

**Short Communication***Copyright © All rights are reserved by Tomáš Hájek*

Let's take the Global Climate Change Debate back to The Interdisciplinary Beginning, where it Probably Never was.

Tomáš Hájek**Sexological Society of J.E.P. Czech Medical Society, International Association of Landscape Archaeology, Association of Writers of the Czech Republic*

***Corresponding author:** Tomáš Hájek, Sexological Society of J.E.P. Czech Medical Society, International Association of Landscape Archaeology, Association of Writers of the Czech Republic

Received Date: May 11, 2026

Published Date: May 19, 2026

Short Communication

This contribution in the style of Short Communication is written at a highly personal level, which is even more private than first-person narrative as such. However, the highly personal level involved a rational approach instead of emotions. This highly personal level, which is seemingly inappropriate for a global scientific journal, is a rational construction allowing for the use of the strategy of insight and shortcut, while at the same time suggesting that whatever the author of the text proposes is not his personal proposition. Instead, the author's proposal stems from the natural character of the truth and the increasingly complicated attempts at finding the truth in the current times. Any response to the call for the truth may only be the subject (and merit) of teamwork.

Therefore, let's look at moral panic in short, as the highly personal level allows for this. Moral panic is a terrible cliché applied by various people from the beginning of the ages or even ever since people could talk. Nonetheless, I am talking about it because I have overheard it recently and while it was said very weakly, it made an impression on me. I would personally never dare to use this expression. Several weeks ago, at the IALA (International Association of Landscape Archaeology) conference on landscape held in Bamberg, Germany, someone probably used this term in the discussion, or perhaps it was not spoken out and loud but was hanging in the air. Perhaps it was spoken in very low voice. Therefore, if someone has uttered this expression on the edge of speech, on the edge of language, on the edge of time, on the edge of

war and peace, I feel that it is legitimate to describe in short what this may have meant. Primarily, it signifies the growing inability of the civilization to distinguish between the truth and lie. While this inability stems from many historical factors, it has been accelerated by the global development of the internet and the occurrence of artificial intelligence.

The term climate change is, in my highly personal opinion, the prisoner of moral panic in the same way as Edmond Dantès in the novel by Alexandre Dumas (The Count of Monte Cristo) was the prisoner of his cruel captors in Chateau d'If. Climate change was imprisoned in the same way in this helpless situation owing to the key injustice, which cannot be generally eliminated, yet from time to time may be defeated. However, this "Dantès" is not just a prisoner, he is also the lord of the chateau, the minister of interior affairs, the one holding the keys to the fortress as a whole or perhaps even to the whole world. The planet of Earth is smaller and smaller – it is now as small as the pin head – and greater and greater fights for resources are played out on this planet of Earth – and the climate change keeps biting of greater and greater portions from these disappearing resources. These are the outlines of fatefulness that create the architectural structure of the fortress of If; this is the terrible fate of the current times and at the same time the source of moral panic. This is the terrible ambivalence of the current times and also the source of moral panic.

There are two options: a revolution, or a strategy of gradual steps. However, there are also countless hybrid third options.

Perhaps, by paradox, there are far too many options – and at the same time there are none at all. Similar to moral panic, the term multidisciplinary also becomes a terrible cliché used by just about everyone. Perhaps excessive fractioning of naturally evolved fields and their excessive classification in individual categories leads to the need for the multidisciplinary approach in order to reach some sort of synthesis. One way or other, as I would say at a personal level, the climate change debate is not interdisciplinary at all these days, not even in the bad sense, let alone in the good sense. The same old topics are stacked one after another in this debate as cars in the morning rush hour in a city. It is not that the debate would be useless, this is certainly not the case. However, the cars of the same global makes are stacked there and their drivers tend to be quite nervous. To use a metaphor, the global climate change debate needs to return – in my personal opinion – to its interdisciplinary beginning and perhaps it needs to return where it has never been.

Perhaps it has been there, but this is ages ago! So, it has never been there.

However, let's go back briefly to the constellation in which *The Limits of Growth* by the team of authors under the leadership of Dennis L. Meadows are emerging at the beginning of the 1970s. Allow me to list all respectable members of this team of authors, as they all deserve everlasting glory – we are still at a highly personal level: Dennis L. Meadows, director, USA; Alison A. Anderson, USA (pollution); Jay M. Anderson, USA (pollution); Ilyas Bayar, Turkey (agriculture); William W. Behrens III, USA (resources); Farhad Hakimzadeh, Iran (population); Steffen Harbordt, Germany (social and political trends); Judith A. Machen, USA (administration); Donella H. Meadows, USA (population); Peter Milling, Germany (economy); Nirmala S. Murthy, India (population);, Roger F. Naill, USA (resources); Jørgen Randers, Norway (pollution); Stephen Shantzis, USA (agriculture); John A. Seeger, USA (administration); Marilyn Williams, USA (documentation); Erich K. O. Zahn, Germany (agriculture) [1].

Climate change is not just an environmentalist topic in the wider sense. It is an interdisciplinary topic in the widest sense. Since I do not know exactly what I am saying myself, allow me to mention specific examples where my personal contribution was received positively with an open door to teamwork. Providence

has led me to become a member of the Scientific Committee at the International Conference On Climate Change, Sustainability & Renewable Energy conference, which will be held from 15 to 17 October 2026 in Prague. The question of program suggestions regarding the structure of conference arose. I noted that the topic of interconnection between global climate change and cultural heritage protection does not seem to be mentioned in discussions as much as the seriousness of the situation would dictate. To my surprise, it came as the manna from above and the program topics for the conference list something I would describe as a revolutionary step forward: Scientific Sessions include Climate Change and Cultural Heritage: Risks, Resilience & Sustainable Preservation.

Second example: I was given the opportunity to participate in two major climate change conferences as a speaker, specifically at the 3rd World Conference on Climate Change & Sustainability (Barcelona, 2024), the 4th World Conference on Climate Change & Sustainability (Milano, 2025). In addition, I was also invited to the 5th World Conference on Climate Change & Sustainability (London, 2026). I used this opportunity to try and promote a topic associated with sexology and population among the usual topics in global climate change discussions, specifically On the Possibility and Suitability of Expanding the Current Environmental Discourse to the Topic of Climate Change with Certain Topic of Neo-Malthusianism and Anarchism. My proposal was kindly accepted.

This is it, although there has been more, but this is enough adorning myself with borrowed plumes, crossing the bridge before coming to it, carrying coals to Newcastle – written at a highly personal level.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

No Conflict of Interest

References

1. Donella H. Meadowsová, Dennis L. Meadows, Jørgen Randers, William W. Behrens III (2026) *Meze růstu*. First Czech edition. Translated by Bedřich Moldan in 1972. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, nakladatelství Karolinum PP. 164.