The Psychology of Denial Versus the Climate Crisis

Asmita Bhattacharyya
B Sc. 1st Year
Department of Environmental Science
Asutosh College

Introduction:

Globally, nearly 36% of the population denies the human origins of climate change (Chandeze & Petit, 2023). The statistic itself is staggering, especially in today'sera where information is readily available. Climate change denial primarily refers to the rejection of or unwarranted skepticism towards the general scientific consensus on climate change, particularly its direct link to human activities(ECPS, n.d.). Deniers, often dismiss phenomena such as anthropogenic global warming, fluctuating climatic conditions, and their impacts on nature and human societies.

Fortunately, a vast majority of people express concern about climate change. However, a large number of people also avoid, minimize, disengage, or distance themselves from effectively addressing rising environmental concerns. Paradoxically, some who acknowledge climate change and environmental degradation as real issues still fail to act.

Denialism often manifests as a pathological rejection of the harsh reality of climate change. It has come to a point wherea small but vocal group of climate sceptics can no longer distinguish fact from fiction, to the detriment of humanity as a whole, while climate-conscious individuals consistently reaffirm their commitment to scientific evidence(Dudman, 2025). This, combined with the outright denial of scientific consensus, raises the question: *'What exactly causes climate denial?*

The Science Is Clear—So Why the Resistance?

The science of the climate crisis is clear and accessible to all. While natural factors play a role, indiscriminate human activities are primarily driving the crisis toward a tipping point.

The ever-increasing demand for natural resources, uncontrolled burning of fossil fuels, overconsumption, plastic pollution, The ever-increasing demand for natural resources. uncontrolled burning of fossil fuels, overconsumption, plastic pollution, and various other detrimental human-driven factors are at an all-time high. These activities are disrupting natural systems, causing ecological imbalances with devastating effects. Immediate mitigation and unified action are the need of the hour to prevent worse outcomes, yet international media, politicians, and even educated populations often deny the reality looming before us. One doesn't need to be a climatologist to notice worsening weather conditions—just look outside your windows. For instance, Indian summers reaching 50°C serve as a stark example. So, why do climate sceptics persist?

Perhaps denial is simply easier than confronting the political, religious, or cultural factors that sow doubt about scientific evidence.

Understanding Denial: It's Not Just Ignorance: In psychology, denial is a defense mechanism where individuals consciously or unconsciously reject reality to avoid anxiety or discomfort. Bailey and Pico (2023) defines denial as the dismissal of external reality and instead focusing on internal explanations or fallacies and thereby avoiding the uncomfortable reality of a situation. It manifests in various ways. For example, someone may insist they have no issue with alcohol despite its negative impact on their family and career. Similarly, a loyal employee might ignore evidence that their boss is embezzling funds(Denial, 2024).

Climate change denial is not solely driven by misinformation; it often stems from how people view the world and their place in it. Several factors contribute to this mind-set. The scale of climate crisis is often overwhelming(Climate Denial: Why It Happens and What to Do About It, 2022). This can lead to what Psychologists call- **"psychic numbing,"-**a mental defense against despair.

It is a psychological phenomenon where indifference sets in when we are confronted with overwhelming calamity, and it's only one of the glitches in our emotional makeup that keep us from working to change circumstances that harm other people or the environment (O'Hara, 2020). Some cope by downplaying the crisis ("it's not that bad"), distancing themselves ("it won't affect me"), or shifting responsibility ("governments should fix it"). Understanding these deeply human defenses is key to shifting the conversation.

Today's digital age amplifies denial through information bubbles. Social media algorithms prioritize content that reinforces existing beliefs, creating echo chambers that foster distrust. Well-funded misinformation campaigns, often backed by fossil fuel interests, further entrench denial, making it not just psychological but systemic. An online article by Global Witness titled How Facebook's Algorithm Amplifies Climate Disinformation states that as soon as they simulated the experience of a climate-sceptic user on the platform, within a few clicks Facebook's algorithm recommended content that denied the existence of man-made climate warming and attacked measures aimed at mitigating the climate crisis.

Beliefs about climate change are often tied to our social identity rather than scientific understanding. In many parts of the world, political, religious, or cultural affiliations heavily influence views on climate change. Actively denying the crisis can signal group loyalty, especially in communities where environmental concern is viewed as an outsider's ideology. Admitting the reality of climate change might feel like betraying one's tribe.

Finally, 'cognitive dissonance'—the discomfort of holding conflicting beliefs—also plays a role. Imagine believing you're a good person who cares

About the planet yet frequently flying, driving a car, or supporting environmentally harmful policies. To resolve this internal conflict created by anxiety or cognitive dissonance, some people try to minimize or deny the problem, as it's easier to claim "climate change is exaggerated" than to overhaul their lifestyle or values(Marien, 2011).

Can Minds Be Changed? Rethinking How We Talk About Climate

Decades of climate activism and various conversations on the climate change show that denial is rooted in emotion, identity, and fear, not just misinformation. Therefore, simply repeating scientific facts won't break through to the masses. To shift worldviews, we must rethink and shift the way we approach climate conversations.

While it's tempting to call out denial as ignorance or stubbornness, shaming or blaming deniers often strengthens resistance. Empathy, however, opens doors. People are more likely to listen when they feel heard and respected, even in disagreement.

Leading with empathy—listening to concerns about health, safety, children's futures, or local economies—can build trust(Four Lessons Psychology Teaches Us About Inspiring Climate Action, 2018). Humans are naturally wired for stories, not spreadsheets. History shows that stories outlast civilizations. Therefore, instead of overwhelming people with complex charts and data, sharing personal narratives from farmers, frontline communities, or young activists fighting for their future may workout well. People are often more responsive to local examples, like rising temperatures, flooding, or worsening air quality in their city, which may resonate more deeply.

Climate change is often presented as an inevitable catastrophe or a moral failing which often backfires causing psychic numbing and restricting required action. Instead, Reframing climate change with solution-oriented narratives----highlighting innovation, resilience, and opportunity—can inspire action. For example, messages like "Solar power is saving rural communities money" or "This city cleaned its air in five years" foster hope without sugarcoating the crisis, and showing that change is possible, and already happening(Shome et al., 2009). People trust those who share their identity. Elevating voices from within communities—religious leaders, farmers, business owners, veterans, or youth advocates who can communicate authentically to their peer groups can break through biases. Messages from unexpected messengers, like conservatives or former sceptics, are particularly effective.

Conclusion

The impacts of climate change are undeniable, yet environmental science remains an evolving field. For some people and ecosystems, it may already be too late. Still, mitigation is the only path forward; all else has failed. We have pushed our ecosystems to a point where they can no longer sustain us and our never-ending demands. That is why the conversation surrounding climate change is so important. The climate conversation must highlight personal impacts to foster understanding. Facts matter, but they're only part of the story. To change minds, we must appeal to values, emotions, and identities. It's not easy, but collective action begins with connection. When people feel seen, heard, empowered, and connected, they're more likely to face the truth—and act.

References:

Bailey, R., & Pico, J. (2023, May 22). Defense mechanisms. StatPearls - NCBI Bookshelf. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK559106/

Chandeze, E., & Petit, G. (2023, December 12). 36% of the world's population still dispute human origins of climate change. Ispos. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from https://www.ipsos.com/en/36-percent-worlds-population-still-dispute-human-origins-climate-change

Climate change Denial - ECPS. (n.d.). ECPS. Retrieved April 24, 2025, from https://www.populismstudies.org/Vocabulary/climate-change-denial/

Climate denial: why it happens and what to do about it. (2022, February 3). The Climate Reality Project. Retrieved April 24, 2025, from https://www.climaterealityproject.org/blog/climate-science-denial-why-and-what-to-do-about-it

Denial. (2024, January 3). Psychology Today. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/denial

Dudman, K. (2025, January 27). Trump voters are not the obstacle to climate action many think they are. The Conversation. Retrieved April 24, 2025, from https://theconversation.com/trump-voters-are-not-the-obstacle-to-climate-action-many-think-they-are-248176

Four Lessons Psychology Teaches Us about Inspiring Climate Action. (2018, February 5). The Climate Reality Project. https://www.climaterealityproject.org/blog/four-lessons-psychology-teaches-us-about-inspiring-climate-action

How Facebook's algorithm amplifies climate disinformation. (2022, March 28). Global Witness. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from https://globalwitness.org/en//digital-threats/the-climate-divide-how-facebooks-algorithm-amplifies-climate-disinformation/

Marien, K. (2011). Climate denial: emotion, psychology, culture, and political economy. In OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF. https://pages.uoregon.edu/norgaard/pdf/Norgaard-Oxford-Chapter.pdf

O'Hara, D. (2020, November 30). Paul Slovic observes the 'psychic numbing' of COVID-19. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/members/content/covid-19-psychic-numbing

Shome, D., Marx, S., &Center for Research on Environmental Decisions. (2009). The Psychology of climate Change communication (Leapfrog Communications, Ed.). The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. https://coast.noaa.gov/data/digitalcoast/pdf/psychology-climate-change-communication.pdf

asmitab2005@gmail.com

****