

**Ecologic –  
The green hornet**

**Can anything be accomplished from the middle?**

Oh, the grand old Duke of York,  
He had ten thousand men,  
He marched them up to the top of the hill,  
And he marched them down again.

And when they were up they were up.  
And when they were down they were down.  
And when they were only half way up,  
They were:

neutral, indecisive, suspended, in limbo, noncommittal, hovering,  
equivocal, caught in the middle, agnostic, moderates, wimps, confused,  
straddling the fence, without direction, twisting in the wind, pointless,  
without meaning, purposeless, wishy-washy, weak, etc.

Can the topic of ‘climate change’ be approached from the middle without necessarily deferring to the extremes or does it take extremism to counter extremism?

Since most of us are not scientists, I think we tend to reserve our opinions on this matter because we don’t seem qualified to render an opinion; we’re not sure – agnostic, if you will. The reference to ‘agnostic’ is not necessarily in a religious context, more about that later, but in a ‘not knowing’ – or for some of us, the sense of the more strict definition recognizing that we could never know the true causes and effects of climate change, much less have the ability to control it.

Let’s first consider the extremes and what they have to offer in the environmental tug-of-war. In one corner, we have the VHEMT (Voluntary Human Extinction Movement) where their motto is ‘May we live long and die out – thank you for not breeding’. And in the other corner, would be some sort of terrestrial nihilist – people who would not only plunder the environment for profit and gain but who would destroy it just for the pleasure of destroying it; I can’t think of any group with this claim, but one must exist.

Since these two extreme extremes wouldn’t seem to get us very far, we should probably take one step towards the center on the continuum of man versus nature – specifically in the context of greenhouse gas emissions. There is any number of groups that will use words like ‘denier’, ‘skeptic’, or ‘cynic’ when referring to a ‘non-believer’ (a non-believer would be a person who does not align himself with the theory that greenhouse gasses are warming the earth to it’s peril and that man-made greenhouse gasses are the sole cause or exacerbating the situation and that we can fix it by reigning in human activity). The converse to this is the notion that climate change theory is a bunch of hooey constructed by the leftist in order to further their socialist agenda.

Then there are the rest of us in the middle going – ‘I dunno; I dunno, it all makes sense to me and none of it makes sense to me.’ We’re not scientists and we don’t have the time to vet the info that’s being blown at us from both sides. So as a non-committal, indecisive, wishy-washy centrist, what are we to do? We actually have a tougher job than the extremes in that we have to evaluate every thread of data that comes in contact with us. The extremes, however, don’t have to do this – they have a template approach and can pass judgment without thinking about it.

I never felt so comfortable as when I was playing black jack all night with a system that was developed by a friend of mine. I knew, in every situation, what to do; no hemming or hawing over ‘hit me’ or ‘I’ll stand’ or ‘double down’ or insurance (what’s that?) – it was mindless and I loved it – no decision making involved at all just the discipline to be consistent; which is the pinion of all of these systems.

Now you can carry that mindset over to real life; think of how much easier it would be if you had a system to lead your life and make decisions. As the old saying goes, if all you had was a hammer, you could view everything as a nail. If your sole criteria were physical beauty, you would seek to surround yourself with all things beautiful. If you were always looking for miracles, you would always find miracles. If you were a perpetual pessimist, you would insure everything turned out for the worst. If you always followed Consumer Reports highest rated item you wouldn’t need to evaluate anything else with your buying decisions. If you depended on your astrologist or other advisor to make decisions for you, then you’re off the hook. If you blindly followed the environmentalists or the right wing radio talk show hosts, you’d have your global warming answer without having to look any further.

The one thing in favor of the extremes (the template or system for living) is the consistency of approach. Environmental extremists consistently seek to minimize man’s influence on the planet so it’s easy to be consistent with answers to questions like should we build roads or buildings or swimming pools or transmission lines or really just anything. The opposite extreme can readily provide their opposite answers as well.

It seems that the largest contingent does sit in the middle though, because of the changing of public opinion regarding the environment versus the economy, and rightly so. The objective is immediate survivability, if we were to subordinate the viability of our socio-economic structure to debatable long-term environmental concerns then the VHEMTers would probably win out.

So there is a legitimate third side to this and that is the extreme middle. And, if pressed to take a side in the argument, you can take the side of the passionate moderate and unabashedly voice the mantra; ‘I dunno; I dunno.’ But you might also mention that compromises may have to be taken, as arbitrary as they might seem to the extremist.