

ACC/acc

a shitpost

by Kem Regik

All Rights Reversed



MMXXIV

Kindly Redistribute

Part I

The Monster: Thanks for coming, sorry about the short notice.

The Oilman: I'm nothing if not flexible. What'cha need?

Mo.: Less about need and more a notification. We're making changes.

Oi.: Changes?

Mo.: Changes. (Looking to The Scientist as he sits down) Thanks for coming. Sorry about—

The Scientist: The short notice, yeah it's fine— (looking to Oi. as he settles) Why are you here?

Oi.: I'm here all the time, what's your excuse?

Mo.: Both of you shut up. I have shit to do later, let me get through this. (Gesturing to Oi.) The new administration is going to be rolling back regulations on your industry.

Oi.: Oh fuck yeah! How much rolling back are you thinking?

Mo.: All of it. The industry will be completely unregulated as of tomorrow.

Oi.: OH FUCK YEAH

Sc.: What?! You can't be serious!

The Monster: (Looking at Sc.) I said shut up. (Looking back at Oi.) As a result, a new tax will be levied on everyone in the industry. Half your profits will be seized on a quarterly basis, we're making a new office in the Treasury to collect it, so you'll be getting the fast track.

Oi.: (Celebration turns to shock)

Sc.: Oh it's just another shameless cash grab you slimy fuck! You're gonna wreck the

fucking climate and kill us all! This is why you fucking assholes are the absolute—

Mo.: (Looking at Sc.) I said shut up. This office will be coordinating with you to transfer that tax money directly into your labs.

Sc.: (bewildered) What...?

Mo.: By law the funds can only be used for research, you'll need to provide paperwork for compliance.

Sc.: ...compliance? Compliance for what, exactly?

Mo.: Climate remediation. Your job is to fix what he's doing. (Pointing at Oi.)

Sc.: (Outraged) What?! But you're just making the problem worse!

The Monster: Yeah, I know.

The Scientist: WHY?!

Mo.: Necessity is the mother of invention. You haven't fixed the problem, so the problem must not be big enough. This idiot (Pointing at Oi.) is guaranteed to go crazy, so you'll get both motivation and funding. Either you'll figure it out or you'll crack under pressure.

Sc.: (Bewildered)

Mo.: Fate of the species in your hands there. No biggie.

Oi. and Sc. are both shocked into silence for a moment.

Mo.: Alright, good talk. Gotta run, keep me posted. (Gets up.)

FIN

Part II

A basal argument, acting as structural description (and NOT advocacy), for Anthropogenic Climate Change Accelerationism, or anthropoclichacc, or ACC/acc.

Necessity is the mother of invention. This is a fundamentally true axiom of human history. Whenever persons, communities, tribes, nations, *the species* is faced with an existential threat, the gift Evolution unthinkingly bestowed upon us activates to its highest potential and we think our way out of it.

Humans are iterative in nature; we build on everything our ancestors built, and every generation that successfully passes their additions down guarantees the next will exceed the benchmark set by the last. This is the force that drives us at increasing speed towards the mythical singularity of fellows like Nick Land (of whom I was not aware, formally, until I had this thought and decided it would be good to check if anyone had beaten me to this punch and I realized he was at the top of any discussion about accelerationism in general because he invented it, apparently) and the occasional Posadist. This iterative process can be, well, accelerated. Human history is uncountably littered with instances of deadly crisis creating salvific technological, scientific, and societal innovations. There is little argument to be made against the notion that humans are primarily loss-averse, and so, best motivated by those external forces that stress us maximally.

Allow me now, from this axiomatic foundation, to present a conclusion for your consideration as a validly constructed political position (and not as a directive I believe ought to be carried out): the only reason we have not solved the issue of Anthropogenic Climate Change is because it is not yet an existential threat to the species, and the only way to generate the solution to Anthropogenic Climate Change is to worsen it until it becomes an existential threat to the species.

From the point of view of an ACC/acc, by contributing to the degradation or instability of Earth's climate, you are forwarding the cause of climate science more effectively. You are generating the very stimulus required to create the solution, because no amount of public or private funding to a research institution will create innovation if there is no motivator towards research. Capital-S Science does not just throw shit at a wall to see what sticks, it focuses energy on solving problems and answering questions; from most urgent to least urgent. If your focus, ethically, is the promotion of scientific advancement, you by definition want scientists to be working towards a goal, and if you want a particular goal to be worked on, you need to give people a reason to work on it. The best reasons are threats. The best threats are those that levy the highest stakes.

What higher a stake than the fate of the species?

Note that this is NOT climate denial. The ACC/acc here has fully admitted that Anthropogenic Climate Change is a real problem, a problem we are making worse by the day, but not bad enough for a critical mass of people to care enough to want to fix it yesterday.

At this point, one could say *Enter Ancap* and take the position that unrestrained capitalism is the most effective means of creating the climate crisis necessary to fix climate change, but I don't think this is necessary. There are statist answers to this challenge; I can imagine Mexico taking its nationalized petroleum industry and using legislation to force it to be as eco-hostile as possible, then taking the profits and dumping them into climate research institutions. There is no mandatory economic component to this ideology: so long as you make the damage bad enough, the scientific community will produce technology to reverse the effects of the damage you're doing, how you arrive at this point is ideologically inconsequential.

There is no mandatory utopian component here either, to be clear. The ACC/acc doesn't need to believe that fixing the climate will bring about some sort of ideal human society in order to want to fix the climate, but I suspect that the primary motivator, ethically speaking, for any genuine ACC/accs will be this belief.

I am terrified to think that in the near future, this sort of applied doomerism might become politically feasible to hold unironically. There are enough scientifically literate revolutionaries (I use that word very loosely here) hanging out in polcompball-flavored coffee shops—I think the kids call them "Discord servers"—for this to catch on eventually given the general distrust in academia and the scientific community at large in the current era. I will not be surprised when banners reading "tree-huggers for deforestation" start showing up in Lafayette Park, and I don't think you should be either.