

Climate Change Committee Meeting Working Documents

Next Committee Meeting 5/16/2010 – 9 p.m. ET

[Committee Meeting Notes 5-15-10-.doc](#)

[NOTE: this document will be posted on the non-public folder: <http://www.redandgreen.org/CCC>]

Some of the documents are included here and some linked to web documents.

1. [Meeting Minutes for 5/9/2010](#)
2. [Notes and Suggestions presented by Walter prior to 5/9/2010](#)
3. [Links – please suggest additions](#)
4. [Climate Change - An Unprecedented Challenge \(The “8 pager” 3/19/2010\)](#)
5. [CCDS positions on Climate Change \(Prepared 4/12/2010 WT\)](#)
6. [Ted’s Critique of the “8 pager”](#)
7. [David’s Response to Ted’s Critique](#)
8. [Ted’s Draft outline 5/11/2010](#)
9. [Meta’s Comments on Ted’s Draft outline](#)
10. [Walter’s Comments on Ted’s Draft and need for targeted position papers.](#)
11. [Walter’s Detailed Comments on Ted’s Draft outline \(5/16/2010\)](#)

Meeting Minutes for 5/9/2010

Invited: (12)

al.weinrub@comcast.net Al Weinrub
carriescoville@yahoo.com Carrie Scoville
dschwartzman@gmail.com David Schwartzman
EC-CCDS@yahoogroups.com Eco-Socialist Email List
jlynjenks@gmail.com Janet Tucker
krake17@hotmail.com David Morrison
margordon@sbcglobal.net Marian Gordon
mvkaufman@gmail.com Michael Kaufman
steve.willett@initcomp.com Steve Willett
tpearson@naarpr.org Ted Pearson
vansicklem@cofc.edu Meta Van Sickle
wteague@verizon.net Walter Teague

Attending: (6)

dschwartzman@gmail.com David Schwartzman
jlynjenks@gmail.com Janet Tucker
margordon@sbcglobal.net Marian Gordon
tpearson@naarpr.org Ted Pearson
vansicklem@cofc.edu Meta Van Sickle
wteague@verizon.net Walter Teague

Bulk of the session focused on a discussion on Ted's disagreements with a number of aspects of the (8 pager) paper developed at the initiative of this committee and presented in the name of the Metro DC Chapter at the Left Forum in NYC by David Schwartzman. [[Ted's comments](#) , [David's response](#) and [Meta's comments](#) will be available on the list, but I will post them on the non-public page listed below.]

It was agreed that we needed to work on developing various papers targeted on different audiences. Ted volunteered to draft an outline of what he thought the general paper should be like.

Walter suggested we should aim for papers, based on CCDS's resolutions and Goals and Principles, for the following groups at least:

- 1) Social Forum - Detroit June 22-26, 2010
- 2) General Public - should include a general political agenda.
- 3) Environmental Groups, Large accommodationist, eco-socialist
- 4) Socialist Organizations
- 5) Labor, local, national and Green
- 6) Youth, not just Social Forum.
- 7) CCDS members
- 8) YouTube, (all of the above?)

All agreed that we needed to work on developing more specific strategic and programatic materials and proposals.

Walter mentioned that given the growth of the world movement against climate change, CCDS needs to take a public position on preventing the worst aspects, at least, of catastrophic climate change. [Some specific [suggestions below](#) were included in the pre-meeting notes],

General discussion also included brief comments on several environmentally relevant conferences.

All are encouraged to read the major documents cited in the links below. Most important would be to review the 8 pager and the decisions that came out of the "World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth" held in Cochabamba, Bolivia. See [Links](#) below.

Meeting notes from Walter Teague

NOTES and Suggestions presented by Walter prior to 5/9/2010

[Top](#)

A. The committee should see if we can agree that CCDS should have a public C3 position, that is both socialist and supportive of the growing world movement. Also, that we support production of targeted position and action papers.

B. Suggested Questions:

1. Should CCDS promote a public position on Preventing Climate Change?
2. Can the CC committee support production of position papers for different needs?
 - a. These can be produced by individuals and/or CCDS where time permits.
 - b. Papers targeted toward or on the following constituencies:
 - 1) Social Forum – Detroit June

- 2) General Public
- 3) Environmental Groups, Large accommodationist and eco-socialist
- 4) Socialist Organizations
- 5) Labor, local, national and Green
- 6) Youth, not just Social Forum
- 7) CCDS members
- 8) YouTube using all of the above?

C. That we consider supporting CCDS take the following positions:

1. Yes. On the need and work for a Global Plan, including our focus on the US
2. No On offsets and cap and trade, but Yes on Carbon Tax – if progressive.
3. Yes Speaking forthrightly to the public about the real threats of Climate Change, and the scientific and time constraints if we are to protect our public interests.
4. Yes To the need for leaders and government be called upon to inform the public just how they are going to meet the needs of bringing about prevention of climate change.
5. Yes To the necessity and value of a scientific and humanistic approach (eco-socialism in essence) to implementing a successful prevention plan capable of preventing catastrophic climate changes.
6. Yes Support the movement as dramatically demonstrated in Cochabamba, Bolivia for a “joint climate agenda” led by and in the name of the people’s most affected by climate changes.
 - a. This means to support the principles as expressed at Cochabamba for:
 - b. Universal Declaration of Mother Earth Rights: <http://links.org.au/node/1647>
 - c. Climate Justice Tribunal
 - d. Climate Debt
 - e. World People’s Referendum on Climate Change
7. Yes A global plan to prevent Catastrophic Climate Change.

Links:

[Top](#)

The public documents and links referred to will be posted to the following web page. If you have additional items, please let me know.

Past public documents posted related to Climate Change

http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/

18. [Climate Change - An Unprecedented Challenge](#) (The 8 pager)

19.- 21. etc., more recent comments on the developing climate movement and the strengths and weaknesses of strategy and plans to address climate change.

22. Cochabamba: (You can also do a Google Search for more responses, but this one gives the update on the work done there.)

<http://links.org.au/node/1647>

The private meeting documents and comments will be posted to the non-public page

<http://www.redandgreen.org/CCC>

These include this meeting notes and a summary I prepared on the positions on the Environment and Climate Change that CCDS has taken so far. It can be found at B. 18. on:

http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/CCDS_positions_on_Climate_Change.pdf

[Top](#)

CCDS positions on Climate Change: Prepared 4/12/2010 by WT

Contents:

- A. [Goals and Principles](#) (In CCDS Founding document)
- B. [Proposals adopted by CCDS](#) (3)
- C. [Climate Change Work of CCDS](#) (Brief, needs expansion and more links)
- D. [Climate Change - An Unprecedented Challenge](#) (The 8 pager from MetroDC)

A. **Goals and Principles:**

A search of the web site reveals references to the document and only found this copy. Maybe there elsewhere, but is not obvious. [I do think we need a more prominent and easily accessible posting.]

Third Revision June 30, 2009

For a Democratic and Socialist

Future: CCDS Goals and Principles

In CCDS-Discussion section, listed under Blogroll and as "Goals & Principles Document V3 - PDF Format at:

<http://tinyurl.com/ccds-gpv3>

References to Environment and Climate Change issues:

1. Paragraph 3 on pg 1.

"An environmental catastrophe looms. Scientists warn that the world may have already passed a point of qualitative climate change from carbon emissions – with alterations of weather patterns causing deep irreversible ecological damage. The inexorable demand of capitalism to put profit before all else aggravates the economic crisis and underlies the system's resistance to confronting the consequences of its environmental pollution.

States that catastrophic climate change [tipping points] may already have been breached, and that capitalism's drive for profits underlies the resistance to confronting environmental problems.

2. Paragraph 4 on pg. 1.

A costly military establishment is undermining national security. Militarism has impeded democracy, undermined peace and security, and caused incalculable suffering around the world. The military-industrial complex has contributed heavily to the present economic crisis by wasting precious funds needed to create

jobs in a new economy based on ecological survival, sustainable growth, and social development. Expenditures for the largest military in history have run to trillions of dollars. The military is a prime polluter and despoiler of the environment. The "sole superpower" must yield to a new global policy based on abolishing nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, closing of foreign bases, and reliance on diplomacy over confrontation."

States that MIC is a major cause of environmental problems and an economic impediment to "ecological survival."

3. Section E. on page 8.

"E. The Crisis of Climate Change and Unsustainable Resources

Two decades of detailed study by scientists from all over the world has ended in stark consensus: the climate crisis is real, urgent, and threatens massive human misery and habitat destruction. Three hundred and fifty parts per million of CO2 in the atmosphere is what many scientists, climate experts, and progressive national governments are now saying is the safe upper limit. Our current level is 387 parts per million. Consumption of fossil fuels, melting of the polar ice caps, increased frequency of devastating hurricanes, and wrenching changes in weather patterns – are all inextricably linked.

The depth of the climate crisis demands an end to the exceptional waste of natural and human resources under capitalism. The crisis demands that billions be invested and tens of thousands employed replacing 19th century carbon based fuels with energy drawn from sun, wind, and geothermal sources. The country needs new energy grids, nonpolluting mass transportation, homes retrofitted to curb carbon emissions, and new global agreements to end the emission of pollutants, to reduce deforestation, and to share the world's energy resources efficiently and equitably.

Inherently wasteful capitalist growth is not consistent with sustaining human life. The wealthy countries, led by the United States have consumed the bulk of the world's resources. Justice demands that those who have gorged on consumption bear the greatest burden in the rationing of non-renewable resources in a finite world where emerging nations now aspire to greater consumption.

Billions of people are stripped of resources by global capitalism. A quarter of all deaths in the world are linked to environmental destruction, to the disruption of indigenous agriculture by global agribusiness, and to political pressure for developing countries to end subsidies to their own farmers. As energy resources shrink, food prices rise – causing widespread malnutrition and disease among three quarters of the world's rural poor.

Disruption of traditional agriculture by global agribusiness has brought huge migrations to cities around the world where displaced rural masses are forced to fight for survival. At the core of such upheavals is the persistent racism reflected in the indifference of political leaders, the silence of media, and the continuing destructive activities of capitalists. The sense of justice and the self-interest of all human beings demand international cooperation to address and solve those basic violations of human rights and dignity."

This section states clearly the cause of C3 as capitalism and that it will require a major reorganization of the world economy to produce both environmental and social justice and sustainability.

4. Part II. Paragraph 1, Pg 10

Contains "The systemic basis of the interconnected crises of social life, the economy, climate, and empire makes the solution of any one crisis dependent upon progress in solving the others."

5. Part II. Paragraph 6, Pg 12

States that preventing climate catastrophe requires an end of "the projection of military power in support of a fading empire," obviously the MIC.

6. Part II. Paragraph 4, Pg 16

States that to deal with climate change, we need more than "A socialism that simply reproduces the wasteful expansion of an earlier capitalism [and] creates more problems than it solves.

B. Proposals adopted by CCDS:

[Top of CCDS Positions](#)

1. First Climate Change Proposal voted and approved at the NCC of CCDS on 12/2/2006.

Proposed by Walter Teague.

On the CCDS web site at: http://www.cc-ds.org/discussion/prevent_ccc_proposal.html

[Even though it was a resolution passed by the NCC, it was posted on the discussion section.]

Prevent Climate Change Catastrophe, Si Se Puede!

Included the following sections:

"Summary: It is proposed that CCDS, as an organization consciously and intentionally promoting democracy and socialism through corresponding our ideas and concerns with the public, recognize that the potential for the existence and growth of these values and goals requires the prevention of a Climate Change Catastrophe (CCC). Of all the "tipping points" we face, the creation of a mass movement able to demand prevention is primary. Since the imperative to prevent CCC is not yet a public demand, CCDS has the opportunity to act now and provide leadership by putting out a clear stance that CCC must be prevented. Our past position statements echoed much of what progressives agreed upon. This time we have an opportunity and responsibility to lead. Prevention, once understood, can provide a clear goal that people can demand of their leaders, organizations and governments to act upon."

"What concretely will prevent CCC?"

1. Rapid creation of a renewable energy infrastructure in the U.S. and the world, consisting of concentrated solar collection in arid regions such as the Sahara, great expansion of wind power, tidal and wave power, photovoltaics.
2. Similarly, the rapid conversion of fossil-fuel intensive industrial agriculture to agro-ecological farming.
3. The required resources must come from a radical demilitarization of the US and global economies, an end to the Imperial Project that feed oil/coal addiction and resource wars."

And concluded a call for the following strategies:

"Therefore CCDS should:

1. Call for a worldwide recognition of the necessity to prevent a Climate Change Catastrophe.
2. Call for the quick development of best possible deadlines and what is needed to meet them.
3. Based on the best science available, call for the development of a worldwide plan sufficient to prevent Climate Change Catastrophe.
4. Call for all leaders to speak up, give direction and take all necessary actions to prevent a Climate Change Catastrophe.
5. And demand that we the people, be fully informed of the threats and progress in preventing the catastrophe.
6. Call for all other progressive organizations, leaders and movements to join in this effort.
7. Call on the US Congress to hold emergency hearings on preventing Climate Change Catastrophe."

2. Resolution on the Crisis of Climate Change voted and approved at the CCDS 2009 convention.

[Top of CCDS Positions](#)

On the CCDS web site at:

http://cc-ds.org/convention_2009/Resolution_on_Climate_Change_passed_at_Convention09.doc

or short url: <http://tinyurl.com/y7hlghw>

"On the need for an Eco-socialist perspective and leadership to prevent Catastrophic Climate Change."

Contains detailed examination of climate change and needed responses. The last two "Whereas" are:

"Whereas the primary resistance to a successful environmental program will come from the nuclear military industrial fossil fuel complex ("MIC" for short) that President Dwight Eisenhower identified 60 years ago as the great burden on humanity. Therefore avoidance of C3 requires the end of oil and fossil fuel addiction, giving up the nuclear option and a rapid conversion to a high efficiency solar energy infrastructure. Since the major obstacle to this path is MIC, especially its U.S. component, this complex and its imperial agenda must be confronted, isolated, and finally eliminated as the biggest threat to human survival. More precisely, its material infrastructure should be solarized, with containment of its huge legacy of chemical and nuclear waste. A solarized and demilitarized world, a formidable challenge to say the least! Achievable only with a socialized or socialist approach

Whereas instead, leadership must be driven by a worldwide, mass movement that understands the need for a comprehensive, crash program and is capable of requiring governments and industry refocus national and global priorities for the sake of saving human life on earth, even if it means reducing obscene short term corporate profits. The priorities of this program must be both the immediate needs of the people most affected by the crisis and the prevention of permanent climate changes before irreversible tipping points are reached"

The resolution ends with: "This call is based on the recognition that socialists everywhere have a role to play that is specific and unique in calling for world leadership as quickly as possible to create and put forward a workable plan based on the science of tipping points and time lines and the political economic factors involved.

That CCDS asserts that a socialist response to climate change is a necessary component if we are to be at all successful in combating the damages of climate change."

3. A second resolution was also voted and approved at the 2009 Convention [Top of CCDS Positions](#)

Resolution on Climate Catastrophe & Social Change

The resolution can be found on the CCDS web site at:

http://cc-ds.org/convention_2009/Resolution_on_Climate_Catastrophe.doc or at <http://tinyurl.com/y7l8nqp>

It ends with a call for CCDS to support: "**Major redirection of resources by the U.S. government for research, development and deployment of all the above proposals, starting by drastic redirection of resources from the military budget**"

C. Climate Change Work of CCSS [Top of CCDS Positions](#)

Further, these issues have been looked at and discussed in committees, workshops, listserves, local and national conventions and passed and adopted in three different resolutions (see above) for at least last 4 years.

For examples of some of the past Workshop documents see:

<http://www.redandgreen.org/CCC/>

http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/index.htm

http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/Ecosocialism_or_Ecocatastrophe.html

More examples exist and cites are welcome.

D. The recent draft paper Climate Change - An Unprecedented Challenge (3/19/2010)

A PDF copy at:

http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/Climate_Change_-_An_Unprecedented_Challenge.pdf or
<http://tinyurl.com/y64zqvp>

An MS Doc, editable version at: http://www.redandgreen.org/Climate_Change/Climate%20Change_-_An_Unprecedented_Challenge.doc or <http://tinyurl.com/y8bzrvj>

An editable copy is posted on Google Docs. If you need to access and are not listed, please send me your email.

<http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AbVmv6kUSr-4ZGRjODNyMjhfMjRkNWlzbWtkaA&hl=en>

For more information, please contact Walter Teague at wteague@verizon.net.

[Top of CCDS Positions](#)

This summary prepared and distributed to the list on 4/11/2010.

[Ted's Critique: Submitted 4/11/2010]

[Top](#)

[EC-CCDS] Comments on "8-pager" on Catastrophic Climate Change - Dated 4/11/2010.

I realize that a lot of work has gone into the pamphlet and in no way do I want to discourage more work from being done. I know how hard it is when one has busted one's butt on a project to have someone else come along and seem to "trash" it - I've been there and suffered that, too. Therefore I hope that my comments will be taken in the spirit in which they are offered.

Let me start by saying that I think that the threat of catastrophic climate crisis is real and imminent. I think that the proposals being discussed (and backed away from) by the Obama Administration are totally inadequate. I think the strategic issues in this struggle are much more difficult than they were in the health care struggle, although I think it may be possible to find more allies in the longer run.

I think catastrophic climate crisis presents a most profound political problem, perhaps the most profound humanity has faced. The Civil War and the fight against the enslavement of African Americans was an existential crisis for the United States. This struggle is an existential crisis for the human race as a whole.

I think there is much in the pamphlet that is valuable. I especially liked the discussion in the section on "The Opportunity and Our Strategy."

But I think that the pamphlet misses the mark if it is addressed to anyone but the most left of the left, and I have questions whether its analysis is correct. It's not that it's necessarily wrong. It's that it is confused the way it is presented. Sweeping statements are presented without support as if they are facts.

This is preaching to the choir at best, and it may be in the wrong church to boot.

I think we should write as if we were addressing people like those who will be at the Good Jobs-Green Jobs Conference next month - workers and trade unionists and community activists. These are the most forward-looking elements of the movement, and in some cases they are the most radical. This pamphlet has nothing to say to them, in my opinion.

Leaving aside the fact that when I was a kid an “8-pager” was a pornographic comic book (let’s just call it “the pamphlet”), I have some very serious issues with this document. I must start by saying self-critically that I have been a listed member of the Climate Crisis Committee and have not participated in any of the conference calls on this document or other work of the committee.

There is no valid excuse for this. I can only say that I didn’t know how to participate because I felt the document was so far off the mark of what’s needed. Being afraid is not a valid reason for failing to speak out, however.

First, and most important, I think that the central thesis of the document is totally unproven in its context, and totally not obvious at all: that the “Imperial Agenda of the Military Industrial Complex (“MIC”) is the main obstacle to preventing C3.” This short phrase in the third sentence of a 3300 word pamphlet would require a book to elucidate.

1. What is the “Imperial Agenda?”
2. Is this an agenda only of the military-industrial complex, or is it broader than that?
3. The military-industrial complex wastes incredible amounts of energy resources in the manufacture and deployment of munitions. That does not make it “the main obstacle to preventing C3.”
4. Is the “Imperial Agenda” the agenda of U. S. imperialism? Is it the agenda of all capitalist countries, what?
5. Granted that the military is one of the two main levers of power exercised by U. S. imperialism to establish and maintain hegemony over the world’s energy resources (the other being economic leverage), the military-industrial complex is the result and the means of the drive for hegemony, not the cause.
6. The necessity of capitalism as an economic system to expand without limit in a world that is finite is the main cause of C3.
7. Some argue that economic expansion can continue if it is better, smarter, and more efficient instead of bigger and more wasteful.
8. Some argue that on this basis the quality of life can improve and consumption of quality goods and services can increase even while eliminating C3.
9. The pamphlet rules out that possibility a priori. I don’t think we can do so without explaining ourselves at least, if this is what we actually think.
10. The CCDS has never adopted this position as far as I know.
11. Science is not at all unanimous on this. It is (almost) unanimous on the threat of C3.
12. The population question is not mentioned in this pamphlet, yet many scientists see it as lying at the heart of the problem (I don’t!). Can we fail to discuss it?
13. There are many other issues here that a short response does not permit.

I think the committee needs to do a lot of work on this pamphlet. David and Walter and Meta live not too far from the DC Area. Perhaps they, Carl and I could meet and talk about it during the GG-GG Conference May 4-6. I don’t know who else is on the committee (it may be a little far for Steve to commute from the Bay Area). Perhaps we can do more conference calls.

Anyway, this is what I think, for whatever it’s worth.

Ted

[David's response.]

[Top](#)

Re: [EC-CCDS] Comments on "8-pager" on Catastrophic Climate Change – sent 5/9/2010].

Ok,

Now we are about 1 hour before our conference call and I finally have found time to reply to Ted's message.

[David: Please see my responses below in his text..]

One important revision is now in order, bringing the paper up to date, with results from the historic Climate conference in Bolivia last month...

David

Schwartzman

[The following was attached with David's comments inserted – and bolded.]

On Sun, Apr 11, 2010 at 9:29 PM, Ted Pearson <tpearson@naarpr.org> wrote:

I realize that a lot of work has gone into the pamphlet and in no way do I want to discourage more work from being done. I know how hard it is when one has busted one's butt on a project to have someone else come along and seem to "trash" it - I've been there and suffered that, too. Therefore I hope that my comments will be taken in the spirit in which they are offered.

Let me start by saying that I think that the threat of catastrophic climate crisis is real and imminent. I think that the proposals being discussed (and backed away from) by the Obama Administration are totally inadequate. I think the strategic issues in this struggle are much more difficult than they were in the health care struggle, although I think it may be possible to find more allies in the longer run.

I think catastrophic climate crisis presents a most profound political problem, perhaps the most profound humanity has faced. The Civil War and the fight against the enslavement of African Americans was an existential crisis for the United States. This struggle is an existential crisis for the human race as a whole.

I think there is much in the pamphlet that is valuable. I especially liked the discussion in the section on "The Opportunity and Our Strategy."

But I think that the pamphlet misses the mark if it is addressed to anyone but the most left of the left, and I have questions whether its analysis is correct. It's not that it's necessarily wrong. It's that it is confused the way it is presented. Sweeping statements are presented without support as if they are facts.

This is preaching to the choir at best, and it may be in the wrong church to boot.

I think we should write as if we were addressing people like those who will be at the Good Jobs-Green Jobs Conference next month – workers and trade unionists and community activists. These are the most forward-looking elements of the movement, and in some cases they are the most radical. This pamphlet has nothing to say to them, in my opinion.

[David: Yes we need a pamphlet or pamphlets in more popular language to address this broader audience. This paper was addressed first to our own members as a discussion piece to generate more popular material. So it is on a more theoretical level.]

Leaving aside the fact that when I was a kid an “8-pager” was a pornographic comic book (let’s just call it “the pamphlet”), I have some very serious issues with this document. I must start by saying self-critically that I have been a listed member of the Climate Crisis Committee and have not participated in any of the conference calls on this document or other work of the committee.

There is no valid excuse for this. I can only say that I didn’t know how to participate because I felt the document was so far off the mark of what’s needed. Being afraid is not a valid reason for failing to speak out, however.

First, and most important, I think that the central thesis of the document is totally unproven in its context, and totally not obvious at all: that the “Imperial Agenda of the Military Industrial Complex (“MIC”) is the main obstacle to preventing C3.” This short phrase in the third sentence of a 3300 word pamphlet would require a book to elucidate.

1. What is the “Imperial Agenda?”
2. Is this an agenda only of the military-industrial complex, or is it broader than that?
3. The military-industrial complex wastes incredible amounts of energy resources in the manufacture and deployment of munitions. That does not make it “the main obstacle to preventing C3.”

[David: These questions are in part addressed in the paper, notably in this section:

The Military Industrial Fossil Fuel Nuclear Terror Complex (aka MIC) is likely the biggest single obstacle to preventing C3 because:

- 1. MIC is the present core of global capital reproduction with its colossal waste of energy and material resources.***
- 2. The fossil fuel/nuclear industry is an integral component of MIC.***
- 3. MIC has a dominant role in setting the domestic/foreign policy agenda of the United States, with no evidence of weakening in the present administration.***
- 4. Pentagon as the “global oil-protection service” for the U.S. imperial agenda (Michael Klare), or even for the transnational capital class itself (e.g., see the work of William Robinson, A Theory of Global Capitalism, 2004).***
- 5. The Imperial Agenda blocks the global cooperation and equity required to prevent C3, as shown once again in Copenhagen in the climate treaty negotiations last December.***

“The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist,” “McDonald’s cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the U.S. Air Force F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley’s technologies to flourish is called the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.” (Tom Friedman, 1999, “The Lexus and the Olive Tree”)

The huge role of MIC in the U.S. and global economy is shown by military expenditure of over \$1.2 trillion in 2006, with the U.S. responsible for 46% of the total. The U.S. 2009 Fiscal Year military budget is actually \$1.449 trillion (the U.S. GNP in 2006 was \$11.5 trillion) (War Resisters League). The projected \$3 trillion for the Iraq War and Occupation is approximately equal to the estimated renewable energy investment of \$2.89 trillion needed by 2030 to insure a 50% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050 (July 2007, www.greenpeace.org/international/press/reports/future-investment).]

4. Is the “Imperial Agenda” the agenda of U. S. imperialism? Is it the agenda of all capitalist countries, what?

[David: Surely those countries in NATO as a start. Every large capitalist country has its own imperial agenda. US imperialism serves as the dominant faction.]

5. Granted that the military is one of the two main levers of power exercised by U. S. imperialism to establish and maintain hegemony over the world’s energy resources (the other being economic leverage), the military-industrial complex is the result and the means of the drive for hegemony, not the cause.

[David: Yes, but this means has crystallized into a very significant part of capitalist reproduction and has its own self-serving agenda with respect to foreign policy and military spending. There are contradictions between factions of capital that must be utilized by the left, a very Leninist approach btw.]

6. The necessity of capitalism as an economic system to expand without limit in a world that is finite is the main cause of C3.

[David: Too abstract a formulation in my view. We should be analyzing real existing capitalism not an abstract model, i.e., ascend from the abstract to the concrete. And where does this abstract formulation leave us with respect to strategy? Abolish capitalism is not a strategy. Carl Davidson's take on strategy is very close to what I argue in this paper. Many on the left lack a strategic analysis, e.g., John Bellamy Foster. I think Bill Fletcher would agree with me, I discussed this issue with him at the Left Forum.]

7. Some argue that economic expansion can continue if it is better, smarter, and more efficient instead of bigger and more wasteful.

8. Some argue that on this basis the quality of life can improve and consumption of quality goods and services can increase even while eliminating C3.

9. The pamphlet rules out that possibility a priori. I don’t think we can do so without explaining ourselves at least, if this is what we actually think.

[David: Absolutely not! Please take another look at these sections:

The most recent climate projections reinforce the urgency of radically cutting carbon emissions by:

“1. Rapidly implementing energy conservation in all areas and phasing out coal use, the most dangerous source of carbon emissions driving global warming.

2. Replacing industrial agriculture with organic farming, especially in and near urban centers.

3. And pumping big investments in creating a high efficiency solar power infrastructure now, both to replace the present unsustainable energy base and to create the base capable of carbon sequestration, the process of removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.” (see <http://www.350.org> and the papers of Jim Hansen)

Opportunities in the Transition

All of these measures have a huge potential to create millions of jobs and sharply reduce poverty in the U.S., simultaneously creating a mass social base for ecosocialist transition. Solar power is by far the easiest energy source to multiply fast, the biggest job generator, and has the biggest potential for community-based control and management (urban, labor, indigenous people, etc.).

And these measures must start from organizing at a neighborhood and community level, from the ground up. The Oakland Climate Action Coalition is a living model illustrating this approach (see <http://urbanhabitat.org/cj/weinrub>).

[and this applies to the U.S. too:]

We do not envisage a world of scarcity, rather clean air and clean water, organic food, meaningful employment and more free creative time for all on this planet, realizing global equity and the highest quality of life for all. While consumption, especially energy consumption in the global North must be reduced, global power capacity should be increased to insure that the global South receives the minimum energy consumption per capita required for world standard levels of life expectancy, education and health. Only a global high efficiency solar power capacity can make this possible.]

10. The CCDS has never adopted this position as far as I know.

[David: So now is the time to discuss this!]

11. Science is not at all unanimous on this. It is (almost) unanimous on the threat of C3.

[David: Not unanimous on what?]

12. The population question is not mentioned in this pamphlet, yet many scientists see it as lying at the heart of the problem (I don't!). Can we fail to discuss it?

[David: Good observation...Will add some language on this. I address this in my papers cited at the end. Neomalthusian views including those of many scientists reduce the issue to biology, an approach so user friendly to ruling classes, thereby diverting attention from political economy.]

13. There are many other issues here that a short response does not permit.

I think the committee needs to do a lot of work on this pamphlet. David and Walter and Meta live not too far from the DC Area. Perhaps they, Carl and I could meet and talk about it during the GG-GG Conference May 4-6. I don't know who else is on the committee (it may be a little far for Steve to commute from the Bay Area). Perhaps we can do more conference calls.

[David: Sorry I was too busy marking finals to get together when you were here.]

Anyway, this is what I think, for whatever it's worth.

Ted

----- End Of David's Comments on Ted's 4/11/2010 statement. -----[Top](#)

[Ted's Draft outline – emailed to list on 5/11/2010]

Most items here need elaboration and documentation. However, it should be kept as direct and simple as possible.

Geophysical scientists today are virtually unanimous in their estimate that unless something is done quickly to radically reduce the emission of gasses that act as a greenhouse canopy over the Earth, we are faced with escalating average global temperatures that will result in massive loss of habitat for tens of thousands of plant and animal species, melting of polar ice caps and mountain glaciers, rising sea levels and inundation of some of the most populous regions on the planet. Indeed, there is evidence that geophysical feedback loops could result in a runaway escalation of global temperatures resulting in devastation of the planet. The very survival of the human species could be at risk as struggles over water resources and land escalate along with the temperature.

Fundamentally, the driving force behind this crisis is the current global economic system – capitalism. This economic system has depended on constant growth of output and consumption since its earliest days. Today, in the midst of a global recession that has cast tens of millions out of work and into deepening poverty, the goal of world leaders is to reinvigorate “growth.” Yet, as any high school student knows, unlimited growth into a finite space cannot take place for long.

Until now “growth” has meant taking more and more of the world's natural resources and either burning them for energy or converting them into new commodities for sale and consumption. Ideas of recycling, conservation, and replacing fossil energy sources (oil, natural gas and coal) with carbon neutral alternatives such as solar, wind and geothermal only now are beginning to catch the imaginations of people. Yet such proposals offer the prospect of increasing economic growth and well being of the people without increasing the consumption of natural resources.

Many corporate economic entities have an interest in the continuation of current patterns of resource waste. Some actually persist in denying that there is a problem. They are powerful and have huge bankrolls with which they influence and pressure law makers and government leaders at every level. They are making billions of dollars in the short run. But the external, unaccounted-for costs of these practices may result in the extinction of all of us, including them.

Three notes:

1. Nuclear power is offered as an answer to the problem of greenhouse gas emissions. This is a fraud because the mining and refining of uranium for nuclear fission consumes as much fossil fuel as that saved by the nuclear power plant that is fueled. Together with the insoluble problem of disposing of waste that remains highly radioactive and poisonous for tens of thousands of years, and the terrible danger of another Chernobyl type of accident, this should end any speculation on nuclear power as an answer.

2. Many scientists point to the apparently limitless growth of the global human population, which of necessity will require greater production and consumption as time goes on, as a fundamental cause of the crisis. Yet history demonstrates that the inevitable tendency among people who have access to education and have economic security is toward smaller families. Population is a self-limiting factor with the reduction of poverty and ignorance. The fact that most of the world's poor are peoples of color, who for centuries lived under the heel of European and American colonialism and neocolonialism justified by notions of white supremacy, makes proposals to limit population growth through coercive and legal restrictions more ominous.

3. The proposal to develop technology for the capture and sequestration of CO₂ emissions from the burning of coal ("clean coal") is, in the view of most who have studied the question, a chimera. No sequestration over long periods of time is likely to be possible. The energy required to capture and sequester CO₂ may consume be as much fuel as sequestered. The only clean coal is coal that stays in the Earth.

Faced with this crisis, what is to be done? There are many proposals floating around; some are fraudulent, such as nuclear power and "clean coal"; some are ineffective; some can work. The thing that distinguishes those that can work from those that won't is a yes or no answer to a simple question: will they result in an absolute and rapid reduction of the concentration of green house gasses in the Earth's atmosphere?

Carbon offsets are meaningless because all carbon offset expire with time, and are unenforceable to boot. The devil that's in the details are even worse, because corporate interests want to suggest that NOT destroying existing carbon sinks, such as forests, should be offset against their continued pollution through burning fossil fuels.

Cap and trade is ineffective. This was the method of the Kyoto Accord (which the United States refused to ratify or observe) and in those countries where it was adopted it proved to be impossible to monitor and enforce. In addition, some corporate interests see cap and trade as an opportunity to make even more billions by selling and speculating on pollution permits.

Carbon fees are the only effective method for reducing greenhouse gas emissions within the framework of our global market economy. This means imposing a fee on all fossil carbon at the point of extraction or import. Such a fee would simply add the external costs of eliminating CO₂ to its price, allowing market forces to give alternative green energy production the competitive edge it needs if emissions are to be actually reduced. The proceeds from carbon fees must be allocated to research, development and deployment of green alternative energy infrastructure, except for that portion for rebate part of the fees collected to those most in need. Otherwise carbon fees will be a highly regressive tax on families at the bottom of the economic order, whose budgets for energy take a larger share of their income.

Tax credits should be provided for retrofitting existing homes, offices and factories. It is estimated that 40 per cent of our energy consumption in the United States goes for heating and cooling homes, offices and factories. Relatively simple modifications to existing structures to insulate them could cut this consumption in half. Such retrofitting would create tens of thousands of skilled and highly paying jobs and would be an investment in the future. The human and energy resources saved would have a big payoff in the near future.

Tax credits for installation of wind farms, and solar power in homes, offices and factories, combined with massive research and development of a smart electric grid that can take advantage of such installations. This would quickly produce economies of scale and the reduction of production costs for solar panels and wind turbines.

Large scale public investment in research and development of new technologies and the perfection of existing technologies for capturing the energy of the sun and the wind.

Strategy

The main opposition to such policies as those above comes from the following sectors of big business and the military-industrial complex:

1. The oil monopolies
2. The coal mining monopolies
3. Electric utilities with heavy investment in old fossil fuel and nuclear technology

Some sectors have mixed interests in this regard. For example, all agricultural and commodity producing businesses will oppose carbon fees that increase their costs. But if the fees are structured so that subsidies for the alternative green energy infrastructure are provided they will be revenue neutral for such firms.

The main sector that can be expected to oppose such measures is the military-industrial complex, the *raison d'être* of which is increasingly the need to secure and control access to global fossil fuel and nuclear fuel resources. The military-industrial complex – composed of career military officers, the huge munitions manufacturing corporations, and the energy monopolies that supply them, will fight tooth and nail against all these proposals.

The main sector that will support these proposals will be people who want to work for a living and who will see the benefit of large scale investment generating jobs and a clean environment, together with corporations that have a direct stake in the success of the alternative energy infrastructure. Because of the key role that pursuit by the U. S. of global energy hegemony plays in motivating and sustaining war and the rationale for military spending, the peace movement should be a major ally in the struggle.

The strongest factor in putting together a winning coalition of forces for a progressive green energy program will be the fact that ultimately everyone will pay the price of failure through the extinction of the human race.

Ultimately the present economic system in which the social product of society is taken as the private property of the owners of the means of production will have to be replaced by a structure in which the people will be able to democratically decide how economic resources should be allocated and the product distributed. This will be a form of socialism, in which the people will collectively own the means of production and will be able to direct the course of the economy.

How do we get from where we are to where we need to go in time to prevent global catastrophic climate change?

1. We have to start with a sober estimate of where we are: the extent and seriousness of the problem.
2. Uniting the forces with an immediate interest in the solution.
3. Fighting for a program of initial steps toward a solution
4. Recognizing that there is an international climate justice movement that is a powerful source of strength, and that most countries are far more advanced in this regard than is the United States.
5. Preparing to advance the fight to the next stage.

----- End of Ted's Draft outline – dated 5/11/2010 ----- [Top](#)

[Meta's Comments on Ted's Draft outline statement. Comments inserted in purple.] [Top](#)

Re: [EC-CCDS] Draft outline for a pamphlet on global climate catastrophe 5/12/2010

Thanks for every ones' work on this. I added a few words that are only thoughts and certainly not edited...the purpose being to add to the discussion, not to insert into Ted's doc.

Thanks,

meta

From: Ted Pearson <tpearson@naarpr.org>

Reply-To: <EC-CCDS@yahoogroups.com>

Date: Tue, 11 May 2010 17:30:32 -0500

To: <EC-CCDS@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: [EC-CCDS] Draft outline for a pamphlet on global climate catastrophe

Most items here need elaboration and documentation. However, it should be kept as direct and simple as possible.

Geophysical scientists today are virtually unanimous in their estimate that unless something is done quickly to radically reduce the emission of gasses that act as a greenhouse canopy over the Earth, we are faced with escalating average global temperatures that will result in massive loss of habitat for tens of thousands of plant and animal species, melting of polar ice caps and mountain glaciers, rising sea levels and inundation of some of the most populous regions on the planet. Indeed, there is evidence that geophysical feedback loops could result in a runaway escalation of global temperatures resulting in devastation of the planet. The very survival of the human species could be at risk as struggles over water resources and land escalate along with the temperature.

Fundamentally, the driving force behind this crisis is the current global economic system – capitalism. This economic system has depended on constant growth of output and consumption since its earliest days. Today, in the midst of a global recession that has cast tens of millions out of work and into deepening poverty, the goal of world leaders is to reinvigorate “growth.” Yet, as any high school student knows, unlimited growth into a finite space cannot take place for long. **Capitalism is dependant upon continued population growth. The continue rise in population increases the use of fossil fuels which exacerbates the gasses in the atomosphere.**

Until now “growth” has meant taking more and more of the world's natural resources and either burning them for energy or converting them into new commodities for sale and consumption. Ideas of recycling, conservation, **energy efficient technologies** and replacing fossil energy sources (oil, natural gas and coal) with carbon neutral alternatives such as solar, wind and geothermal only now are beginning to catch the imaginations of people. Yet such proposals offer the prospect of increasing economic growth and well being of the people without increasing the consumption of natural resources.

Many corporate economic entities have an interest in the continuation of current patterns of resource waste. Some actually persist in denying that there is a problem. They are powerful and have huge bankrolls with which they influence and pressure law makers and government leaders at every level. They are making billions of dollars in the short run. But the external, unaccounted-for costs of these practices may result in the extinction of all of us, including them.

Three notes:

1. Nuclear power is offered as an answer to the problem of greenhouse gas emissions. This is a fraud because the mining and refining of uranium for nuclear fission consumes as much fossil fuel as that saved by the nuclear power plant that is fueled. Together with the insoluble problem of disposing of waste that remains highly radioactive and poisonous for tens of thousands of years, and the terrible danger of another Chernobyl type of accident, this should end any speculation on nuclear power as an answer. **There are two types of nuclear plans—none in the US nor Europe have the design that Chernobyl had. While I still do not think nuclear fission is a good answer, please be judicious when describing the problem.**
2. Many scientists point to the apparently limitless growth of the global human population, which of necessity will require greater production and consumption as time goes on, as a fundamental cause of the crisis. Yet history demonstrates that the inevitable tendency among people who have access to education and have economic security is toward smaller families. Population is a self-limiting factor with the reduction of poverty and ignorance. The fact that most of the world's poor are peoples of color, who for centuries lived under the heel of European and American colonialism and neocolonialism justified by notions of white supremacy, makes proposals to limit population growth through coercive and legal restrictions more ominous.
3. The proposal to develop technology for the capture and sequestration of CO₂ emissions from the burning of coal ("clean coal") is, in the view of most who have studied the question, a chimera. No sequestration over long periods of time is likely to be possible. The energy required to capture and sequester CO₂ may consume be as much fuel as sequestered. The only clean coal is coal that stays in the Earth. **Our "natural CO₂" sinks are basically "full" (atmosphere and ocean) we could increase the number of forests and increase the capacity of the flora sink, but then there is the 100 year problem—they die and the CO₂ is re-released. Other forms of sequestration come with significant risks and at this time don't seem to meet the scientific/technology criteria for "if you start the process you must be able to stop it."**

Faced with this crisis, what is to be done? There are many proposals floating around; some are fraudulent, such as nuclear power and "clean coal"; some are ineffective; some can work. The thing that distinguishes those that can work from those that won't is a yes or no answer to a simple question: will they result in an absolute and rapid reduction of the concentration of green house gasses in the Earth's atmosphere?

Carbon offsets are meaningless because all carbon offset expire with time, and are unenforceable to boot. The devil that's in the details are even worse, because corporate interests want to suggest that NOT destroying existing carbon sinks, such as forests, should be offset against their continued pollution through burning fossil fuels.

Cap and trade is ineffective. This was the method of the Kyoto Accord (which the United States refused to ratify or observe) and in those countries where it was adopted it proved to be impossible to monitor and enforce. In addition, some corporate interests see cap and trade as an opportunity to make even more billions by selling and speculating on pollution permits.

Carbon fees are the only effective method for reducing greenhouse gas emissions within the framework of our global market economy. This means imposing a fee on all fossil carbon at the point of extraction or import. Such a fee would simply add the external costs of eliminating CO₂ to its price, allowing market forces to give alternative green energy production the competitive edge it needs if emissions are to be actually reduced. The proceeds from carbon fees must be allocated to research, development and deployment of green alternative energy infrastructure, except for that portion for rebate part of the fees collected to those most in need. Otherwise carbon fees will be a highly regressive tax on families at the

bottom of the economic order, whose budgets for energy take a larger share of their income.

Tax credits should be provided for retrofitting existing homes, offices and factories. It is estimated that 40 per cent of our energy consumption in the United States goes for heating and cooling homes, offices and factories. Relatively simple modifications to existing structures to insulate them could cut this consumption in half. Such retrofitting would create tens of thousands of skilled and highly paying jobs and would be an investment in the future. The human and energy resources saved would have a big payoff in the near future.

Energy efficient technologies should be encouraged and used...

Tax credits for installation of wind farms, and solar power in homes, offices and factories, combined with massive research and development of a smart electric grid that can take advantage of such installations. This would quickly produce economies of scale and the reduction of production costs for solar panels and wind turbines. Municipalities could install their own wind/solar farms and provide the energy for the small town or city, off shore wind farms could supply the energy for small towns (eg. Charleston, SC). The wind/solar farms might serve a population better if a government entity owns it rather than the big business.

Large scale public investment in research and development of new technologies and the perfection of existing technologies for capturing the energy of the sun and the wind.

Strategy

The main opposition to such policies as those above comes from the following sectors of big business and the military-industrial complex (reference: President Eisenhower):

1. The oil monopolies
2. The coal mining monopolies
3. Electric utilities with heavy investment in old fossil fuel and nuclear technology

Some sectors have mixed interests in this regard. For example, all agricultural and commodity producing businesses will oppose carbon fees that increase their costs. But if the fees are structured so that subsidies for the alternative green energy infrastructure are provided they will be revenue neutral for such firms. The main sector that can be expected to oppose such measures is the military-industrial complex, the *raison d'être* of which is increasingly the need to secure and control access to global fossil fuel and nuclear fuel resources. The military-industrial complex – composed of career military officers, the huge munitions manufacturing corporations, and the energy monopolies that supply them, will fight tooth and nail against all these proposals. This is the best reason for seeking change. Anytime a population has to “fear” Then it is time to find a alternative.

The main sector that will support these proposals will be people who want to work for a living and who will see the benefit of large scale investment generating jobs and a clean environment, together with corporations that have a direct stake in the success of the alternative energy infrastructure. Because of the key role that pursuit by the U. S. of global energy hegemony plays in motivating and sustaining war and the rationale for military spending, the peace movement should be a major ally in the struggle.

Another major reason that is being “bandied” about is the need to “scale” up the production of the ‘green’ technologies—too large a population to do it quickly without the industrial base. Too many people would ‘lose’ jobs if we just switched over without the time and resources to scale up the production of the green technologies. I think this is another scare tactic and that we could in fact be already moving on this...

The strongest factor in putting together a winning coalition of forces for a progressive green energy program will be the fact that ultimately everyone will pay the price of failure through the extinction of the human race.

Ultimately the present economic system in which the social product of society is taken as the private property of the owners of the means of production will have to be replaced by a structure in which the people will be able to democratically decide how economic resources should be allocated and the product distributed. This will be a form of socialism, in which the people will collectively own the means of production and will be able to direct the course of the economy.

How do we get from where we are to where we need to go in time to prevent global catastrophic climate change?

1. We have to start with a sober estimate of where we are: the extent and seriousness of the problem.
2. Uniting the forces with an immediate interest in the solution.
3. Fighting for a program of initial steps toward a solution
4. Recognizing that there is an international climate justice movement that is a powerful source of strength, and that most countries are far more advanced in this regard than is the United States.
5. Preparing to advance the fight to the next stage.

----- End of Meta’s Comments on Ted’s Draft outline -----

[Top](#)

Walter’s Comments on Ted’s Draft outline - and need for targeted position papers.

I appreciate Ted’s work and contribution, and think it will be helpful in producing both the positions and papers we should have to better represent CCDS at upcoming opportunities to unite and contribute to the environmental movement and growing public concern.

However I don’t think any of our efforts yet achieve what we must do to be effective and relevant.

I will add my specific comments on Ted’s draft later today, but I understand this process gets very verbose and tiring to read, so here are some immediate concerns and issues I think neither Ted nor the 8 pager address:

1. I think CCDS should have a position paper to distribute at the June 22-26 USSF in Detroit.

The first or front page should summarize clearly what we advocate should be done to address the crisis of Climate Change. Less is more on this front page. The content should back this up with sufficient explanation and citations so the reader understands our position and knows how to check it out further. I don't think it matters so much how many pages this takes, as long as the reader isn't bored and is properly referred to our sources and further arguments.

2. This position paper should be sufficiently vetted by the Climate Change Committee, the NCC, the NEC so it can be adopted and posted as an official position. Of course individual supporting documents can be distributed by members and workshops, but it would be embarrassing if we can't say "The CCDS position on this crisis is...." Even a brief, preliminary position that can be expanded and modified later would be better than none. And by none, I don't mean we haven't spelled out most of what constitutes a position in our prior principals and proposals. It just hasn't been drafted and approved for a leaflet or position paper ready for the USSF.

3. There remain differences among us about climate strategy and how best to propose the progressive movement should respond. Some of these show up in our choice of terms or emphasis;

-- Do we use terms like the Military Industrial Complex or some variation that includes Oil, Carbon, etc.?

-- Is it just a matter of readability or are there disagreements about the effect if we use acronyms like MIC or political terms such as Imperialism and eco-socialism?

-- Have we reached a consensus that we face a crisis, a likelihood of further or worse catastrophes, and even if we agree about the irreparable and catastrophic dangers of crossing certain environmental tipping points, do we agree it is right or wrong to emphasize these deadlines and dangers?

-- Then there are the differences among us about whether we should advocate that the environmental challenges are best addressed by mentioning what a socialist approach would look like. Do we agree that a failure to organize a worldwide approach sufficient to prevent catastrophic changes from happening means death and devastation for millions? If we do think the science suggests this, do we agree that a socialist organization should or should not be warning about this possible outcome?

-- Do we agree that for a sufficiently rational response to climate change to occur in time and degree to be successful, it will require a popular force capable of demanding what current governments and economies don't want to voluntarily give? If so, what do we believe it will take and how will we and the general public know if we are going to succeed in time?

-- What should be the minimal demands made of politicians and government agencies? Do they agree to no more than 360 parts per million? What is their position on prevention of catastrophes and who oversees the "overseerers"? Should governments be held accountable and how? Should allowing catastrophes such as the BP spill be a crime? And do we have an immediate and long range strategic take on these questions?

The different possible answers to these questions suggest very different strategies.

Such as:

1. Do we support the Cochabama Accords?
2. Do we call for prevention or adaptation to climate change?
3. Do we join the growing critique by the left that says the main stream environmental organizations are lacking plans sufficient to address climate threats?

4. Given that there are “high road” capitalists who will support some or all of the environmental changes needed, what should we say about the fact that most of the world’s environmental resources are as yet controlled by those who prefer a more profitable low road? And what is our strategy in the face of corporate and imperial resistance to make sure we (all) don’t fail?

Please check out the sources above. One in particular is:

[World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth](#)

[Top](#)

Walter’s Detailed Comments on Ted’s Draft outline – 5/16/2010

[These are Walter’s comments of Ted’s Draft outline he emailed to list on 5/11/2010.]

Ted’s Draft outline – emailed to list on 5/11/2010

[With Walter’s Comments in red.]

Most items here need elaboration and documentation. However, it should be kept as direct and simple as possible.

Agree, but the size, style and content should be suited to the audience. Thus a full presentation of CCDS’s position would be 8 pages or longer. But even the longer examples should have brief summaries up front and itemized position points as needed.

Geophysical scientists today are virtually unanimous in their estimate that unless something is done quickly to radically reduce the emission of gasses that act as a greenhouse canopy over the Earth, we are faced with escalating average global temperatures that will result in massive loss of habitat for tens of thousands of plant and animal species, melting of polar ice caps and mountain glaciers, rising sea levels and inundation of some of the most populous regions on the planet. Indeed, there is evidence that geophysical feedback loops could result in a runaway escalation of global temperatures resulting in devastation of the planet. The very survival of the human species could be at risk as struggles over water resources and land escalate along with the temperature.

This paragraph does cover most of the basic science and points, but is a bit vague and uncertain about the catastrophic consequences. While we can’t know the exact outcomes, we do know that crossing “tipping points” will be devastating, not “could be.” I think the public we will be addressing and the scientists are in agreement that such consequences “will” be catastrophic.

Fundamentally, the driving force behind this crisis is the current global economic system – capitalism. Glad you name the beast, but I do think you should add here, the MIC or some variation of the larger beast, even using some term referring to the full economic-political-military entity of Imperialism.

This economic system has depended on constant growth of output and consumption since its earliest days. Not just depended on, but determined to obtain and certainly won’t easily let go of the environmental resources is so over consumes. Today, in the midst of a global recession that has cast tens of millions out of work and into deepening poverty, the goal of world leaders is to reinvigorate “growth.” Yet, as any high school student knows, unlimited growth into a finite space cannot take place for long.

Agreed, but I think this point is a little vague and should clearly spell out that you can't save the environment without stopping the capitalist rape of the planet.

Until now "growth" has meant taking more and more of the world's natural resources and either burning them for energy or converting them into new commodities for sale and consumption. Ideas of recycling, conservation, and replacing fossil energy sources (oil, natural gas and coal) with carbon neutral alternatives such as solar, wind and geothermal only now are beginning to catch the imaginations of people. Yet such proposals offer the prospect of increasing economic growth and well being of the people without increasing the consumption of natural resources.

This paragraph is rightly positive, but leaves out the scientific requirement that to have a chance at sustainability, the catastrophic outcomes must be prevented. Prevention of C3 needs to be linked or the idea of better and green becomes a bit Pollyannaish and naïve.

Many corporate economic entities have an interest "have an interest" is weak. As you say earlier, they are "driven" by profit and many of the big players have no interest in giving it up just to maybe prevent catastrophes later. Remember the "Shock Doctrine" and who will really be paying for the Gulf spill? in the continuation of current patterns of resource waste. Some actually persist in denying that there is a problem. They are powerful and have huge bankrolls with which they influence and pressure law makers and government leaders at every level. They are making billions of dollars in the short run. But the external, unaccounted-for costs of these practices may result in the extinction of all of us, including them. I agree, but it needs to be said more directly. "If we don't take control of the environment away from the corporations, millions will suffer and die." Or some such.

Three notes:

1. Nuclear power is offered as an answer to the problem of greenhouse gas emissions. This is a fraud because the mining and refining of uranium for nuclear fission consumes as much fossil fuel as that saved by the nuclear power plant that is fueled. Together with the insoluble problem of disposing of waste that remains highly radioactive and poisonous for tens of thousands of years, and the terrible danger of another Chernobyl type of accident, this should end any speculation on nuclear power as an answer.
2. Many scientists point to the apparently limitless growth of the global human population, which of necessity will require greater production and consumption as time goes on, as a fundamental cause of the crisis. Yet history demonstrates that the inevitable tendency among people who have access to education and have economic security is toward smaller families. Population is a self-limiting factor with the reduction of poverty and ignorance. The fact that most of the world's poor are peoples of color, who for centuries lived under the heel of European and American colonialism and neocolonialism justified by notions of white supremacy, makes proposals to limit population growth through coercive and legal restrictions more ominous.

While this paragraph rightfully focuses on population issues, there is no mention of the Global South or economic justice movement. I would argue that Cochabamba has shown that the environmental justice movement is far more important at this moment than any concerns about population. Doesn't mean we shouldn't rebut reactionary diversions about population, but the Global Justice movement is far more a priority.

3. The proposal to develop technology for the capture and sequestration of CO₂ emissions from the burning of coal ("clean coal") is, in the view of most who have studied the question, a chimera. No sequestration over long periods of time is likely to be possible. The energy required to capture and sequester CO₂ may consume be as much fuel as sequestered. The only clean coal is coal that stays in the Earth.

David would be sure to want to add to this paragraph. Cites would be necessary. I suggest we not be afraid to mention key organizations and issues such as 350.org. Most readers will instantly get the reference and relevance.

Faced with this crisis, what is to be done? **Ted! A good section title, once we decide our position on just what we think should be done!** There are many proposals floating around; some are fraudulent, such as nuclear power and “clean coal”; some are ineffective; some can work. The thing that distinguishes those that can work from those that won’t is a yes or no answer to a simple question: will they result in an absolute and rapid reduction of the concentration of green house gasses in the Earth’s atmosphere?

“Rapid reductions” I agree and a very important point. But it has two parts and we should not be afraid to say so. One is a reduction to no more than 350 ppm and the second is within 8 to 10 years or more specifically before irreparable tipping points are breached. Change and simplify the terms, but the science is unforgiving and requires both degree and timeliness to work – and I think we all should say so until it is widely understood and part of our political demands.

Carbon offsets are meaningless because all carbon offset expire with time, and are unenforceable to boot. The devil that’s in the details are even worse, because corporate interests want to suggest that NOT destroying existing carbon sinks, such as forests, should be offset against their continued pollution through burning fossil fuels.

Cap and trade is ineffective. This was the method of the Kyoto Accord (which the United States refused to ratify or observe) and in those countries where it was adopted it proved to be impossible to monitor and enforce. In addition, some corporate interests see cap and trade as an opportunity to make even more billions by selling and speculating on pollution permits.

Carbon fees are the only effective method for reducing greenhouse gas emissions within the framework of our global market economy. This means imposing a fee on all fossil carbon at the point of extraction or import. Such a fee would simply add the external costs of eliminating CO₂ to its price, allowing market forces to give alternative green energy production the competitive edge it needs if emissions are to be actually reduced. The proceeds from carbon fees must be allocated to research, development and deployment of green alternative energy infrastructure, except for that portion for rebate part of the fees collected to those most in need. Otherwise carbon fees will be a highly regressive tax on families at the bottom of the economic order, whose budgets for energy take a larger share of their income.

Again, I agree Ted, but this is wordy and leaves out just who they are. Not simply families, but whole populations; island nations, poor populations, those who will increasingly be struggling to survive, much less develop and improve. Carbon costs, whether fees, taxes, etc., will be passed on to the whole world, most devastatingly to the already vulnerable, unless very carefully regulated from the get go!

I think we should not neglect to provide a better answer to this, that only if a truly socialistic [lets use the term when it clearly applies] approach is taken, can there be any justice in the such carbon fees.

Tax credits should be provided for retrofitting existing homes, offices and factories. It is estimated that 40 per cent of our energy consumption in the United States goes for heating and cooling homes, offices and factories. Relatively simple modifications to existing structures to insulate them could cut this consumption in half. Such retrofitting would create tens of thousands of skilled and highly paying jobs and would be an investment in the future. The human and energy resources saved would have a big payoff in the near future.

Tax credits for installation of wind farms, and solar power in homes, offices and factories, combined with massive research and development of a smart electric grid that can take advantage of such installations. This

would quickly produce economies of scale and the reduction of production costs for solar panels and wind turbines.

Large scale public investment in research and development of new technologies and the perfection of existing technologies for capturing the energy of the sun and the wind.

Strategy

The main opposition to such policies as those above comes from the following sectors of big business and the military-industrial complex: “opposition” is a bit weak in describing how determinably MIC or MIOC, etc. will fight against and work to defeat...” Remember, BP is the Green oil company! “Such policies” isn’t clear. You don’t specify which policies you are referring to. Above there are a mix of policies. Would be good to refer instead to what you mean. Such as “opposition to implementing environmental policies realistically capable of preventing catastrophic climate changes...”

1. The oil monopolies
2. The coal mining monopolies
3. Electric utilities with heavy investment in old fossil fuel and nuclear technology
4. All government, industrial and military organizations currently involved in the maintenance of the US global effort to retain dominance. No I suggest you need a 4th item, call it what you will, but the MIC is and must continue to be the main source of opposition to changes in environmental and energy policies and practices, since combined they have the most power and most to lose. You have only to check out the plans to reap benefits from and survive catastrophic climate changes that they have published to see how unremittingly they will oppose. Consider, that any variations of changes that will bring us back from the brink, would take away most of their reasons for being. They will oppose to our deaths, their right to destroy any efforts to socialize the larger world’s environment.

Some sectors have mixed interests in this regard. For example, all agricultural and commodity producing businesses will oppose carbon fees that increase their costs. But if the fees are structured so that subsidies for the alternative green energy infrastructure are provided they will be revenue neutral for such firms.

The main sector that can be expected to oppose such measures is the military-industrial complex, the *raison d'être* of which is increasingly the need to secure and control access to global fossil fuel and nuclear fuel resources. The military-industrial complex – composed of career military officers, the huge munitions manufacturing corporations, and the energy monopolies that supply them, will fight tooth and nail against all these proposals. Good. Here you acknowledge the MIC’s role. But I suggest we, CCDS should not be afraid in this section to mention Imperialism. It can be done in a non-rhetorical way. Say, like the early European Empires devastated Africa and Asia, now the inhuman policies of the global corporations and their government partners constitute a cross national and cross continental imperial agenda that has brought us all to this brink. Or something shorter, but that explains before stating the term

The main sector that will support these proposals will be people who want to work for a living and who will see the benefit of large scale investment generating jobs and a clean environment, together with corporations that have a direct stake in the success of the alternative energy infrastructure. Because of the key role that pursuit by the U. S. of global energy hegemony plays in motivating and sustaining war and the rationale for military spending, the peace movement should be a major ally in the struggle. Again, “these proposals” is unclear since just which ones this refers to isn’t stated anywhere.

Also, missing from this section is mention of the Cochabamba and growing eco-socialist movement. I understand the term grates with some, but like with imperialism, it does describe a real way of looking at and addressing the issues.

The strongest factor in putting together a winning coalition of forces for a progressive green energy program will be the fact that ultimately everyone will pay the price of failure through the extinction of the human race. Agreed, but not sufficiently spelled out. These forces in the various forms; Cochabamba, Green Jobs, environmental movements growing everywhere, are spurred by the realities that threaten them – and by the growing awareness of what it will take to survive and prosper.

Also, see the **specific requirements** mentioned below of how this movement must develop if to be successful

Ultimately the present economic system in which the social product of society is taken as the private property of the owners of the means of production will have to be replaced by a structure in which the people will be able to democratically decide how economic resources should be allocated and the product distributed. This will be a form of socialism **Good and agree., but why not say it could be called “eco-socialism”???**, in which the people will collectively own the means of production and will be able to direct the course of the economy.

How do we get from where we are to where we need to go in time to prevent global catastrophic climate change?

1. We have to start with a sober estimate of where we are: the extent and seriousness of the problem.
2. Uniting the forces with an immediate interest in the solution.
3. Fighting for a program of initial steps toward a solution
4. Recognizing that there is an international climate justice movement that is a powerful source of strength, and that most countries are far more advanced in this regard than is the United States.
5. Preparing to advance the fight to the next stage.

Good, now we address the main and necessary specifics of what and how.

Specific Requirements:

1. There are specific scientific deadlines that must be known and addressed if any plan is to succeed.
2. Prevention of catastrophic outcomes, since not reversible, is the only sensible goal. Accommodations will ultimately fail.
3. A world scale plan is necessary to shift sufficient resources in time.
4. The plan and it's components must be scientifically constructed to meet needs of 1-3 above, but also to prevent reactionary and profit motives from sabotaging the outcome.
5. Specifically the plan must meet known requirements such as 350 ppm, avoidance of other major tipping points, and overcoming the MIC opposition to such benchmarks.

6. Sufficient popular awareness and understanding of 1-5 must exist that people's movements will be strong and determined enough to demand the needed changes.

7. A world movement so informed must hold all governments and economic agencies accountable to the goal of prevention of all possible catastrophic climate changes – and all necessary and possible accommodations for a just outcome.

[Top](#)

----- END -----