#### **Human inputs may be involved in climate change, but this focus on the human is precisely how corporations co-opt status quo environmental discourse. Climate change is a hyper object that cannot be grasped entirely through local manifestations, which means it is always withdrawn from direct human awareness. Instead of attempting to transform climate change, we must theorize climate change as a hyper object and adapt to its existence.**
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One of the central theses of climate science is that accelerated global warming is primarily anthropogenic, or human induced. According to experts, temperature escalations are linked to increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels that are, in turn, caused by human activities, including fossil fuel combustion, aerosol usage, cement manufacturing, ozone depletion, and deforestation. With the exception of anti-intellectual climate change deniers and politicians pandering for publicity (often an interchangeable crowd), this narrative has gained consensus, both in the sense of being hailed as empirically accurate by the greater scientific community and consensually affirmed at the everyday level, where millions of people practice eco-friendly lifestyles, from driving hybrid cars to installing photovoltaic panels in their homes.¶ Eco-friendliness is good for the preservation of the planet. More and more, however, the discourses within which environmental protections are debated are suborned to neoliberal imperatives, to the exploitative, if industrious, logic of capital accumulation. Cap-and-trade may be the example par excellence, a policy promoted as putatively "green" that incentivizes pollution control through the creation of an emissions market, where large polluters increase their legal emissions capacity by purchasing carbon credits from smaller firms, in what amounts to a carbon pricing scheme. Originally proposed as a vehicle for regulating sustainable development, this scheme is, nonetheless, depoliticizing in its insistence on subjectivities molded on imminent catastrophe, incapable of resisting the capitalization of alternative futures as the purchase of eco-salvation is tied to the purchasing power of corporations monopolizing the technologies necessary for sustainability. In other words, energy suppliers—for example, British Petroleum—seek hegemonic control not just of alternative energy products, but the discourses informing a population's decision to employ such products, thereby ensuring that 'futures' remain a market mechanism, not an unfolding of new political potentialities. For international relations theorist Julian Reid, this entails a transition from predicating development on accounts of environmental 'security' to those of 'resilience', defined by Carl Folke, science director for the Stockholm Resilience Centre, as "the capacity to buffer change, learn, and develop as a framework for understanding how to sustain and enhance adaptive capacity in a complex world of rapid transformations." Reid states:¶ The resilient subject is a subject which must permanently struggle to accommodate itself to the world. Not a subject which can conceive of changing the world, its structure and conditions of possibility. But a subject which accepts the disastrousness of the world it lives in as a condition for partaking of that world and and which accepts the necessity of the injunction to change itself in correspondence with the threats and dangers now presupposed as endemic (Reid, The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience, 2010). ¶ If sustainability strategies are said to be expressions of neoliberal governance's own ability to adapt to critique (in this case, from environmentalists and nature-cultures), then the terms of eco-criticism must be concurrently viewed as already appropriated by neoliberal regimes, rendering them impotent. So, what to do? Decentering humans from their privileged position in eco-critical debate might be a good, if not obvious, place to start. Ironically, reification of human relations lies at the heart of mainstream conservationism, as well as its political opponents, with the former emphasizing mankind's role in causing ecological damage and the latter contending that human freedom is endangered by preservationist efforts to curb capital excess. Any wonder that the conversation led back to monetization and trading schemes, idols of the most informationalized and normative economic system yet enacted? ¶ In recent years, shedding one's skin has been made theoretically palatable by the evolution of object-oriented ontology, a philosophy that puts all objects—human and inhuman, animate and inanimate—on an immanent, equal plane of being. Objects are no longer instrumentalized, nor are they held to be exhaustively representable through human knowledge and discursive constructs. According to object-oriented anthrodecentrism, human perception is not the lone cosmological constant through which reality is mediated, but rather one being, albeit sophisticatedly conscious, among a multiplicity of singularities. Moreover, objects cannot be defined relationally and, instead, 'withdraw' from one another, retaining an untranslatable essence no matter the context in which they are situated (untranslatable because, as Graham Harman, one of the movement's founders, argues, any relation is an act of translation, and acts of translation involve converting reality into something other than the thing-in-itself). Put differently, object-oriented ontology rejects Kantian and post-Kantian anti-realism, which, according to onticologist Levi Bryant, treats the world "as being given in advance and as resulting from the agency of human structuring activity," marginalizing examination of object networks by regarding objects as implements for the facilitation of human agency—through cognition, politics, language, etc.—that contribute nothing of any real significance (pun intended), and, consequently, reducing philosophy to a "transcendental anthropology that seeks to investigate the manner in which cognition forms or produces objects."¶ Confused? Consider the following poem, my first attempt at OOO-specific verse:¶ I, Object¶ I object¶ to not being objectified¶ to being humanized as if my¶ thingitude fell entirely between¶ the lifelines traversing your mind.¶ I reject¶ being confined inside¶ the qualifications claimed to¶ define my nature by the sharp,¶ piercing eye of the knowing blind.¶ I reflect¶ your accidental refrain¶ withdrawing into my core,¶ while perturbing the common¶ terrain of our inexhaustible relation.¶ I protect¶ my saturnine difference¶ from becoming a machinic¶ cog in infectious ethics factories¶ that rebrand bland fabric as desire.¶ I, object,¶ uncategorizable, unified,¶ beyond an infinite loop, one¶ oak in the forest, irreducible to¶ burnt ash or a smoldering memory.¶ Sometimes it's simpler to read things aesthetically. ¶ Back to the Earth. As already indicated, an anti-realist climatological stance literally centers on humans, focusing on the protection of human beings, environmentally or monetarily. A typical environmentalist discourse repudiates the ecological recklessness of human activity where a typical corporatist discourse bemoans industrial disenfranchisement, but the color is the same. In extending the thought of Julian Reid, one can interpret the ability of the prevailing political system of the world's dominant polluters, neoliberalism, to arrest critique as a product and progenitor of anthropocentrism, a project through which agonistic forms of life are homogenized into homo sapien relations. Additionally, it is only within the boundaries of such a project that the essentialization and mobilization of species life can occur, allowing for the perpetuation of a permanent state of emergency and warfare waged in the name of safeguarding monolithic populations. Object-oriented theory injects a caesura into anthropocentric experiments, leveling the ontological playing field, emancipating climate change from the realm of pure human experience. Climate change is, then, theorized as an entity of its own accord, mereologically independent of the cars, gases, and, of course, humans, that factor in its composition—an example of what eco-theorist Timothy Morton calls 'hyperobjects', or objects that are so vastly partitioned spatiotemporally that they cannot be completely revealed through local manifestations. According to Bryant, hyperobjects are produced by the material traces of practices, in this case human initiated, that take on a life of their own, though it should be noted that hyperobjects, too, withdraw from other objects, including those objects whose material traces feed the hyperobject. Climate change, hence, escapes human awareness, which focuses on the localization of climate as weather, an impossibility falsified by the valorization of weather forecasts during the evening news, which make one feel as though the totality of climate change is graspable in the always already mediated immediate moment. Thus, the problem posed by climate change is not one of reconfiguring human security writ large, but, conversely, probing the lives of material traces, particularly those emerging from and evading one's own practical intentions.