Twenty years after his death, Deleuze’s thought continues to be mobilised in relation to the most timely and critical problems society faces. We are compelled to consider the philosophical consequences of the irreversible and profound impacts of industrialisation and consumerism on environments at a planetary scale. Theory is starting to reconcile itself with a grim environmental future, and more ambitiously, with the emergence of the Anthropocene as an eternal conceptual horizon. The Anthropocene disrupts thought itself, requiring that we return to the question of the place of the human species in the cosmos: a third Copernican Revolution. It is widely accepted now that the human species is itself a geological force. Any erstwhile conceptual distinction between human and natural history has more or less collapsed.

The question whether there could be a “good” or “bad” Anthropocene endows humans with an immense and unprecedented agency in their relationship to the earth, positioning us as accountable to future generations for past actions and present inaction. We should beware of the fact that this moral dimension tends to offer little more than a biblical version of human stewardship as ostensible solution for the catastrophic futures scientists are alarmed about. It has precisely been such selfish anthropocentrism, and its most vicious avatar, capital, that landed the species in this predicament in the first place.
If the risks embedded in the Anthropocene conceptually unify the human as a species desiring food, energy, art, and a minimum of groundedness, it also brings into relief the ways in which a violent earth further fissures humanity along economic, racial and sexual axes. Anthropocene anxiety manifests itself variably in reassessments of the entanglements of the human and the nonhuman, the continuing breakdown of the subject/object distinction, the mania apparent in the plans for geo-engineering, and an increasingly popular rethinking of the human body in the context of becomings-animals, -plant and -mineral. The Anthropocene likewise reminds us of the necessity to think at more-than-human scales. It has required that we consider deep time as well as vast space, reflecting in the process on the inevitability of human extinction and the hypothesis of a world “without us”. What worlds are there before, beyond and after human time and thought?

In philosophical debates, the concept of the Anthropocene has triggered an invigoration of ethical theorizing through the “posthumanist” redeployment of phenomenology, deconstruction, psychoanalysis, philosophy of science and literary theory. What might the significance of Deleuze and Guattari be in relation to this new and urgent set of concerns? Deleuze’s work presaged much of the concept of the Anthropocene, not only in his sustained challenges to humanism, anthropocentrism and capitalism, but also through his interest in geology and the philosophy of time. Guattari was keen on giving his work an “ecosophical” and “cartographical” dimension and spoke of a “mechanosphere”. Together, they posited a “geophilosophy” which called for a “new earth” along with “new peoples”. Not only does the work of Deleuze and Guattari offer a range of useful concepts that can be applied to contemporary global problems such as anthropogenic climate change, peak oil and genomics, but it also models the kind of interdisciplinarity that the epoch of the Anthropocene requires.

This special issue of *Deleuze Studies* will engage the many philosophical tools provided by Deleuze and Guattari and their interlocutors in order to critically approach our particularly tense moment in earth history. It also asks how this moment could change the ways Deleuze and Guattari are further developed.

We invite considerations of Deleuze, Guattari, or Deleuze-Guattari in relation to the Anthropocene from scholars working in any discipline. Contributions should be 6-8000 words in length and use the journal’s style. Abstracts are due on March 1, 2015. Decisions will be made by the March 15, and final essays due November 1. Articles will then be subject to double-blind peer review and published in 2016.
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