



CLIMATE DEADLINE
Paris, December 2015

—Director's Script / 2nd draft—
November 8, 2015
[some titles not yet transcribed]

Richard Widick
richard.widick@orfaleacenter.ucsb.edu
Orfalea For Global & International Studies
International Institute of Climate Action & Theory (iicat.org)
Metroglobe Productions (metro-globe.com)

Executive Producers

Michael K. Dorsey, John Foran, Richard Widick

Written, Filmed, and Edited by Richard Widick

Music
M. Coleman Horn

SEGMENT #1 – Opening Titles, Interview Vignettes, and Narrative

[Music: Earth Song, Written by Michael Jackson; producer Malik Yusef]

[MONTAGE: 10 images: Cracked earth, Power station cooling towers, dried out skull and bones, dried out tundra, dead forest, flooded roads, flooded town, cooling towers (CU), glacier calving, ice flow]

Voice Over: Richard Widick, Narrator

[TITLES: large white block lettering against black]

Climate Deadline, Paris, December 2015 <4 secs>

The Nations will adopt the Next Universal Climate Treaty <4 secs>

That Treaty is being created right now <4 secs>

Whose interests will it serve? <4 secs>

What can be done? <4 secs>

What should we do? <4 secs>]

Interview clips, presaging four of the marquee interviews

> **Michael Dorsey (Sierra Club, Washington DC)** <

“The true story of the 21st Century unfolding climate policy is corrupt **corporations**, recidivistic corporate criminals, shaping the policies...”

> **Camila Moreno (Porto Alegre, Brazil)** <

“It’s a problem we are seeing everywhere. Which, we call it... we name it **climate structural adjustment**. Legal frameworks like the mining code, the forest code, new legislation for example on the sense of regulating services on environmental services is so-called are being created everywhere. In Latin America this process has been overwhelming over the last four to five years. Every country has had their legislation changed, and people were believing that this was for climate protection, when actually it for **the creation of new property rights over a new class of assets**, over intangibles.”

> **Patrick Bond (Center for Civil Society, Durban, South Africa)** <

South Africa had racial apartheid, where the key division was the race line. It shifted. We're now in what I would call South African class Apartheid. The key division is how much money you have, and if you are in a circuit where your money and your race gives you the kind of access and the networks to live a good life while more people are suffering in socio-economic terms. **And in the future, climate apartheid will certainly work along race and class and gender lines in very important ways.**"

> **Mithika Mwenda, PanAfrican Climate Justice Alliance, Kenya** <

"We look this as a struggle. And what the difference between this and the **anti-apartheid, anti-slavery, and anti-colonial movements** was that this is bigger than that. We are fighting a bigger force."

[TITLES: The Fight for Africa? Again?]

> **Voice Over: Richard Widick, Narrator @ 00:2:30** <

[CROSS FADE: Richard Widick is running up the street during the Battle in Seattle Montage]

[TITLES: The BATTLE in SEATTLE/November 30→ December, 1, 1999/-Peoples, Labor and Environmental Movements shut down the World Trade Organization (WTO)]

[NOTE: all of the street scenes and tear gas shown for several minutes are from the Battle in Seattle, 1999]

[MUSIC: sound collage with Bonnie Raitt singing "War on the Workers," recorded live, together with layers of street sound, recorded by Richard Widick live in Seattle, November 30 – December 1, 1999:

[LYRICS to "War on the Workers," sung behind the following theoretical frame for the film: Listen Up, We got a war zone here today, right in our heartland, around the world and in Seattle USA. These multinational bastards don't use tanks and guns it's true (Ya!), but they've declared a war on us Fight Back! It's up to you. It's a war on the workers, oh it's a war on the workers, oh it's a war on the workers and we've finally started calling the shots... Going to work, could be the death of you and me, we're not unarmed, our weapon's solidarity. Jim Beals and Karen Silkwood, the list goes on and on. With every year that passes untold workers killed and gone, it's a war

on the workers, and it's time we started calling the shots.... (40 seconds)

[TITLES: Richard Widick, Sociologist Orfalea Center for Global & International Studies University of California, Santa Barbara]

My name is Richard Widick, and I've been struggling to understand and confront these global threats to democracy, human rights and the environment since 1999, when the Seattle police department almost put my eyes out with an exploding tear gas canister.

All I was doing was recording events, trying to document the struggle for social justice at what turned out to be the biggest anti-corporate globalization protest ever.

In those days, peoples, labor, and environmental movements were focused on the World Trade Organization, which they saw as the triumph of what we now call the 1% — giant corporations negotiating international trading rules that overrule and nullify local, regional and national labor and environmental regulations.

It made perfect sense. The WTO wants money and investments to circulate freely, while people and workers are stopped at the borders, and the habitats and species are taken at will for the production and accumulation of ever more concentrated wealth.

[SOUNDTRACK: Guitar Sample, "Rise," by the Flo-Bots]

But... the Battle in Seattle broke the fever for global trade deals, and then the anti-globalization movements forced the WTO into a background story; the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, once touted as NAFTA for the whole western hemisphere, died on the vine;

[TITLES: NAFTA – 1994/The North American Free Trade Agreement]

9/11 happened, the US went to war in the Middle East, and activists around the world increasingly understood that fossil-fueled industrial capitalism and militarism, hand in hand, are driving humanity and global ecology to the tipping point: together they are driving the unfolding climate crisis.

Now it's 2015; the United Nations are creating the next universal climate treaty; and **the same forces that brought us Seattle 1999** and the anti-

globalization movement **are coming back together again**—converging, this time, on the international climate negotiations.

My problem is making sense of this whole complicated mess—and trying to explain how deeply **the new climate treaty depends on the very same institutions that programmed the world for corporate-driven globalization and destruction of the climate system in the first place.**

[SOUNDTRACK: Seattle Police Department announcing: “We are going to start using chemical agents now.”]

This is crucial knowledge for the social movement that’s trying get the world back on course for a livable future on an environmentally friendly planet.

It’s no easy task, but when in doubt, why not do what I always do? — just pack up get going to where the action is.

I’m used to putting all my gear in a sack every year and heading out to the frontier—of the expanding world economic system, that is—where the rising tide of fossil-fueled industrial capitalism is doing its best to swamp the rest of us in a sea of carbon pollution.

I’m heading back to the United Nations, again, for yet another meeting of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

They’ve been at it for 23 years – and I’ve been to the last four big meetings myself...

First in Durban 2011, where the nations agreed to start work on a new form of market-friendly, non-legally binding treaty, built on greenhouse gas reduction promises made by each nation, according to their nationally determined circumstances.

Then in DOHA 2012, where the nations advanced a wide range of New Market Mechanisms and more deeply committed the treaty to dubious carbon trading solutions.

[TITLES: Polish Ministry of the Economy, Warsaw, November 2013/
— the World Coal Summit is underway inside]

Then in Warsaw, where the global King Coal Lobby reasserted itself as part of the solution, and the nations agreed on a new Loss & Damage mechanism, but filed it under pre-existing Adaptation programs and failed to commit any funding.

And finally in Lima, 2014, where the Draft Negotiating Text was released, with lots of hopeful Human Rights Language and references to equity, sparking optimism among many activists, but disbelief among others who doubt that the most progressive language will survive the coming months and enter into the legal form of the coming treaty.

And now it's off to Paris for the next big meeting, where the nations will finalize and adopt a new treaty that promises, again, that carbon markets and private finance will change its ways and mobilize industry to transform itself, regardless of widespread skepticism due to **20 years of the same BROKEN PROMISE.**

Lately I've been making a lot of new friends along the way, folks who can explain these things from inside the struggle.

So let's get out there and see what they're saying —let's go inside the UN climate talks —let's talk to the scholars, activists, capitalists and politicians who are putting together this global deal on climate change.

Let's put everyone on record, now, so that future historians will know where people stood when humanity came to the carbon crossroads.

Let's find out who's for climate justice and human rights, and what these terms mean for everyone involved. Let's find who's for social justice, for environmental justice and justice for women around the world, for the first peoples everywhere, for the islanders, for the 99%, for the future generations, and for all of our animal brothers and sisters on whom we rely for so much, and who now need us now to succeed more than ever before...

MAIN TITLES @ 00:07:51

[Set against the NASA Hyperwall montage]

[Music: "Cisna", by Bednarek, Polish Language with Nyabinghi drums]

[TITLES: NASA Hyperwall: live mix videographed at COP 19, Warsaw, Poland]

International Institute of Climate Action & Theory

Metroglobe Productions

CLIMATE DEADLINE
Paris, December 2015

Written, Directed, Produced, Filmed, and Edited
By Dr. Richard Widick
Orfalea Center for Global & International Studies
University of California, Santa Barbara]

SEGMENT #2 @ 00:08:30

> Voice Over: Richard Widick, Narrator <

Lima, Peru, December 2014 ...

Scene of the crucial South American COP, mandated to produce the negotiating text for the Paris treaty in December 2015.

Conquered by Spain 500 years ago, its history of **carbon mal-development** mirrors the world.

10 Million people breathing Latin America's worst air; 3 million people living in the worst slums—a city alive with concentrated wealth as well as brutal poverty, wild with creativity, stirred by pent up social forces, driven by violence and beauty... how can it function at all?

[TITLES: UN Headquarters/New York City]

But this is only one city, in one nation; at the UN climate talks, 194 Nations must act together as one.

This time, **11,000 delegates came**, representing each nation and hundreds of corporations and universities and non-government organizations from each of the Treaty Organizations nine formally recognized constituencies: Business, Environment, Farmers, Indigenous, Municipalities, Researchers, Trade Unions, Women and Youth.

Everyone has their opinions and demands — and they have come here to talk and to claim their rights.

Yes, this is **the Discourse of Right**: the practice of standing before the law and claiming a right.

Here, **the rights of all peoples are put on display — a pedagogical Spectacle** for world to consider, according to the rules set up by the victors of World War Two, who set up the United Nations according to their own ideal image of themselves.

To begin, a **Constitution**, the UN Charter, setting up institutions to preserve peace on Earth by conferring Human Rights on every individual, outlined in the Universal Declaration as dictated by the science of modern liberalism.

[TITLES: Universal Declaration of Human Rights — Article 19:
Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others]

First: **Private Property rights must be held sacred and enforced by law** backed by legitimate state violence, lest there rise up a tyrannous majority; this right will create wealth by ensuring that the economic sphere of social life is relatively autonomous from political power.

[TITLES: Article 18 — Everyone has the right to freedom of expression and opinion]

Second: **Rights of Free Speech and Assembly, including religions, must be held sacred**, ensuring that lively debate in the public sphere will spring forth fostering open debate in which interested parties can educate themselves and prepare for self-governance;

[TITLES: Article 21 — Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country]

Third: **Rights of Universal Franchise, protected from economic tyranny and religious intrusion** — a secular space of total representation within which the unforced force of reason, cultivated by the public sphere, and enriched by economic wealth, will rule rightly precisely because it is the rule of RightReason.

Enter **the UN climate talks — a juridically programmed perpetual public sphere struggle over property rights** — a struggle to proliferate and enshrine private interests in law that will govern the exercise of constantly expanding *private property rights*.

Everything will turn on this question: **who will be given The Right to own what**, and how will that ownership be allowed to be exercised?

Some will not recognize this critical fact; others will seek to obscure it; all will chime in according to the philosophical premises of the founding speech that set up the UN climate talks and structures their function according to the idea of Universal Human Rights.

That means that **the necessary tools for delivering Climate Justice are already built into the system**; they are its Constitutional Promise, its guarantee on the future, and why it must now fulfill that promise.

> **Manuel Pulgar-Vidal of Peru, UNFCCC President, 2014 – 15 @ 00:12:25 <**

[TITLES: Manuel Pulgar-Vidal of Peru, UNFCCC President, 2014 – 15]

So, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a pleasure to invite, now, the Executive Secretary, Mrs. Christina Figueres, to give her welcoming speech. Madame Executive Secretary, you have the floor.

> **Ms. Christina Figueres, UNFCCC General Secretary @ 00:12:47 <**

You know, I think when you are at a COP, it is always very helpful to understand **the Bitter... the bigger picture**.

Any result of any COP is never the end of the road, it is always one step toward.

[TITLES: The Official 2 Degree Target/is consistent with 450PPM CO2;/The Current Count is 400+ PPM ...]

If governments are serious about keeping the temperature rise to the **two degrees maximum increase** that they have already committed to, repeatedly, there is only one pathway.

And that is to reach **global emissions peaking**, that means the maximum point of global emissions, over the next few years

To then get to this point of turning around **the turning point of emissions** from where we are now, which is a continual increase, to a continual decrease in emissions, and ultimately, by the second half of the century, to be able to be climate neutral.

That restablishing of that balance, which was the balance that we had prior to the industrial revolution, is ultimately our goal.

That is what we call **Climate Neutrality** – in the second half of the century.

Now, getting there is not easy, because we have had a **Development Modell** that has done exactly the opposite, over one hundred and fifty years, increasing **the carbon content of both our production and consumption patterns**.

It is not easy because every single country is affected in one way or the other, and that is why **we must reach agreement by consensus** of all countries.

And it is not easy because every country has **national circumstances**, be they economic circumstance, political, natural resources, or other circumstances that are completely unique to that country.

Lima is the COP in which countries come together to design exactly that process of how they are going **to initiate that decarbonization process**, and how they will combine two sources of input.

[TITLES: A new hybrid form of treaty:/Bottom-Up national commitments to reduce emissions/and Top-Down, science-driven emission limits

The Bottom-Up:/Each nation will submit their/Intended Nationally Determined Contributions” (INDCs/ — these will be promises to cut emissions

The Top-Down:/ Climate Science will determine the required emissions cuts]

One is the **bottom-up national contributions** – which are called the INDCs, **the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions** — the bottom-up, with the **top-down**, which means that the sum total of all country efforts needs to be not only nationally determined and make sense for the economies of the individual countries, but as a collectivity they also need to be globally responsible.

> **Brice Lalonde, French Ambassador on Climate Change @ 00:15:37** <

OK. My name is Brice Lalonde.

[TITLES: Brice Lalonde/Former French Environment Minister/French Ambassador on Climate Change]

I’m a Frenchman.

I was a student leader.

And I became an environmentalist, because I saw the man on the moon and I thought... Ahhhh, the planet is the only big cause that we need to fight, so I’m for the planet.

Phew.... Unity of humanity — this is my utopia, Okay?

The convention was signed in Rio '92, and of course you remain a minister all of your life.

I was then mayor.

And I was appointed ambassador for climate change for my country.

And after, I thought, these guys on the climate they want to put everybody under the rule, they forget the big picture, so I worked on Rio +20.

And now it's back to the climate.

And I'm working with **the Global Compact**, which is the interface between the United Nations and business.

And I can tell you, business is much more efficient and pragmatic than all of this.

190 nations are not able to take care of the planet, because they defend national interests and they forget completely the planet.

That's what's happening.

Besides, we are having what I would say is a difficult North/South (or so) negotiation which is stuck for the last 20 years.

So, it's very difficult.

We are sort of cutting into pieces the global environment and development.

So we are talking here on financing, the Green Climate Fund, and lots of things like that.

We are talking in another forum of financing for development.

And in another we are talking about universal sustainable development goals.

All of that is the same thing, actually!

But, you know, it's very difficult to talk about all of that.

And I believe that we are having some big mistakes.

> **Camilla Moreno, Grupo Carta de Belem @ 00:17:18** <

What I think it's always important to remember is that the UN was part of a larger agreement after the WWII, which was the Bretton Woods, and **the Bretton Woods package of agreements** that were entailed, and the world order that followed, including the exchange currency politics that were involved, also.

[TITLES: Camilla Moreno/Grupo Carta de Belem, Brazil]

So we are witnessing right now, in my opinion, a change in this.

We have new hegemonic powers, and I'm from a BRICS country, so I can talk.

[TITLES: BRICS/The powerful but still developing countries of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa]

But they reaffirm and they restate and they kind of kind of reboot very old colonial dynamics and hegemonic dynamics.

So, we have to watch out.

I think it's a problem that we are seeing everywhere, which, we call it, we name it, the **Climate Structural Adjustment**.

That means that legal frameworks like the mining code, the forest code, new legislation for example on the sense of regulating payment on services on environmental services so-called are being created everywhere, to give like a bottom-up approach to those new markets that the system expected that they will emerge from this COP.

Because in Latin America this process has been overwhelming over the last four to five years.

Every country has had their legislation changed, and people were believing that this was for climate protection, when actually it for the **creation of new property rights over a new class of assets**, over intangibles.

> **Dirk Forrister and Christiana Figueres @ 00:18:53** <

And I think there is a growing, unfortunately not as quickly as we would like, but **a growing realization that THE ONLY WAY to get to the level of mitigation this is needed is actually through VALUING — MONETIZING — THE EFFORTS OF PARTIES.**

Now, how exactly that is going to be done still remains a work in progress.

And that we still have resistance to the previous, ingrained concept of Market —or the **CDM** — is definitely true.

[TITLES: CDM/Clean Development Mechanism/-the UN's main mechanism for producing carbon offset credits for the carbon markets]

I think one of the main challenges that we have is to actually unpack all of the different layers of the market, and in particular of the CDM, such that everyone can see that this is actually... it's not exactly a jack of all trades, but certainly it is a tool for many different opportunities.

> **Michael Dorsey in Warsaw @ 00:19:48** <

We have a situation where the climate problem is fundamentally about **injustice**.

Economics 101 tells you that **you don't use the market to tackle problems of injustice**.

[RW – but that is exactly what the Secretary is saying in the previously segment: to solve the problem of climate injustice we need the markets; we have to commodify everything! Monetize the actions of parties, turn them into credits, and market them, trade them]

If you want to fix a problem that is rooted in injustice, you need the state to be involved in this.

Markets deal with problems about inefficiency.

Markets are designed to check problems of inefficiency — the inefficient allocation of goods.

We need to be inefficient, which is how you respond to injustice.

When you have a situation of injustice, you sometimes have to disproportionately allocate resources to those that are being harmed the most.

> **Pascoe Sabido and Christiana Figueres: Q & A at International Emissions Trading Association @ 00:20:44** <

PASCOE: I guess I come from a European perspective, looking at the ETS in Europe.

[TITLES: The European Emissions Trading Association]

And I was just wondering, in these negotiations, it doesn't feel like we actually have agreement between countries on whether we want a **New Market Mechanism**.

I was just wondering, in the interest of objectivity, in your position as the Chair, you're the Executive Secretary, whether you would consider, or why we are not considering, in fact, a moratorium on New Market Mechanisms, before we have assessed current ones.

Because, as I have said, I come from a European perspective, where the market has failed miserably.

It has lead to windfall profits.

It has not lead to emissions reductions.

And it has led to other instruments such as energy efficiency and renewables being weakened as a result.

And for someone who really cares about the climate, that is a very depressing situation.

[TITLES: CARBON CREDIT PRICES/TON on Oct. 1, 2015/California Exchange: @12.48US/EU-ETS: \$8.16EU]

So, I was wondering, how do you deal with that.

How do we actually assess markets on their genuine merit, and not to prejudice, in either direction, but try to be objective, and to listen to some countries who might not be so keen on new markets, and when that review might take place in interest of all of us.

CHRISTIANA: Well. It's a very interesting idea.

I'm not sure, in fact, I am sure that there is no "mandate," being the magical word we use... There's no mandate to do a review across all of the current instruments.

But I do think that there have been many efforts to review the different instruments, each in its own jurisdiction.

What we perhaps haven't done is across the board.

But your idea actually of putting, as you called it, a moratorium on the **New Market Mechanism**, until we can review: I actually think that that is currently in place.

I think the timidity of walking much quicker into defining if there is going to be a role for markets, and if so, what that's going to be in the Paris Agreement... hence, that would be the moratorium that you're talking about is actually in place, because what countries want to see first is, well, what are the ambition levels that are going to be on the table.

And that, I think, from a very simple lesson **learned from the CDM** — if there's no demand, it doesn't matter how much supply you have, you just don't have a market, hence prices fall.

[TITLES: Carbon Trader's Ambition for the Paris Climate Treaty:/create new demand for carbon credits and revive the carbon markets ...]

And so I think that certainly developing countries have been very much on the thought of well, first let's see what the collectivity of mitigation targets, commitments, contributions, whatever noun you want to put to it, are going to be, then let's figure out how we're going to get there.

So, very much to say, OK, the markets are an instrument to a final goal, they are not a goal in themselves.

> **Michael Dorsey in Warsaw @ 00:23:26** <

[NOTE – Dorsey will here contradict the Secretar'ss assertion that markets are not a goal in themselves; they are, he implies – it's what they want for their purposes, which are profit and growth]

What the Conference of Parties has become, over the past several years, is increasingly a space not so much for concerned members of the public.

But it's become a space that is essentially kind of a lobby party for corporate interests, many of them corrupt, many of them recidivistic corporate criminals, many of them engaged in undermining the very climate policies that they've come here to influence.

> **Christiana Figueres @ 00:23:51** <

In order to help you follow the process here in Lima, could I point out that you might want to follow at least **four tracks of work**.

[TITLES: The Secretary's four points coincide with the four main sections/of the NEGOTIATING TEXT agreed in Lima ...]

The **first** is the process of developing collectively the draft agreement.

[TITLES: MITIGATION/Each nation will submit mitigation PROMISES called/"Intended Nationally Determined Contributions" (INDCs))

That **draft agreement** will have to both be clear on how the national contributions are going to come forward next year, as well as be clear about how **the GAP** between the collectivity of the national efforts and the global need to decarbonize, how that gap is going to be closed over time.

That is called **The Review**.

[TITLES: The REVIEW will function on a "Name and Shame" basis;/not legally enforceable, but rather a tool of peer pressure]

But you can think of it as the process, over time, that will gradually close **The Gap**.

[TITLES: The GAP:/ Business as Usual/+4.5°C/INDCs so far/+3.5°C/>Thus... the GAP:/ +3.5° - 2° (UN target) = +1.5°C]

Because **we already know** that all the national contributions that are going to come forward next year, including those that have already been announced this year, will not actually close **The Gap**, that this is going to have to be a gradual process, over time.

> **Michael Dorsey at IICAT Press Conference, LIMA, COP 20 @ 00:25:05** <

[NOTE: The Secretary has just explained away the draft treaty's lack of ambition; Dorsey now points back at and elaborates this lack of ambition]

Lima has been a display of **the pathway of Low Ambition**, particularly by governments.

The refrain has been the same.

We can't have emission cuts that are too steep.

We can't raise sufficient funds for **the Green Climate Fund**.

And more ostentatiously, we can't have a renewable energy future very soon.

[TITLES: US – China Climate Deal, (October, 2014:/ China commits to increasing emissions until 2030]

We can have it some time in the distant future.

We have also heard a new refrain of what's not possible, perhaps the grossest, most repugnant one, coming from hallowed halls of those faculty sitting at Harvard and London School of Economics.

That refrain is that students and a growing number of pension funds should not divest from fossil fuels.

As the negotiations here in Lima close, we are not seeing the necessary kind of ambition we need.

We are not seeing the kind of urgent action that we faced not so long ago in front of **the world financial crisis**.

Just before the onset of that particular crisis, in 2007, the Food and Agriculture Organization said we need roughly about \$30 billion per year to end hunger on Earth.

By September, a year later, in 2008, the world would put together some \$17 trillion, some of it, hundreds of millions, were assembled in the US in a matter of weeks.

What would happen if you divided that \$17 trillion, conservatively estimated, that was levied to attack the financial crisis, what would happen if you divided it by the \$30 billion per year that the FAO said we needed to solve hunger on the planet?

You get **600 years of a world free of hunger and poverty** — more than half a millennium.

> **Christiana Figueres @ 00:26:9** <

[TITLES: 2. ADAPTATION Preparing for the Effects of Global Warming/that are already locked in due to Historical Emissions]

Secondly, you may want to follow what is going to be happening under the rubric of adaptation, because there is a very clear call from most countries, if not all countries, to increase the level of action on adaptation,

and certainly increase the political attention to adaption, given the fact that both **Adaptation and Mitigation are of equal urgency**.

> **Michael Dorsey @ 00:27:23** <

We live in a world where there is never enough for those that have nothing, the poorest of the poor, but there is always enough for those who have everything.

Here in Lima, we have that same attitude in these discussions.

There is never enough money to be found to capitalist **The Green Climate Fund**.

[TITLES: GREEN CLIMATE FUND (GCF)— Still just a promise of \$100billion/year/in support from rich to poor countries/for mitigation and adaptation]

They have capitalized the low end, some \$10 billion paltry dollars.

While, whey you do the math, the European Union has put more than two hundred billion dollars into the pockets of polluters.

[NOTE: see below Charkiewics statement that the ETS is a strategy to redistribute public funds to the private sector]

> **Christiana Figueres @ 00:28:05** <

[TITLES: 3. Finance & Technology/Including carbon trading and other market mechanisms]

Thirdly, you may want to follow the activities and the work that is going to occur under finance and technology, which are **the two arms of support which need to be given to Developing Countries** for them to be able to follow a deep decarbonization pathway.

> **Michael Dorsey @ 00:28:24** <

We need urgent collective action.

We need to shut down broken carbon markets.

We certainly don't need to establish a new bailout fund, the **Market Stabilization Reserve** that some are discussing in the EU, to give further billions to polluters.

[NOTE: Is this not the easiest future to foresee for any renewed market regime – a future full of bailouts like those for every other so-called crucial market that is, like the big banks, too big to fail?. Is not the Climate too big to fail? Aren't the carbon markets under the Globally Connected Markets initiative of IETA trying to build just that— a carbon market that is “too big to fail”?]

> **Christiana Figueres at 00:28:42** <

And finally, you may want to follow what is being done here in Lima both to recognize and promote and encourage the action on the part of **all stakeholders**, beyond national governments to private sector to the insurance sector to civil society... to all sectors.

[TITLES: 4. Stakeholder Actions/Supporting low carbon development solutions at every scale]

While it is the fundamental responsibility of governments to chart the path and be very clear about the course toward 2 degrees, that governments cannot do this alone, and that they actually need the support from all **Stakeholders**, in particular **the private sector who can actually mobilize both finance and technology with much more ease than the public sector**.

****[NOTE: Maybe they “can,” but they are not ... so this is a response to Dorsey on how much was mobilized for the banks during the financial crisis; they might be able to mobilize capital, but they are not, so... we must give them markets to do so? But it was political will to save the markets during the financial crisis; now, there is no political will to save the poor and their environments]****

> **Brice Lalonde @ 00:29:35 sec** <

So what's very interesting is that business is starting to move.

And the financial world is starting to move, starting to divest from carbon.

The problem is the **logic of business is not the logic of the negotiations**.

Business, for instance, would agree on sectorial agreements, like what aviation has done.

But sectorial agreements here are not allowed.

Ah! So business is not encouraged to go on.

Here people say, we don't agree on anything unless we agree on everything.

That's not at all what business thinks.

Business thinks if you can pick a fruit, let's take it right now, and move and be pragmatic.

And the **price on carbon** — business says we need a price on carbon.

Here, it's not even mentioned anywhere.

RICHARD WIDICK, Interviewer, from off screen: Well, over in the IETA Pavilion there's a lot of people who are very interested in this process. Have you been over there? Are you familiar....

Of course!

WIDICK: Do you know Dirk Forrister?

Of course, I've been working with them.

WIDICK: They think there's some business to be done here. Can you talk about that? What do they want?

They want **Market Mechanisms** – “**Flexibility Mechanisms.**” OK?

Aviation wants the same thing.

In 2020 all of the airlines are going to cut their emissions.

And if they are going to go over these emissions, they're going to ask for a **Market Mechanism** to compensate.

So, you could envision, for instance, a big alliance between aviation and forests.

Aviation would finance conservation of forests.

That would be quite nice.

But if you want to have a market, you need deep commitments,.

You need to create demand for real action credits.

If you don't have any demand, you don't need to create a market.

I mean, it's completely useless.

So, what's important is to have a long-term vision, commitments, and countries really jumping into reductions and the commitments to reduce emissions.

We are going to see in the next six months if we are going to have those with these contributions with a funny name.

> **Christiana Figueres @ 00:31:32** <

What countries actually want to see first is, well, what kind of **ambition** levels that are going to be on the table.

And that, I think, from **a very simple lesson learned from the CDM**: if there's no demand, it doesn't matter how much supply you have, you just don't have a market, hence prices fall.

And so I think that certainly developing countries have been very much on the thought of, well, first let's see what the collectivity of mitigation targets, commitments, contributions —whatever noun you want to put to it — are going to be, and then figure out how we're going to get there.

So, very much to say, Okay, the markets are an instrument to a final goal.

They are not a goal in themselves.

> **Dirk Forrister @ 00:32:17** <

But ultimately, kind of **the Nirvana State for Business** would be if all of the big emitters, for competitiveness reasons, were all in a similar system, and there's tradability amongst the **Carbon Commodities** in those.

And the EU ETS, which some people think has had, has faced a lot of challenged, I would say it's actual a hero in this story, because it has demonstrated, and you know, it has found warts in the system and it has dealt with them, but it's demonstrated that you can get buy-in across most of Europe's industries, and has them on a trajectory that is reducing emissions, and meeting their share of obligations, and they're still in business, and they're doing.... They still have hopes of growing and all of that stuff.

> **Pascoe Sabido @ 00:33:04** <

Why is the EU pushing **Carbon Markets** despite their failure at home?

Because it's in bed with those energy intensive industries who threaten to leave if they don't push **Carbon Markets**.

And the worst thing about it?

The same corporations responsible for climate change want more influence.

[TITLES: The Carbon Majors/ 90 largest historical private & state-run fossil fuel companies & their relative share of emissions]

There was an article that came out on Wednesday in the *Financial Times*, and there the **International Chamber of Commerce** said they're not happy with their role here.

They're not happy with the role business plays in the climate talks.

I mean, this is despite the UN bending over backwards to integrate business into these talks.

In Warsaw, last year, we have a Pre-COP, pre-negotiations just with business, no civil society.

They've had unrivaled access, and yet what they've claimed is that it doesn't go far enough.

And **they're calling to be Co-Parties**.

Business wants the same power as countries.

I mean, I think we have to understand how far this is going.

So if we're really serious about tackling climate change, if we're really serious about making that transition now, not in 2020, not in 2025, now, then I think we need to accept that we don't want and we don't need business and we can't have business at the negotiating table.

> **Brice Lalonde @ 00:34:29** <

WIDICK off screen: OK, talk to us about the role of Paris. There is going to be a big conference as you know, in your country.

Yes, it's going to cost a lot of money!

NOTE: Right. You're not happy about that.

No!.

NOTE: Tell us about their preparations there — are you familiar with anything?

Of course the French are very serious about it.

All of the ministers are, I would say, mobilized.

They're trying to do their best.

They would like to take away as much as possible from this conference, what's left to be decided at Paris.

Of course everyone wants an agreement in Paris.

Now the problem is, we need an agreement.

We'll probably have an agreement.

Here too, because, in all of these conferences, if nothing comes out of it, people are going to say, 'let's stop.'

SO, the problem is in the discrepancy between what's going to happen in these agreements and the climate.

So what's important, and what's more important, is what's not happening here.

What's happening elsewhere, that's what's more important.

NOTE: What's not happening here that is happening elsewhere?

Action!

NOTE: Where?

Everywhere!

NOTE: Be specific.

Cities, business, people and lots of things are happening.

Much more, actually, is happening in different countries that negotiators accept to say... because, negotiators: “National Interests!” Not the planet.

NOTE: Right. OK. There’s a lot of people here from civil society claiming that there is going to be a big showdown in Paris. What’s the potential for that? Is civil society mobilized there?

Of course! Of course, even the youth, they want 10,000 people...

I mean, yes, lot’s of things are going to happen.

But, the problem is not to get a lot of people.

The problem is to get an agreement.

I think it would be better to have **190 Heads of States**, put them in a room and not allow them out unless you get an agreement.

Heads of State can go beyond national interests — all of the others cannot.

NOTE: How can they? Why would they ever do that? How could they, without these civil society groups demanding that?

Because **their job is to save the planet.**

Isn’t it that?

You think that’s for junior negotiators?

That’s for Heads of States.

They should do their job and get to work.

NOTE: Tell us about the militant labor unions of France and what their role is going to be. You know how important they were back in the ‘60s.

Very important,, because you need to have a fair transition.

I mean, listen, if you have to close coal mines, you have to take care of the miners and how it’s going to work out, and find a job and help them.

It’s very important.

I mean, the whole thing of **Equity** is very important.

Equity is the hidden god of these negotiations.

Nobody knows exactly how to deal with it.

So it has to be with imagination.

It has to be with the heart.

And we need a lot of help from everybody.

> Tom Athanasiou, EcoEquity @ 00:37:03 <

My name is Tom Athanasiou.

I'm the director of EcoEquity, a small activist think tank based in the United States, and I am also one of the coordinators of the Climate Action Network's Equity Working Group.

This is the beginning of the big second week of the Lima negotiations, and the good news is **The Good News!**, which is, the new negotiating text has a lot of good stuff in it.

It hasn't been nailed down.

There's always options.

Many of the options are terrible, but a lot of good text remains in the treaty, the draft treaty, at this time.

And if I can say the same thing in a week, then Lima will have been a success.

Richard Widick (from off camera): What is the role of Equity in this document? Does this new universal climate treaty use the word "Equity"?

Absolutely! It's all over the place, and that's why I'm a happy man today, because we only just got the draft this treaty this morning, and much of the text we've been lobbying for years now is in the treaty.

For example, it says the following: when a country submits its INDC —its intended nationally determined contribution, what we used to call, in the English language, its pledge — it should explain why it considers that pledge to amount to its fair share of the global effort.

That's "**Fair Share**" — **that's a way of talking about Equity.**

The Equity text, the Equity clauses, the Equity considerations and paragraphs that are in the current text are a mish mash because part of it is here and part of it is there.

In some cases there is option one, option two, and option three—and only option two will have the Equity text in it.

And we don't know which option that the negotiators are finally going to be able to agree on. Right?

This is a treaty, we are negotiating a treaty that will be applicable to all.

It will not be like the Kyoto Protocol.

That doesn't mean that all countries will be treated in the same way.

In fact, the real reason why this meeting is such a big deal is that it's the beginning of a **Differentiation Debate** that the parties have acted for.

I mean, this is big, Richard.

There was a really, really firm division between the wealthy countries and the developing countries, and that just doesn't work anymore.

There are ... the world is a more complicated place.

The easy way to prove that is that there are really rich people and really poor people in China and the United states both, right?

> **Godwin Ojo, Executive Director, Friends of the Earth Nigeria @
00:39:57<**

My name is Godwin Ojo.

Executive Director, Environmental Rights Action, Friends of the Earth, Nigeria.

This COP in Lima, COP 20... we can call it a COP of injustice.

Because it does not at all reflect the will and the aspirations of the common people.

Since oil was discovered in Nigeria in 1956, the Niger Delta has known no rest.

It has been one of violence, it has been one of deprivation, it has been one of corporations taking over community resources.

A small place of the Ogoni people, with just a million people.

Shell has taken the land, they have polluted the water, they have destroyed peoples' livelihoods, yet they have not shown any signs of responsibility by way of clean up; gas flaring continues unabated; also, there are monumental oil spills on a daily basis.

So what we have in the Niger Delta is that the government and the oversight agencies are not able to bring Shell to account.

So we have seen a situation in which the regulator has become the regulated, and the regulated that ought to be the oil company has become the regulator, because they influence government policies and make sure they don't see the light of day.

For example, the UNEP Report recommendations recommend the setting up of a \$1 Billion US dollar clean up fund -- that is not on the table; and that UNEP report has also discovered that hydrocarbons have been found at a depth of five meters - no action is taken! As we speak, people in Ogoni communities are drinking water that is contaminated with benzene up to 900 times beyond World Health Organization standards.

So, virtually nothing. People are sentenced to death, and they are dying by this torment.

We say that the Niger Delta is a crime scene that is tantamount to ecocide.

And Shell, the oil companies, should not be able to get away with crimes against humanity.

But they are here, at the COP, influencing decisions

[cut away to Christiana Figueres and Dirk Forrister of IETA with Shell logo on the screen behind them].

So we can also call this a Corporate Capture COP, because everything is about monetary mechanisms, it's about profit,

> **Michael Dorsey @ 00:42:34** <

So, the thing that we need to understand is that corporations aren't just exploiting workers, they're exploiting the environment.

And they are often times doing that in cahoots with the very same governments that are tasked with the responsibilities for regulating them.

The next generation will undoubtedly be rethinking this old, beleaguered 20th Century capitalist exploitation that bleeding slowly bit surely into the 21st Century.

But let us be clear, that that process that continued for about a hundred or so years —20th Century exploitative capitalism —That's the next thing on the chopping block.

That's why we see growth of new types of economic thinking; the growth of ecological economics; the growth of thinking about justice.

And that's precisely why broken mechanisms like the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme, now called system.... That's precisely why those mechanisms aren't working—because they're premised on the faulty, broken, exploitative economic paradigms of the late 20 and early 21st Century.

Richard Widick (from off camera): If these markets are broken; if they're not working; if they're producing injustice; if they're destroying the environment and exploiting labor... why are they still here?

When the jailor and the criminal are in cahoots... when ArcelorMittal steel, one of the largest polluters not just in Europe, not just in Poland, but on the planet—when that corporate criminal is allowed to fly its banner on the approval of the ostensible jailer, Ms. Christiana Figueres, then we don't see the big breakthroughs that we need.

What we see is hucksterism.

What we see is bamboozlement.

What we see is **Spectacle**.

> **Godwin Ojo, Friends of the Earth, Nigeria @ 00:44:35** <

We are talking here about **historical responsibility on climate debt** that has been agreed upon to be the platform of action.

And this simply means that the developed countries will provide the enabling environment in terms of finance, in terms of capacity building, in terms of technology transfer.

These things are no longer on the table.

And this is the crux of the matter.

Richard Widick (from off camera): Let's go a little bit deeper into that **Contradiction on Finance** that you just mentioned there: \$100 billion per year is a lot of money, right? But... how does that compare to the amount of money that was made available to the banks when the financial crisis struck the world and especially the City of London and New York, those credit markets, in 2008 I think it was.... But, over that period of time, I mean, hundreds of billions of dollars became available overnight, like a Marshal plan for Citybank. What is it? Where's the psychology behind the lack of will for this, whereas, for that

Yes... the message here is that governments, working with civil society groups, should take back the power they have lost to corporations.

As we see the world today, corporations are the game in town.

Corporations are ruling the world.

If \$100 billion is on the table, for example, it's not enough compared to the monumental damage climate change has caused in the world.

You can see how a lot of inconsistencies, and the money is grossly inadequate to actually address a quarter of the problems that climate change has caused.

So the money is inadequate is a game that is going on.

Richard Widick, Narrator

< Voice Over with Lima Climate Protest Montage @ 00:46:28 <

Yes, indeed, it's a game that is going on... and on and on and on ...

And Lima was just the latest episode...

The Secretary has informed us on what to expect — the nations will decide for themselves what is fair, and announce their contributions as the year unfolds.

But Camila of Brazil has thrown up a flag: it's a ruse, it's a screen for interested parties that themselves just embody historical forces decades on the move, internalizing everything, peoples and places, labor and environment, churning out profits as well as emissions and now taking aim at the heavens and earth, seeking **the Right** to the air and the forest.

But Godwin has raised the Spectre of Ogoniland — these are the human faces of faces of market disasters already fallen.

And everywhere these faces are turning to you, to the climate talks, coming in droves wherever you meet to claim their rights to oppose and to testify, again, that people and citizens, workers and women and children together must also be heard.

We are the real productive force at work; we are the bodies that matter.

Will the markets you propose be for us, or for them —the one percent-teers? And their carbon traders and bankers, or for the 99% and their lands and their friends in the animal nations and the seas and the skies and the woods they call home?

Here, in the streets of Lima we see these forces assembling, answering the call of the Law of the Nations to stand up and be counted.

But will they be heard? Will they be admitted?

We will see, once in Paris, just what is in store.

And now, in preparation for Paris, we look back at how the social movements responded to the rise of carbon trading markets.

Patrick Bond @ 00:48:16 <

When Al Gore came in 1997 to Kyoto in Japan, and he didn't really have a mandate to negotiate.

In fact, there had already been a vote 95 to nothing to not actually support the Kyoto Protocol as it was being negotiated.

But he seemed to give the impression that if more concessions were made he could take it back and negotiate in the Senate and get President Clinton to sign it.

We, Al Gore got this huge street cred to work to inject markets, and that was the concession he most wanted, to allow the corporates to trade away emissions.

In other words, they could keep emitting, beyond a reasonable amount, but buy the right to emit from others.

If the air was privatized; if we could carbon trade these emissions, companies that were more efficient could sell them to less efficient ones, and the more efficient ones would gradually get a competitive edge and the market would do its magic.

Well, Gore promised that the US would join, and of course he couldn't do that, there wasn't a balance of forces at that time., 1998-9.

And by the time that they had left at the end of 1999 and the Bush regime came in at the end of 2000—the Bush regime came in in 2001, and Bush just was walking away entirely from these kinds of deals...

And so the COPs faltered along, and when Gore had proposed the 1997 plan to make carbon trading central as a mechanism to get a cap and to bring that down gradually and let the markets efficiency do that, the Europeans and the NGOs that were active in these COPs weren't convinced, but over time they got really bought in.

And by about 2005-6-7 those COPs, different places, Bali in 2007, particularly, alienated radical environmentalists and the global justice movement had come up....

Spectacular opening if you will from Seattle, December 1999, to disrupt a similar type of UN gathering, in this case the World Trade Organization.

And after the 9/11 attacks **The Global Justice Movement** and the radical environmentalists found in Bali an opportunity to walk out of the COP process because it was so frustrating.

The Europeans, the big NGOs, had become wedded to the corporate project of carbon trading.

And at that point **CJN** was formally established.

And the two words **Climate Justice**, as far as I can tell, were first used as the basis of a conference in Amsterdam, CorpWatch 2000.

And in 2004 the Durban Group for **Climate Justice** was established, in fact, at the time I started my job in Durban, coincidentally.

And it was, again, carbon trading as the central contradiction of global climate management.

And it's in those little seeding processes that we found an important division.

Climate Action Network had been the NGO umbrella strategy, and was always inside the COPs and appealing and lobbying and coming up with some clever memes now and again, like they still do.

But **Climate Justice Now** came out and said we actually want to see Justice and Equity and Redistributive problems involved in working out the program.

And we want to ultimately move with the CJ project to a "**System Change.**"

Now, how far Climate Justice brings you to a critique of capitalism we should explore, because it doesn't bring you all the way.

But the Cochabamba meeting in 2010 helped to define a large-scale program. And 35,000 people met in Bolivia to say we need something stronger than what the COPs were.

Now, don't forget that 2009 was the real climax, and in Copenhagen 100,000 people marched. There was another march near the very end of COP 15 in Copenhagen.

There was a conflict between those inside and those outside, and many of **the CAN/CJN divisions** became quite stark.

And a few groups were stuck kind of in the middle, I mean, one that's most important had just begun to drop out of CAN because its politics weren't strong enough.

It was too much in favor of those market solutions.

That was Friends of the Earth International.

And that was a really important signal around about that time to say we really do need to make a CJN project.

Unfortunately, the CJN network has had its own divisions.

One is, do you come to these COPs and spend all of the time and resources that we are doing in either lobbying inside or protesting outside or generally trying to influence the messaging?

And that's one strategy, where the global scale is seen as ultimately where we have to be because it's a global problem.

The critics say, look, the balance of forces are so adverse, you're just wasting time, and in a way your legitimating a process that we should de-legitimize, and we shouldn't even be here.

And that's convincing at some level, if there is an alternative strategy of scale.

But the biggest problem I think CJ has as a philosophy is not generating a coherent inside outside approach.

And so, there are plenty of insiders who say we're getting a few reforms here and there; and the outsiders say, ya, but you're just smoothing the rough edges of the system, and in the process allowing it to continue gathering momentum, and you're feeding it when we should be starving it and feeding what's happening at the base, instead.

Camila Moreno @ 00:54:21 <

Ya, we have kind of a really critical assessment of what this thing here is all about.

And I'm going to give you a quote, a fresh quote, from our guru, no, in the sense like Margaret Thatcher, which is Rachel Kyte, Vice President of the World Bank Group and also Special Envoy for Climate Change.

In a side event last week she said, referring to the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions, that they were key because they would, in a sense of putting a price on carbon, or establishing a carbon tax, or carbon budget, whatever you want to call it.

But in the sense that carbon becomes a macroeconomic concept, what's is all about here, and she said that literally, there is nothing to do with climate and air pollution, it has to do with reengineering the world economy.

And I think once you get this less naïve approach to what this thing here is all about, then you can kind of follow what is on purpose, or what is embedded in the legislation and the normative frames and what we should call the **Climate Structural Adjustment**.

But, I think we should go back and learn from history, because what we are seeing now is the deepening of something that was foreseen almost 200 years ago, you know?

To get, to expand, to accumulate, to generate profit out of this planet, you know, what the system needs and the rationality that goes with the system is to create first the primitive accumulation, no?: the very important historical 24th Chapter of Capital, Volume 1.

But then to expand, **primitive accumulation** over the intangibles.

This was something that this Friedman guy from the Chicago School was talking back in the Fifties.

So. It's also, you know, very at the core of the system that now we need to go over what they call **Natural Capital**.

We need to commodify water, biodiversity, and most of all carbon.

You know, this is all about commodifying carbon and having carbon as a universal value that can circulate because it's not about, as said our friend from World Bank — there's nothing to do with climate pollution, it's about the intensity and the cost of energy that is embodied in carbon.

> Eva Charkiewics at 00:56:43 <

How do we think about responses to climate crisis through this lens?

And I'm very pessimistic about the possibilities of, for instance, scrapping the ETS.

Actually, when I read in the Polish discourse here and the international discourse, I think the strategy is to **Globalize the Trading Schemes**.

There are already these World Bank projects to, projects that deal with institutionalizing it, and we can also see this agenda in Poland as well, and in the European Union.

The other day I have read a paper by two scientists who point out that the **carbon premiums to German companies was 18% of exceptional profits**.

So it's, the ETS [European Emissions Trading System] was **a strategy to redistribute public funding to polluters, but also empower them with property rights to the atmosphere**.

So, how do we challenge this prevailing system?

And I think that all kinds of critique and reformist coalition building are very important, but we also need to look from the point of view of reproduction of daily life.

And people need alternative sources of income; they need food produced in a different way; they need some sort of mechanism of exchange, like markets before they were transformed through capital relations; they need also some arrangement such as old age arrangements; we need our own pension systems; our own health care; our own food production.

And this is, this project is not receiving adequate attention yet, although there are wonderful examples of what people are trying to do.

The **Spectacular dimensions** of the debate on climate: one function is to support the, directly support the accumulation of capital in **new carbon markets**.

So, that's what Debord said in the 60's about how the accumulation of images directly links with the accumulation of capital, because the debate actually creates these new markets and opportunities for enormous profits for the biggest polluters in the finance sector.

So there was this recent report by [HansVerhomer] done for the Heinrich Boll Foundation, and they talk about financial energy complex: do actually this **Financial Energy Complex** have got a new boost of life with the **Spectacular dimension of the COP discourse** translated directly into accumulation of capital.

But the other dimension of the **Spectacle** is its legitimizing role.

This is the fake belief at all that we, people believe that they do something for the environment, they protect planet earth in this place that interpellates us to care and mobilizes our caring emotions, but at the same time it disguises the accumulation of capital & gender, class race inequalities that mediate the relations climate and with the earth and the people who live their real lives

And so, the **Spectacular dimension of climate politics** takes place at several levels simultaneously.

But, so, I'd like to come back to the **Spectacular dimensions**, because we really have a problem, a political problem resisting it.

And this—to what extent the engagement with these conference, and also to what extent the critical discourse that we produce is immediately appropriated.

So, how do we create the outside to this?

How do we create the outside to this system?

This is the pressing question.

We have the debate on the commons, which has been hijacked already after the Rio Conference; the World Bank commons that Michael Goldman for instance writes about.

We have the debate on gender, like gender in emissions trading schemes—it's such a fast process of appropriation.

So how to we create the outside?

And I think sometimes not to participate in this discourse is a better strategy.

> **Godwin Ojo @ 1:01:33** <

There is a groundswell of civil society groups building the critical mass that will effect the change and the transformation that is desired.

But we must not loose momentum.

We have to keep building.

We have to keep fertilizing ideas.

We have to keep attending meetings.

We have to keep taking spaces.

But we have to keep organizing and making sure that we are not only in a _____ basis, in terms of making demands.

We should also make those changes that we desire.

We can make it happen.

> **Richard Falk @ 1:02:06** <

[TITLES: Richard Falk/Orfalea Center for Global &n International Studies/University of California, Santa Barbara]

It's very important to understand that if there is to be an effective and equitable response to climate change, it does require the sort of mobilization that was associated with these past movements — anti apartheid; anti slavery; — and I think one has to put one faith in the power of people to envision their own beneficial futures.

And to organize in such a way as to change the political climate, that governments act responsively to the human interest as well as the national interest, and exert effective control over the private sector.

So it's, it's a open question whether a world organized ideologically on the foundations of **Neoliberalism** can be reshaped without a real transformative process challenging that structure.

> **Camila Moreno @ 1:03:39** <

The system, we keep saying in the climate justice movement “Change the System, not the Climate!”, but exactly this is what this is all about here.

They're changing the very system.

They are, they're talking, and this is a new narrative that emerged especially in this COP: it's transformative, it's a big transformation, it's a very huge paradigm shift — and transformation, transformation, systemic transformation, they're incorporating the language because it's the very thing that they're doing here.

And once we get this clear, and forget about any hope that this is about emissions, or temperature or whatever, than things get easier to assess, I think, in a less naïve way.

> Patrick Bond @ 1:04:28 <

I think the critical point will be where the social movements, together with the better elements in labor, can say, we're going to need massive new industries of renewable energies and public transport and agriculture that are labor intensive.

And that means they're going to have to have such a shift in their perspective and a broadening of their vision.

And I hope the climate issue will allow them to do that, because if they don't then we're all sunk.

> Mithika Mwenda @ 1:04:56 <

I'm seeing a situation where the leaders are going to be left by the people very soon.

And so, we are going to forge ahead,

We are going to keep forging alliances.

But, if the leadership currently will not rise to the occasion and address it adequately, I can assure you that it will come a time when they are going to be shoved and swept into the seas and oceans, like what the tsunami is doing right now.

These hurricanes will sweep them — the hurricanes of people power!

> Closing Protest, Montage @ 1:05:40 <

[CLOSING TITLES @ 1 hr 8 min 26 sec <

Written, Directed, Produced,
Filmed and Edited

by Dr. Richard Widick

Orfalea Center For Global & International Studies
University of California, Santa Barbara

International Institute of Climate Action & Theory

Metroglobe Productions

EXECUTIVE PRODUCERS

Michael K. Dorsey
John Foran
Richard Widick

MUSIC / samples

"Earth Song," by Michael Jackson
Produced by Malik Jusef/Randy McDermott
HOME (2014/BMI)

"War on the Workers," sung by Bonnie Raitt
Street recording by Richard Widick, December 1, 1999
Seattle, Washington, World Trade Organization protests

"Rise" by the Flobots
FIGHT WITH TOOLS (2007/Universal Republic)

"Cisza," by Kamil Bednerek
JESTEM (2012/Lou & Rocked Boys)

Radio Lima, Background Radio Sounds recorded by Ricahrd Widick
Lima, Peru, December 2014

UNFCCC Opening Plenary Sound - recorded live by Richard Widick
Lima, Peru, COP 20, December 1, 2014,

"Snowblack," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Buffalo," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Strung Out," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Argos," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Steganos," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Ad Nocturn," by Coleman Horn
THE HONEY SACRIFICE (2010/Neo Ouija)

"Kura Uone (Grow Up & You Will See)," by Bongo Maffin
NEW CONSTRUCTION (2005/Gallo Records)

"I Do (Remix)," by Simi
Single - (2011/First Concepts ITL LTD)

Additional footage: Carbon Markets - Trading With Our Future, Heydon
Prowse, Director, 2011

Special thanks: United Nations Photo Archive

Stay tuned to this channel
for new releases (periodically)
between September 1 and November 15, 2015

See detailed film theory and production notes at
IICAT.ORG

Follow the serial release
on our dedicated YouTube Channel
CLIMATE DEADLINE

... also on Twitter [@iicat_richard](https://twitter.com/iicat_richard)