

Radicalization for Positive Climate Change: The new Normal

“Scientists say it may still technically be possible to limit warming to 1.5°C if drastic action is taken now”

--Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change

Summary

As I attempt to differ from skeptics who are using the battle between what is “scientific” and what is “politically possible”, my approach is “the environment in my eyes”. I do not need to be told that there is an alarm for danger from a politician or a scientist. At 35, I have the lived experience of patterns of farming in my village in Uganda. I have seen the seasons dramatically change. Uganda being one of the main importers of used fossil-used machinery, I have seen and breathed the dangerous puffs of smoke from the engines as old as “impossible to use”. In short, I have seen the reckless anthropogenic activities of my people. My life in Japan since 2012 adds to my experience of human-environment animosity. For example, as I walk to the supermarket to buy my dinner items on occasions, I have had to memorize the Kanji labels for agricultural products from the prefectures that have not suffered from nuclear that spread after the earthquake hit Japan. When a scientist proves to me that nuclear is the best alternative to fossil fuels, I tremble into the darkness of fear. Therefore, environment apocalypse is best understood if we looked at it in our lived experiences (as will be elaborated) if apt claims are to be made.

I partly agree with Christopher Booker who argues in his work titled *The Real Global Warming Disaster: Is the Obsession with Climate Change Turning out to Be the Most Costly Scientific Blunder in History?* that, the real problem is not the climate change catastrophe itself. It will instead be the result of the measures being suggested today by the politicians. Non-action is to me one of those measures likely to drown the planet into severe extinction rated with nuclear replacement of fossil fuels (or the continued irresponsible fossil fuel use) on a similar scale.

In this discussion, there are three vital issues; prevention of further destruction, adaptation as an important risk-management strategy and mitigation to already existing devastations. In all the three, I will explore human savagery/agency on the environment at three different levels of society: the parochial civic culture of individuals as agents of environmental destruction; the hegemonic quest of some nation-states in capitalistic pursuit; and, the reluctance of other nation-states (developing state). Rather than treat these different levels of analysis individually, an idea traversing through all could yield imagination. For example, adaptation is not always just a local issue as many would say but nested within a web involving the governmental policies, the economic and technological architecture, and responses to international economic interference/ interventions that tend to constrain the survival of poor nations.

The bitter fact is that; we cannot do away with fossil fuels- at least not too soon. Just a mere increase in fuel prices both in developed countries and developing countries is a potential spur to popular protests and violence. The examples are the French Vest protests, the Zimbabwe and Sudan fuel protests. In other countries in developing world, shortage of fossil fuel for a week can lead to severe humanitarian catastrophe. That is exactly how we are faced with a double edged sword. Replacing the fossil fuel with clean energy is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the reduction and

prevention of global warming. There is no source of clean energy that can satisfactorily replace fossil fuels. Proponents of nuclear energy have argued that, it is the alternative we should have embraced yesterday but cannot guarantee openly how they intend to deal with issues associated with nuclear use. Such serious issues range from the sources of raw materials like uranium, dealing with nuclear waste disposal around the world, and the response to nuclear accidents and contamination.

Equally, it is not very easy to dramatically change in the livelihoods of people already suffering severe marginalization and disadvantage part of which is orchestrated by eminent climatic apocalypse like droughts, famine, severe unemployment, abject poverty and disease especially living in the developing countries. But, to begin with, we need to start defining the agency. Who is our exact target in the “environmental turn”? Is it viable to mute the voices of the developing nations into parochial reluctance? Everyone is a potential suspect and victim of the environmental predation. Whether a poor farmer in my Ugandan village primitively and/or culturally burning up the bushes and forests for his survival, or a capitalist in United States or Russia opening and closing fossil fuel reservoir taps, or that coal merchant in South Africa- we are equally culpable.

I suggest a bottom-up strategy to aversion of the already eminent climate change apocalypse- one that advantages agency as a key player in shaping the collective outcome. Put different, collective power comes from the will of the individual agents. Although it is clear that, individual solutions alone cannot bring the needed positive climate change, they build a stronger bottom-up support from which institutional policies and solutions can be reached both at national and global level. A typical example is how Greta Thunberg transformed into the face of the international intervention. Her advocacy not only rose the consciousness of fellow teenage students and older people world-over, it propelled the people’s power to the attention of United Nations.

United Nations and taming the state predation. The states generally listen to the voices involving coercion. The United Nations through the enactments of environmental good practices should include the penalties for non-compliance. It is however sad that the UN giant member states are already threatening to withdraw from the IPCC. What is the future of IPCC? What is the gap between the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change agreement and the real commitment? What are the possibilities of the agreement’s total ratification by member states? What are the restraints to non-ratification or withdrawal of particular member states? Is the agreement tenable? The questions whose answers are ironically political, if well approached may propel the UN to prosperity in the fight against global warming.

Introduction

It is important that before delving into the environmental apocalypse associated with global warming, the following two questions are crucial and worth a reflection by the reader of this piece. What have you done to something (Global Warming) you see and know is wrong? Where does the individual meet the collective? These questions would not have been irrelevant to my late great grandfather and probably to my grandfather who busked in the glory of the environment's hospitality to the human species. From the 18th century, global warming was simply out of question. It was in fact not until Wallace S. Broecker's 1975 paper titled *Climate Change: Are We on the Brink of a Pronounced Global warming?* that the idea of global warming gained currents in the US politics and academia. Human Activity has since continued to peak, in the developed world, with exploration of new fossil fuel wells, the coal mining, industrialization and innovation being the common place for the definition of "the normal". While in my village in Africa, there have been periodic bush burnings and deforestation in preparation of vast fresh lands for agriculture, house constructions, firewood being the signs of human domination of the earth. Particularly, I come from a pastoral society, where bush burning was and still is part of the culture, as it prepares the grazing land for the cattle's fresher pastures. We never imagined time would come and we would look back at the environment as our sanctuary. However, as Victor Hugo clearly stated, nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. The emergency break signal has already been pressed. Non-action by the world's human occupants (individually or collectively) against creeping global warming (of which humans are culpable) declares the intentional and worst mass extinction of not only human race itself but also other ecological species.

Perhaps to begin on an optimistic note, there is still a possibility as Carrington reported in *The Guardian* January 2019 the 16.00 GMT issue, that to limit the devastation of global warming, a drastic action should be taken now. On the other hand, the dreamt UN position is a total threat-free environment, where humans are protected against all threats to life, values and properties- which threats include global warming. If this dream is to be achieved, Sustainable human development requires individuals, groups and communities to be responsible for their actions on the environment use. The Paris Agreement of 2015 on Climate Change Affirms "the importance of education, training, public awareness, public participation, public access to information and co-operation at all levels on the matters of climate change".

Optimism nurtured by Boswell et al (2012) and Susanne C. Moser (2013) emphasizes positive environmental propaganda that encourages co-creative process of regeneration success. Effective communication according to Cooke and Kothari (2001) is a necessary condition for successful decision making process. Rather than spend a lot of time campaigning for the end of fossil fuels use (which is very unlikely), we need to increase activism for careful and effective refinery, use and byproducts disposal; and reducing unnecessary excessive use of fossil fuels.

Is it possible that a dramatic reduction of greenhouse gases emitting technologies' use would greatly provide equivalent safeguard against global warming? Can we engage in conscientization of people of the world to participate in the reduction of CO₂ emission not only through reduction of fossil fuel usage but also other habits and practices directly contributing to global warming? These questions may get relevance in discussions around global warming and its devastating effects.

While trying to observe the UN Paris agreement, pursuing efforts to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels as a way to significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change, we must be also cognizant of human activities other than industrial complex and fossil fuels influencing climate change and global warming. For example, deforestation for agriculture and settlement for ever expanding population can generate sizeable environmental devastation. If we only discuss technological effects on climate change, we may end up with no hope derived. Why? Because, nations all over the world are on the innovations spree to the extent that the nations that were seen to lag behind the development and industrialization axis have since taken the effort in the recent years to prioritize industrialization as an economic development strategy. This leaves us in a dilemma. As we are putting the North on pressure to reduce greenhouse gasses emissions vented by intense industrial complex, the developing countries are creeping with industrialization working papers to inform national development strategies leading to increase in urban pollution. For example, Uganda in its national budget¹ reading paper 2018/2019 financial

¹ Find the speech of the Minister of Finance and Economic Planning on the (14th June 2018 budget day). Retrieved January 29, 2019 from parliament.go.ug:
<https://www.parliament.go.ug/.../088bf849-3b76-419f-9971-d93a1f6e9299%253B1>.

year emphasizes the theme of “industrialization as an enabler for job creation and shared prosperity”. Where does this leave the fight against fuel fuels-related pollution?

This work agrees with scholars arguing that global warming is on the rise, abnormal weather and devastating natural disasters increasingly reported world-over. That said, the efforts at curtailing global warming in this essay takes three dimensions. One, is the conscientization intended for a thorough orientation to the predicament of climate change; two, the individuals'/families'/communities' radical environmental turn; and nation-state governmental/intergovernmental political will. Although the problem is inherent in the interactions and contentions between individual interests, government and international motivations, the last card of the game depends on the divergences and consensus- which is in itself ironic.

Everyday, almost everyone directly or indirectly benefits from use or uses fossil fuels or wood. It therefore requires a committed and radical interest in responsible use of fuels whether fossil, wood or otherwise. I would love that who ever reads my essay (regardless of creativity), changes the way they have been relating with fossil and wood. Some simple ideas for you: if you drive a fossil fuel car, drive only when you must, always go to the shopping mall with your own shopping bag and only use plastic materials when its unavoidable; if you are resident of a place where planting a tree is possible, make it a hobby; if you are in school please join the activism as a collective action against industrial exploitation of the environment; the list of action plans is limitless.

Problematizing Global warming

Common sense dealings with global warming start with individual consciousness and the will to make a change. Although there are scores of people in the world willing to make sacrifices for a better world, the economic and political structures in which we live demand a collective action with a guided leadership at global, regional, national, sub-national, and societal level. The world is so vast that without an inter-continental or international agreement and engagement, success of proactive, mitigation and adaptation measures aimed at curtailing global warming only remain a dream. At my individual level, what is my contribution to containing fossil effect? How about the neighbor's role (considering that we have shared responsibility in the occupation of the world)? Or, what if my friend that runs a local shop using an old fuel generator replaces it with solar energy? How about if all Japanese people

who own houses install clean energy to replace CO₂ emitting energy? At national governmental level, are governments in developing world willing to protect the little vegetation cover before we discuss afforestation? What is the action plan for afforestation? At international level, would political systems regulate the international trade in used fossil-driven technologies and old electronics to the third world? Is international community in position to tame the hegemonic ambitions of some capitalistic developed states? All these questions are very vital for the reduction of CO₂ emission rates but at the same time very embedded in the political, socio-economic structures of survival.

It has become apparently common knowledge that human-driven climate change is dispelling the warning signals (for example, the initial associated catastrophic manifestations) through year by year climatic variations like sudden severe droughts, heavy floods and tsunamis displacing measures of people and claiming lives of others, devastating animal and fish species and forced climate-based migrations displayed across the globe. Richard's report on Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) research in 2007 established that, over the past half century, underlying land use changes and massive CO₂ emissions are majorly outcomes of human activity and not merely a resultant effect of natural processes. We need to interrogate the initial interest of IPCC's enactment as an environmental-friendly-energy promotional body or an objectively scientific body. Also, how much of "science" do we need to understand that ice is melting steadily on the mountain tops in Africa, that the ice in Greenland is melting at a terrible speed, or that the droughts in Africa have something to do with human activity? What are the politics of existing science? There is a multifaceted dynamic increasingly manifesting in millennial researches and activism, media, international organizations' platforms, national environmental adaptation and mitigation policy programs, environmental protection- some trying to lay claims on reversing the catastrophic effects of anthropogenic climate change, others rubbishing climate change claims as immaterial and others unwilling to engage the alternatives to greenhouse gases.

Of particular interest is the mushrooming environmental activism with agency of teenager. The teenage school-striking against global warming that started in Sweden late 2018 and spreading steadily in Belgium, Germany and United Kingdom among other countries shows a conflicting generational relationship with the environment. A 15-year-old Swedish student Greta Thunberg while raising awareness, found her way to the World Economic Forum in Davos. Verbatim, Thunberg insisted, "adults keep saying we owe it to the young people to

give them hope, but I don't want your hope. I want you to panic. I want you to feel the fear I feel everyday then I want you to act”². She feels little is being done about the climate change and control of the fossil fuels. She adds, everyone says that Sweden is the role model which is not the case, but we are never too small to make a difference. It is clear from Thunberg’s agitation that individual solutions alone cannot bring the needed positive climate change but they build a stronger bottom-up support from which institutional policies and solutions that can make a change- at a global level (Stoknes 2017). Reay illustrated that, positive Climate Change begins at home (2005). The point here however is not to showcase the fame and the role model countries and personalities in the fight against climate change. I noted two major points of interest in Thunberg’s activism. One is that, to the older generation, the climatic predicament has become a catchy “story line” a resonating journalistic rhetoric which after use (for example in the inter-governmental forums, the national planning circles, the lobbyist interviews/workshops and protests) gets filed and piled in the put away cabinets.

Two, I was inspired by the young peoples’ awakening and creeping interest and concern about their environment. This shows the level at which the message of positive change is getting wide spread day by day. We (environment-biased researchers) generally already know the top ten Co2 emitting countries; we already know what causes the global warming; what are we doing to bring real change in such countries? How do we harmonize the divergences between what needs to be done and what is politically possible? We talk of the rich few sacrificing ecosphere at the alter of global warming, who are the rich? How can we make them culpable?

Rather than concentrate on beautifully crafted, scientifically proven, objectively researched, methodologically coherent and imaginatively rigor, why don't we- as a people- start doing what is possible with immediate resources to make a positive change, to make a world a better place not only for us but also for generations to come? As I write this, first, I started a tree planting campaign in my home village in Uganda as an exemplifier model. In this tree project, I persuaded my tourism business partner to include eco-environmental tourism in our business packages. We are conserving medicinal and other tree species that we deem likely to go into extinction. Second, I have denounced use of charcoal stoves in my home at least hoping to save a tree or two that may be cut because of me. I hope that, the world’s policy

² Thunberg Greta a Swedish teenage climate activist. 2019. Retrieved February 8, 2019 at youtube.com: here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K-Ywhb1j0NE>

makers and economies encourage investment in and use of clean energy at very affordable prices for poor people in developing countries. If at least half of the developing world's population start using clean energy and stop cutting vegetation cover, that would be a stride ahead of time. It would however be short-sighted for one to limit strategies of environmental regeneration to just a sustainable green environment. This approach only plays a workable and significant role especially in situations where land is not yet a scarcity. Yet of course, the land is continuously getting occupied with ever increasing world population. Therefore, a green planet may no longer be as possible as we think we can make it. So, what do big multinationals like UN say about this predicament?

Right now we are facing a man made disaster of global scale. Attenborough (2018)³ is quoted;

Our greatest threat in thousands of years is climate change. If we don't take action, the collapse of our civilizations and the extinction of much of the natural world is on the horizon. The United nations provides a unique platform that could unite the whole world. And as the Paris Agreement proved, together we can make real change happen. The world's people have spoken; their message is clear. Time is running out. They want you- the decision makers to act now. They are behind you along with the civil society supporting you in not only making tough decisions but also willing to make sacrifices in their daily lives.

To help make change happen, the UN is launching the ACT NOW to help those lagging behind the information flow to discover their everyday actions so as to recognize that they too must play their part. The people have spoken, leaders of the world must lead the continuation of our civilizations and the natural world upon which we depend is in your hands.

It is obvious that, people of the world may be willing to forfeit their private interests and engage climate change remedies (far from what political leaders may perhaps believe). However, the people's willingness is deserving of a strategic rallying and guidance by political structures and planners if a common global goal is to be attained. Nations with individual environmental strategies (however effective) cannot guarantee success if the neighboring nation-states are not in the same pursuit. Dealing with climate change must take

³ Sir David Attenborough was addressing the UN Climate Change Summit in Poland. Retrieved January 20, 2019 from theguardian.com:
<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/dec/03/david-attenborough-collapse-civilisation-on-horizon-un-climate-summit>

into consideration the exogenous as well as endogenous approaches. Some are local, others are national and other are multinational in nature.

How (given the adversity associated with rapid social, technological and economic change) do we prevail over climate change? What does a successful adaptation to climate change mean to International Organizations as well as nation-states and common citizens? At what point do these different levels of environmental adaptation conjuncture? Why should it be of great importance to emphasize adaptation as an enforcement of regeneration? These questions are central to the discussions of theory and practice in environmental dealings that will follow in this piece of work. While attempting to answer these questions we are inclined to think deeply about the quantification of anticipated climatic threats and how far in the future (although the future is not an area of objective analysis sometimes). What exactly are the climate regeneration strategies practically possible? And quite obviously, how do we tell that our efforts really reversed the drifting into catastrophic future? We may not have an easily accessible counterfactual grounding to support our active engagement in regeneration of the environment. However, if we stop seeing different bird and fish species dead on the sea showers, camels dying in arid Sahel region, or finding difficulty in access to clean breathing air in China's industrial cities, devastating droughts and floods in Africa and else where, or city pollution in India or many cities in Africa today, rampant bush fires in Australia among others, we can make a guess that perhaps our efforts did not go to ruins (although these may also be outcomes of other factors other than climate change).

It is of great concern however that questions such as these (mentioned above) neither have straightforward answers nor receive responsiveness from the planners, politicians, government bureaucrats as well as humanitarians. The answers may lack scientific-ness as well as political right-ness yet they immensely shape the future in which the line between survival and extermination will be thin (if not well addressed). Moreover, as the United States Research Council- US RC (2010) indicates in their new research findings on climate change, with the impacts of climate change on the globe, it is no longer just a threat to the future generations (as has become a climatic story line), but in fact increasingly presenting itself as challenge on effective decision making faced at the moment. I would not differ from the USRC on this, because for example the economic and environmental refugees from developing countries especially from African nations could in part inform the imagination that climate conflict is already present.

Also, whereas the discussions associated with dangerous interference in the climate system have been in a scientific curtail and politicized, the understanding of what happens after global warming to a significant threshold and/or issues of Carbon emissions involves a multifaceted cocktail of analytics including social sciences, and related disciplines. A skill is required to discuss environment while taking caution of practical informed-ness yet scientifically and politically relevant.

That said, there is an impeccable consensus that United Nations is a fountain from which world's powers (strong and weak) converge. This can be a platform from which different nation-based strategies can integrate to nurture an enduring possibility for effective and inclusive responses to climate change. The common notion in the academic discourse has been the dichotomy between environmental Co2 emission aggression from the North (to mean and include US, Russian Federation, China and Japan among others) and the passive/less sophisticated agrarian South like Uganda, Congo among others). The North taking the major part of Co2 responsibility and South as a victim region already being devastated by the adverse effects of climate change. As implied, in the UN Paris Agreement for example the introduction (paragraph 5) acknowledges the specific needs and special circumstances of developing countries, and (paragraph 6) where the powers pursuant of the agreement take full account of the specific needs and special situations of the least developed countries on matters of funding and transfer of technology (2015). However, as it turns out, there are entanglements between the technological North (including Japan and China) and governments of developing countries in conscious or unconscious syndicates leading to total vegetation destruction and proliferation of urban pollutants compromising existent hope for environmental recovery.

Is it possible that Japan can reduce on exportation of old fossil engine technologies like automobiles to less developed countries? Can the less developed countries enact/ evoke laws aimed at regulation of hazardously old Co2 emitting technologies? These questions inform the entanglements of political economies of the developed and developing countries in the Co2 emissions complex. The other quandary of the Paris Agreement, is that although, the parties to the agreement claim a collective consent, the UN's use of developed party countries and developing party countries is not only problematic but also, vague and ambiguous. The developed party countries agree to support the developing party countries but they do not

specify the criteria and the measure of support. For example, I would like to see the definition of the “developed” and the “developing countries” and the politics of identity and responsibility; that is the political realism in the west and the civilization traps in developing world. Why do we always play around claims that, we need to support poor economies as an environmental adaptation measure? and not how we plan to reduce the fossil fuel irresponsible use? The developed countries in this agreement (or in a consortium with other developed countries) are at liberty to choose a developing country of their interest and support such a country (whether in boosting investment or grant-in-aid). The extent of support has no boundary and oversight. What are the sanctions for non-compliance of nation-states to the Paris agreement? This question is not in search for written answers but critical pondering.

Taming the nation-states’ unending predation.

To help us understand the notion of climate change criminality, I will use some of the conservative scholarships on the dangers of climate change activism. The purpose here, is that we need to start questioning the intentions of climate change activism. Some of which has good intentions; some unconsciously victims especially when their movements are used as evidence for private gains; and, yet others are deliberately funded to perform in the name of science-fiction to distort the responsible-environmental-use discourse. An attempt to cluster around the predicament of global warming is a venture filled with contradictory outcomes. There is a severe dichotomy between real consequences of climate change and the climate change as a market place for extension of exploitation and dominance by some nation-states and international organizations over the weak world’s population.

It is fair to argue that, since the end of world war two and most preposterously in the recent years, the powerful states have managed to create global empires primarily through economic architecture. Such empires have identified poor third world countries and then hit them with financial attacks made possible by international financial institutions such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank (WB)’s unequaled loans. Such loans rarely benefit the majority population but the rich few in such third world countries and the international corporations through construction of power plants, highways and industrial complexes detrimental to environmental regeneration.

Such international corporations then condition or compel the third world governments to accept certain conditions (upon failure to settle the loans) without regard to environment like irresponsible and inequitable exploitation of oil fields or destruction of vegetation cover for industrial complexes, infrastructure and extensive farming in order to generate raw material for their industries. Penny Green and Tony Ward in their book titled *State Crime: Governments, violence and corruption* illustrated the state and multinational corporations' illegal and socially injurious actions resulting from mutually reinforcing interaction between policies and practices in pursuit of one or more institutions of political governments and the pursuit of the economic institutions involving production and distribution of resources. As the poor nations sink further into disadvantage and severe survival threats, the only way left for the poor citizens is adapting to the most immediate alternatives which includes further vegetation destruction and use of cheap and old technologies that produce acute Co2 fumes as a survival card (as evident in poor countries' polluted urban cities).

Based on the above, there is a reasonable possibility that, some people and governments are unscrupulously fronting the global warming as a justification for their economic maneuvers. The view of commodification of environmental discourse is becoming irrefutable and consistent. Skeptics such as Bell have demonstrated that climate change is a product of corrupt politics and therefore simply a hoax (2011). Bell claims that in fact in addition to lack of evidence to support the anthropogenic effect, Co2 is not necessarily a bad thing after all; especially for developing countries that depend on agriculture. I do not agree entirely with Bell on the goodness of high Co2 accumulation in the atmosphere but I agree to the politicization and predation in the crafting of environmental catastrophic alarms. Meaningful interpretation of environmental reality *vis-à-vis* the vested interest of the powerful states and capitalists must be emphasized.

The narrative of man-made global warming is a “political agenda that suppresses the truth and spreads fear. In this effort, they have recruited academics, media, environmental groups, governments, the United Nations, even religions” (Johnson 2008). In a foreword to Bell (2011), the former director of the US National Weather Satellite Service and author of *Unstoppable Global Warming*- Fred Singer augments that, the international climate business has degenerated into a scheme to transfer recourses from developed to developing nations. There are two sides of the coin to this; one as Singer puts it; resources are transferred from the poor in rich countries to the rich in poor countries. Two, is that of the transfer of

resources from the rich developed countries for the exploitation of the poor in developing countries as will be illustrated below. Others like booker, the real problem is not the alarmist climate change, but the measures that are being suggested to curtail it (2013). Bigger governments mean bigger budgets and therefore capable of enforcing the greater regulation (Inhofe 2012).

Something interesting about this fire fighting strategy to curtail global warming is but a deliberate avoidance of the real problem culminating into this global obliteration. The states and their unending hegemonic desire to control the economic and political power is at the center of this predicament. The two illustrative situations highlighted below may draw some meaningful nuances of untamed state hegemonic ambitions contributing to the major part the global warming apocalypse.

1. The Arms Race and Cosmic Hegemony

The militaries of the powerful nations have been in a race to control the ionosphere in the earth's upper atmosphere for decades now. Far from fossil fuels, there are reports that the powerful nations have in the recent years been involved in intense researches intended to manipulate the ionosphere to gain military dominance in the enemy territories. As the business insider reported in their issue on 21st December 2018, Russia's Sura base in Vasicsursk is believed to be the world's first large-scale facility built for this purpose. Operational in 1981, it enabled Soviets to manipulate the sky as an instrument for military operations, such as submarine communication. This technological manipulation of the atmosphere has a potential to spur perturbations that can create natural disasters such as cyclones, earthquakes and hurricanes. How can we predict that the natural disaster that will occur will be purely a natural disaster and not a creation resulting from cosmic heating experimentations?

Turning to the most sensitive topic in the world "the nuclear energy and weapons". Nuclear energy has been put at the center of politicization of Co2 emitting technologies replacement as the most efficient and effective source of energy. The campaign of fossil fuel replacement by nuclear is most popular in countries ranked by world resource institute (WRI) as major fossil fuel Co2 emissions such as the US, China, Russian Federation, Japan and India among others. If nuclear is used to generate electrical energy, then it is possible to reduce emission of greenhouse gases according to some politicians and policy makers in these countries.

Popular proponents include Former presidents George Bush and Tony Blair's in the US, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's government in Japan as well as President Yoweri Museveni in Uganda among others. However, some environmental activists have argued that nuclear energy cannot be a perfect replacement for Co2 emitting energy (Jürg 2007). Nuclear can only contribute an insignificant percentage (close to 10%) in the reduction of global warming but can instead be a dangerous option if we intentionally get blindfolded on the negative effects of nuclear energy such as nuclear residues/ waste disposals, the unguaranteed access to uranium, issues surrounding nuclear research, proliferation politics and the exposure to nuclear accidents such as that in Fukushima in Japan. This already presents an acceptable public opinion in favor of responsible production, use and disposal of fossil Co2 emitting fuels because no amount of clean energy can replace the world usage of such fossil energy.

It is obvious that we are increasingly producing a lot of clean energy to supplement effective and efficient use of fossil energy and therefore, nuclear cannot be the very issue to propagandize about. We are aware that, the energy companies have the economic potential to lobby into public policy. The politicians as well find the demand for public goods such as inclusive supply of energy as the leveraging positions to further their ambitions but as Jürg Rohrer puts it, "We will now have to change our behavior: We can only afford to use as much energy as we are able to produce in a sustainable way. Demand has to follow supply and not vice-versa any more. If we do so, suspicious solutions like nuclear power are automatically out of discussion" (ibid). UN recognizes that sustainable lifestyles and patterns of consumption and production, with developed country parties taking the lead, play an important safeguard against climate change (UN Paris Agreement 2015).

Indeed, the devastation by nuclear weaponry is a definite action of hyper heating of the targeted skies, waters and lands and living things resident in these spaces. I am sure that everyone who has visited Hiroshima Nuclear memorial site (please try and visit if you have not) has a much better hands-on experience of nuclear bomb heating. The one-time devastation of an A-Bomb in Japan has lived in the lives and minds of the people generating fear of what may happen to the world again if a similar or much bigger nuclear hyper heating attack happens. Interestingly, the debate on whether or not the nuclear weapons are needed as a deterrence in a hegemonic warfare (the dichotomy between the pros and cons) is still stiff. In my view UN has a dilemma to deal with, considering that, its formation in the first place was to tame the political hegemonic anxiety that dominated the political discourses before

and after World War two. The challenge of nuclear disarmament of North Korea is a disguised international tension that may drag many powerful countries back to the warfare. Nuclear disarmament of US, Russia, China and elsewhere in Europe is not a question of debate insinuating the inherent UN difficulty. We only leave this part of pessimistic discussion to the readers some of whom active manufacturers and in proliferation of nuclear hoping that, they can have mercy on the world by not subjecting it to total destruction.

2. Oil wells in Niger and The Lake Chad Question

Why does china, Italy and their Lake Chad basin partner countries perceive improvement of infrastructure as a great development breakthrough in Lake Chad's catchment area? Is the recovery of the disappearing lake an environmental project or an economic and security project? Technology and other economic activities have so-far been seen as the worst enemy of the environment on African continent. Ironically, governments party to Lake Chad basin are seemingly excited about the infrastructural benefit that will come with Inter-Basin Water Transfer (IBWT) from Congo basin. I am not a complete enemy of technological advancement, nor am I in disagreement with the inter-water transfer to lake Chad, but it is possible that if water transfer project gets implemented, the Congo basin will equally dry to unrecoverable proportions adding to the vegetation destruction orchestrated by the so-called "transport infrastructure" as well as basin draining. We need to critically understand the intentions of parties in this so-called humanitarian project. It is normal to sound activist here. Tell a friend that the states' capitalistic impunity of this nature is unwanted in an already crumbling environment.

At the end of 2018, the Africa Study Center (ASC) hosted a seminar at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, citing a realization that there is a brewing crisis relating to Inter-Basin Water Transfer (IBWT) from Congo Basin to almost empty Lake Chad- a lake whose benefits extend from Chad to Cameroon, Nigeria, Niger, The Central African Republic (CAR) and by proxy Libya. The Global Resource Information Database of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) established a historic incremental shrinking of Lake Chad as much as 95% from about 1963 to 1998, but later from 2007 the lake had started a significant improvement until recently. The report indicated that the earlier shrinking was rather natural and not anthropogenic. However, the recent developments in climate change indicate that most likely the shrinking of the lake is out of man's-activity. This could be a very important humanitarian project but the motivation of parties to the IBWT is suspicious.

While nations have encircled the water crisis as a humanitarian catastrophe deserving intervention, every individual state involved in the dealings aimed at restoring the lake by inter-Basin Water Transfer from Congo Basin seemingly harbors political and/or economic interest and not the interest in reversing a climate change catastrophe. For example, for Chad (with the political support from president Idriss Deby who has been in power since 1990) and the staunchest proponent of IBWT perceives the idea of water transfer as a rationale for international aid mobilization. Niger runs oil wells in the vicinity of Lake Chad and therefore the stability in the area is core for their economic benefit associated with fossil fuel production. For Cameroon, the idea of IBWT is a geopolitical issue intended to win the Anglophone population living in the area as a governmental providence thereby legitimating the Francophone government in the South. Central African Republic has no tangible benefits from the water transfer project but its involvement is basically international political coalitions with powerful states in the region. Libya as a proxy beneficiary looks at the future of the lake as a survival project as it provides sustained supply of water through the Nubian Sands where water pumping has been done for the past years.

For the international lobbyists and investors, the interest is an open secret (economic and political hegemony) with France, whose intellectuals have been promoting resilience and livelihood on one hand and the partnership between Italy's engineering and construction firm (Bonifica) and China's Power Construction Company (Power China) who want this project started as soon as possible on the other. Sanusi Abdullahi executive secretary of the Lake Chad Basin Commission- (one that oversees the use of water and other natural resources) was quoted by Daily Nation in United Kingdom issue of 28th February 2018, verbatim, "Inter-basin water transfer is not an option but a necessity and process delay is generating frustration. We are faced with the possibility of the Lake Chad disappearing and that would be catastrophic to the entire African continent." The IBWT Commission believes that if the Transaqua is implemented, Africa stands a chance to be like China. How ironic? Interestingly, rethinking the actual realities of the environmental situation in Chad basin, we turn to UN for estimates of the extent of humanitarian crisis which (with the support of the so-called Pan Africanists like the IBWT commission) unwittingly tend to legitimate the predation of the involved nations. For example, UN has estimated that scores of people living near this Chad catchment area are among the poorest in the world, and most of these can only survive with

humanitarian handouts. As United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Stephen O'Brien (2017) noted:

The humanitarian crisis in the Lake Chad Region is truly massive with a staggering 10.7 million people in need of immediate humanitarian assistance. Without our increased support, affected communities will face a life of hunger, disease, gender-based violence and continued displacement. But there is another future within grasp: as the international community scales up support, we can stop a further descent into an ever-deepening crisis with unimaginable consequences for millions of people. I am grateful for the generous support to humanitarian action we have heard this morning. The UN and our partners are ready and mobilized to further scale up our life-saving response - the people in the region have no time to wait.

Additionally, the Lake Chad's disappearance is threatening not only livelihoods but also to sweep the invaluable biodiversity (UN Environment 2018). At the same time, creeping desertification has forced cattle keepers from the lake's (formerly) hinterland, instigating a conflict with farmers farther south. Therefore, to the United Nations, environmental apocalypse evident in the Lake Chad water Catchment area, is a security issue. UN secretary General António Guterres (in the Press Release of 28th February 2018) called up all "governments of the countries of the Lake Chad area and the international community at large to take decisive action to save Lake Chad".

Now, although Transaqua is a very real proposal for a very real problem -- how to replenish the shrinking waters of Lake Chad and prevent an environmental and humanitarian crisis from spiraling out of proportion, the intentions, interest and motivation of the project's proponents must be critically reasoned. According to China, the project is an opportunity to deepen its already strong ties with Africa in a masked narrative of social responsibility. Rosalie Falla's article in GB Times China published on 01st July 2018 that, China for this reason has already pledged US \$1.8 millions for prefeasibility and feasibility study. Italy has pledged US\$2.5 millions. Else where, in EU and US, a project involving Lake Chad would win support because it is a chance to curtail global terrorism as the Basin has hosted a notorious Islamic terrorist group known as Boko Haram. Therefore, the intervention is a hope for restoration of peace and security in the region. For Italy, according to Bonifica's Technical Director, the sight of 100s of people dying in the Mediterranean Sea instigated them into this humanitarian action (Daily Mail 28th February 2018)- which makes the replenishment of the lake an immigration issue. Also, the Transaqua project is fronting an

argument that, there is a guarantee for a creation of a new transport infrastructure as well as Hydro-electric power necessary for boosting regional trade and agro-industrial zones.

So, beyond the obvious humanitarian spirit with an environmentally constructed/manufactured public opinion on interventions, lies the multi-layered complex and dubious nested national and international interests. Rather than for environmental interests, the IBWT is more of a political and economic project (both local and international) than prevention of global warming effects. Why is UN not pivotal in this Transqua case? Paris-Based UNESCO unilaterally “has launched a new \$6.5-million (5.3-million-euro) research and conservation programme involving Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria, as well as the CAR”. Instead of UNESCO’s interest in areas of resilience and adaptation, the UN through its consortium ought to encourage a well crafted feasibility study before investors jump in and cause more catastrophic challenges in the region. Before water can be transferred from Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), how much do we know about the effect of this transfer on DRC? Such an environmental question needs to be addressed. UNESCO could be pivotal on both the conservation of the Lake as a heritage feature as well as cultural and vegetation displacement effect in the process of IBWT implementation. Also, UN could increase vigilance through its Secretary General’s Office.

So, what is the point?

The point is, we should not aspire to be the Attenboroughs of this world but what Attenborough would want us to do. As teenage Greta Thunberg puts it, the issue of climate change is a matter of black or white, no grey zone. Let us stop contemplating, let us act. If you read my essay as an evaluation of eloquence and put it away as if the content never matters in relation to reality, you will have betrayed the generation that looks up to you. You will be counted among the enemies of the world. I will not suggest to you, the course of positive action because issues of climate change today are more or less like “judicial notice” and no longer confined to science-ness. In the same way we know that, there are 7 days in a week, we are much fond of the predicament of global warm and action plan.

The bitter fact is that; we cannot do away with fossil fuels- at least not too soon. Just a mere increase in fuel prices both in developed countries and developing countries is a potential spur to popular protests and violence. The examples are the French Vest protests, the Zimbabwe and Sudan fuel protests. In other countries in developing world, shortage of fossil

fuel for a week can lead to severe humanitarian catastrophe. That is exactly how we are faced with a double edged sword. Replacing the fossil fuel with clean energy is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the reduction and prevention of global warming. There is no source of clean energy that can satisfactorily replace fossil fuels. Proponents of nuclear energy have argued that, it is the alternative we should have embraced yesterday but cannot guarantee openly how they intend to deal with issues associated with nuclear use. Such serious issues range from the sources of raw materials like uranium, dealing with nuclear waste disposal around the world, and the response to nuclear accidents and contamination

The only aspect I would like to emphasize is the convivial complementarity of positive action to change the course of global warming. While the international community and national governments have a responsibility to promote good environmental practices and sanctions for non-compliances, we as the people directly affected by the climate change have a role to play. One is, put our governments on pressure to change their passive interest in the environmental welfare and their untamed economic and industrial hunger. Two, to do everything in our means to change what we see and know will make us both suspects and victims of environmental predation. Just like the “America’s Pledge” for the Paris Agreement, we need at individual, community and policy level integrated global warming reduction strategy in all aspects of human activity such as business and treating climate change as a public health issue.

Also, interest yourself with use of any available clean energy (or invent one) and castigate excessive use of wood as source of energy. If you must use fossil fuels, use them sparingly and dispose them responsibly. If you have access to land, boost the ecosphere with afforestation to help reduce the concentration of Co2 in the upper atmosphere. With action, hope is possible as Thunberg emphasizes; Rather than treat environmental degradation as an issue of a distant future and not an emergency, as if we have no direct relationship with the disaster, or even as a positive dissonance such as winning the World Nobel Prizes (best-argument-gets-rewarded-mentality) or essay competitions, we are not doing enough of practice to reverse the warming apocalypse. *Let us be part of the new normal. I cannot have any other better way to put it.*

References

Alley, Richard. 2007. *Climate Change the Physical Science Basis: Summary for Policymakers: Contribution of Working Group I to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC Secretariat.

America's Pledge. "10 High Impact Climate Action Strategies for State, Cities and Business". Retrieved January 25, 2019, from americaspledgeon climatechange: <https://www.americaspledgeonclimate.com/>

Bell, Larry. 2011. *Climate of Corruption: Politics and Power behind the Global Warming Hoax*. Austin, TX: Greenleaf Book Group Press

Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari. (Eds), 2001, *Participation: The New Tyranny?* Zed Books, London.

Booker, Christopher. 2013. *The Real Global Warming Disaster: Is the Obsession with Climate Change Turning out to Be the Most Costly Scientific Blunder in History?* London: Bloomsbury Continuum.

Boswell, Michael R., Adrienne I. Greve, and Tammy L. Seale. 2012. *Local Climate Action Planning*. Washington, DC: Island Press/Center for Resource Economics

Broecker, S. Wallace. 1975. "Climatic Change: Are We on the Brink of a Pronounced Global Warming?" *Science* 189, no. 4201: 460-63. doi:10.1126/science.189.4201.460.

Business Insider. (December 21, 2018). "China and Russia Are testing Technology That Could Modify the Atmosphere, Reports Suggest" Retrieved January 15, 2019 from businessinsider: https://www.businessinsider.com/china-russia-band-together-on-atmosphere-heating-experiments-2018-12?utm_source=email&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=topbar&utm_term=mobile&pt=385758&ct=Sailthru_BI_Newsletters&mt=8&utm_campaign=email_article

Daily Mail UK. (28, February 2018) "Italy, China Propose Solutions to Lake Chad's Water Problem" Retrieved January 12, 2019, from dailymail.com: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/afp/article-5445147/Italy-China-propose-solution-Lake-Chads-water-problem.html>

Falla Rosalie. 2018. "China Invests in Lake Chad Regeneration Project." GBTIMES. July 01, 2018. Retrieved from January 13, 2019 from gbtimes.com: <https://gbtimes.com/chinas-deal-with-italian-firms-will-rescue-lake-chad>

Green, Penny, and Ward, Tony. 2004. *State Crime: Governments, Violence and Corruption*. London: Pluto Press

Inhofe, James M. 2012. *The Greatest Hoax: How the Global Warming Conspiracy Threatens Your Future*. Washington, D.C.: WND Books.

Johnson, Leo Francis. *A Layman's Guide to Understanding the Global Warming Hoax*. Oakland, OR: Red Anvil Press, 2008.

Moser, Susanne. 2013. "Successful Adaptation to Climate Change." doi:10.4324/9780203593882.

National Research Council, and Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate. "Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change". National Academies Press: Open Book. May 19, 2010. Retrieved January 12, 2019 from nap.edu: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12783/adapting-to-the-impacts-of-climate-change>.

Reay, Dave. 2006. Climate Change Begins at Home: Life on the Two-way Street of Global Warming. London: Macmillan.

Rohrer, Jürg. 2007. "Time for Change Book series". <https://timeforchange.org/pros-cons-nuclear-power-global-warming-solution> Last Accessed online on 12/01/2019

Stoknes, E. Per. 2017. "How to transform apocalypse fatigue into action on Global Warming". Ted Global. Retrieved February 10, 2019, from Ted.com: https://www.ted.com/talks/per_espenn_stoknes_how_to_transform_apocalypse_fatigue_into_a_action_on_global_warming/up-next

The Guardian. (24, January, 2019). Immediate Fossil Fuel Phase-out Could Arrest Climate Change- Study. Retrieved January 12, 2019, from Thegurdian.com: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/jan/15/immediate-fossil-fuel-phaseout-could-arrest-climate-change-study>

UN Environment. (28, February, 2018). The tale of a disappearing lake. Retrieved February 05 2019, from United Nations Environment Programme: <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/tale-disappearing-lake>

UN. OCHA. (24, February, 2017). Oslo humanitarian conference for Nigeria and the Lake Chad region raises \$672 million to help people in need. Retrieved December 12, 2018, from Reliefweb: <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Joint%20PR%20OsloHumConf%20FINAL.pdf>

UN. Paris Agreement on Climate Change. 2015. Retrieved February 15, 2019, from unfccc.int: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf

UN. Secretary-General. (28, February, 2019). Take Decisive Action to Save Lake Chad, Secretary General Urges Governments, International Community, in Message for International Conference. Statements and Messages. SG/SM/18918. Retrieved February 10,

2019, from United Nations: 60 Meetings Coverage and Press Releases:

<https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/sgsm18918.doc.htm>