Environmental historians, neo-materialists, and posthumanist thinkers in a variety of disciplines have begun to suggest the many ways in which human culture is inseparable from the material world. Chakrabarty. 5 For a penetrating critique of the “Good Anthropocene,” see Clive Hamilton, The Earthmasters: The Dawn of the Age of Climate Engineering (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014). I criticize the broader Anthropocene concept itself in Timothy J. LeCain, “Against the Anthropocene: A Neo-Materialist Perspective,” International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity 3, no. 1 (2015): 1– From a more
constructivist perspective, here are some of the things the naming of the Anthropocene does: 1. It provokes thought, generates attention, brings other terms/groups/discourses together in ways that facilitate communication, exchange, and growth (funding, etc.). This means it blurs differences between different socio-ecological orders, that is, the very things that neo-materialist and post-constructivist approaches in the humanities and social sciences — like actor-network theory and others — are specifically attempting to focus on. In this sense, it does not particularly help us think through the ways we live on this earth, interacting with its other inhabitants, components, and flows.