

All change, please

Published: January 13, 2026, 9:23 am

Three articles jumped out at me for various, but it seemed related, reasons when reviewing this morning's papers.

The first [was an article in the Guardian](#) on what it calls 'The Great Abandonment'. This is how it describes the process of people withdrawing from the habitation of areas that previously supported human occupation. They noted:

Since the 1950s, some scholars [estimate up to 400m hectares](#) – an area close to the size of the European Union – of abandoned land have accumulated across the world. A team of scientists [recently calculated](#) that roughly 30m hectares of farmland had been abandoned across the mainland US since the 1980s. As the climate crisis renders more places unliveable – too threatened by flooding, water shortages and wildfires to build houses, soil too degraded and drought-stripped to farm – we can expect further displacements.

This does, of course, highlight my concern about climate migration. But, it also makes clear just how significant the process of climate change already is. Change is happening.

Another [was also in the Guardian](#). This was headlined:

'By 8pm it is time to head home': whatever happened to the big night out?

The article notes that people no longer seem to stay out late. Clubs are shutting or starting in mid-afternoon and closing by 9 pm. Bars are seeing their peak business on Saturday afternoons and not later on Saturday evenings. People want to go to bed because they know that is good for their well-being. And the phenomenon is not only observed among older people. Younger people are also changing their lifestyles. The night is dying.

The link between the two articles is that the way we are living is changing. That's not, as yet, been imposed on us. It's been chosen, in the main. But, as the third article shows, there is a massive resentment amongst the far-right, who would much rather

that the opportunity to profit that they once enjoyed was maintained. [The FT has noted](#) that:

Texas and 10 other Republican-led states are suing BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard, alleging they conspired to curtail coal supplies to further “a destructive, politicised environmental agenda”.

The federal antitrust lawsuit accuses the three largest US index fund managers of using their holdings in the coal producers to constrict supplies and drive up prices in pursuit of net zero carbon emissions goals.

You could, of course, argue that this has nothing to do with the first two articles, but I think there is a link.

BlackRock and others have looked to the future and seen that unless they back away from coal and other carbon-producing assets, all they will be buying by investing in them is stranded assets that will, before too long, have no value because they will be unusable. They are not noted for their green agendas, whatever they might like to claim in their PR. They are making cold-headed decisions to avoid wasting money on buying things that will not be used, and the far-right hates that because their own political agenda requires that it be pretended that what exists now will always be the way things are.

Reality and the far-right are in conflict then, and those (in this case, investment managers) who have smelt the coffee are caught in the crossfire.

Who will win? I have no idea what the court will decide in the US because US law and reality appear to be increasingly out of touch with each other, but reality will win.

If people need to move because of climate and other changes, they will.

If people want to change their lifestyles to be kinder to themselves, they will also do that.

And if people will not buy toxic products then there is nothing a court can do to require them to do so.

This is reality. That is the common theme here.

The Right might not like it, but the instruction has been heard, and it's 'All change, please'.