

Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities

Rethinking “Decoloniality and Futurity” for
the Anthropocene: A Speculative Spectrality

Rangga Kala Mahaswa

Proceeding of 10th International Conference on Nusantara Philosophy (ICNP)

Risalatul Hukmi, Rangga Kala Mahaswa, M. Rodinal Khair Khasri, Putu
Pradnya Lingga D. (eds)

Rethinking “Decoloniality and Futurity” for the Anthropocene: A Speculative Spectrality

Rangga Kala Mahaswa

Department of Western Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

e-mail: mahaswa@ugm.ac.id

Abstract

What is this thing called the Anthropocene? The Anthropocene is a strange thing. It is interesting conceptually, fascinating scientifically, and critically intriguing for our understanding when experiencing the borderless uncanny world-earth meeting. If an ontological uncanny of natural crisis time represents the promise of [M]odernity, which civilisation has altered nature, even colonised Earth into terra incognita circumstances and catastrophic possibilities simultaneously. The word ‘decolonisation’ of Anthropocene means ignoring the role of the world-colonialism system and creating the worlding conditions after modernity progress. However, the objections of the Anthropocene do not separate calamities based on ideology, political movement, social class, cultural local-wisdom, or even philosophical doctrine. In the eye of a geological epoch, human is being objects at the same time. For example, after the Great Acceleration event, people unconsciously produced a new planetary risk through rapid uncontrolled population growth, advanced post-capitalism industrialisation, and other unseen anthropogenic activities. Should [All] Humans be responsible for mass extinction and be wise in adapting near planetary future? The answer is open-ended because all of us are always possible contributors to anthropogenic wastes, even in small amounts, as non-neutrality accumulation. So, we cannot really hide in the image of the decolonisation of the Anthropocene, although it challenges Western thought categories about geophysical force and geopolitical agents in postcolonial view. It has never been (geo) decolonised—dwelling on the Earth—but we are only possible to decolonise our humanity. The limitation of our perception grasps the real-uncertainty-materiality world, breaking the wall of narcissistic self-exceptionalism. Conceptually, decentering subject helps us feel the strangeness of non-human entities, opening a more-than-human possible world. Additionally, (re)questioning the status of ‘Anthropos’ in the Anthropocene is critically important to remind us that it is part of our concern to consider the prospect of new interrelations between human and non-human. To do so, the recent revival of new weird materialism and speculative turn can open up the context of agency and materiality in the global Anthropocene.

Keywords

Anthropocene, Decoloniality, Speculative-Fiction, Spectrality.

1 Introduction: Moment of Becoming

The Anthropocene is a moment of becoming. We claim it as the age of humanity. When it comes to the Anthropocene, it is not only about the latest geological epoch finding but also about our self-existence as fragile species and simultaneously as an altered being. It sounds so strange. How is it possible that humans, in all their superiority, domination, and exceptionalism on Earth, capable of altering the geological surface, are still apprehensive about the prospect of existing in a greatly altered world in the near future? Such ambivalence prompts me to call it the moment of becoming in the new adventure of geological deep-time scale. Moreover, now is the time for humanity to show what they can do for this pale blue dot. Dancing in a time of ecological crisis is so chilling, and only through these moves can humans celebrate the latest dawn of advanced global civilisation. Geologically speaking, the timeline of humanity is brief compared to other previously existing multispecies that lived on earth. On the other hand, the Other-species/entities now live with us in shared-ecological world-life boundaries and are also forced embracing the moment of becoming in the last call of the Anthropocene—the sixth mass extinction.

Perhaps, my intention to problematise 'Anthropos' or the role of humans in general as part of the wider important agenda of the Anthropocene and its exciting prospect can be best summed up through the replacement of modernity thinking. Obviously, if we believe that we are alone in forcing the state of nature to depend on the progress of science and technology without interventions by 'Others', we are seriously at risk. One of the most celebrated quotes in philosophy, 'cogito ergo sum', which implies thinking alone, by and for yourself is insufficient to justify a solipsistic self-confidence that is dismissive towards the status of the external world and non-human world support that is appropriate and allows us to exist in the first place.

We can proclaim that we have conquered everything in this world that made our lives enriching, at least several decades after the devastating World War II. Ironically, we still never know what will happen next even though we understand how the unconcealment of all things, from super-microscopic entities to the great grandiose past event, but we only depend on what we call a scientific probability and model prediction concerning the next couple of times.

Thus, in this short philosophical essay, I intend to turn to the experimental, speculative perspective that the definition of the Anthropocene should be welcomed by multiple interpretations, particularly the disturbing nature of the Anthropocene. As the Anthropocene is that 'moment of becoming', 'becoming' in a lot of ways, such as becoming to be ratified by geologists, becoming to be philosophised by philosophers, becoming to be a discursive object by global policy by politicians, becoming the landscape by architects, becoming the inspiration by artists, becoming the cosmic horror by non-fiction writers, becoming the ecological anxiety by psychologists, and so forth. This moment means that the Anthropocene definition depends not on the geological ratification but on how we uniquely experience this global-Anthropocene circumstance.

Therefore, the discussion topic is divided into three limited points. The first discusses the decolonisation of the Anthropocene as the (Unfinished) Anthropocene World-Objects from the legacy of the spirit of modernisation hiding behind the banality of evil that masked colonisation as the project of humanising "civilised barbarism" around the globe. The second proposal explains decentering the subject and considering more-than-human worlds. For a state of Anthropocene to exist, non-human existence must be recognised and genuinely involved, not only as passive and subordinate contributors, but all possible non-humans to be assigned the status 'equal' to humans upon constructing an ecological world. Lastly, the projection of futurity is the primary point that people can survive during several critical times, like previous world events: the World Wars, economic recession, global pandemic, and many others. To reiterate the prospect of Anthropocene, each global phenomenon is seen as multifaceted—that a critical event is no more a single event and is always ongoing on living, dwelling, and intimating with us as haunting existence like a "monster and ghost in the landscape of the Anthropocene"—the spectrality of the great calamity that awaits us. Furthermore, the remnants of past events involving non-human entities contribute to the creation and alteration of our ecological ghosts.

2 The Decolonization of the Anthropocene

Global colonisation commenced important remarks pre-Anthropocene. Colonialism and imperialism brought complete social and political repression to colonised subjects that greatly affected their histories, landscapes, and their own ways of feeling and interacting with nature until an awareness of global climate change occurred. The Anthropocene is the time to bring a different way of decolonisation framework.

"If the Anthropocene acquires the status of a true geological epoch, it is obvious that such an epoch will determine the historical representation as well as the social and political meaning of the events occurring in it. In other words, this new geological era will not and cannot have the neutrality and a-subjectivity characteristic of geological eras in general. The Anthropocene situates the human being itself between nature and history. On the one hand, it is still the subject of its own history, responsible and conscious. The awareness of the Anthropocene, then, originates through an interruption of consciousness" (Malabou, 2022).

Nevertheless, the responsibility demanded by the Anthropocene is extremely contradictory and challenging, to the point that it involves conceding to a sense of powerlessness in assuming responsibility. The idea of the Anthropocene captures a dualistic crisis between the unfolding global ecological

catastrophe and the global capital collapse. The latest discourse regarding the Anthropocene begins when colonised people have experienced this epoch since late capitalism. The alternative to the issue of the Anthropocene rests on the notion that essential human nature is not only determining the contemporary crisis in the past, but a very ignored idea of the role of social system, from colonialism, capitalism, and marginalised small minorities. The vision of globalism generates a racialised history of extractive colonialism and erases non-human world demands.

Anthropocene is an Eurocentric intellectual pursuit since it is measured and dated in accordance with the scientific perspective set by a Western standard. Currently, the debate on the origin of the Anthropocene was popularly triggered by colonialism and extraction timeline: Conquest of America (1492), Colombian exchange (1610), European industrialisation (the 1800s), and 1945 the nuclear tragedy. The origin of the fossil extraction and plantation trade was sustained by slavery and racial inequalities. Kathryn Yusoff (2019, 2021) defends that the Anthropocene should recognise these histories in naming the future of the Anthropocene. It means to respond to such danger and risk that requires decolonising an act of epistemic violence.

Cheryl McEwan (2021) offers a postcolonial theory critique of the Anthropocene to critically engage the political ecology in responding to the epistemological dilemmas. Dipesh Chakrabarty's approach (2021) to understanding the human as both a geophysical force and a political agent represents a significant shift in postcolonial thought, but it does not take into account the different levels of vulnerability that exist within human society. Meanwhile, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Sylvia Wynter, on the concept of *becoming planetary* offer an alternative perspective on the Anthropocene and global change, encouraging the decolonisation of knowledge about the world by considering it from outside the framework of Western thought. Thus, the multifaceted realisation of the Anthropocene entails an experience based on geo-socio-stratigraphic layer that can be plausible in the attempt to fulfil epistemic decolonisation.

Why should it matter for the Anthropocene to decolonise knowledge? A popular rationale is that the legacy of colonialism has set up only a single perspective which automatically designated it as epistemic authority over many other possible perspectives, thus resulted in the form of epistemic injustice. Injustice here does not only relate to the moral claim that 'epistemic colonisation is extremely wrong', instead I want to show that this legacy unconsciously affects our understanding of this current crisis of the Anthropocene, especially people who live in the Global South or postcolonial world as subaltern Anthropocene. They survive the crises caused by colonial legacy by following the Western standard of modernisation while quietly acknowledging the dark side of colonisation that haunted them. The limited understanding of the impact of Anthropogenic activity can be attributed to a Eurocentric perspective.

An alternative key of epistemic decolonisation in the Anthropocene takes the real social situatedness of the agent into account. By building a more inclusive and diverse epistemic framework, the revitalisation of fractured socio-epistemology as disintegrated knowledge system through its contact with the dominant epistemic system holds the potential for members of socially marginalised groups to rethink the dark legacy of understanding the natural and cultural opposition, and its means epistemic colonialism embedded on cultural behavior can be revised to experience the real situation following "critical condition emergence" without depending on Euro-Anthropocene centric.

Matolino (2020) argues that there is no 'purification' of epistemic decolonisation because colonialism and slavery are historical facts that cannot be denied and the hybridisation of knowledge sources has come into contact with each other either directly or indirectly. It then resulted in the question of the locus of a pure form of knowledge of the traditional culture since there is no amount of theorisation on epistemic decolonisation in ensuring our true identity.

Every epistemic decolonisation struggle sometimes finds themselves trapped in victim-blaming or overly arrogant accusations towards [W]estern people who have only taken responsibility for the impact of cultural devastation and environmental crisis, yet oblivious to what the local perpetrators of greater injustices did so far. This claim is an expression of self-criticism regarding the epistemic decolonisation that encourages historical facts aside from increasing our efforts to aspire for a new understanding post-decolonisation and experiencing the evolving life-world we inhabit as well as how this geo-trauma changes what we see afterwards: the post-world war II, the great acceleration, and hyper-globalisation. These three preconditions also push the Anthropocene geo-socio-stratigraphical layers.

I assume that these three preconditions have thus far ushered the discourse of the Anthropocene to prominence. These three things are a combination of three basic concepts for understanding how colonialism has actually shaped the Anthropocene world. Although the thesis on colonialism is not formally recognised across disciplines in Anthropocene-based geology, it is important for us to understand the process of the formation of the Anthropocene in line with the global colonialism in the past and even the remnants of new colonialism that still affect affected countries. If, in the past, the orientation of colonialism

was to expand power and influence, today, in the name of global economic interests, the colonialisation of power has shifted to the domination of natural resources based on energy and capital. Global progress must be paid for with the earth's energy based on fossil fuels. Unconsciously, this is where the process of the third precondition of the Anthropocene works, which I call geo-socio-stratigraphical layers.

These three basic stratifications are used to provide a general understanding of the Anthropocene as a meeting point between the world of life and the continuously formed earth. There were pre-given structural conditions before colonialism became an ideology. Geospatial conditions and abundant natural resources exist in a specific spatial and temporal geographic region. This natural prosperity, blessed with an abundance of energy resources, is sought upon to fulfill the lavish social world's desire for life. Along with the spirit of exploration and the orientation of accelerating the industrial revolution in various developed countries, it is necessary to sacrifice regions that do not have the same social-political power in maintaining their geographic environment. This is where the struggle for geological power occurs. The mapping of natural resources and power is called a geopolitical map.

The passage of centuries does not mean a dissolution of the impact brought by colonialism. The geo-power mapped in geopolitics evidently leaves traces on the geological layers that can be deciphered through stratigraphic excavation. The stratigraphic approach is generally used to map the relationships between rules and historical events in the past based on rock layers. The rock body, chronologically and spatially, has different characteristics. Similarly, during the period of global colonialism centuries ago, it left layers of traces and sedimentation. These layers determine to what extent the geo-power stratigraphy influences the community's understanding of their social world, but they are also forced to accept the given conditions of the past as a barren environment because everything was transferred to the Metropole. Furthermore, the extraction of natural resources routinely performed by colonial administrators all over the world greatly left lasting impacts on the progress of social life and ecological well-being. This exchange equally happens not to affirm a harmonious balance model, but to illustrate that the geopolitical map is always concerned with geo-power that creates long-lasting geotrauma generation after generation.

We can trace these markers of geotrauma by examining the geological record through the folds, fractures, blocks, and sedimentation carved in nature due to anthropogenic changes. The Anthropocene has left scars or scratches on the earth's outer structure, which can be found when measuring the impact of anthropogenic pollution. However, suppose we only provide a narrative of the Anthropocene on the aspects of globalisation and the impacts that are only counted cumulatively. In that case, it will not give any meaning to the decolonisation approach of the Anthropocene. Unfortunately, these geotrauma survivors only raise issues of degradation of their ecological environment based on geopower or social-political power and cultural repression dominance. To advance the agenda through narrative, they will invite us to rethink that the legacy of geotrauma as their concrete material basis affects the extent to which they can think about their social life in a more dignified way.

On this occasion, I see that through a speculative approach to the dimension of human imagination, from a narrative and a sense, we can see to what extent our ability to re-read the given materiality is. Geotrauma is not just a damaged environment, the terms damaged and destructive may only be attributed to human interests. Discomfort in life causes us always to mourn and give symbolic signs of damage. If we look at the earth per se, the changing earth, the damaged earth that heals itself, just like natural healing, is not an essential problem for us. However, human reasoning and interests make us able to decolonise our thinking about the traditional definition of the earth. Of course, I reject that liberation from this decolonisation project can fully free us from the impact of geotrauma that has occurred.

Our inability to decolonise geo-ecology is inherent in our existence as humans within all processes because we silently carry out the mindset set by colonisation that provides a justified basis in our life. However, since life on earth is inevitable, human interests need to be addressed first before discussing what kind of world on earth is suitable for humans to live in. Thus, I borrow Negarestani's view on geotrauma. Negarestani argues that human imagination, narrative, and sense are integral to the process of understanding and shaping the world around us. It suggests that instead of trying to eliminate stories or cultural narratives, we should focus on constructing a "science of real plots" in order to understand and address the compulsive-repetitive symptoms that are present in human culture. He mentions this approach, "Geotrauma," which seeks to understand the world through the lens of narrative and storytelling.

Of course, to further analyse geotrauma, a more detailed and in-depth explanation and analysis are needed. I offer some initial concepts for re-reading to what extent the Anthropocene decolonisation project should be carried out. First, we need to reconsider the ontological differentiation between the human world of life and the earth as a point of human reference. They are different but are often equated in practice and general conceptual views and are often misunderstood when advocating for issues that arise. Further analysis is needed on this matter as well. Second, it is necessary to carry out a decoloniality projection. This

decoloniality projection applies to the social world and geo-earth in the context of the world before and after colonisation. This world is considered a complex convergence of many complexities, whereby absolute freedom mingled in an infinite space through the new world of virtuality and market globalisation.

However, can all of our experiences and perceptions of the earth that situates us at the level of individual agency and scale of capacity be ignored? Do we always follow what is formulated in a single global discourse? The answer is no. Every agency that surfs on geotrauma ecology has the right to speak and the right to state its inability to live on certain territorial boundaries. For the time being, the earth is always undergoing deterritorialisation under the layer of the name of national boundaries or reterritorialisation beyond the boundaries of agency perceptions. Finally, we need to rethink efforts to decentralise subjects and consider more-than-human worlds to re-examine more open discussions, namely the new earth. A more open earth that interprets geotrauma more realistically without any illusion of romanticised projections of the past. It is reasonable for the Anthropocene to always speak of futurity or the future in general. The future is where the ghosts of the sixth extinction or human extinction scream loudly and demand constant attention. Every step and ability of anthropogenic power that we have determines the geotrauma steps in the plane of society.

3 Decentering the subject and considering more-than-human worlds

Rose et al. (2017), following Jacques Derrida's remark, draw attention to something often overlooked, as mentions the phrase "each time in defiance of arithmetic". This highlights the importance of how we think about, name, and categorise non-human life, which is not just a mere academic exercise. The very notion that one can simply choose an animal from a list and think about it, without much consideration, reflects the difficult situation that multiple-species face in the Anthropocene. They are surrounded by humans who have reduced the complexity and mystery of the living world into a set of words and fleeting images. The way in which human understand and think about the living world is increasingly dominated by a false sense of familiarity, where everything is brought closer to anthropocentric perspective by stripping it of its manifold sensory experience, reducing it to the barest minimum of logical meaning.

Decentering [S]ubject is an attempt to reevaluate the decolonisation approach of the Anthropocene. Philosophically speaking, decentering the subject involves shifting away from a human-centric perspective and instead considering the point of view and experiences of non-human entities in the world. This approach is becoming increasingly important as we face issues like climate change and the destruction of biodiversity as the consequences of human activities that have ignored the impact on other beings and the planet as a whole, as the Anthropocene discourse proposed. The primary goal of the decentering project is to reassert that subjectivity is not the only justification for the Anthropocene. On the contrary, the Anthropocene is relatively independently from humans, because we cannot directly control and determine the Anthropocene impacts, even though we have geoengineering to hack this natural system. Again, humanity is not specifically product of Earth. Humanity is simply another form of the World, and the world itself came into being as a result of the cultural demarcation that formed hundreds of thousands of years ago. Culture is often seen as the most integral and essential aspect of humanity. However, the vanity of human exceptionalism has become commonplace and every projection is always been oriented toward the subject itself. Without any considerations, humanity often arises in the lack of subjectivity and is closed by reclaiming everything hierarchically superior, including the Earthlings relation.

Several key philosophical figures have been debating this decentering subject discourse in the context of the Anthropocene from new materialism, object-oriented philosophy, posthumanities, and Deleuzian geophilosophy. Jane Bennett (2010), a new materialism philosopher, argues that non-human entities should be considered active agents in their own right, rather than passive objects to be acted upon by humans. This perspective allows for a more holistic understanding of the world, recognising the interconnectedness and interdependence of all beings. For example, Jane Bennett presents a convincing argument for why and how we should view geological things as active forces in daily life. Bennett notes that in modern times, we are becoming increasingly intertwined with non-human nature, which has intensified and become more difficult to ignore.

"...modern selves are feeling increasingly entangled, cosmically, biotechnically, medially, virally, pharmacologically, with non-human nature. Nature has always mixed it up with self and society, but lately this comingling has intensified and become harder to ignore" (Bennett, 2010: 115).

Human culture is now enmeshed with vibrant, non-human agencies, such as the food revolution, which involves a mutual transformation between human and non-human materials. The geologic is also a key participant in the effectiveness of the electric grid, which is a complex assemblage of human and non-human agents. When the grid blacks out, it does so with an agency that is distributed among many sites, from a quirky electron flow to members of Congress who believe in neoliberal market self-regulation. Thus, this concept is rooted in the idea that human subjects do not solely make up the world-construction, but also entangle a more-than-human world in which all beings have different roles to play.

Here, more-than-human world in the Anthropocene also challenges the traditional and romanticism of human superiority over others. For example, the traditionalistic framework of morality on anthropocentrism, which holds that human well-being is the ultimate moral goal, is challenged by the recognition of the moral value of non-human entities. The more-than-human perspective, on the other hand, recognises that power is not solely held by human subjects, but is also distributed among non-human entities. This leads to the consideration of new forms of politics, such as 'multinatural politics,' which seeks to bring non-human perspectives into the political process. By recognising the agency and vitality of non-human entities, and the interconnectedness and interdependence of all beings, it can advance the idea of a more holistic understanding of the world during the Anthropocene turn.

In a time when humans are believed to have become the most significant force in shaping the Earth's geology and atmosphere—as represented by the new geological era known as the Anthropocene, there is a growing interest in exploring alternative forms of biopolitics. This has led to a "geological turn" in the humanities and social sciences. By placing human beings within a broader geological and ecological framework, which includes the threats of global climate change and extinction, new ways of thinking about the environment and new forms of storytelling that move beyond human-centered perspectives are emerging. As Herbrecht et al. (2022) emphasise, "Placing the human within a deep-time geopolitical and geo-ecological framework in the context of the Anthropocene, global climate change, and extinction threats allows for a new deep ecological thinking and new forms of postanthropocentric narrativisations, or "geostories". The urgency of understanding the nature of humanity in our time is highlighted by two interconnected perspectives: the recognition that humans may be the most influential factor in shaping geomorphic factors on the planet and the increasing integration of humans and technology, which may lead to a post-biological future envisioned by "transhumanists".

The idea of the Anthropocene, dangerously, tends to presuppose the possibility of an anthropocentrism consensus where historically, there is only one significant species and difference changes and impacts on the Earth. If we accept this notion it means that we always accept the only existence and death determination of such a shared and essential myth of humanity over all non-human aspects. For instance, the proposed solutions to the climate crisis through unilateral and anthropocentric geoengineering approaches are highly questionable, particularly given their potentially drastic consequences for non-human entities. Ben Woodard (2013), at this point, partially has doubts concerning the lack of discussion of Mortonian's Hyperobjects – objects that are too large and complex to be fully understood by human race, such as global warming and plutonium. Woodard's geophilosophy grasps thought in relation to earth and its territory, and then how two different traumas (earth and world) lie on the terrestrial plane and fluxes of populations of all kinds. Geotrauma perhaps unconsciously exists among the multiple or beyond relations between all matters. Suppose the concept of alien artifacts and the theory of hyperobjects also materiality of things cannot explain the possibility of non-human entities being captivated by objects on a different time scale and the possibility of a non-human fascination with objects within inhuman and posthuman temporality. In that case, this concept is circularly trapped on the cosmic conservative background.

The planetary crisis makes us aware of how interdependent everything is. This has resulted in anthropogenic anxiety, a weird experience, and geotraumatic after entering the Anthropocene; there is literally no world as same as human-world anymore. Facing the real ecological crisis makes humans realise their state of fragility and desperation because of the prospect of losing an ontic or the actual physical level people trust for the next. Questioning meaningfulness in times of crisis is futile. This challenge lies in regarding relics not simply as artifacts that represent past human cultures and civilisation, but this might lead to the development of a more-than-human-world consciousness after all. *Terra incognita* world is not a world to index past human scientific prediction, which happens to be preciously accurate and fixed. Against the "naïve" philosophy on objects that they are so vacuum-sealed and connected across various actions and only exhibiting surface-effect level, thereby evading how these objects came into being in the first place. If this thought is commonly accepted, then such a notion of the Anthropocene is stopped on mere ideological or political questions. The Anthropocene is "hiding in placing a too placing universal, over-

generality and responsibility on our self-understanding the human-centrics while ignoring an idea of the subtleties of history, culture and difference" (Colebrook, 2016), and also I call attention to "more-than-human worlds".

As soon as geologists, ecologists, biologists, and earth system scientists provide evidence of mass extinction at global level, humanity seems to become 'instant victim,' 'the end of mankind,' and many sustainability projects are swiftly devised for surviving human civilisation. Cohen et al. (2016) bring the challenge for a critical posthumanism, however, rejecting [M]an as global victims, so-called "stories of an innocent and civilised species". Instead, the Anthropocene might open the possibility to the realisation that the limitless of the many living beings (non-humans, inhumans, and more-than) coexist on Earth, facing their own unique challenges and obstacles, surviving, struggling, dwelling even without any grasp of humanity as it is commonly understood. The question of what it could mean to be "Anthropo-un-seen(ly)" might thus lead to a form of geological angst in this context in that humanity fails to uncover certainty and is more tolerant to keep the angst alive in times of uncertainty. As Wood writes:

"...Thinking geologically, understanding human beings on a time scale much greater than our own history (or even the history of life), invites a certain naturalism, in which our pretensions to being special are burst like a bubble." (Wood, 2019).

This way of thinking from post-Anthropocene(-tric) implies the transition from a mere human to more-than-human on deep-time questions regarding the place of agency and its responsibility at a point where humans and terrestrial history will end. Because of thinking geologically, we most urgently need answers that our exceptionalism or privilege are shattered, as if a bubble has burst. Manuel DeLanda (1997) argues that a phenomenon like the Industrial Revolution might be seen as a feedback loop or reciprocal stimulation between technological advancements and social institutions. A historical narrative called 'geological', emphasises the dynamic elements like energy, flow, and nonlinear causality that humans share with non-living structures such as rocks and mountains.

"DeLanda accumulates "a single matter-energy in the process of becoming novel structures and manifesting for the processes of various kinds, as emphasised... all different manifestations of this dynamic material reality, or, in other words, they all represent the different ways in which this single matter-energy expresses itself ..."
(DeLanda, 1997: 21).

Therefore, it can be formulated that we are living on a new structure of social and geological strata simultaneously, or that specific social and geological stratification is differently based on the degree of sedimentation of fossil powers and materials.

Moreover, Kathryn Yusoff (2016, 2017) advocates the (geo)political value of the differentiation ideas related to a geological 'proto-human', as a human-as-fossil-to-come, or new originary moment for the civilisation, as an epoch of socio-geology with more-than-social regulations, differentiated by inhuman forces. Clark and Szerszynski (2021) highlight that 'planetary social thought' happens because of the effect of such a social-geology-stratified narrative in the face of a recent unconditional geostratification during the Anthropocene, which is particularly relevant when considering the current state of humanity, which is geophysically active but politically inert. Geostories, whether based on science fiction or scientific fact, are involved in constructing a planetary memory that can better represent the intricate interrelations between human and non-human life-worlds, as well as local, regional, and global concerns. Most importantly, perhaps various stories also highlight the intersection of personal and planetary experiences and offer the potential to imagine the past from a posthuman or more-than-human perspective. By examining the physical landscape as an indicator of environmental memory, geostories reveal a "palimpsestic layering of human and non-human bodies" (Bond et al., 2017: 860). This process is crucial in understanding the ructions of the Anthropocene, including the scalar, systemic, and conceptual shifts that are taking place, and in exploring the potential for new paradigms of imagined Anthropocene and geo-memories built by geostories.

Living in the Anthropocene blues is made of a "mesh" of relations, interconnectedness of various entities, which includes human family and its neighbours, also extends to non-human living and many materiality matters that surround human ecology. The entanglement relations warn against the unfolding collapses that are not just a space for human actors but also as well as a non-human character which means artists register the experiences of its inhabitants in the way of more-than-human memory state of affairs. The bounding of storytelling between two memories of humans and non-humans, among others, has described

this attention to temporal scales of “the syncopated and juxtaposed temporalities of biological and socio-economic growth.” Anthropologist Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing (2015), has described this attention to an event, as the Anthropocene’s commitment to living and dying in more-than-human communities that they tangled up with humanity projects. As Tsing and many scientists and artists show, the *Feral Atlas* project to recognise the world behind ‘feral’ ecologies. *Feral Atlas* goes beyond simply listing locations of destruction memories caused by imperialism and industrialisation by focusing on the connection to non-human histories. It expands the conventional concept of mapping by using digital tools to create innovative methods for the importance of on-site observation and interdisciplinary cooperation in developing crucial forms of awareness and action toward the pressing ecological crises of our times.

The notion of decentering humanity also includes the recognition of multiple indigenous worldviews; as Andersen et al. (2023) mentioned, “Pluralistic idea is very different from the universalistic and unitary where the realm of the Anthropocene today is limited that present as the humanistic identity.” In line with this project, Amoureux and Reddy (2021) acknowledge ‘multiple Anthropocenes’ equally as Hoelle and Kawa (2021) apply the philosophical idea of ‘Pluriverse’ as broad transcultural thinking from many *worlding* from around the world. This idea challenges the modernity of universalism ontology. Many worlds of the Anthropocene are excluded by the misrecognition of different interconnectedness of all non-human living things and avoided the process of ‘othering.’ This design should be focused on interspecies justice by rethinking the matrix of geopolitics, capitalism, and global colonial projection. Thus, introduction of the pluriverse of the Anthropocene is needed to reclaim “very condition of the Anthropocene as a way to call attention seriously consideration on ontological politics” (Mahaswa & Kim, 2023), namely, there are many kinds of worlds governed by all living beings during this ongoing epoch.

Elizabeth A. Povinelli (2016) proposes ‘geo-ontopower’; as “a set of discourse, affects, and strategies used in late liberalism to shape our coming relationship of the distinction between geo/bio, life/non-life, human/non-human”. The Anthropocene is an emerging intersection of the social and the geological matter by material-dynamics system. Paradoxically, this distinct boundary justifies the dehumanisation, objectification, and commodification of certain groups of people and extends to non-human organisms and the environment, which are treated as objects to be exploited. The use of violence and injustice against these groups persists historically. Povinelli (2021) also invites us to examine the contemporary experience of ecological collapse in our society and the great climatic event on the level of temporality and spaces. To transcend the imagination of catastrophe not as a future event that will always happen in new ways, but it began as an ancestral constellation of entangled human and more-than-human living.

“The ancestral catastrophe is not the same kind of thing-event as the coming catastrophe, nor does it operate with the same temporality. When we begin with the catastrophe of colonialism and enslavement, the location of contemporary climatic, environmental, and social collapse rotates and mutates into something else entirely. Ancestral catastrophes are past and present; they keep arriving out of the ground of colonialism and racism rather than emerging over the horizon of liberal progress.” (Povinelli, 2021: 3).

However, the tension between the past ‘utopian’ and the future ‘dystopian’ thought still haunts us, and still interacts with itself. Meditating the present thought is perfectly appropriate, given the spectrality of the end of the world always formed out of an entanglement with more-than-human worlds—an otherness of stranger. The survival of the Anthropocene involves material exchanges between living matter and non-living forms that silently traverse the boundaries and contrasts by which we use to classify different forms of life. At this point, the efforts of decentering subjects remain a question that humanity is still reliant on this categorisation of state of affairs to survive. Nevertheless, part of this journey is always dependent on an unpredictability and unorganised world in facing the uncanniness of futurity.

4 Calamity Spectrality: Do we haunt ourselves?

We already live in spectral times—a time in which temporality itself feels somehow displaced. The end of the Anthropocene used to live in a period of uncertainty and disorientation, where the concept of time and territorial spatiality seems to have lost its traditional meaning and stability. In other words, we are experiencing a time that feels ghostly or spectral, as if we are haunted by the past and uncertain of the future, stimulating a sense of temporal dislocation or distortion. Campbell et al. (2019) locate three

ontological dimensions; what if climate change is unstructured because of its unboundedness, unthinkability, and incalculability? It reveals climate change as a new planetary awareness that human never do have characterised. As the three unconditional statuses of equivocal climate change on passivity and dependency, which is a chance to overcome the distinct idea of non-human and rational beings. Indeed, rather than a negative prediction of future crises, the Anthropocene gives us what we follow as Quentin Meillassoux's metaphor 'great outdoors' through its geological correlationism.

Additionally, Monika Kaup (2021) advances a thought-provoking notion of the Anthropocene as a face of catastrophic *planetary objectification*. Catastrophic objectification, integrated with ontology capable of thinking that "the real" Anthropocene is essentially an irreversible entanglement between the plane of social and the realms of nature. Again, if we accept the real as merely exclusive of human fabrication, this speculative of Cartesian realism seems weirdly conservative.

One step in approaching this philosophical concept of calamity spectrality is through a reconceptualisation of the spectrality on the Anthropocene. In line with Marija Grench (2022) on reading how and why the anthropogenic matter is possible understood to be 'spectral.' The spectrality that animates or deanimates over every other material existence in terms of the logic of hauntology rather than ontology, even this notion creates the distinction between presence and absence of matter or being, and graps into question the issues of valorisation of living and non-living presence. Grench points out that hauntology can bring the spectrality of the Anthropocene:

"To view life hauntologically is to view it in this way—materially—to acknowledge its embeddedness in that which supposedly lies outside of it, disrupting any simple notion of its own self-presence. And this is precisely what a hauntological reading of the spectrality of the Anthropocene can offer." (Grench, 2022: 56).

Actually, reflecting on the Anthropocene does not necessarily need the ontological perspective to provide the existence of the present being conceived through the futurity. It also does not have to involve being stuck between the possibility of imagining a future and its absence. That is centered around humans and the inability to imagine unknown things based on the world and whether they are present or absent. Remember, the past is not an attempt to preserve the artefact archive and fix the present world in order for reclaiming in the future. By understanding ourselves and our own presentness as embedded in the geological worlds and biological realities, this material phenomenon seems spooky and spectral because it is always entangled in complex interweavings, "non-contemporaneity of multiple-helix memories" that we so often separate differently.

In regard to 'specters', they are typically associated with the possibility of something continuing to live on beyond the end of life—that something remains present even after it appears to have died. They conquer a space after life that is neither fully living nor fully dead, thus indicative of a continuation of life. The experience of the spectral often occurs in the space where something is meant to be absent but remains present, life and death, and vice versa. This spectrality usually refers to a past life, acting as a sign or trace of what it once was. Such a spectrality becoming material appears to come back as a new form of present "radioactive" life. Radioactive isotopes live on as traces of past events, such as nuclear explosions and their fallout, but this living on is a form of survivance that does far more than simply refer back to the past. Geologically speaking, fossil material tracing is identified as a past spectrality in the pre-historical time, but how is this temporal spectrality created by post-world war and modern globalisation progress? Increasing technological risks continue as an uncanny sense of spectrality in order to ongoing nuclear destruction, global pandemic, and environmental upheaval threats.

According to Claire Colebrook (2014), the idea of the Anthropocene epoch requires us to look at our present world and imagine how it will be perceived in the future. This perspective creates a sense of displacement in the present, as it is viewed through the lens of future-retro-vision, where it no longer exists as the spectral past of a speculative future (Grench, 2022). Nevertheless, while the spectral temporality of the Anthropocene forces us to confront the possibility of our own end and the end of the world, it also posits a continuing existence of the present world in the future. The idea of a human presence that continues to exist and haunt the future remains present as a spectral trace, despite the possibility of its own supposed nothingness.

Binge-watching serial-on-demand or watching movies at the theater about 'post-apocalypse' is even more likely experiencing near present situation in the phase after 'end of the world.' This sensation of "naked apocalypse" or near-extinction embodiment when we read literature or visit the 'postapocalyptic' wasteland of Chernobyl, or the silent hill of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in which our horizon of the world summoning them every temporal spectrality moment. Remembering everything else connected to the past

and the spectrality of the present as temporally fractured in-between past/future is also constituted out of otherness, already to be immanently traced on the earth's strata after. The notion of spectrality here is the primary concept to almost at its most basic level of the Anthropocene geological justification, in which on the belief that the mark of 'ancient spectrality,' including anthropogenic waste, will be recorded persistently in the earth's sedimentation like some ghostly fossilised archaic that perseveres long after its spectators are in absentia.

However, as Marija Grech (2022) shows in what follows; the contemporary intimations of anthropocentric spectrality are always mediated by a continued sense of presence by a "fantasy of survivance" that affirms the significance of humanity complexity, even when the determination of future supposedly does not really exist. This imagined possibility between the presence and absence of human's existence upon the earth at the same time, learning live in the present and die in the future. In this spectrality postulates the future of survival and persistence of the anthropogenic imaginary, always breaking space of mourning, remembrance, and redemption. Placing Derrida's *Specters of Marx* is relevant to say that the Anthropocene always attempts to geologise remnants, make them recreate in the present, and haunt us perspectively in the future as a spectral trace of the past. Grech (2022) points out that "If the present is already past, then it is already absent." It is because "the Anthropocene is conceptually predicated on a spectral reciprocity between these two points: it postulates a presence that persists and survives, but only in and as its own absence." While it allows the present to survive and goes beyond itself as a future trace, the spectrality of the Anthropocene also suspends this presentness by distracting its state of living and lived existence.

Accepting this spectral creates a feeling of still-ness and static-ness because the current moment is perceived as something that has already passed, then it becomes fixed, unable to be altered or move forward. Additionally, if the future only serves to reflect this frozen time, continuously reproducing and repeating it, then it too becomes trapped in this similar static suspension. There is no space for transformation in this self-referential (specular imaginary) perspective, which only speculates about itself. Although as a new human condition, the Anthropocene may offer a different kind way of relating to the earth, it is actually structured by a circular logic that eliminates the possibility of change. Instead, the present and future are stuck in a mirrored stasis of sameness.

The Anthropocene teaches us to how to learn between live and die at once, in which a way of "living in the calamities" and "an acceptance that our modernity is already dead". It is also to a certain ecological crisis that we cannot be ignored in attempts to understand multispecies inequalities. The world we imagined before has been gone after we realise the sedimentation of knowledge terms in the context of the geologization of ancestry thinking. As Quentin Meillassoux (2009) puts it, in this desire for an ancestral understanding is reasonable, even necessary and inevitable, it nevertheless remains somewhat skeptical (emphasised by Herbrechter et al., 2022). Therefore, while the desire for an ancestral understanding is not inherently problematic, it is still important to approach it in the sense of connection to their roots and identity. It can also provide a valuable perspective on how previous generations lived, what they believed in, and how they coped with the challenges they faced. One reason why the desire for an ancestral understanding can be viewed with suspicion. For one, it can lead to glorifying the past and rejecting the actual condition of the Anthropocene trajectories. This can lead to a reluctance to adapt to changing times from seeking a new definition of Humankind. Meanwhile, for Timothy Morton (2019), in *Humankind*, the Anthropocene is an ecological moment for transversing the human truly thinkable to care with non-human solidarity.

Moreover, the geological turn in the Anthropocene relies precisely on such a diachronicity or a synchronicity in according to which human only ever have access to the correlation between thinking and being and never to consider 'the great outdoors' or 'absolute outside,' as following Meillassouxian's reference; can be understood in which that prehuman deep time in paleontological words was not relative to us. Indeed, it is developed as the idea of nothingness, outside relation to the anthropocentric observer, and anti-humanist speculative. It also coincides with more general geological thinking; most importantly, it opens up the possibility of linking a 'bereavement' that refers to 'what does exactly exist before humanity emergence?' Since the spectrality of arche-fossil originates in a literally 'unexperienceable' sense and therefore remains exactly speaking 'implausible' from *Anthropos* perspectives, it means embracing a deep-time spectral that is closer to the idea of a pre-geological-givenness on our recovery process, in turn, is directed toward what we call 'ontological pre-given.'

4.1. Personal View: On Decoloniality and Futurity

The concept of 'decoloniality and futurity' has been compellingly addressed by many scholars such as Walter Mignolo, Marija Grech, Kathryn Yusoff, Marisol de la Cadena, and others. They have argued for the need to foreground postcolonial critiques that move beyond the current condition of coloniality towards a new form of decolonial thinking in which self-determination is possible. I propose a reconsideration of further decolonial thinking agenda, called 'Spectrality of Geophilosophy,' an emerging field of inquiry that seeks to explore ways to reconceptualise our relationship with the earth in light of human-induced climate alternation. Spectrality is understood as an ontology that seeks to challenge the boundaries between life and death, past and present, corporeal and incorporeal. By engaging spectrality in the Anthropocene, living with Spectrality offers an important opportunity to embrace and inhabit interstitial spaces between knowledge and practices related both to colonialism and postcolonialism; thus allowing us to reformulate decolonial futures as an ongoing conversation between past, present and future. A Spectrality that acknowledges death, both human and non-human, as part of life.

At the same time, Spectral Geophilosophy reaffirms the importance of resilience in resistance to colonial violence while also providing new possibilities for reimagining the relationship between living beings, material objects and environments. Spectral conversations provide an alternative approach to decolonising futurity by recognising multiple temporalities – including those that are often excluded from conventional colonial linear narratives– thus providing spaces for unlearning colonial logic. I also hope that we can begin to interrogate our current temporality and how it is shaped by colonialism. Spectral conversations offer an opportunity to re-envision colonial legacies and take steps toward decolonising the present and future. Through these conversations, we can come together to create new ways of being in the world with non-human entities and multi-temporal perspectives.

As a philosophical concept, doing spectrality conversations call attention to multiple nonlinear temporalities – from past, present, and future – and highlights their entanglement and integration in each other. Spectrality is not linear but rather cyclical, antiphonal, and polyrhythmic, thereby creating new possibilities of being which are not rooted in colonialism. This opens up an opportunity to rethink our deep relationship with the earth and its inhabitants by centering multi-temporalities, ecologies of memory, and disruption of colonial legacies. Spectral on futurity analysis allows us to consider how our actions in the present shape futures that may be yet invisible.

In doing so, Spectral Geophilosophy also challenges the notion of the Anthropocene as a human epoch, instead situating humans within a multispecies world in which we are entwined with other forms of life. In this way, it needs to develop decolonial strategies that consider the long-term consequences of our decisions. Spectral Geophilosophy also allows for a rethinking of *decoloniality and futurity*, in which we can begin to reimagine futures and create connections between present and past and inviting new imaginings of alternative worlds that are not premised on colonial legacies or exploitation.

5. Conclusions

The lines of decoloniality and futurity project are the primary sources of fear and anxiety in the future-unknown world, such as global pandemics, economic rupture, extinction mass, and natural disasters. These events have the potential to disrupt daily life and cause widespread suffering, making it difficult for individuals to feel secure and stable. Additionally, the rapid pace of technological change and the increasing interconnectedness of the world can make it difficult for individuals to keep up and understand the implications of these changes. Another source of fear in the future-unknown world is the sense of powerlessness that individuals may feel in the face of these global events. It can be difficult for individuals to know how to protect themselves and their loved ones, and the lack of control over the future can lead to feelings of helplessness and despair.

At its core, speculative spectrality focuses on understanding how people can anticipate potential risks posed by environmental change while simultaneously considering ways to mitigate them through proactive measures such as adaptation or mitigation strategies for nothing rather than something. Living in a world that is constantly plagued by fear of the future and the unknown can be a daunting and overwhelming experience. The future is uncertain, and the unknown is unpredictable, making it difficult for individuals to feel secure and safe in their daily lives. This fear can manifest in a variety of ways, from anxiety and stress to feelings of helplessness and despair. One of the most intriguing concepts associated with this new era is speculative spectrality—a concept that seeks to explore how humanity's actions will shape its future

prospects for survival in an ever-changing world. To fully grasp spectrality, we must push beyond the constraints of opposing ideas, set boundaries, and explore the inherent non-simultaneity of presence in the entanglement between various life forms and materials.

The approach of Spectrality Speculative on Geophilosophy and Anthropocene in terms of decoloniality and futurity challenges us to think beyond the limiting colonial binary categories of past/present, human/non-human, and inside/outside. By acknowledging the fluidity and complexity of these concepts, we gain a deeper understanding of temporal and spatial dimensions. This approach also invites us to consider how various temporal and spatial scales interact with one another and how they relate to concepts like ecological injustice, sustainability, interconnectedness, resilience, and vulnerability. Therefore, in the name of the Anthropocene, thinking with Earth can envision new possibilities for moving beyond simplistic binaries and towards a more nuanced understanding of our relationship to the world.

Acknowledgments This article briefly introduces my research concerning 'New Materialism and Its Agencies' funded by *Hibah Penelitian Dosen Muda*, Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada [No. 905/UN1/FFI/KS/OT/2022].

References

- Amoureux, J., & Reddy, V. (2021). Multiple Anthropocenes: Pluralizing space–time as a response to ‘the Anthropocene.’ *Globalizations*, 18(6), 929–946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1864178>
- Andersen, A. S., Hauggaard-Nielsen, H., & Christensen, T. B. (Eds.). (2023). *Interdisciplinary perspectives on socio-ecological challenges: Sustainable transformations globally and in the EU* (1 Edition). Routledge.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Duke University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822391623>
- Bond, L., De Bruyn, B., & Rapson, J. (2017). Planetary memory in contemporary American fiction. *Textual Practice*, 31(5), 853–866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2017.1323458>
- Campbell, N., McHugh, G., & Dylan-Ennis, P. (2019). Climate Change Is Not a Problem: Speculative Realism at the End of Organization. *Organization Studies*, 40(5), 725–744.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618765553>
- Chakrabarty, D. (2021). *The climate of history in a planetary age*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, N., & Szerszynski, B. (2021). *Planetary social thought: The anthropocene challenge to the social sciences*. Polity Press.
- Cohen, T., Colebrook, C., & Miller, J. H. (2016). *Twilight of the anthropocene idols* (First edition). Open Humanities Press.
- Colebrook, C. (2014). *Death of the PostHuman: Essays on Extinction. Vol. 1* (Vol. 1). Open Humanities Press.
- De Landa, M. (1997). *A thousand years of nonlinear history*. Zone Books.
- Grech, M. (2022). *Spectrality and survivance: Living the anthropocene*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Herbrechter, S., Callus, I., Rossini, M., Grech, M., de Bruin-Molé, M., & John Müller, C. (Eds.). (2022). *Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism*. Springer International Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04958-3>
- Hoelle, J., & Kawa, N. C. (2021). Placing the *Anthropos* in Anthropocene. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 111(3), 655–662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2020.1842171>
- Kaup, M. (2021). *New ecological realisms: Postapocalyptic fiction and contemporary theory*. Edinburgh university press.

- Mahaswa, R. K., & Kim, M. S. (2023). Introducing the Pluriverse of the Anthropocene: Toward an Ontological Politics of Environmental Governance in Indonesia. In A. Triyanti, M. Indrawan, L. Nurhidayah, & M. A. Marfai (Eds.), *Environmental Governance in Indonesia* (Vol. 61, pp. 15–31). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15904-6_2
- Malabou, C. (2022). *Plasticity: The Promise of Explosion* (T. Williams, Ed.; 1st ed.). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781474462112.001.0001>
- Matolino, B. (2020). Whither Epistemic Decolonization. *Philosophical Papers*, 49(2), 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2020.1779605>
- McEwan, C. (2021). Decolonising the Anthropocene. In D. Chandler, F. Müller, & D. Rothe (Eds.), *International Relations in the Anthropocene* (pp. 77–94). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53014-3_5
- Meillassoux, Q. (2009). *After finitude: An essay on the necessity of contingency* (Pbk. ed). Continuum.
- Morton, T. (2019). *Humankind: Solidarity with non-human people* (Paperback edition). Verso.
- Povinelli, E. A. (2016). *Geontologies: A requiem to late liberalism*. Duke University Press.
- Povinelli, E. A. (2021). *Between Gaia and ground: Four axioms of existence and the ancestral catastrophe of late liberalism*. Duke University Press.
- Rose, D. B., Van Dooren, T., & Chrulew, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Extinction studies: Stories of time, death, and generations*. Columbia University Press.
- Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins* (New paperback printing). Princeton University Press.
- Wood, D. (2019). *Deep time, dark times: On being geologically human* (First Edition). Fordham University Press.
- Woodard, B. (2013). *On an Ungrounded Earth: Towards a new geophilosophy*. Punctum Books.
- Yusoff, K. (2016). Anthropogenesis: Origins and Endings in the Anthropocene. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 33(2), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276415581021>
- Yusoff, K. (2017). Geosocial Strata. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 34(2–3), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276416688543>
- Yusoff, K. (2019). Geologic Realism. *Social Text*, 37(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-7286240>
- Yusoff, K. (2021). The Inhumanities. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 111(3), 663–676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2020.1814688>