

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	20-LITHIUM-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Lithium Valley Commission
<b>TN #:</b>	242455
<b>Document Title:</b>	Keshav Boddula Comments - Concern for for misguided and hyped renewable energy transitions
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Keshav Boddula
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	3/24/2022 2:13:15 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	3/24/2022

*Comment Received From: Keshav Boddula*  
*Submitted On: 3/24/2022*  
*Docket Number: 20-LITHIUM-01*

## **Concern for for misguided and hyped renewable energy transitions**

Lithium Valley Commission,

I hope this message (that if truly/fully considered, I imagine would be very challenging and inconvenient for you) will help to increase your clarity on a very difficult position/decision you are having.

I have already contacted CNRA Salton Sea and CEC regarding my concern about the planned lithium mining for misguided, hyped renewable energy transitions, and now to reiterate my concern, to you...

?Are you aware of the very inconvenient, but actually negative impacts, especially to environmental health of lithium mining, and subsequent use of the resource in the hyped energy transition? This transition is from a more desperate Economy that (understandably) wants to continue its drug addict-like fix and familiarity with a way of life that is actually destructive to our shared environment to continue to satisfy our unfortunate, drug-like dependence on artificial, industrial levels of energy (including "renewables," where merely the energy SOURCE is natural and renewable, but it doesn't require overly sophisticated science to see that other parts of the LCA point to imbalance and destruction).

I used to think the switch to renewables was obviously the best way to go too, but then two very well presented documentaries came out recently - "Planet of the Humans" (2020) and "Bright Green Lies" (2021, also a great book), and informed a more complete understanding of our ill, chronic reliance on artificial energy sources. I even wrote this reflection (attached) (including great references) that could help provide better clarity.

I can imagine that when you authorities really understand the ramifications of such environmentally unsustainable artificial energy development, the very inconvenient predicament may not give way to an obvious or easy decision... so I guess I should just emphasize the importance of CLEAR awareness (for HUGELY impactful decisions such as the lithium mining plans, you know) here.

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

# [Hyperlink-Charged](#) Reflections of our Way of Life

## Fueled by Industrial-level, Artificial Energies



"Deep Greens' State of Being / Consciousness: the most beautiful.., yet also unfortunate" is a deeper (or at least more holistic)-than-a-"deep-green" **poem-like [reflection](#)**<sup>1</sup> that's potentially profound, or at least interesting, though perhaps limited in practicality/functionality than the relatively holistic, strong defense of our very real endangered environment, and goals of environmental sustainability, so I digress until I find the [solution](#)\*, you know?

The [deceiving](#)<sup>9.1</sup> **merit of renewable energies** is that they are *better* in the sense that it is less imbalanced, non-finite and cleaner-air producing *source* of energy than relatively quickly burning millions of years old fossil fuels that are running out and tend to cause air pollution and GHGs, and with a BUT bigger than the elephant in the room's...

These reflections are especially initiated and assisted from the **clearer, more accurate understanding** of the whole picture, which was **from documentaries** such as 2020's "Planet of the Humans" and more recently, "Bright Green Lies: How the Environmental Movement Lost Its Way and What We Can Do About It" (BGL) (my [review](#)). The revelatory book of BGL gives even more details than the film...

The **book** presents very inconvenient or [sobering truths of our way of life](#)<sup>2</sup>, from the compromised authority of government that should be protecting the environment, to the destructiveness inherent in our modern civilization/cities, and other profound insights. A main point is that much of what passes for environmental concern today is geared primarily toward sustaining an unsustainable lifestyle. One tipping-point-hopeful takeaway reflection from BGL is the unfortunately hugely impactful "industrial civilization," conqueror mind-set has reached its final-peak time when the otherwise natural planetary energies from the great sources like the sun, wind, and water that are needed and sufficient for life, has been (possibly in a parody-like way) artificialized (even [blocked](#)<sup>2.1!</sup>) and thought sincerely and implemented as the main solutions to our unfortunate way of life characterized by drug-addict-like, weak, dependencies...

The ecocidal supporting of the transition of our society to renewable energy, is partly understandable as it is a very inconvenient truth that may be too tough for us to really want to deal with, very unfortunate... when - like a drug addict realizes they have become weakened with dependency on their fix - as a society we realize [our weakened state](#)<sup>3</sup> of being **dependent on industrial levels of artificial (& excess/imbalanced) energies** (whether fossil fuel-based or "renewable"-based) to maintain our environmentally unsustainable economy / way of life, rather than a more holistically healthy way of life, in better harmony with the natural world and natural energies.

The **book** [explicitly states its purpose](#)<sup>4</sup>, offers [beautifully written](#)<sup>5</sup> [analogies](#)<sup>6</sup>, [poems](#)<sup>7</sup>, [warning signs from history lessons](#)<sup>8</sup>, even [an orienting spectrum of environmentalism](#) (and other

caterings to a needed target audience with more reductionist/categorization thinking and proclivities to subjects like math and engineering), and so much more outstanding content.

Though I guess one could try to explain the psychological reasons for a deep green's understanding (the seeming lone, accurate observer of the ludicrous ecocide, like via [the ER analogy](#)<sup>6.1</sup>), BGL includes **several [explanations](#)<sup>9</sup> of the ongoing normalized pathological thinking of modern industrial society** (especially the dangerous positivity/confidence in the renewable energy solution embraced by the "bright greens").

When one is aligned with truth even at the possibility of inconvenience or self-sacrifice that I tend to align with, then it is easier to agree with almost everything from BGL. But there is an interesting **deep divergence** in our respective beliefs, as they see relatively more equality of various beings, but I (maybe with a more "mechanistic mind" – BGL, p. 9) [believe](#) in the law of karma and reincarnation type, hierarchy-of-life understanding, but this at least adds to the beauty in diversity in our shared worlds, right?

Well, at least regarding my vegetarian/vegan dietary preference, from a blessed, more satwic or elevated being/consciousness, with an uplifting, positive view, my hierarchical view (should) clearly sees "lower" / more animalistic forms of life as not to harm, kill, eat, or take down, but if anything to uplift. While still bonded to the physical body and the natural cycles of creation and destruction (not to mention the nature-oriented [design of the human digestive system / physiology is more like herbivores](#)), I still have needs to sustain the body by killing and eating the (even) lower life-form, plants (with their leaves that solar panels can be likened to).

Such a hierarchical view is sometimes mistakenly negatively associated, but in an evolution of consciousness, with a positive understanding, this seems similar to "deep greens" in BGL also helping our clarity to see how the industrial economy is violent against the planet, and what to do, especially with the difficult-to-do, but needed "Real Solutions" chapter at the end that I bet the otherwise voiceless/protectionless natural world would totally support. And not that one (like an unaware Hindu) should reach the subtlest sheath of anandamaya kosa while (effectively) supporting a misguided [modern civilization](#)<sup>2.1</sup>, or one (like an immoral environmentalist) should have truly environmentally sustainable way of life while also manifesting their lower, more animalistic tendencies, right? Why not go for the best at all levels!

\*Of course, [solutions](#)<sup>10</sup> start with us, and unless one is super influential where what they do has a massive, or significant enough impact, it is not such a good idea to go for a natural energy way of life alone without sufficient support (or withdrawal for that matter) from the overly-dominant/-pervading, nature-imbalanced way of life/culture. So solutions ought to include those in powerful positions to give the appropriate corresponding consideration to very real, long-lasting, negatively impactful planning/decisions, and then enable all people to practically, more easily, habitually on a daily basis, participate in a way of life that truly supports life and the protection of nature (or dharma).

# References

## 1"Deep Greens State of Being / Consciousness: the most beautiful.., yet also unfortunate"

I daydream of another dimension, world where you can imagine your image of heaven, the most desirable place to be or ultimate goal of life, and let's just go with the angels in the clouds imagining for now. The angels create art that is so beautiful, uplifting, and most importantly the art fortunately reflects their heavenly abode accurately!

But in the waking dimension, I find myself to be in a more hellish (from my own karmic doing? my own dharmic progression?) situation where I find myself looking up to honest, bold writers (like Derrick, Lierre, and Max) for their "relative" (as compared to the deceivers, or at least those that are not accurately seeing) goodness in accurately reporting the *unfortunate* world of environmental destruction, climate chaos, and a damaged planet

My YouTube playlist, [Wholistic unsustainability of "renewable energy SOURCES"](#)

[DGR News Service articles](#) such as:

[Car Sick Part 1](#)

[Green Lithium Mining is a Bright Green Lie. Dispatches from Thacker Pass](#)

[The Long Shadow of the Tar Sands: Lithium Mining and Tar Sands Sulfur](#)

[How we manufacture silicon: computers' crucial ingredient not found in nature](#)

[Lithium: Mining Mountains of Water](#)

Friday essay: [searching for sanity in a world hell-bent on destruction](#)

[Re-Evaluating Solar Photovoltaic Power: Considering the ecological impacts we aim to reduce](#)

go from "bright" green to "right" green, take out the "b" / let's HAVE our earth, not consume it,



irth day reminder, you see?

## Samples from the BGL book

*Our way of life doesn't need to be saved. The planet needs to be saved from our way of life. (p. xviii)*

### 2Sobering truths of our way of life

#### The compromised authority of government

"Abolitionists never sought to regulate the slave trade," Thomas Linzey (co-founder of the Community Legal Environmental Defense fund) says, "they sought to abolish it." He explains that the very concept of regulating industrial harms comes from industry and not concerned people, who would in most cases rather ban harmful activities altogether." (p. 122)

"What if they made some deal they shouldn't have made, and we're leading us all [in the wrong direction]" – not from BGL, but from Jeff Gibbs from Planet of the Humans @ 1:10:xx

## 2.1 Modern civilization/city

“the reality of people living in numbers large enough to require the importation of resources: city dwellers need more than the land can give. Food, water, and energy have to come from somewhere else. From that point forward, it doesn't matter what lovely, peaceful values people hold in their hearts. The society is dependent on imperialism and genocide because no one willingly gives up their land, their water, their trees. But since the city has used up its own, it has to go out and get those from somewhere else. That's the last 10,000 years in a few sentences. Over and over and over, the pattern is the same. There's a bloated power center surrounded by conquered colonies, from which the center extracts what it wants, until eventually it collapses. (p. 4)

“The idea that a compact, dense city can reduce energy use and emissions, protect wildlands and water quality, save biodiversity, and provide a better quality of life is at the heart of the mythology of the sustainable city, and “mythology” is the operative word... the bad news is that they *have* to conquer other peoples, because they've overshot and harmed the carrying capacity of their homeland.” (p. 303)

“To the dedicated young people marching to save the planet, we offer our solidarity. But the demands of this movement boil down to public money for sectors of the industrial economy. What that money pays for, very directly, is the bright white salt and the cracked brown earth, masses of dead fish and no sign of animal life, the destruction of the last wilderness and the places that spirits live, while the elders cry for future generations, because there is no future in any of this.” (p. 163)

2.1 “We can't go through and debunk every crackbrain plan put forward by members of an insane culture who will do anything to maintain this way of living. But we do need to describe one more, because this crackpot plan is where this culture has been heading for a long time, and this particular atrocity will kill the earth.

Geoengineering, sometimes called climate engineering, is the deliberate modification of weather/climate patterns by human intervention. The most popular geoengineering proposals involve using high-altitude airplanes to inject fine particles called aerosols into the upper atmosphere. These particles would, in theory, reflect some incoming solar radiation, thus cooling the planet.

It sounds like the plot of a comic book villain, but it's being seriously considered by national governments and scientific bodies.” (p. 416)

## Profoundeep

“our current way of life requires industrial levels of energy.” (p. xix)

“In the battle between mood management and reality, reality is always going to win.” (p. 85)

## **3 Our weakened state of being dependent on industrial levels of energy / fossil fuels**

“The problem is that our entire modern global civilization is... “addicted to oil”, and addicted to consumption and the conventional development model in general. An addictive substance is something one has developed a dependence on, which is either not necessary or harmful to

one's longer-term well-being. Fossil fuels (and excessive material consumption in general) fit the bill." (not from BGL, but from "[Ecosystem Services In Theory And Practice](#)" by Costanza)

[not from BGL, but Sai Baba's weakened life from over-nurturance/-protection of plant/human analogy at 10 min. from [Mere Sai, ep. 342](#)]

"Only here, in the wealthy nations, and especially now in this age of fossil fuels and globalized trade, can importation create the illusion of sustainable cities, cities that treasure green spaces. It's much easier to conserve nearby forests, meadows, and mountains when your primary source of timber, food, and minerals lies far away." (p. 338)

"Nothing compares to the energy density of fossil fuel. Its 46 MJ/kg made industrial civilization possible. It takes energy to fight a war against life itself, because life wants to live. It takes energy to turn biotic communities into dead commodities and ship them across oceans and over continents, and the only way to do it at a profit is if the energy is essentially free. But \$50 a barrel is pretty close to free.

The math is not complicated. The best lithium battery can only store 1 MJ/kg. Imagine life in an industrialized country at a mere 46th of the amount of American consumption. You'd have just over 30 minutes of electricity a day. The average American drives 37 miles a day: divide that by 46. That's assuming your car would exist, which it wouldn't, not without the fossil fuel to mine the ores and make the steel. And your car would be mostly useless without the fossil fuel needed to carve out and pave roads. The infrastructure and consumer goods of industrial civilization require a level of extraction, transportation, manufacture, and distribution only possible with an easy flow of fossil fuel.

We are being sold a story, and we are buying it because we like it. We want it to be true. We want to believe that our lives can go on with all the ease and comfort we accept as our due. How painless to believe that a simple switch of wind for oil and solar for coal and we can go on with our air conditioning and cell phones and suburbs. Every time we hit a trip wire of unsettling facts or basic math, we soothe ourselves with our faith in technology." (p. 177)

#### **Example of how renewable energy does not displace oil, gas, etc.**

"...his research found that "Non-hydro renewable [energy] sources have a positive coefficient, indicating *the opposite of displacement* [emphasis ours], but this coefficient is not significantly different from 0, indicating that renewables tend to simply be added to the energy mix without displacing fossil fuels."

In other words, the amount of emissions reductions you get per dollar invested in "renewable" energy is essentially zero. In fact, the emissions actually increase, because the production, installation, maintenance, and disposal of these "renewable" energy forms release greenhouse gases; and because the extra power provided by these renewable sources is being used to power more electronics, more data centers, more marijuana grows, and more military installations, which all have their own associated greenhouse gas emissions, from destruction of forests and grasslands to production of cement, plastics, and other materials." (p. 438)

## **4Purpose of the book**

"One of the things we're trying to do in this book is model the process of asking where products come from, and who is harmed by their production." (p. 227)

"Although we've spent hundreds of pages laying out facts, ultimately this book is about values. We value something different than do bright greens. And our loyalty is to something different.

We are fighting for the living planet. The bright greens are fighting to continue this culture—the culture that is killing the planet.” (p. 465)

“What we are asking you to consider is that the idea of “green energy” is not sound—neither in the broad strokes (continuing to fuel the destruction of the planet is in fact a bad idea) nor in the particulars (that nondestructive sources of industrial scale energy exist).” (p. 155)

## **<sup>5</sup>Beautifully written**

### **<sup>6</sup>Sample analogies**

“Have you ever ridden a bike down a hill? Did you have to pedal? No? Really? Let’s write a headline: “Person rides bike without having to pedal!” Then bright green enthusiasts can write books and articles about how renewable energy companies just need investments to develop stationary bikes that don’t need to be pedaled that will power the economy.”(p. 69)

“Swap gas for coal, methane for carbon dioxide, and it’s not even rearranging the deck chairs. It’s telling the drowning and the terrified that you’re bailing out water—and maybe even believing it— while filling the hull with more.” (p. 81)

<sup>6.1</sup>“There’s an image I can’t get out of my head that describes the mainstream environmentalist response to the murder of the planet. A patient is brought into the emergency room, bleeding out from scores of wounds. The doctors and nurses work frantically to close the wounds, stop the bleeding, infuse more blood. They use every high-tech machine and medicine they can, and they do everything possible to save the patient—everything except the most important thing of all, which is to stop the killer from refusing to leave the ER and continuing to stab the patient, again and again and again. Bright green solutions merely keep stabbing the living planet again and again and again. We need to stop them.” (p. 471)

### **<sup>7</sup>Sample poems**

#### **“In goes... and out comes” industrial economy poem**

“In go the lives of impoverished children, and out comes chocolate, wrapped in foil and ready for Mother’s Day. In go the limbs of workers hacked off by machetes, and out come diamond rings, to be delivered with the understanding that “every kiss begins with Kay.” In go lowland mountain gorillas, and out come cell phones. In go the Columbia River and millions of salmon, lamprey, sturgeon, and all those beings who depend on them, and out comes “green,” “sustainable,” and “renewable” energy. In go the Colorado River and its delta, and all those who live there, and out come Las Vegas, golf courses, citrus orchards, alfalfa fields. In go the marshes and prairies of Iowa—once one of the most biodiverse places in North America, called by early explorers “a country so full of game”—and out come cornfields and “clean” and “green” and “sustainable” biofuels. In go forests and out comes “biomass.” In go mountains, and out comes coal. In go lakes, rivers, meadows, entire islands, and out come the materials to build solar panels and windmills. In goes the whole planet, and out come the luxuries that characterize this way of life, the luxuries for which the bright greens are fighting so hard.” (p. 82)

#### **“The Answer is that we can’t (continue to consume the planet)” poem**

“We can ask, “How can we stop global warming?” when we really mean, “How can we stop global warming and maintain an industrial lifestyle?” And the answer is that we can’t. Similarly, we can ask, “How can we save the oceans?” but we really mean, “How can we save the oceans without stopping industrial fishing, global warming, and the production of plastics



and other pollutants?” In other words, “How can we save the oceans and still have an industrial lifestyle?” And the answer is that we can’t.

We can ask, “How can we save the salmon?” but we really mean, “How can we save salmon without stopping industrial logging, industrial fishing, without removing dams, without stopping the murder of the oceans, and without stopping global warming?” In other words, “How can we save salmon and still have an industrial lifestyle?” And the answer is that we can’t.

We can’t stop atrocities without stopping the actions that functionally cause the atrocities.” (p. 311)

### **<sup>8</sup>Warning signs from history II / lesson**

“The introduction of railroads was widely hailed as a technological solution to the horse problem. But instead, rail made these issues worse. More efficient transit by rail allowed more trade to take place, and since every item shipped by rail needed to be picked up and delivered by horse-drawn wagon, overall demand for horse transport and thus the scale of the problem went up. New technologies don’t always displace older problems; sometimes they just pile on top. What finally did replace horse transportation was the automobile, which by 1912 outnumbered horses in many American states. Aided by new regulations on urban horses, cars took over the streets and were proclaimed to be an environmental savior. According to Morris, “Neither draconian regulations nor disincentives for travel were necessary to fix the horse pollution problem. Human ingenuity and technology did the job—and at the same time they brought a tremendous increase in mobility.”

But at what cost? Far from a triumphal tale about ingenuity and technology, the story of automobiles solving the problem of horse poop could be read as a cautionary tale on the perils of escalations in technology, and more fundamentally on the tendency within this culture to sidestep problems rather than solve them. In this case, the problem was not addressed; it was just transformed. Instead of feces-filled streets, we now have smog-filled skies and a greenhouse-gas filled climate. Trashing mountains, forests, wetlands, and prairies to provide food for horses was replaced with trashing mountains, forests, wetlands, and prairies to provide steel to Henry Ford’s factories, and oil for the automobiles.

Now, in the face of a car culture that’s ruining the climate, the response is to sidestep the issue again by developing technologies that will once more displace the destruction, not eliminate it.” (p. 178)

### **<sup>9</sup>Explanations of the ongoing normalization of socio-/psychopathology of the “industrial civilization” (especially Bright Greens)**

**(Excellent (and fair/true) edit of Naomi Klein’s claim)**

“So the issue is, ~~global warming deniers~~ *bright greens* understand that if the science is true, their whole ideological project falls apart, because, as I said, you can’t respond to a crisis this big, that involves transforming the foundation of our economy—our economy that’s built on ~~fossil fuels~~ *functionally and systematically converting the world into products; in other words, destroying the planet, no matter how the destruction is fueled*. The idea in this—we hear this from a lot of ~~liberal environmental groups~~ *bright greens*, that we can change completely painlessly, just change your ~~light bulbs~~ *source of energy*, or just a gentle market mechanism, tax and relax, no problem. This is what bright greens understand well, that in fact it [stopping global warming] requires transformative change as in stopping industrial civilization. That change is abhorrent to them. They see it as the end of the world. It’s not the end of the world, but it is the

end of their world. It's the end of their ideological project. So, that is unthinkable, from a *bright green* perspective. So, rather than think about that, they deny the science, *and they deny what's really at stake.*" (p. 107)

<sup>9.1</sup> "Bright green environmentalism has gained as much attention as it has ("over the past 20 years that it has effectively colonized main stream environmentalism" and) because it tells a lot of people what they want to hear: that you can have industrialism and a planet too, or put another way, that you can have a planet and consume it too. But we can't. And so bright green environmentalism does great harm by wasting time we don't have on "solutions" that cannot work." (p. 256)

"In terms of stopping the destruction of our planet, or at least stopping global warming, all the mainstream solutions are, at best, distractions. They're really responses to the recognition that a) world oil supply is finite; b) industrial energy demand will continue to rise; and c) the demands of the economy are not negotiable" (p. 438)

"And when our food and goods are delivered to us by the economic and social system, we can easily come to perceive the system as the source of the food and goods. The fish you just ate came from Safeway, not the ocean, and the materials in your house came from The Home Depot, not a forest. And when we perceive the system as the source of life, we can come to value the economic and social system over life on the planet. This is how an environmentalist can say that polar bears don't do it for her, and many others can strive to save industrial civilization over life on the planet.

Even when we understand in our heads that the earth is the source of all life, our *experience* will be that the system supplies us with what we need. And we will defend to the death—in this case the death of the planet—what we experience as supplying us with what we need...

The bright green movement is based on avoiding for a bit longer the consequences of our actions, life on the planet be damned. It's ignoring that this current way of life is and has always been unsustainable, ignoring that this particular party is over, and pretending we can keep this current orgy of planetary destruction going, only now powered by wind and solar. It's about rationalizing the despoliation of what remains of the planet—forget nonhumans (who don't really do it for us) and forget the future; we want to party on! It's a desperate attempt to stave off facing the consequences of our way of life, even though it will lead to an even more horrifying collapse at the end." (p. 319)

"This [rationalization] is what bright greens are doing. In their quest for a (fraudulently accounted) carbon-neutrality, they ignore horrors perpetrated along the way. So, a cement factory that destroys a biome to facilitate the destruction of undersea biomes is suddenly an environmental success story. How? Simple. Ignore everything but the fact that algae are going to scrub carbon dioxide from the smokestacks. Ignore even that the algae will presumably be fed to cows or turned into fuel and burned, releasing the carbon anyway. Ignore the real world. Then the only polluting thing you'll remark is exhaust from the car you drove up in. That's the story we're debunking over and over in this book. That's the story of bright green lies." (p. 233)

"People don't like to admit—to themselves or others—that they're doing terrible things. As psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton brilliantly laid out, before people can commit any mass atrocity, they must convince themselves and others that what they're doing is not, in fact, an atrocity, but instead that they're doing something beneficial." (331)

"I'm increasingly convinced that within this culture the primary use of human intelligence is to try to rationalize whatever behavior we already wanted to do. Much of our philosophy and

religion— from Plato to the Bible to St. Augustine to Descartes to Adam Smith right up through today, including bright greens—can easily be seen as providing intellectual support for human supremacism and the conquest of the earth.” (p. 464)

“It shouldn’t surprise us that the values of the environmental movement have degraded so much in the last 30 years. Now more than ever, people are immersed in technology instead of the real world. As one report states, “The average young American now spends practically every minute—except for time in school—using a smartphone, computer, television or electronic device.” A recent poll in Britain found that the average 18-to-25-year-old rated an internet connection as more important than daylight.

We’ve come a long way from the naturalists we were born to be; from inhabiting a living world flush with kin to serving a society in thrall to machines.

It’s no wonder, then, that so many people believe in nonsensical technological solutions. Technology does it for them and the real world doesn’t.

And so, *{this could be edited to past tense, like “hear” -> “heard”}* the absurd becomes normal.

We hear that green technology will stop global warming. We hear that cutting down forests and burning them is good for the planet. We hear that damming rivers is good for the planet. We hear that destroying the desert to put in solar panels is good for the planet. We hear that industrial recycling will save the world. We hear that commodifying nature is somehow significantly different than business as usual. We hear that we can invest our way to sustainable capitalism. We hear that capitalism can be sustainable.” (p. 423)

## 10 Solutions

““How can we continue to harvest industrial quantities of energy without causing harm?” is the wrong question. The correct question is: “What can we do to help the earth repair the damage caused by this culture?”” (p. 435)

“We don’t need technology that breaks the world while it continues to break us from the world. We need to let our planet repair while we repair our place within it. It really is that simple.” (p. 455)

“So many indigenous people have said that the first and most important thing we must do is decolonize our hearts and minds.” (p. 466)

“People protect what they value, and so long as they value this culture and the conveniences it brings to some humans over life on the planet, so long shall they try to save this culture and their own conveniences at the expense of the life that does not seem to do it for them.

If the planet—and ironically enough, if we ourselves—will survive, it will only be because enough of us begin to value life over these conveniences. The irony comes because the bright greens claim that their proposals are “all about us.” But “us” clearly doesn’t include those who will inherit the wreckage of a world their plans will leave behind.

When we change our values, previously insoluble problems become soluble. Instead of asking how we can meet insatiable industrial energy demands and still live on a planet at least minimally capable of supporting life, the question *must* be: How can we help the earth to be stronger and healthier while still meeting human needs (needs, not conveniences, not luxuries, not addictions, and further, *human* needs, not the needs of industry and commerce).” (p. 467)