

The dominant discourse upholds an idea that accumulated financial capital (money) can reliably address climate change challenges. What is often neglected is the fact that since the current trends of climate change is blamable on money-making human enterprises; the ability of the product of such enterprises (liquid capital/money) to address the environmental and climate consequences they create is put in question. The big question to be addressed by this study is; can a bad master (towards climate) be a good servant (towards its re-address)? This study attempts to challenge a dominant modernistic-capitalistic tendency of thinking that money and technology can and will resolve all problems of the world! In this study, climate change is viewed as closely linked to environmental destruction by the modernistic practices of capitalism and consumerism, which seek to indiscriminately convert natural resources into consumable articles. Herewith, 'capitalistic' development (in its extremist tone) is viewed as predatory to natural environment, the inventor of consumerism and a master-minder of climate change. In many cultures of the world, environmental conservation is/was communal responsibility and a cultural/religious requirement. In the current global order, though, money is the driving force, even of climate change redress work! Even tree planting work (a conservation dimension) is largely done as a business endeavour. Africa needs to look beyond the monetary gains for values of vitality; to stop replacing forests and swamps with factories. Industrialists need to learn that increasing the amount of money dedicated to climate change, without decreasing carbon emission and the sacking in raw materials from the environment is no solution. I herewith caution that finances should not be the driving force behind climate change redress, but a desirable companion to uphold higher environmental value.