

# Climate/Eco-anxiety: A real issue, but not in the way we're told!



DAWN LESTER

JUN 23, 2023



31



21

Share

The fear-mongering about 'Covid' seems to at last be subsiding; so surely we can now all heave a huge sigh of relief and get on with concentrating our efforts on creating new ways of living that will move us towards experiencing ever-greater freedom?

Alas no!

It would seem that the 'would-be controllers' do not want us to feel calm; they don't want our nervous systems to return to homeostasis, which will allow us to be more creative, as we are meant to be.

Instead, they want to prevent that creativity; they want us to remain in a heightened state of fear so we will acquiesce to their agendas. And therefore they need to perpetuate fear-based stories, of which there are a number that are possible contenders for being rolled out as the next 'emergency'.

Although not new by any means, the one that appears to be the favourite front-runner in the next media circus is so-called 'climate change' due to increased CO2 levels as the result of human activities. Contrary to this mainstream narrative is the huge body of information that shows quite clearly that CO2 does not drive 'climate change' nor does it cause warming temperatures.

However, the lack of evidence for the mainstream narrative about 'climate change' is not

© 2023 Dawn Lester · [Privacy](#) · [Terms](#) · [Collection notice](#)

[Substack](#) is the home for great writing

the implications on human health, especially our emotional and mental health, a key aspect of true well-being.

The type of media coverage I'm referring to is exemplified by a June 2023 BBC article entitled *El Niño planet-warming weather phase has begun* that begins with the statement,

“A natural weather event known as El Niño has begun in the Pacific Ocean, likely adding heat to a planet already warming under climate change.”

The point to note is the acknowledgement that El Niño is a ‘natural’ weather event; it is therefore not a new, strange, or unexpected phenomenon. In fact, the article provides a link to another article entitled *What are El Niño and La Niña, and how do they change the weather?* that makes the following statements,

“El Niño is part of a the natural climate phenomenon called the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO).

It has two opposite states - El Niño and La Niña - both of which significantly alter global weather.”

Again, note the use of the word ‘natural’ in the description of the phenomenon called ENSO and the acknowledgement that both parts - El Niño and La Niña - have the ability to affect the weather across the world.

So, how can they justify blaming human activities for alterations in the weather?

The simple answer is that the ‘the would-be controllers’ who are behind all of this have ulterior motives that clearly involve the perpetuation of fear to ensure that the general public - or the vast majority of them at least - will comply with the recommended measures that they claim need to be implemented in order to address the problem.

Whatever the proposed measures are, they will not and cannot address ‘climate change’ because they are not based on a correct understanding of ‘the climate’.

In his book, *Climate: The Counter Consensus*, palaeoclimatologist Professor Robert Carter states that,

“...climate is a complex, dynamic, natural system that no one wholly comprehends...”

If no one fully understands the ‘climate’, how can anyone claim to be able to ‘tackle’ climate change?

This poor elephant is being ignored! But then tackling ‘climate change’ is not the real goal.

In order to achieve their real objectives, the ‘would-be controllers’ need people to believe their story and will use any means possible, whether fair or foul - and their means are usually foul.

The key message in many of the articles that have been posted lately by so-called ‘news’ websites, is that the world could be headed for a new ‘record’ global temperature in 2024 and that this may exceed the 1.5 degree C limit set at the Paris climate agreement.

The main purpose of such articles is to perpetuate fear about ‘climate change’ to make people think that ‘something needs to be done’ and clamour for somebody to do that ‘something’! Of course, the ‘would be controllers’ already have their plans about the ‘something’ that needs to be done and are ready to implement them when the time is right. But first, they need to make sure we are all afraid - very, very afraid.

This can be seen by a variety of reports about what is being called ‘climate anxiety’, which is said to be a sub-set of ‘eco-anxiety’, although these terms may also be used interchangeably.

Here’s an example of the way ‘eco-anxiety’ is framed in an article published in October 2021 by the *BMJ* entitled *The climate crisis and the rise of eco-anxiety* that typifies the mainstream view and the way this alleged ‘crisis’ is being framed for the public. Here is the beginning of the article,

## The climate crisis and the rise of eco-anxiety

October 6, 2021

*Levels of eco-anxiety are growing, particularly among children and young people, and are likely to be significant and potentially damaging to individuals and society, warn Mala Rao and Richard A Powell*



The world's climate is changing in every region and across the whole climate system, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Working Group confirmed in its report *Climate Change 2021: the Physical Science Basis* in August 2021. [1] Described by the United Nations secretary general António Guterres as a "code red for humanity," the report's alarm bells were "deafeningly loud," spelling out the irrefutable facts that "greenhouse gas emissions from fossil-fuel burning and deforestation are choking our planet and putting billions of people at immediate risk, and many of the changes are becoming irreversible." [2]

Note the use of the term 'code red' and the reference to 'indisputable facts'.

The article also includes this paragraph,

For the eco-anxious, more concerning than even this apocalyptic news is the extraordinary level of indifference and banality with which the climate crisis is treated by many others, including those in positions of influence. Eco-anxiety is growing, and refers to the chronic fear of environmental doom probably first described in 2017 by the American Psychiatric Association. [3] Although not yet formally considered a diagnosable condition, recognition of eco-anxiety and its complex psychological responses is increasing, as is its disproportionate impacts on children, young people, and the communities with the least resources to overcome the adverse consequences of the climate crisis. [3]

The article continues with the comment that,

"Does eco-anxiety matter when compared with the more familiar climate change impacts on physical health, such as heat-related stress, asthma and allergies, vector borne illness..."

The concept of vector-borne illness is an extension of the 'germ theory', as shown by the WHO March 2020 *Vector-borne diseases* fact sheet that claims,

"Vector-borne diseases account for more than 17% of all infectious diseases, causing more than 700 000 deaths annually."

This statement is followed by the claim that,

"They can be caused by either parasites, bacteria or viruses."

At the risk of sounding like an old worn-out record on a never-ending loop - or is that a mixed metaphor - there are no 'infectious diseases'. There is no evidence, and there

never has been, that parasites, bacteria or viruses cause any type of disease.

In other words, there is no such 'thing' as a vector borne illness!

Unfortunately, there is a clear acceleration in the efforts to promote the idea of 'vector-borne illnesses' beyond the regions of the world where they are claimed to be endemic. For example, a June 2023 BBC article *Mosquito-borne diseases becoming increasing risk in Europe* claims that,

“European scientists say more frequent heatwaves and flooding, and longer, warmer summers, have created more favourable conditions for the bugs.”

This is an obvious attempt to insert 'climate change' into the narrative and make a connection between these 2 unproven theories.

The key point I want to highlight is that the purpose of this is to perpetuate fear, especially in the minds of children and young people.

The above-cited BMJ article about the climate crisis refers to a study entitled *Climate anxiety in children and young people and their beliefs about government responses to climate change: a global survey* that was published in December 2021 in the journal *The Lancet Planetary Health*. The study background states,

“Climate change has important implications for the health and futures of children and young people, yet they have little power to limit its harm, making them vulnerable to climate anxiety. This is the first large-scale investigation of climate anxiety in children and young people globally and its relationship with perceived government response.”

Note the reference to the lack of 'power' children and young people are claimed to possess to limit the harm from climate change.

The study involved 10,000 children and young people between 16-25 in 10 countries.

**Findings** Respondents across all countries were worried about climate change (59% were very or extremely worried and 84% were at least moderately worried). More than 50% reported each of the following emotions: sad, anxious, angry, powerless, helpless, and guilty. More than 45% of respondents said their feelings about climate change negatively affected their daily life and functioning, and many reported a high number of negative thoughts about climate change (eg, 75% said that they think the future is frightening and 83% said that they think people have failed to take care of the planet). Respondents rated governmental responses to climate change negatively and reported greater feelings of betrayal than of reassurance. Climate anxiety and distress were correlated with perceived inadequate government response and associated feelings of betrayal.

**Interpretation** Climate anxiety and dissatisfaction with government responses are widespread in children and young people in countries across the world and impact their daily functioning. A perceived failure by governments to respond to the climate crisis is associated with increased distress. There is an urgent need for further research into the emotional impact of climate change on children and young people and for governments to validate their distress by taking urgent action on climate change.

The funding for this study was provided by AVAAZ, which is described as follows on Wikipedia (yes, I know),

“Avaaz is a U.S.-based nonprofit organization launched in January 2007 that promotes global activism on issues such as climate change, human rights, animal rights, corruption, poverty, and conflict. In 2012, The Guardian referred to Avaaz as "the globe's largest and most powerful online activist network".

I'll let you decide how independent this organisation is!

The message being promoted is that young people feel betrayed and are ‘dissatisfied’ with the response by governments; they want them to ‘do more’ to stop the climate crisis.

The idea is that insufficient action is being taken by governments and other ‘authorities’ to deal with this alleged crisis and that it is the younger generation whose lives will be negatively impacted by the actions taken now or the failure to take action.

The fact that they will be the ones most affected has led to the idea that young people should have a greater say in the actions being taken to ‘save the planet’ as can be seen by an April 2023 BBC article entitled *Earth Day: How to talk to your parents about climate change*. The context of this article is that parents don’t know anything so their children need to tell them about it, because, as the article claims,

“Young people are some of the world’s most powerful climate leaders and want rapid action to tackle the problem.”

Unfortunately, these young people have no idea that they are being lied to about 'climate change'; that it has nothing whatsoever to do with their 'carbon footprint' because of increased CO2 levels as the result of human activities and that we can 'tackle' this problem by reducing our 'carbon footprint'. This is the story that these young people believe due to their education - or more accurately, this is the information with which these young people have been indoctrinated through their school or college, as well as through the media and of course social media.

The typical messaging promulgated by the media can be seen in a November 2022 BBC article entitled *Climate change: Four things you can do about your carbon footprint* that claims,

“Tackling climate change will require world leaders to take action on a global level.”

The article continues - and here's the key point,

“But as individuals we also contribute to warming emissions.”

This is unproven. Furthermore, as stated above, no one fully understands 'the climate'.

The 'four things' that the article suggests people can do are:

1. Insulate your home
2. Cut out food waste and cut down on red meat
3. Drive less, fly less
4. Think before you buy

Interestingly, but not surprisingly because these messages are co-ordinated to drive the propaganda narrative, these four things are very similar to the topics young people are encouraged to speak to their parents about in the Earth Day article cited above. The topics covered in that article were:

1. How to talk about going meat-free
2. How to talk about flying less
3. How to talk about being waste-free

The idea that flying exacerbates carbon emissions which drives climate change was further promoted in a June BBC article entitled *Flight turbulence increasing as planet heats up - study* that claims the increase in wind turbulence is the result of,

“...changes in wind speed at high altitudes due to warmer air from carbon emissions.”

I'm not going to cover the 'meat-free' aspect of this agenda in this article; I may cover it in a later article because it has become a very divisive issue - which in my view is intentional.

There is an issue with waste although not in the way it is framed in the 'climate change' narrative.

I would like to emphasise at this point that we ARE experiencing environmental problems; however, these problems should NOT be equated to 'climate change' - they are not the same issue at all.

In my opinion, the main purpose of the rise of the idea of 'global warming' in the late 1970s was to mask the very real and growing environmental problems that we do face but are not being addressed.

The key point is that young people are being propagandised with flawed information and then told that they know more than their parents, who are perceived as ignorant and lacking the will to take the appropriate action, which is driving young people into a state of anxiety, which obviously negatively impacts their mental health. An important aspect of this is that for some of these young people, their parents may well have a far better understanding of the reality of so-called 'climate change', a situation that has the potential to further divide people, a topic I have previously written about.

## Divide and Conquer.

DAWN LESTER • SEPTEMBER 11, 2022

