

from COP is that every country has realized this is a problem.” Well, if this was the year 2000 that would be a fine analysis, but it’s 2015 and we’re fast burning up the last gigatons of carbon that will doom a human-favored climate.

“Progress” is not enough. At this point it’s fatal. We all know the usual thinking, “It’s better to get something than nothing. We’ll keep on calling for more. That’s better than grandstanding, etc., etc.” It sounds sensible but the thinking is wrong.

At some point climate activists have to dig in their heels and say we have to get the minimum necessary to save a livable climate and we have to get it now. On this issue half-measures are as good as being half alive. The whole system that is poisoning the climate has to be reformed, changed, revolutionized, ...whatever.

We have an immense task and we have just a few decades to get it accomplished.

Climate Activism Websites

350.org

lenearth.org

Capitalismvsclimate.org

Sierraclub.org

Risingtidenorthamerica.org

And see PEP’s archive of articles on climate on our website. Click on “Resources” and “Archives - Climate”



They said we couldn’t do it, but together we won.
Keystone Pipeline #Fail

Fracked Gas is a Bridge to Nowhere

#LeavItInTheGround

Got Nuclear? Got Fukushima?

Promoting Enduring Peace

Pepeace.org

office@pepeace.org

Founded 1952



We MUST Win
the Fight to
Preserve A
Livable Climate



PEPeace.org

In 20 years we go over 2 degrees celsius. That's the warning of Michael E. Mann the climate scientist famous for creating the "hockey stick" graph showing how the amount of carbon dioxide in our air has in recent years shot up like the angle of the bottom of a hockey stick. In Scientific American he said the way things are going we hit that number in 2036. Two degrees Celsius is the limit the U.N. picked in 2010 as the amount the world must not hit without creating climate catastrophe. Actually, now scientists believe the real number is a 25% lower. Anything over 1.5 degree Celsius is very, very dangerous.

So what about the Paris Climate meeting last December that was supposed to be so important?

Historic! Oh, how the elite love to use that word when touting their meetings and decisions. It's so important to have a record of *historic* agreements for your "legacy." So it was no surprise that President Obama said the Paris agreement on climate (Dec. 2015) was a "historic agreement" and "tribute to American leadership".

Now considering that the **New York Times** had said that the Paris meeting was "the world's last, best hope of striking a deal" that would begin to avoid devastating climate effects, the Paris agreement must have been one doozy of an arrangement. Except why didn't the 32 page document talk about fossil fuel? It literally doesn't mention those two words, nor can you find the words "coal" or "oil" in the text. That's because the world's great muckamucks are promising to limit emissions without challenging the beast whose waste is the emissions. The pretend they can do this without insuring that most of the world's fossil fuel stays right where it is, deep in the ground.

Former top NASA climate scientist James Hansen called the deal a "fraud". About the agreement he said, "It's just worthless words. There is no action,

just promises. As long as fossil fuels appear to be the cheapest fuels out there, they will be continued to be burned."

He has a point. There's **nothing** binding in the agreement. Though all the countries made "commitments" nothing will happen if they're not honored. And even if all the commitments *are* fulfilled the earth's temperature will go up 3.7 degrees Celsius, far more than that 2 degree limit that the nations of the world said was a safe limit five years ago and double the 1.5 degree limit this Paris agreement says the world should "pursue." For an inkling of what that means read the **New York Times** article about Shanghai.



Four degrees of warming will put three-fourths of Shanghai "underwater" by 2100. That's a city of 24 million people.

Obama admits the agreement doesn't get anywhere near the needed 1.5 degree limit, but says that's not a problem because the agreement "establishes the enduring framework the world needs to solve the climate crisis." It's the "mechanism," the "architecture." So the agreement isn't the measures that are our "last, best hope," but a "framework" that will lead to the measures that are needed. The language was used with regard to the Administration's Middle East policy. Back in 2013-4 Secretary of State Kerry went through nine months of peace talks with the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority. When that went nowhere, he went after "Plan B," to make an agreement for a "framework" on all the major issues. It was

a useless exercise that produced nothing. "Process," "roadmap," "framework." We need to use the technical word "baloney" to describe these phrases. They are words to describe non-agreements, words to fool the public into thinking something important has actually been accomplished.

The agreement doesn't even challenge the subsidies that governments give to the fossil fuel industries to go out and find more carbon to burn. A piece in Scientific American in May 2015 calculated the total yearly amount of these subsidies, a breathtaking; mind boggling **\$5 trillion**, \$5 trillion a year to hasten the end of a human-favored climate.

Another thing missing from the deal is indigenous rights. As we know much of the fossil fuel is found in the "wilds", the land where indigenous peoples live (think Alberta tar sands or the "wastes" of North Dakota). The indigenous are mentioned in the agreement "preamble" along with the other lofty wishes and in the airy "acknowledgements" of the Annex.

The UK, Norway and the U.S. fought any mention of specific "rights" fearing it would help court suits against land theft and the like. The Indigenous Environmental Network said in a press statement that the Paris agreement "may turn out to be a crime against humanity and Mother Earth".



Some "Green" organizations seem to be buying into this deal. Michael Brune head of the Sierra Club spoke on Democracy Now! about how the agreement was a "good start" and that "progress" is being made. He said, "the best news that I think we saw