

# Review of: "The Anthropocene Borderline Problems"

Lydia Ayame Hiraide<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Goldsmiths College, University of London

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting article which engages with and compares three different working concepts related to the notion of the 'Anthropocene' - by now, a well debated yet still contested term which seeks to describe our era. The paper argues that 'characterising anthropogenic global change requires more than assessing geoscientific features.' This argument is supported by an emphasis on complementary/supplementary geological methods as a useful tool for defining and describing anthropogenic global change.

The paper does a very good job of situating the three concepts within their specific academic and political contexts, tracing the history of these ideas and their dissemination before digging into them on a more conceptual level. Indeed, the author engages with recent literatures very thoroughly, citing and conversing with other papers from both natural scientific and more philosophically oriented fields. From this perspective, the author is engaging with a very relevant and current debate.

I appreciate that the focus of this paper is geological (which is not my own expertise), but I wondered whether it might have been interesting to draw out some of the societal aspects more explicitly as part of the discussion. If the claim is that assessing geoscientific features is not sufficient for characterising climate change, then it seems relevant to engage with the various interventions made by critical scholars in politics and geography who are arguing that the 'Anthropocene' cannot account for historical and contemporary heterogeneity amongst the humans that supposedly make up this 'anthropos.' Whilst this article does recognise the undistinguished anthropos as an issue, I could not help but feel left wanting more of an exploration of this issue - especially in relation to the more geoscientific and geological aspects of the arguments presented. Is there a way of weaving these conversations together more tightly? Some authors that might be worth engaging with are Donna Haraway, Richard Norgaard, and more recently, Malcolm Ferdinand.

Overall, however, I really enjoyed reading this article which offers an interesting perspective on a very hot debate. Thank you for the chance to engage with it.