

[www.better-management.org](http://www.better-management.org) provides invaluable insights that will help you understand and deliver better organizational performance.

## **Better-Management Newsletter 5 November 2015**

**And the winner will be: man or Gaia? / De-growth is their aim / Will COP21 be more successful than past failures? / The philosophical argument for changing course**

**And the winner will be: man or Gaia?**

I often wonder whether we are any more intelligent than diesel bug. The bug forms on the interface between fuel and any moisture that may condense there, and yet goes on to infect and pollute the whole body of diesel in your fuel tank.

We humans also live on the interface of a large body of earth and a wafer thin film of atmosphere and we have taken significant control of our environment by demonstrating mastery over both energy and edifices, whilst at the same time burying waste or placing it in the rivers, lakes and sea or if lighter than air, into the atmosphere.

We know that for 200,000 years we humans never got more populous than a few millions but we found fire, invented the wheel and iron implements, then sometime later got a huge energy boost from fossil fuels. Within about 250 years of using coal our population swelled from one to 7 billion and with that our domination of nature came as of right. Growth not only a passion, but also now a necessity, without which the global economy will crash and burn.

We can all observe the big environmental bun-fights like Kyoto, Copenhagen and Paris get more “het up” as time progresses. The scientific community get more anxious to save the world. A huge publicly funded lobby group focused on the chemical composition of the atmosphere and led by the UN’s IPCC, has now decided it is time to attack both the capitalist/free enterprise business model that relies on exponential economic growth and the use of our main energy source – fossil fuels. So try as we may, we cannot any longer ignore the limits to growth and the limits to which we can be destructive of our natural world.

### **De-growth is their aim**

The IPCC movement is rather clandestine, in that it allows governments to harbour aspirations for economic growth, while at the same time attacking the sources of energy which make growth possible. But make no mistake...degrowth is their aim.

This holds major ramifications for every business.... and all business leaders would be wrong to ignore it. Financiers have already committed to remove funds of somewhere around USD2.6 trillion from fossil fuels to other investments. So, at a time when vastly more needs to be invested to produce even the same amount of energy from oil gas and coal: coal has been declared totally “taboo” and oil declared a nasty (*Editor’s note: except by China, Russia, India and many less-developed countries*).

The IPCC process has become ever more desperate to effect some sort of change to human behaviour...to the point where opponents are vilified and would be locked up if that could be managed.

### **Will COP21 be more successful than past failures?**

Success is unlikely based on the submissions of parties to COP21.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/11968064/Why-the-Paris-climate-treaty-will-be-the-flop-of-the-year.html>

The sad fact is that some large developing countries (including India and China) are only paying lip service to the possibility of future cuts and the game seems to be one of taxing non-renewable energy sources. If viable energy storage systems already existed there would be a prospect of some success from OECD savings, but that is not the case. It is only the OECD that is being expected to make the savings and thereby destroy their economies.

The best they can achieve is the destruction (sooner) of the global economy by limiting availability of oil. Oil producers cannot continue to produce at a loss for more than another six months or so...and even then, volumes will likely drop.

### **The philosophical argument for changing course**

Humanity's problem is not just about energy but many minerals are also finite. The next 20 years will see shortages of some, however it is hard to predict which minerals can be substituted for others. This is one short dissertation on the philosophical subject of degrowth...

<http://www.feasta.org/2015/10/26/living-in-the-anthropocene-a-frame-for-new-activism/>

From earlier comments you will see I don't agree with all of it, but it provides the general philosophy of those doing "the moving and shaking".