

Review of: "Let the Transformative Anthropocene Be Positive!"

Anisa Mitra¹

¹ University of Calcutta, India

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"Let the Transformative Anthropocene Be Positive!" gives a very solid argument on the profound effects of human activities on planetary systems and the urgency of ethical reconsideration. However, there is no proper clarification of concrete actions, too much oversight on human dominance, and inadequacy for discussing new technologies and indigenous knowledge systems. Such an analysis would be stronger and more applicable to today's environmental challenges with a more balanced approach and solutions. The authors effectively cover the framework of the Anthropocene. The explanation relates to the scope of the core problem of the paper: the multifunctionality of human activities. They have covered integrative frameworks of a Technosphere with a Bio-Evolutionary Anthropocene (BioEA), which puts forth new evolutionary processes initiated by technological evolution and human influences on ecosystems. They further highlight the presence of hybrid and genetically modified organisms as evidence for how people have accelerated evolution to the detriment of ecology: an important issue in present-day sustainability.

This article is worth reading as it highlights the need for a re-evaluation of one's ethical approach in the context of our future interactions with the world. Shifting from visible human supremacy to the dominant but less apparent type of human domination, the authors stress the combinatorial effects humans have on biodiversity, urban sprawls, and climate.

The article rightly emphasizes that there is an ethical need to rethink our relationship with the planet. The point of human supremacy over Earth being visible and invisible catches the multidimensional dimensions of human impact on biodiversity, urban spread, and climate.

Despite all this, the commentary has a few weak points:

1. This article identifies the tremendous nature of the impact that has been made on the Earth by human beings. The implication of the article is a culture and ethical revolution that is called for, but it offers very little in terms of concrete actionable solutions. This idea of changing human behavior and cultural attitudes is integral; yet, the authors fail to outline clear paths towards achieving this transformation. Such a call, without suggesting mechanisms for policy changes, educational reforms, or technological innovations, sounds vague and idealistic.
2. Ironically, the article laments from the "Anthropocentric" perspective but, unconsciously, tends to emphasize human influence almost as the only determiner of planetary change. Such a position risks underplaying the robustness and agency of non-human species and natural systems, all of which persist in evolution and adaptation, sometimes beyond human choices, and even against the latter. A better-balanced position may represent the relation between human-driven

and naturally caused evolutionary forces without the risk of over-emphasizing the hand of human agency.

3. The article, in some parts, generalizes that human influence is uniformly bad and related particularly to biodiversity. The Anthropocene indeed entails an enormous degradation of the environment. Still, authors can identify many consequences of human intervention, which are less negative than would be drawn from earlier analysis. For instance, one could find a number of environments where projects of rewilding, urban green, or conservation have positive impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity. Yet staying strictly on the destructive aspects of human actions overgeneralizes the complexity of human-environment relations.

4. The authors only mention GMOs, hybrid species, and technological innovations, such as antibiotics; the discussions of all these points are relatively superficial. The benefits and ethical issues surrounding such technologies must be subjected to further profound analysis because these findings may contribute to possible later sustainability. For example, genetic engineering is both a threat and an opportunity, so a more balanced analysis of its potential could add value to the analysis.

5. By focusing attention exclusively on Western technological and ethical frameworks, the approach does not bring to light a scintilla of evidence provided by the authors that could be contributing ideas derivable from indigenous knowledge systems in addressing environmental stewardship. While several indigenous communities have fostered sustainable practices based on deep ecological understanding, these perspectives could provide an alternative ethical model derived from the challenges of the Anthropocene.