THE FUTURE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION, ENERGY

Posted on 28/04/2015 by Naider

That today's economy is highly dependent on fossil fuels is nothing new. The solution seems clear and it is to create energy alternatives for the future. But can we really afford from an economic point of view to fight against climate change? That is the question that The Guardian asks in this video that we share.

As far as data is concerned, 80% of existing fossil fuels would have to be kept underground, which would entail a great expense in other types of energy and the financial markets would be altered. Some opinions in this regard are in favor of the idea, arguing that a restructuring of the economy to fight climate change would bring a global benefit. Others, on the other hand, are inclined to think that it would inevitably lead to an economic recession and, therefore, the slowdown in growth that we currently enjoy.

There are actually three approaches to keeping fossil fuels in the ground and starting a more radical fight against climate change:

- 1.- The **skeptics** who believe that it is a losing fight and that there is nothing to do.
- 2.- The **subversives**, in favor of a change in the economy and of stopping the constant growth to which we are subjected since it only increases emissions.
- 3.- The **evolutionists**, who accept capitalism and the growth that it entails but with regulations. Radical regulations, of course, that change the current environmental legislation. Measures that have predetermined dates and deadlines to put pressure on the private sector and thus direct research and innovation resources towards that objective.

The next technological revolution will revolve around renewable energy and there are many ways to get energy without harming the environment. The video gives us hope and makes us see that sustainable growth is possible from an environmental point of view. The challenge (or the solution) is to continue researching cleaner and cheaper energy sources, which requires a stronger commitment and political determination than the current one.

There are no comments yet.