

the **naked** environmentalist

Solitaire Townsend

Sex will save us.

Or more specifically, a transformative shift in sexual signalling, away from material goods and towards virtual social status, will radically dematerialize our economies. This will enable a transition to decentralised and renewable energy systems, thus preventing biosphere collapse and irreversible climate change. Phew.

Yep, this paper is all about sex, sustainability and social media, with some 'intrinsic versus extrinsic' values arguments thrown in. Plus a mix of capitalism, gay marriage, Gandhi, Francis Fukuyama, Darwin, millennials and Rousseau just to spice things up.

But mainly sex.

Sex drives us. Without procreation, everything else is moot. Children are unarguably our future, in a purely technical sense. Without them, the human species' wild, wonderful journey ends. This is why so much of our behaviour, instincts and mind-sets are dedicated to sex. With regards to the human species, sex has become wildly complex, subtle and ubiquitous in terms of how our societies operate. These huge brains of ours have constructed a mammoth architecture of diverse rituals, signs, personal interplay, social contracts and unavoidable multifaceted rules for mating. Our endocrine system has hardwired these rules into our bodies and brains to ensure the greatest probable chance of personal success in the intricate dance.

Big brains, combined with females who don't have estrus (only occasional periods of heat/fertility), means that we are constantly on this hamster wheel of sex, with no time out. Our societies have coalesced around that need, irrespective of whether or not an individual is personally interested in mating. We are all swimming in the pheromone pool of a culture built around an insatiable sex drive.

We have evolved from using only secondary sexual characteristics (beards and boobs), to a host of wonderfully complex tertiary sexual characteristics (wealth, goods, knowledge, rituals). You're born with your secondary characteristics pre-programmed, but you learn your tertiary ones; something which is superbly helpful for the environmentalist. Secondary characteristics come with a host of their own problems – but not environmental ones. The complex tertiary signal of material consumption is what causes all the problems. Thankfully, because these signals are learnt, we can change them. To be absolutely clear – we can't avoid them, minimise them or strip them of power – not without enormous mental effort. But we can swap them out for something else.

The ubiquity of sex

What's the point of a peacock's feathers? They look lovely but they are laughably impractical. The poor male peacock is easy to spot and easy to catch as he stumbles along dragging them behind him.

Darwin worked it out, of course (although it seems obvious now). The feathers themselves are completely useless – but they prove to lady peacocks that the male is so good at finding food and avoiding predators, that he can afford to grow big, pretty, useless feathers. The bigger, brighter and more useless the feathers, the smarter, healthier and better 'father material' the peacock must be.

"The sexual struggle is of two kinds; in the one it is between individuals of the same sex, generally the males, in order to drive away or kill their rivals, the females remaining passive; whilst in the other, the struggle is likewise between the individuals of the same sex, in order to excite or charm those of the opposite sex, generally the females, which no longer remain passive, but select the more agreeable partners"

Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*

So why, then, do we human beings, who are so much smarter than peacocks, trash our natural environment in order to procure big red expensive cars, designer watches and fur coats? Actually, don't answer that.

Nobody gets breast implants to make themselves smarter. A Ferrari won't help you live longer. That new designer outfit doesn't make you a better parent. Conspicuous consumption is simply another name for Darwin's 'sexual signalling'. This is no new phenomenon.

I was once invited to a Royal Society of Arts debate on whether medieval Britons cared less about consumption and status, and placed more value on community and morality than modern Britons. If you've ever read Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* you'd be forgiven for not understanding the question. That riot of sex, false piety, drugs, honour, war and love is a personal favourite; and more risqué than most of today's celebrity mags. My favourite character is most certainly the Wife of Bath:

Her headdress was of finest cloth and silks;
I dare swear that it weighed a full ten pound;
Which, of a Sunday church, she wore around;
Her stockings were of the choicest scarlet red;
With ornaments, her shoes were soft and new.

A rug was tucked around her buttocks large;
 And on her feet a pair of expensive spurs;
 The remedies of love she knew, because;
 Long ago she learned that old, old dance.

Over seven hundred years ago, Chaucer gloried in a sex and status obsessed widow who used church as a display case for her wealth, whilst enjoying the sexual success that this brought her. If you believe that the modern status and consumption-obsessed Kardashian culture is something new, go and read some fourteenth century English literature.

Although the Wife of Bath follows modern conspicuous consumption sexual rules, such signalling through goods behaviour isn't locked in. Our human need for status signalling has used any wonderfully inventive mechanism our human minds can create. In the early tenth century, Emperor Li Yu of the Southern Tang dynasty in China executed an entire clan for laughing at the Empress. She didn't have bound feet, thus making her seem a lowly peasant. The Maoris tattoo their faces, while the Victorians strapped three year old girls in corsets. Today you can spend thousands of dollars on either a Rolex watch or to attend the TED lectures. Both status signals, both exclusive, both likely to get you laid; but only one associated with material consumption. The fight for status, the desire to look desirable, and wanting to be well thought of are the secret motivations which drive a great deal of our behaviour, as well as taking up a great deal of our daily mental attention. Material consumption simply fits those driving needs very nicely and neatly.

It fits other needs too. Subsistence consumption to keep your children alive. Labour saving consumption to free women from household drudgery. Heuristic consumption so embedded in your behaviours, you don't realise you're doing it. We are a consuming species. But when you're talking about conspicuous consumption, status signalling and keeping up with the Joneses – then we're talking about sex.

Remember that animals also demonstrate their sexual desirability by being hugely wasteful – with long feathers, large antlers and so on. These natural 'conspicuous consumption' displays demonstrate that the individual is so good at securing food and avoiding predators that it can afford to grow utterly useless and wastefully pretty appendages. This is where our own conspicuous consumption has come from. Conspicuous consumption is not wasteful by accident; it's *supposed* to be wasteful. Material consumption, as a sexual signal of desirability, is designed to show that you are so successful that you can afford to waste resources.

And it's powerful stuff. Every single one of us is influenced by the subtle nuances of status signalling. When someone attractive with visible 'high status' walks across the street on a red light, most of us will step out and follow them even though we know it's dangerous. We won't even check the traffic ourselves. If a confident, obviously successful, attractive person does something – then we assume it's a smart idea to do it too.

The joy of sex

This is all great for the environment. Indeed, if a huge amount of our material consumption is actually sexual signalling, competition and status, and if our energy system has been developed to meet the mass production requirements of that consumption, then we have a solution. Change sex. Change how human beings fulfil the need for sexual signalling. Let me be absolutely clear, this doesn't mean making people care about other things rather than sexual signalling. The answer to our current crisis is to change the signal, not the need. Replace accumulation of wealth and material goods with something else better suited to modern sexual competition.

But before I get to that, we've run right into the 'intrinsic versus extrinsic' argument raging in the environmental movement right now.

Intrinsic sex?

Do we benefit more from competition or co-operation? Should intrinsic or extrinsic values guide our societies?

Hobbes or Rousseau? Hedonic or Eudemonic? Selfish gene or group selection? Values Modes or Common Cause?

This is an old argument, and a fascinating one; even Plato and Socrates didn't agree on it. One reason for its enduring fascination is that, after thousands of years of philosophy, and now neuroscience and evolutionary biology, it still hasn't been definitively answered. This is great for meta-ethicists and psychology lecturers.

But, as a 21st century environmentalist, it's a huge distraction. One that must be dealt with before we move on. Firstly some myths...

Are intrinsic values better than extrinsic ones?

The simple answer is *no*. Intrinsic values come from your own judgement, whilst extrinsic values come from the judgement of others. Intrinsic values reward the individual, whilst extrinsic values

reward through feedback from others. As a superbly louche French colleague once put it, “intrinsic is no sex, and extrinsic is sex, non?”

If we’re being kind to both, then their best attributes are:

Intrinsic Values	Extrinsic Values
Cooperation	Achievement
Independence	Influence
Spirituality	Sociability

If we’re being unkind to both then:

Intrinsic Values	Extrinsic Values
Intolerance	Competition
Dogmatism	Status
Detachment	Sexualisation

Many intrinsic values are noble and we aspire to them in the quiet moments of our mind. Then we go out and act on our extrinsic values in the sexual selection locus of the world. From an evolutionary perspective, it’s somewhat surprising that we even have intrinsic values; they aren’t biologically necessary, but our extrinsic ones are utterly unavoidable.

Also, take care with the assumption that intrinsic values are ‘automatically’ lefty liberal. Intrinsic values don’t mean left wing values. Putting the community above the individual can be noble, but it can also be an abuse of human rights. Being morally driven can result in seeing the natural world as having rights equal to those of humans, or can result in seeing homosexuality as morally wrong. Both the far right and the far left believe deeply, personally and intrinsically that they are doing the right thing.

Religions have historically been the self-proclaimed keepers and proponents of intrinsic values, which is why almost every religion has dedicated huge resources to controlling sex. Rules about who can marry whom, where and in which season, all seek to control extrinsic sexual signalling. Religions can’t function fully in a ‘free-market’ of sexual competition, and so they must prescribe which type of sex is good and which bad. This often spills over into rules about gender, power, family structure, education and politics. Modern religions, as well as the vast plethora of historical religions, have held

hugely different values. From human sacrifice to institutionalised incest, religions haven't agreed on the basic tenets of ethics, but they've all controlled sex.

And the more they've controlled our mating protocols, the more successful they've been. Once a religion loses its control over sex, it more or less loses its control over society. This is because society is built around the driving need to mate and raise a family. How we mate determines how we organise ourselves.

This is why environmentalism looks so much like a religion to so many. When we seek to prevent consumption, we are in fact trying to prevent the main form of sexual signalling. This puts us in direct conflict with other sexual control mechanisms (like religions) and with the majority of the public who hold an understandable and natural attachment to their means of winning and keeping a mate.

You might believe you are trying to control consumption, but you're actually trying to control sex. You're not preaching sacrifice of material goods, you're preaching abstinence from sexual competition. When you challenge the multinationals' advertising messages, it can sound like you're actually challenging people's chances of doing well in the gene pool. This is why so many people get pissed off with greenies.

Is Western culture obsessed with sex at the expense of society?

This is where it gets interesting. Is western capitalism a negative, frivolous and destructive consumption obsessed aberration? Or is it the first truly 'free market' of sexual competition which has enabled huge freedoms?

Liberal capitalist democracies have been the most successful at protecting the vulnerable, embedding equality into law and practice, minimising internal violence and enabling freedom of thought. Notice I said 'most successful' and not 'completely successful'. Capitalism comes with its own brutalities and inequities. These often occur where the deal hasn't been fully realised and class structures, the rump of feudalism or religious control still have too much influence. To test that statement, we can use philosopher John Rawles' 'veil of ignorance'. Just for a moment, imagine that you don't know whether you are a woman or a man, poor or rich, sick or well, part of a family or an orphan, high or low class, educated or ignorant; you may be any religion, any race, gay or straight. Where and when would you prefer to live? Where are your rights and your life best protected? In which historical or modern culture might you be able to marry who you wish, and raise your children in relative safety?

As a woman from a poor background, I can't tell you how quickly and strongly I shout 'liberal capitalist democracy'. It may be far from perfect, but it's far preferable to the other options.

Think of the different ways human beings have organised societies as more like a series of ways to organise sex. Procreation and family structure can be ordered through top-down religious feudalism. There are a number of modern societies (mainly theocracies and dictatorships) who still organise sex this way. Gender roles, family ties and mate choice are all methodically disciplined via priests, officials and socially embedded rules that reflect the system. Breaking those rules, or challenging the authorities by trying to mate or marry outside them, will result in censure, exile or execution. An adulteress will be stoned to death. A strict cultural caste system (as was the case in India) acts in the same way. Castes and class systems are basically a set of rules about who can breed with whom, with a spill-over into how power, wealth and choice are also distributed.

Both capitalism and communism tried different pathways out of those religious, feudal or caste control of sex. In many ways, communism attempted to circumvent status hierarchy entirely. Looked at from an evolutionary perspective, the equal distribution of wealth was only unstable because, whilst it did away with feudal control of wealth (and control of sex), it crucially *failed to replace them* with another powerful means through which human beings could compete for mates.

Capitalism has done a much better job. As argued by Francis Fukuyama, in his *End of History* and more recent *The Origins of Political Order*, liberal capitalist democracies substituted consumption for feudalism superbly well. By making material wealth our main sexual status signal, we have circumvented many religious rules, caste systems, physical dominance and 'born rights' to reproductive success.

This is why our media is so obsessed with sex; a notion manifested in 'sex sells' marketing, but also in the crucial the question of whether gay couples can marry. Capitalism is obsessed with the equal rights of everyone to signal their sexual desirability through material success. That has been extraordinarily beneficial for civil and gender rights, and has slowly but surely eroded the sexual controls which had lasted through previous generations. This Grand Deal, namely moving to a slightly more meritocratic system and putting everyone on the same sexual competition footing through consumption, has worked.

It's also allowed for intrinsic values to flourish and be debated. Our movies are obsessed with sexual selection but also with self-realisation, ethics and honourable action. Our public discourse is dominated by the economy, but also the rights of the individual and of collective benefit. We expect our leaders, in the main, to demonstrate strong extrinsic success but also intrinsic ethics.

Our populations in liberal capitalist democracies express a strong interest in, and connection to, intrinsic issues in survey after survey, but act on their strong extrinsic values in the public sphere of sexual status. We talk about intrinsic values, and act on extrinsic ones. That balance has enabled huge improvements in freedom and equality.

In many ways I agree with Fukuyama that liberal capitalist democracies are a superb system.

Except for the fact that they're totally fucked.

Will only intrinsic values save the environment?

If you're an informed environmentalist, then for the previous few paragraphs you were probably thinking "yes, perhaps, but none of that matters because THERE ISN'T ENOUGH TO GO AROUND!"

The Grand Deal, Fukuyamaism, and Capitalism itself missed one fatal issue; the third limit. Classical economics recognises two limits to growth – capital and labour. But it has forgotten about the third – that we only have access to a finite planet. It turns out that capitalism is an unintentional Ponzi scheme. The first investors (Europe and North America) are still doing pretty well and are able to maintain sexual competition based on unbelievable amounts of resources. But late entrants to the scheme are slowly realising they won't get the same return.

As you already know, not only will the rest of humanity be unable to join us in using material wealth as the primary sexual signal, nor will we for much longer. Resource pressure, biosphere collapse and climate change are driven by consumption. Plain and simple. Stuff, junk and things are going to kill us.

This is terrifying, not only for the obvious impact on species survival, but also for the impact on sex. If capitalism's grand deal crumbles, and if we can simply no longer use material wealth as the sexual signal, then what will replace it? This is especially frightening if the collapse of the deal happens concurrently with a collapse in environmental stability and a breakdown in infrastructure. We'll still need a sexual system. Even at the very precipice of disaster, our mating urge will drive us to it.

And it's most likely to drive us backwards. We can say goodbye to gender equality if we lose the 'labour saving devices' of the home, and if child rearing/home keeping once again requires the full time labour of one member of the sexual partnership. We can also say goodbye to sexual equality if family planning becomes harder to come by. Hello religious, feudal or caste control of sex, which fills the vacuum left by sexual signalling through material wealth.

This is a real problem when it comes to the 'intrinsic versus extrinsic' debate. It's a distraction from the real threat. Extrinsic values aren't the problem; how we fulfil them is. And we *have* to fulfil them. Capitalism meets those needs in an environmentally unsustainable, but arguably more equitable way than other systems. If that fails, then we'll find another way to control status signalling. And I fear that women from poor backgrounds won't be writing polemical papers about sex in that world.

Let's put this one to bed. Gandhi, Buddha and Jesus were reportedly able to replace their extrinsic values of sexual competition with intrinsic values to such an extent that they could leave the pheromone rat race of sexual status and hierarchy entirely. This is extraordinarily impressive and extraordinarily difficult to follow. A few others have also been led entirely by what they believed was right, but we don't revere their names because they were monsters.

So, we're left with the situation that even a major shift towards intrinsic values won't save the environment, unless intrinsic values become the basis for sexual selection itself.

Read that sentence again. If you can think of realistic ways for intrinsic values to become the basis for sexual selection, then intrinsic can replace extrinsic as the main organising principle of society.

You may face a problem, because intrinsic values are about you, whereas sex is about other people. You may be able to pull a sleight of hand, and make intrinsic 'seeming' behaviours the basis of sexual selection – but that would simply be extrinsic values wearing intrinsic clothing.

You can't take sex out of the equation, and sex is primarily extrinsic.

These options suck. Capitalism can't become intrinsic, and in fact we're most likely to get a much more unpleasant sexual system when it inevitably fails.

So, it's good that someone hooked up calculators to telephones, because that might just save us.

The serendipity

You can't substitute intrinsic for extrinsic. But you can find other ways to fulfil extrinsic sexual status needs in a radically dematerialised way.

In fact, it's already happening, and it's got nothing to do with the environment.

There are four horses of the apocalypse driving us off the environmental cliff; resource pressure, population, biosphere collapse and climate change. These are all huge, macro, world-spanning and

transformative pressures. The fifth element, if added to this mix, could be the catalyst which checkmates the other four and helps to drag us away from the edge.

The virtual world may allow for the development of a new, radically dematerialised, sexual signalling system; one in which conspicuous consumption simply dies on the vine. Indeed, this could happen in a generation or less.

Facebook alone already includes over ten per cent of the world's population. If it were a country, it would be the world's third largest, after China and India. Over two billion more human beings are due to join us online over the next few years. I won't list more stats and facts about how many people are online, because with every keystroke I type, the numbers will be out of date. New applications, technologies and interactions are being plotted in Silicon Valley, in Kenya, in Beijing and in geeks' bedrooms across the world by the light of flickering screens. The internet has broken out of developed countries and is spreading faster than electricity or vaccines to parts of the world considered almost impossible to reach. People in Chad, Afghanistan and Borneo are building their own wireless networks out of wood, cans, plastic tubs, old wire and car batteries. For about \$60, these MacGyvered internet connections can serve hundreds of people, especially in places where cautious internet companies dare not tread. In Mogadishu, over twenty per cent of the population access the internet at least once a week. Remember, these new internet users have had ample access to holy war, in a state too dangerous for foreigners to visit freely. Indeed, here a quarter of a million citizens live under plastic sheeting; infested, hungry, and reliant on assistance brought in on ships (well, the ones that aren't attacked at sea by pirates). Despite this, they are getting online.

The internet and social media have spread further than capitalist democracies. More people have access to mobile phones than to modern sanitation. People seem to want mobile phones more than toilets. If we're looking for a global system more equitably distributed than any other, then the internet is already there.

The speed of this system's spread is extraordinary. This world-wide shift in behaviours, power, information and access is almost exactly the same age as I am. It was invented as a way for academics to share data, and was built by the USA military to control operations. Email was created for use by the administrators of the internet to co-ordinate their small groups. Text-messaging was supposed to be a side-line to mobile calling. Facebook was set up as a dating site.

In fact, the scenario of digital geeks wanting to meet girls hints at the unexpected and unplanned solution to planetary meltdown.

Liberal communications democracy

Sexual signalling through material goods could be replaced by sexual signalling through social media status.

Just for a moment, envisage that. I don't just mean dating and direct mate selection moving online, but *all* of the myriad behaviours and signals wrapped up in social hierarchy and status. This would be a system in which your social media status becomes more important than your wealth, your car, your home or any of your material goods in the 'tangible' world.

Remember - social media status is inherently intangible. Your likes, followers, klout score, level in online gaming, number of Facebook friends, retweets and pokes have no significant physical manifestation at all.

How much of our material consumption would fall away if our extrinsic needs, status and sexual signalling moved in its majority to the virtual space? The impact would be staggering. What would become of GDP and growth if the accumulation of virtual status replaced the accumulation of goods? What would happen to travel, infrastructure and planning if we spent huge periods of time online? Think of the decentralised renewable energy system which would fit this world compared to the centralised energy requirement of mass manufacturing material goods.

Remember, there are already weak signals that this is happening, and it's already more global and flat than material capitalism.

The online world does use some resources. It needs plastics, rare earths and energy, and creates its own piles of electronic waste. Huge data centres and ICT currently account for almost two per cent of world carbon. But if we use this communications system to replace our consumption system, then that really won't matter. If communications technology can pull off this sexual transformation, then it is welcome to whatever it needs. The decline of other material consumption will offset the internet by a huge ratio.

Don't forget, we're not talking about the small impact of 'video conferencing' versus flying, or the hope that communications technology will give poor farmers better access to markets. We are talking about an entirely new, totally transformative mechanism by which human beings compete, sexually display and build status virtually, rather than through material consumption. This is even more equitable than capitalism, more truly meritocratic.

How do we build that status online? It's constantly evolving but seems to be based on being extrovert, smart, funny, zeitgeist making, talented, sexy, angry, inspirational, emotional, controversial, confrontational, good with words, tribal, inventive and responsive. Those aren't all intrinsic, but they sure aren't the current dominant signals of being so rich that you can afford to be superbly wasteful. Remember, I'm not talking about the ability of the virtual world to build a more intrinsic society. I truly don't care which signals will gain you status online, and I suspect they will remain rampantly extrinsic. All that matters is that they are more powerful than material consumption.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs will come into play. The basic needs of food and shelter can't be fulfilled online. Of course, we don't always value food and shelter above sexual displays anyway. Across the world today, people will risk death itself to impress potential mates. But if the huge demanding and bullying need of sexual and status, as displayed through goods, is lifted off resource availability, then it will become significantly easier to fulfil those basic needs for all. The Royal Society report *People and Planet* concluded that "the planet has sufficient resources to sustain nine billion" but only with a radical redistribution of resources away from the ten per cent who currently consume the lion's share to the rest of the world. Whilst material consumption is the basis of sexual selection, that is nigh-on impossible. However, re-set status signalling and we can hope that developed world consumers will loosen our white knuckle grip on resources.

In economic speak, virtual status would have to become totally 'fungible' with conspicuous consumption; a replacement not an addition. If online status is simply another window to display material wealth, then we're in the same sinking ship. Only a wholesale move of sexual selection into virtual hierarchies will do that. So for this to truly work, your virtual status, in some way, must transition into the physical. This is crucial, as online status needs to intersect with the human endocrine system. Whilst the majority of our status signalling is complex, and we continue to do it even after we've found a mate we're committed to, at heart this new mechanism needs to get you laid.

You need to immediately know the virtual status of everyone you physically meet, so that your sex hormones can flare up, your face can redden and your back can straighten; behaviours that our current secondary and tertiary sex signals generate. Thankfully, that ability doesn't seem far off, as Google will soon launch glasses which use facial recognition, and readable RFID tags in clothes will display your social status when you step out of your door. No doubt this early 'online/offline' isthmus technology will be clunky. But if it's as desirable as other communications technology seems to be, then soon we'll all have physically embedded transmitting chips and retinal displays to tell us

who has a sexy status. It won't be pretty or peaceful. There will be cheats, unfairness and manipulation – just like there is the in 'honest signalling' of the natural world. That tension is a standard part of evolutionary dynamics. This virtual 'you' is part of a new disruptive institution with its own codes, rituals, civil servants and control mechanisms, of course - just dematerialised and equitable ones. It's an almost perfected system for sexual selection and status. This is an accident – a beautiful one.

The only question is – will it move us fast enough away from material consumption to save us?

This 'liberal communications democracy' is the ultimate fulfilment of the meritocracy which capitalism tried to bring about – without that damn destructive side effect of climate change and biosphere obliteration.

The best bit is that virtual status fits more perfectly with extrinsic motivations than material consumption. That's why the transition won't fade or be relegated to fashion. And it means the tipping point could happen fast. Virtual status is simply better at the job. Extrinsic motivation means caring about what others think; the online world gives that feedback directly, unequivocally and with perfect comparison ability. It is a faster and more perfect mechanism for sexual selection which is based on extrinsic values rather than the accumulation of wealth. For those raised with traditional consumption displays, it may be a hard and uncomfortable transition. Thankfully, the populations of Brazil, China, India and most of the emerging economies are significantly younger than in the traditional home of consumption in Europe and North America. These millennials have the potential to transition to virtual sexual competition during the formative years of puberty and first mate selection. Indeed, they may already be doing so.

The implications of this are astounding, and could create huge winners and obliterate losers in the economy. If the power to sexually signal moves away from material consumption and into the virtual space, other parts of the economy will follow. Status signalling, aspirational lifestyles and sex are the bedrocks of material capitalism. Just like religions fade if they lose control over sex, so will material capitalism.

Social media, gaming and the virtual world won't need to be about sustainability, values or debates. The virtual world doesn't need a purpose beyond what it already has. It just needs to become superbly good at what it is already becoming – a more important status symbol than material consumption.

This is the promise. It might not make you comfortable or happy if you're an intrinsically motivated environmentalist, but it might just save the world.

That's not guaranteed, of course. The window may be limited, and the climate crunch may happen too quickly for the online transition of sexual competition to bed in. Competition for energy could move electricity sources away from the online world to traditional industry in key markets. Misguided governments may try to limit or curtail the transition, because traditional capitalism will be swept away, along with the religious or state control of sexual mores.

Which is where you come in.

If you find this idea intriguing, challenging or even inspiring, then get online. Find the places where we can make the transition faster. Hold back the environmental event horizon long enough for the transition to happen.

And start talking about sex.

First published 2013 by Futerra
www.futerra.co.uk

Copyright © 2013, Futerra Sustainability Communications Ltd, London

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher, except for brief inclusions in a review.