# Story Brief

## Title/author

## What is the key climate solution proposed in this story?

Nature vs Technology

## Do you include other climate solutions? If so list.

Mechanical tress, reforestation

## Story outline (please include any ideas on how to make it engaging to read)

Already in analysing feedback from climate experts I see a clear division between those who favour high tech solutions and those who favour nature based solutions.

The arguments tend to go as follows: Those in power (mostly rich men, often with vested interests, looking for silver bullets) are targeted by industry lobbyists hungry for investment. The business lobbyists, chosen for their persuasive power, sell decision makers high tech expensive solutions that require lots of energy and money and may never pay off. These often solve one problem by causing another – or cost a lot of precious metal, carbon emissions and money and never quite pay off.

These high tech ideas tend to win out over less sexy, but proven, safe, nature-based solutions, solutions relevant to local context and community needs and solutions focussed on demand reduction.

The nature lovers want us to change our capitalist values and decision-making processes to move way from monetisation of everything. The ecofeminists ask how decision making processes can change to reflect feminine values of nurture and care and local community needs over the drive to dominate and control? They want more women in power, and more local decision-making.

But the engineers and technicians argue that we need science too. Carefully targeted technical solutions that take into account unintended consequences are necessary because we’ve left it so late. Greenhouse gases need to be drawn down FAST and if tech can help, we must embrace it. The trouble is does the excitement of a high tech solution lead us to not fully consider unintended consequences (e.g. behavioural consequences such as consuming more if we know carbon is being captured, or loss of biodiversity due to giant solar shade for example.)

The story could have fun with this and pit nature against technology in some kind of public debate with intriguing characters and high stakes. You can use this as an opportunity to explore in detail some proposed solutions. For example in ‘39 ways to save the planet’ they talk about mechanical trees <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m000r5nz>. How do these compare with normal trees in terms of multiple criteria?

You can also check out their episode on indigenous wisdom <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m0010pvq>

Can you find other examples?

Your job as writer is to make the story engaging. Don’t worry if you don’t know everything about the topic- do enough research to write a good story and our experts will double check and amend as needed.

## Follow up information

*Each story will be accompanied by a webpage that gives more details to any reader inspired to follow up. We will have a researcher to fill in the gaps but s/he will have limited time so please fill in the next sections as much as you are able – if you don’t know, it’s fine to say.*

## What makes you think it (specify which solution) will make a difference. How did you find out about it? What are your sources?

## How confident are you in your judgement i.e. are you expert in this field or have you consulted an expert – give details (please complete for each solution)

## What can the reader do to progress this idea? How we can get from where we are now to the ideal outcome. Who/what is required to get to ideal outcome? (policy, finance, research?)