

## Zoom Chat Box: Week One The Anthropocene

### General Info

**Kailani Sparrow** : [The books] are also available on kindle for a little cheaper I believe. I'm not sure. I think I only got one on kindle.

**Hope Jennings**: Butler's *Dawn* often included in *Xenogenesis* or *Lilith's Brood* (trilogy)

**Samantha Baxter** : the readings are just for in-class discussion, correct?

**[Hope Jennings]** : Yes, only in-class discussion. Readings are meant to provide examples of different kinds of eco-writing and help us explore different topics/themes in the podcasts and class discussions. You will not have to write about them (nor will you be tested on them). Use the readings to help inspire ideas for your own stories.

**evansaylor** : Will this class consist of any quizzes? Or is it just mainly bigger assignments.

**[Hope Jennings]** : No quizzes or exams. Just the writing assignments.

**Sarah Clouse** : We can get pictures from google for the eco postcards as long as we cite them, correct?

**[Hope Jennings]** : Yes, just be sure to cite if they are not in the public domain.

### Student Questions/Discussion

**Sarah Clouse** : All of the historical and sociological perspectives were interesting since I mostly heard about climate change from a biology perspective

**yaseen** : What was ultimately the start of the anthropocene? Was it the use of fire

**Tiff** : One thing I was surprised about was the topic of how our diet has impacted the ecology; the use of fire being part of that.

**evansaylor** : For future generations what can we do to help protect their well being?

**Jared Compaleo** : Is there a limit to how much CO2 the atmosphere can hold?

**Sarah Clouse** : Do you think the use of fossil fuels was inevitable? Is there a world where people came up with renewable energy sources before nonrenewable ones?

**Samantha Baxter** : this was from the podcast because you both discussed the interesting blend of this course: How important is story telling vs hard delivery of facts?

**Kailani Sparrow** : There's a loud 5 year old here so I shouldn't unmute myself but... In conservation biology we talked about anthropocene vs the biocentric view. What do you think will help us shift towards the biocentric view? reduction of population, overconsumption, etc.

**Amanda Wibel** : In my other class conservation ecology and it was mentioned in the podcast, but eco racism and animal agriculture plays a big part of the global climate. Is there a way to make these things more manageable within our lifetime?

**Grace Reibold** : I was interested in the discussion of fire in "The Anthropocene: Are Humans Now Overwhelming the Great Forces of Nature?" Do you think that without the discovery of fire, early humans would have died out, or would they have persevered?

**Alexis Voisard** : In Nixon's article, he mentions that "We may all be in the Anthropocene but we're not all in it in the same way." What kinds of systems of power impact the way that we're not all in it the same way, yet the term assumes the human species as one entity? How do we navigate these barriers to solve the climate crisis?

**Paige Dunham** : In the podcast, you both spoke about the beginning of the anthropocene. It seems almost like a subjective question. I almost disagree with the start of fire. I wanted to know if there is an objective answer or if it is always debated.

**McKenzie Stefanoff** : Are there potential long-term effects to human health by using geo-engineering in order to help reduce climate change? Or is this idea too new to know?

**Drew Gillum** : Who is actually "in charge" or deciding the geologic periods, and are they actually going to make the distinction?

**Noah Berner** : This one's more Nixon based: We live in a world where money can buy you basically anything. Is there any way that a capitalistic society like the US can successfully limit themselves to the point that Carbon emissions and other indicators of climate change can be significantly reduced?

**johnny** : How do we accommodate cultural diversity while making changes at a global level?

**Samantha Baxter** : on the basis of the appeal to futility/inevitability that surround this genre of literature and science: What is the purpose of art/literature in a world "destined" for destruction?

**John Reedy** : What are some of the potential side affects of adding sulfate particles/aerosol's into the atmosphere to cause back scatter that worry scientists. This was discussed in the first reading about geo-engineering.

**Kendra Fields** : most of the solutions seem to involve technology in same shape or form. If we use technology to "fix" what humans have done with the Earth, wouldn't we be eliminating

Nature? If we have to geo-engineer our world, is it still the world we knew? Does the hubris of humanity allow us to become "gods" to fix something we will probably end up destroying again?

**Amber Massie** : What is the root of the controversy surrounding the Anthropocene? Why do many scientists see us moving into the new epoch as a "negative" thing?

**kylieking** : in the article by stiffen, it states that preindustrial humans did not have the technological or organizational capability to match or dominate the great forces of nature. do you think that today we do? or do you think that we still haven't fully reached that capability?

**Carissa** : I really appreciated Dr. Jennings comment in the podcast about how these issues aren't personal to everyone because they seem so distant and I agree that's the biggest issue facing possible solutions because (coming from a biological perspective) the human being is programmed to selfishly survive (and at this point in our advancements, prosper), even at the cost of our own planet. I guess that isn't so much a question as it is a pondering thought if anyone else could contribute to?

**Haylee** : In one of my other classes (trophic ecology), we discussed how the Earth goes through cycles of heating and cooling and how we are approaching this threshold of heating to where we exit this cycle into a new one unless we can stop this heating. How could we prevent the Earth from breaking out of this cycle?

**Nicole Wallace** : At this point, would any potential "fix" be enough to fully undo the damage done since at least the Industrial Revolution? Or can we only ever hope to mitigate any future damage?

**Cassidy Alspaugh** : Do you think that climate change has become a political issue? And if so, do you think that makes it more difficult to address the issue and implement changes?

**Drew Gillum** : How does carbon sequestration actually work? What are the risks?

**Hannah Pavalko** : Nixon's question of "what does it mean [in light of the Anthropocene] to be human?" Is this asking us to dive into our core values or asking for more of relational definition (using our relationship to different members of the ecosystem) to define this?

**Kailani Sparrow** : Also in relation to the environmental racism that Dr. Jennings brought up, I had never thought of it from that perspective. I looked into it more and there was a statistic that said that 56% of those living near toxic waste are people of color and 95% of their claims against pollution are denied by the EPA. It's not really a question but more of a comment and observation.

**Paige Dunham** : In the podcast you spoke about how it is important for big business and industries to make the changes that we need in order to stop climate change. That statement

takes the burden off the shoulders of all of us normal people and places it on the people who can actually make a difference. That said, what are the ways that us "normal" people can do in order to help change the state of the environment?

**Kendra Moran** : I have found that, much like discussed in the podcast, all personal efforts made to lessen my footprint have been mostly futile because of larger forces out of my control. Is there actually any way to personally make a real impact? Or is any small change I make in my life completely negated by large corporations that refuse to join the fight?

**Alexandria Robertson** : I know humans have changed the environment so much within the last few decades and it was mentioned in one of the readings that the impact of humans would remain for many years after we are gone. Is there an idea to how long would our impacts last and how they would affect other organisms?

**Tiff** : It seems to me that there are always people who don't believe in the data given: for example regarding 'warming of the planet', 'glaciers melting', 'is Covid19 real or just a hoax'. So, how can we help people see the big picture rather than it being conceived as a Conspiracy Theory?

**amayawillemsen** : in the stiffen article, it mentioned the ozone layer eroding, and made a decision to reduce the production of CFCs, how do we know that is going to prevent from continuing to erode?

**Noah Berner** : Should we be willing to go to extreme lengths to conserve the state of life and diversity of life on Earth even if it means limiting human life and opportunity of growth (technology and population) through population management and management of resources?

**amayawillemsen** : also how much are humans willing to sacrifice, to change the progression of the anthropocene?

**marianna laufo** : i found it interesting that more nitrogen is being fixed by fertilizer products and fossil fuel combustion than by all natural processes in terrestrial ecosystems and, in understanding that agriculture is a major contributor to the climate change, I just can't help but wonder how a shift in more sustainable agriculture also generally leads to a lower output of food crops and such and how that change would impact such a large world population

**Jenaya H** : I'm not sure how to phrase this but a lot of solutions propose and evoke this idea that humans will perpetually evolve and progress and become better as if on a graph we're always trending upwards. But we're not always progressing. We regress throughout human history, as well. How concerning is that we're still evoking this as we propose trying to make solutions? And how can we integrate non-humans into our proposals and ideas to help 'save' the planet?

**Hannah Pavalko** : I really love that question Jenaya

**Amanda Wibel** : The Dakota Access Pipeline

**Jenaya H** : Thanks! I'm glad you understood what I was trying to convey.

**Amanda Booher** : Two different views from the Nixon paper looked at the anthropocene as an opportunity while another saw it as a crime scene. I lean more toward the opportunity outlook. Given the ability to obtain and share information offers a better outlook for the future. The crime scene view conveys a message of an inability to change and correct what has happened.

**Grace Reibold** : What do you think of the dichotomy of the nature of the inventions mentioned in "The Anthropocene: The Promise and Pitfalls of an Epochal Idea"? For example, the creation of large factories or the making of the railroad did in fact damage the environment around us, but made aspects of human lives better and more easily navigational. What do you think of this dichotomy?

**Carissa** : How can the developed minds that can create solutions--which are guaranteed to be disruptive and difficult--overcome our own consciousness to make the harsh decisions to put the Earth before our own species? For instance, population control could be a step towards correcting the climate crisis, but that would mean limiting the sizes of families everywhere. This is where I believe the biggest obstacle lies, in taking these big ideas with good intentions and actually considering what it means to us personally to follow through on those intentions. Is it possible to backtrack universal ideals to do what is best for the Earth?