and destruction onto his internal and external world. He is alienated. Horkheimer and Adorno go particularly far with their ideas on alienation

seeking sources of (self-)destructiveness inherent in the rationalism of Nazi antisemitism. While *Dialectic of Enlightenment* forms one of the more well-known contexts where the concept is advanced, alienation is a popular field of study elsewhere in Critical Theory which builds on Marx's ideas (cf., e.g., Burkett 1999; Foster 2000; Yates 2018). Directly related to the discussion here is the employment of the concept to hold 'Enlightenment Man' responsible for 'a kind of species imperialism which would ultimately work to the disadvantage of ... himself' (Jay 1972, 296). Critical hope for reconciliation with oneself and nature lies with, among others, authentic art, play and affective life which are prominently featured in Ernst Bloch's writings.

This prophecy in Critical Theory of an alien and unreconciled 'nature' backlashing against human civilisation (Stoetzler 2018, 153) haunts the Western world in the Anthropocene today, arguably mainly through non-anthropocentric discourses. Even though these discourses are rooted in multiple intellectual traditions and attempt to distance themselves from Critical Theory, they often co-opt fears embodied within Critical Theory that consider alienation from nature as a form of regress for humanity. These fears are based on imaginaries of a 'great divide' between humans and nonhumans. The discourses intend to diagnose or undo the epistemological and environmental damage caused by the domination of "Man" (specifically, affluent, white, Europhone, able-bodied, masculine, urbanized, heterosexual, liberal citizens of the Western world; see Braidotti 2017, 23). They make attempts to re-think the Earth in terms of socio-ecological systems, hybrid species, more-than-human cyborgs, assemblages, affective life and so on (Wakefield 2014, 452; e.g. Bonneuil and Fressoz 2016; Burke et al. 2016; Chakrabarty 2009; Harrington 2016; Moore 2015; Head 2016; LeCain 2015). The great divide -- or in Marxist terminology, the metabolic/ecological rift (cf. Foster et al. 2010; Wark 2015) -- in question is considered to be caused by capitalism. However, the original sin is often thought to be inherited from modernity which is considered to have the potential to foster the tendencies innate in capitalism (and as some emphasise, also in socialism) to go against nature and nature's instrumental treatment in order to pursue human progress.

It is crucial to recognize that despite its pessimistic outlook, this type of critique is in essence very hopeful, following in the footsteps of Critical Theory (see Chandler 2019). This hopeful non-anthropocentric critique attempts to rework existing relations of alienated humans with their nonhuman others; the ultimate aim is to come up with new treatments of the latter by the former so that humans can continue to thrive. It is hard at times to miss the theological and romantic undertones in such thinking, i.e. the yearning for an imaginary, pristine, Edenic nature (unspoiled by humans, and eventually modern, capitalist industry) where everything is entangled and, as such, is 'simultaneously human and natural' (Harrington 2016, 490; see Lane 2015, 489). This is, in fact, critical hope in action, aiming for a self-reflexive, softer and more enlightened relationship between humans and

nonhumans (see Stoetzler 2018, 152-153). It serves to open up possibilities for the post-industrial Western world to redeem past mistakes and make a new start.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance and inspirational nature of non-anthropocentric discourses when it comes to avoiding the treatment of the Anthropocene as ‘business as usual’. Such treatment would, without any doubt, play ‘directly into the hands of ecomodernist arguments’ who suggest ‘we can manage change through [yet] more sophisticated technology or economic growth’ (Fagan 2019, 58). However, it should also not pass unnoticed that the primary concern of such hopeful critique is *to save ‘humanity’*, whomever that may refer to (see below), and *to save the human planet*, i.e. the planet that is home for humans, not indifferent to them and which embodies a sense of meaning for them (Chandler 2019). In other words, this is not a struggle to ‘save the planet’ of the rats, crows and cockroaches who are most likely to survive the sixth mass extinction event anyway (Pievani 2014: 92). At the root of the enthusiasm to reunite humans and nature, to overcome ‘modernity’s detachment from entangled and affective life’ (Chandler 2019: 701) and to acknowledge the unavoidable intimacy between humans and nature is a very anthropocentric desire: to survive this crisis by learning from mistakes, making vows to ‘never again’ and to live, sort of, happily ever after (see Chandler 2019; 2020). Paradoxical as it is, while for non-anthropocentrism the most loathed characteristic of modernity is, obviously, anthropocentrism, what we are witnessing here is a cunning return of anthropocentrism in disguise: acknowledging the significance of and befriending non-humans for human’s sake.

Importantly though, not all non-anthropocentric critique of the Anthropocene embodies critical hope; some, in fact, outright reject the back-to-nature approaches discussed above. The main emphasis in these studies instead is on re-understanding Earth via new ontologies that involve, among others, ‘dark ecologies’ where a humiliated humanity struggles with finding meaning and hope in a world of ‘hyperobjects’ (Morton 2016; 2013) as well as subtle ways of ‘dis-hoping’ while engaging with the Anthropocene (Latour 2017: 13). However, even then serious issues remain with such critique when we simply ask the question: who are the anthropoi of non-anthropocentric discourses? Or, put differently: which humans does modernity -- deceptively claim to (cf. Latour 2017; 1993) -- separate from nature and centralise according to the non-anthropocentric critique (see Mirzoeff 2018: 123)? As has been rightly pointed out on various occasions, answering the question of who bears responsibility for the environmental degradation that marks the Anthropocene requires that the definition of the anthropos be narrowed down (e.g. Malm and Hornborg 2014; Witmore 2019). This is to avoid having the anthropos of the Anthropocene become a misleadingly universal category: placeless, classless and lacking historical context (Ruddick 2015: 1115; Yusoff 2014: 454; see Yates 2018: 1507 – 1508; Latour 2017: 121-122). Likewise, the anthropos in the context of non-anthropocentric discourses must

be narrowed down. In this case, however, epistemological and ontological preoccupations arguably hinder appropriate adjustments.

Coming back to the question posed earlier, the anthropos here can obviously not be, for example, the black lives enslaved in the course of modernity. Suggesting that would grossly neglect their histories and how they were considered a form of animal life or ‘thing’ that could be bought, sold and treated accordingly (Mirzoeff 2018: 123). However, even when this history is acknowledged, does not the inherent lack of focus on human-human relations within the non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene risk to neutralise, de-centralise and de-politicise that history (Fagan 2019)? It appears as if the environmental crisis, which is feared to shake the foundations of the modern way of living in comfort and in material abundance (a way of living enjoyed mostly by the upper classes of the West), carries the implicit right to treat the history of human oppression as a nuance. It is as if the situation ‘humanity’ faces right now is of a much more crucial essence, requiring a hasty response in the form of re-thinking ‘humans’ as inseparable from ‘things’, ‘machines’, ‘nature’ and ‘other species’. For Earth System Sciences studying the Anthropocene, humans are geological agents (and history is geo-history) or nothing at all. Do the non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene enable a tacit way for the humanities to agree?

The anthropos in the question above cannot be indigenous people either, given the timing and urgency of the non-anthropocentric call. After all, indigenous people have long endured many hardships akin to those in the Anthropocene (such as ecosystemic and economic collapse, biodiversity loss, forced displacement and cultural disintegration) due to colonialist and capitalist exploitation, and their being perceived as part of ‘nature’ in the process (Whyte 2018: 226). The horror of these hardships has become apparent to a large proportion of non-indigenous people (and, as such, appear to truly matter to the non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene) only now. Discourses with non-anthropocentric tendencies get energised by indigeneity only when inquiries into resilience in the Anthropocene, hope to reunite humans with an increasingly unstable, complex and unsafe nature (Grove and Chandler 2017). The implication is then that the rest of humanity can learn survival strategies from indigenous people (e.g. Bardsley and Wiseman 2016; Salick and Ross 2009). In such contexts, where we meet critical hope again, the reference to indigenous intimacy with nature is not only romanticized, but also tainted. The discourses also treat indigenous local knowledge as an untapped resource, *untouched* or at least *unharmd* by modern colonial histories (Whyte 2018: 236), a resource ready to be used for finding solutions to the Anthropocene crisis and for the salvation of ‘humanity’ (see Chandler and Reid 2019). These perspectives serve as yet another means to centre the anthropoi of non-anthropocentric discourses of the Anthropocene, this time as those in charge of ‘planetary emergency management’ (Rothe 2020) with the specific task ‘to manage and ultimately master the ecological crisis’ (Roelvink and Zolkos 2015: 47).

Non-Anthropocentrism in Anthropocene Archaeology

Archaeology followed other disciplines in adopting non-anthropocentric discourses in attempts to formulate responses to the dire challenges that characterise the Anthropocene. These attempts include efforts to enrich archaeological practice and thinking in the Anthropocene via object-oriented ontologies (Pétursdóttir 2017), to develop strategic theories for heritage (Harrison 2015; Solli et al. 2011), to re-think existing concepts prominent in the discipline such as ‘artefact’ (Hudson 2014), ‘landscape’ (Kelly 2014) and ‘past’ (Olivier 2020), to set new priorities for environmental ethics (cf. Shaw 2016) and to affirm both the dialectics between human and non-human vectors in the Anthropocene and the overwhelming nature of this tension for humans (Pétursdóttir 2020; Witmore 2019). Critical hope is prominent (or at least apparent) in many of these studies which orient towards a better present and future for humanity and/or better protection or understanding of the human past. There are also obvious affinities between the ethnographic and/or historical attempts to use indigenous knowledge to survive the crisis, as discussed above, and archaeological attempts to valorise the discipline by using archaeological pasts for environmental crisis management (cf. Pétursdóttir 2017, 180-181). The latter is then bound to be overburdened by the ethical failings of the former.

Importantly, Pétursdóttir (2017; 2020) and Witmore’s (2019) approaches to the epoch stand out here as they illustrate how non-anthropocentric Anthropocene critique can effectively exclude critical hope and, as such, self-contradiction. They depict a world in which humans struggle to find meaning, a world deprived of promises for human salvation and survival, and of inspiration for human progress. Given the pervasive ethical issues discussed above, however, it still stands that while it is ‘a useful theory in some cases, the Anthropocene topic is a great example to illuminate both ... limitations, and important epistemological implications’ (Ion 2018: 192) of non-anthropocentric critique.

Acknowledging these limitations and implications makes it vital to start a discussion within archaeology on how to take steps towards an Anthropocene critique that is not dominated by non-anthropocentric discourses (see also González-Ruibal 2018: 18-19). The larger aim is, of course, to contribute to the formulation of a correct archaeological response to the challenges of the Anthropocene - a massive historical responsibility. The critical hope incarnated by non-anthropocentric discourses surely energises a range of historically familiar and comforting imaginaries that soothe Anthropocene anxieties and promise human survival, salvation and, despite all odds, even progress. As such, it is hard to escape its hold. Yet, as Mirzoeff (2018: 24) puts it, ‘however the Anthropocene is to be defined ... interpretations of world history will be bound up with it’; so will understandings of *present* and *future*, *here* and *there*, and the many agents involved in shaping these temporalities and spatialities. This is all the more so given the popular interest in the topic which

would amplify the effects of any discursive error made within academia. Therefore, as a final point, I advocate taking our time to establish an Anthropocene theory in archaeology rather than hastening to incorporate popular discourses, for the stakes are very high (see also Hussain and Riede 2020). If this is another call for slow archaeology, it is surely the most pressing one. During the process, archaeology will most probably have to switch its prime/explicit critical focus from the modern episteme to the destructive forces of capitalism (see Hamilakis and Duke 2007). After all, picking our fights is absolutely crucial in responding correctly to the mess and disaster named the Anthropocene today. This is especially true now as it becomes increasingly clear that formulating correct responses to the epoch remains impossible as long as the reckless exploitation of the Earth and its people through capitalist practices prevails.

References

- Bardsley, D. K. and N. D. Wiseman, 2016: Socio-ecological lessons for the Anthropocene: Learning from the remote Indigenous communities of Central Australia, *Anthropocene*, 14, 58-70.
- Bonneuil, C. and J.-B. Fressoz, 2016: *The shock of the Anthropocene: the earth, history, and us*, London, Brooklyn, NY.
- Braidotti, R., 2017: Four theses on posthuman feminism, in R. Grusin (ed.), *Anthropocene feminism*, Minneapolis, 21-48.
- Burke, A.; S. Fishel; A. Mitchell; S. Dalby and D. J. Levine, 2016: Planet politics: a manifesto from the end of IR, *Millennium*, 44, 499-523.
- Burkett, P., 1999: *Marx and nature: a red and green perspective*, New York.
- Chakrabarty, D., 2009: The climate of history: four theses, *Critical Inquiry*, 35, 197-222.
- Chandler, D., 2019: The death of hope? Affirmation in the Anthropocene, *Globalizations* 16(5), 695-706. doi: 10.1080/14747731.2018.1534466.
- Chandler, D., 2020: After pessimism? Affirmative approaches to the Anthropocene, in T. Stevens and N. Michelsen (eds.), *Pessimism in International Relations: Provocations, possibilities, politics*, Cham, 173-190.
- Chandler, D. and J. Reid, 2019: *Becoming indigenous: governing imaginaries in the Anthropocene*, Lanham.
- Fagan, M., 2019: On the dangers of an Anthropocene epoch: geological time, political time and post-human politics, *Political Geography*, 70, 55-63.
- Foster, J. B., 2000: *Marx's ecology: materialism and nature*, New York.
- Foster, J. B.; B. Clark and R. York, 2010: *The ecological rift: capitalism's war on the earth*, New York.
- González-Ruibal, A., 2018: Beyond the Anthropocene: defining the Age of Destruction, *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 51, 10-21.
- Grove, K. and D. Chandler, 2017: Introduction: resilience and the Anthropocene: the stakes of 'renaturalising' politics, *Resilience*, 5, 79-91.

- Harrington, C., 2016: The ends of the world: international Relations and the Anthropocene, *Millennium*, 44, 478-498.
- Head, L., 2016: *Hope and grief in the anthropocene: re-conceptualising human-nature relations*. *Routledge research in the Anthropocene*, London, New York, NY.
- Horkheimer, M. and T. W. Adorno, 2002 [1944]: *Dialectic of Enlightenment: philosophical fragments*, Stanford.
- Jay, M., 1972: The Frankfurt School's critique of Marxist humanism, *Social Research*, 39, 285-305.
- Hamilakis, Y. and P. G. Duke, 2007: *Archaeology and capitalism: from ethics to politics*. *One world archaeology series*, 54, Walnut Creek, California.
- Harrison, R., 2015: Beyond 'natural' and 'cultural' heritage: Toward an ontological politics of heritage in the age of Anthropocene, *Heritage and Society*, 8, 24-42.
- Hussain, S. T. and F. Riede, 2020: Paleoenvironmental humanities: Challenges and prospects of writing deep environmental histories. *WIREs Climate Change*.
- Hudson, M. J., 2014: Dark artifacts: hyperobjects and the archaeology of the Anthropocene. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 1, 82-86.
- Ion, A., 2018: A taphonomy of a dark Anthropocene. A response to Þóra Pétursdóttir's OOO-inspired 'Archaeology and Anthropocene', *Archaeological Dialogues*, 25, 191-203.
- Kelly, J., 2014: The Anthropocene and transdisciplinarity, *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 1, 91-96.
- Lane, P. J., 2015: Archaeology in the age of the Anthropocene: a critical assessment of its scope and societal contributions, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 40, 485-498.
- Latour, B., 1993: *We have never been modern*. New York; London.
- Latour, B., 2017: *Facing Gaia: eight lectures on the new climatic regime*, Cambridge, UK; Medford, MA.
- LeCain, T. J., 2015: Against the Anthropocene. A neo-materialist perspective, *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, 3, 1-28.
- Malm, A. and A. Hornborg, 2014: The geology of mankind? A critique of the Anthropocene narrative, *The Anthropocene Review*, 1, 62-69.

- Mirzoeff, N., 2018: It's not the Anthropocene, it's the white supremacy scene; or, the geological color line, in Grusin, R. (ed.), *After Extinction* Minneapolis, London, 123-149.
- Moore, J. W., 2015: *Capitalism in the web of life: ecology and the accumulation of capital*, New York.
- Morton, T., 2016: *Dark ecology: for a logic of future coexistence*, New York.
- Morton, T., 2013: *Hyperobjects: philosophy and ecology after the end of the world*, Minneapolis.
- Olivier, L., 2020: Interpreting archaeological evidence in the Anthropocene. Incidental and meaning, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 30, 160-163.
- Pievani, T., 2014: The sixth mass extinction: Anthropocene and the human impact on biodiversity, *Rendiconti Lincei*, 25, 85-9.
- Pétursdóttir, Þ., 2017: Climate change? Archaeology and Anthropocene. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 24, 175-205.
- Pétursdóttir, Þ., 2020: In Passing: Beiläufigkeit at the Verge of Anthropocene, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 30, 164-168.
- Roelvink, G. and M. Zolcos, 2015: Affective ontologies: Post-humanist perspectives on the self, feeling and intersubjectivity, *Emotion, Space and Society*, 14, 47-49.
- Rothe, D., 2019: Governing the end times? Planet politics and the secular eschatology of the Anthropocene. *Millennium*, 48, 143-164.
- Ruddick, S., 2015: Situating the Anthropocene: planetary urbanization and the anthropological machine, *Urban Geography*, 36, 1113-1130.
- Salick, J. and N. Ross, 2009: Special issue: traditional peoples and climate change, *Global Environmental Change*, 19, 137-190.
- Shaw, J., 2016: Archaeology, climate change and environmental ethics: diachronic perspectives on human:non-human:environment worldviews, activism and care, *World Archaeology*, 48, 449-465.
- Solli, B., et al., 2011: Some reflections on heritage and archaeology in the Anthropocene, *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 44, 40-88.
- Stoetzler, M., 2018: Dialectic of Enlightenment: philosophical fragments, in B. Best, W. Bonefeld, C. O'Kane (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory*, London, 142-160.

- Wakefield, S., 2014: The crisis is the age, *Progress in Human Geography*, 38, 450-452.
- Wark, M., 2015: *Molecular red: theory for the Anthropocene*, London.
- Whyte, K. P., 2018: Indigenous science (fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral dystopias and fantasies of climate change crises, *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 1, 224-242.
- Witmore, C., 2019: Hypanthropos. On apprehending and approaching that which is in excess of monstrosity, with special consideration given to the photography of Edward Burtynsky, *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 6, 136-153.
- Yates, M., 2018: Environmentalism and the domination of nature, in B. Best, W. Bonefeld, C. O'Kane (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory*, London, 1503-1519.
- Yusoff, K. 2014: The Anthropocene frack, *Progress in Human Geography*, 38, 452-456.

Biographical note:

Piraye Hacıgüzeller is a senior post-doctoral researcher at the Ghent Centre for Digital Humanities and the Archaeology Department of Ghent University (Belgium). Her research interests are the theory and practice of digital archaeology and more generally digital humanities, in the cases of geospatial linked data and semantic technologies, and geospatial data creation, aggregation, management and analysis. She works on human landuse assessments, models and reconstructions in the Anatolian Bronze Age, which links her up with studies in Anthropocene archaeology. She is the deputy director of the Sagalassos Archaeological Research Project and co-editor of two recent books on archaeological space: *Re-Mapping Archaeology: Critical Perspectives, Alternative Mappings* (Routledge, 2019) and *Archaeological Spatial Analysis: A Methodological Guide* (Routledge, 2020).

Department of Archaeology and Ghent Centre for Digital Humanities
 Campus Ufo, Ufo, Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35
 B-9000 Ghent - Belgium