

# **Beyond climate fear: eco-optimism is a better path to deal with the challenges**

by [Luc Sala](#), August 2017

We are in the ban of climate fear, there is what could be termed a war on climate, comparable to the war on terror, the war on drugs and the basically using the same strategy, using fear to keep the people in line. This is not an effective way to deal with the problems, we better adopt a positive attitude, which I would call eco-optimism; we will deal with the problems and are already well underway. There are serious problems, but technology, cooperation and good will help us minimize the impact.

The world got gripped by a fear for climate change, global warming and react from that fear, a tunnel vision has developed and one could even talk about a war on climate, blaming ourselves, industry, materialism and the political system. Not a very productive approach, looking at climate developments as a challenge, dealing with it, would be a better approach.

Let's look at the ecological challenges for what they are, opportunities to find solutions, adopt an eco-positive attitude, a can do mindset, we can make a change because the technologies are emerging or already there.

There are many positive developments, new technologies and, attitude changes, we are well on our way to deal with the climate, with oil and gas, but have to realize this means the world will change.

Cheap energy is on the horizon, the need for fossil is diminishing, and this will impact our economies, logistic models and even the economic balance of the world, for where will the benefits of cheap solar be felt and monetized first? In the hot countries, in Africa, India, where small solar units will change urban life first, bring people back to the land where with fresh water (desalination is easy with cheap energy) will make small scale food production feasible.

Cheap energy means cheap transport, bringing water to remote place, automation and autonomous transport will help. Cheap energy means cheap air conditioning, also in remote places, making climate changes bearable. The world picture of poor and rich will change, although dealing with diversity will remain a first order issue, but diversity is not always bad, it's also stimulating.

It may even mean that within 20 years we will realize, that the real 21st century issue is not how we deal with energy (that will be cheap and will help problems like water availability, mobility in general, even urbanization and the refugee problems (diversity), but the meaning of life for the individual. Quite a different perspective from the fear based war on climate.

## **Eco-optimism is not heard**

There are opposing voices, like eco-optimists who claim we can deal with some amount of global warming, that cheaper (alternative) energy will diminish the need for oil (which claim the lower prices seem to support), allow ubiquitous desalination of water, increase local and even private greenhouse food production, mobility and revert urbanization, restructure mobility and revert globalism in favor of local identity. Even the diversity and rich/poor dichotomy, the elite/looser schism, the elephant curve disappearance of middle class developments may benefit from what we can see as cheap and maybe even free energy.

## **Disappointed by Trumps denial of Paris?**

Don't need to, progress towards cleaner energy will proceed at a fast pace, because it just makes sense. The war on climate in the Paris perspective is mostly high on the agenda because of corporations or nations who think they will benefit from the need for the technology to fight CO2 emission, and create alternative energy sources. If one looks at the Paris Climate Agreement it really is no more than a compromise, the major sectors of air and sea travel are not dealt with, bio-industry and notably the way we raise and feed cattle are not included, it was obviously an event to show unity, to impress the world and instill more fear. Some countries benefit more than other, like China being allowed to flood the world with dubious product much longer than the USA. The real motives and interests behind Paris are unclear, Germany (and Holland) stands to profit from the technology investments in alternative energy and CO2, Paris has their nuclear expertise to throw in, so is China with their blooming solar products, and there are parties (Gore) who like to make the war on climate a global issue (good for export) so the eco-optimists (we can deal with climate, at a cost) are silenced

It all sound sensible, but are we really cooked out of existence with a 2 degree temperature change, humankind survived ice-ages, tropical periods, over historic times the sea-level and temperature has varied considerably.

If you see that, the war on climate is as manipulative as the war on drugs was, and mostly feeds fear and keep us away from seeing the real problems of the world.

## Why are the realities and positive messages turned into fear based manipulation?

The need for conflict has to do with a, war for identity, both a social and a personal level. Why do we need to fight in the first place? In our development as a baby and child it is obvious that we have certain needs and we will develop ways to get or try to get what we want. We develop an identity, a sense of self and a personality, with its strengths and flaws, and this means potential conflicts with the world around. Not only for survival, but for growth, we need challenges and opposition to learn. It's a way to establish border, territory and thus homeostatis, the balance that feels safe. We fight to establish who we are, we are engaging in war for identity.

So do nations, and sometimes religions, and unless we understand these are identity conflicts and look beyond the materialistic facts like the economy, social injustice, extreme diversity and use fake arguments like democracy, human rights or fabricated enemy caricatures, we will not really solve them. Those conflicts are mostly rooted in insecurity, in threats to the deep identity, and just as in personal relationships, things like greed, fear, jealousy, envy, and even guilt, shame and autism are what drives wars, and are just expressions of fundamental inferiority feelings. Wars are ways to fight for our deep identity. The sentiments are used, very cleverly at times, to further the interests of a few, but never identified as such. We go to war for the nation, truth, God, our culture, human rights, never to make money of gain power!!

## War on identity

It is obvious that many, if not most wars have been fought for material interests and to prove we are better than the enemy. Usually the enemy was an outside force, another country, an axis of evil, another culture or social system, but the most damaging wars are those attacking ourselves.

The war on drugs is a good example, the underlying purpose is clear, prevent people from choosing for themselves, from dropping out, from living the 60s slogans. It is a war on our identity as free citizens, and one must be blind not to see that it has served the capitalist exploitation model in many ways. It created a illegitimate industry, feeding both the white and the criminal elite (and who are what), boosted the power of the LAW, created the new slavery of the prison system (In the USA) and has been ineffective in curbing the use of drugs. In fact it could be argued it has effectively boosted crime.

Now that this bubble has been pinched, there is a need for a new enemy, for industry, capitalism and the need to keep the people in line is still there, at least in the eyes of the ruling class. So let's restart the cold-war with Russia, create unrest in the Middle East, but most effective is probable to call for a new war amongst ourselves:

## **The WAR ON CLIMATE is manipulation.**

There is climate change, always has been there, but now we can blame it on us, on our consumption, our luxury, our use of fossil fuels, the guilt card has been drawn.

The motives of the leaders of the war on climate seem honest, we have to fight an impending disaster, rising sea levels, contamination of earth and sky, the future of mankind is at stake. But how truthful are these positions, what are the real interest, keeping an enemy-image alive has many advantages.

These voices are hardly heard, deemed pseudo-scientific, overoptimistic, and receive little attention in media and politics. So, apart from the need to deal wisely with energy, oil, pollution, etc. what deeper motives lie beyond the superficial fear mongering. Is the war on climate not another form of the war of drugs or in general the war on individual identity rights?

This is part of a new book on identity (a draft is at [www.share-shop.nl/identity.pdf](http://www.share-shop.nl/identity.pdf))

L.S.