

If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

TODAY'S "QUICK HIT": PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD: WHY BOTH THE LEFT AND RIGHT SHOULD WANT OUT!



By Stephen L. Bakke  June 2, 2017

Here's what provoked me:

Hey SB! I think the withering uproar surrounding Trump's withdrawal from the Paris climate accord might drown out all the other crap raining down on our President. Either way, the guy is imperturbable, and is trying to do what he promised. That is one thing his violent detractors must admit. Give me your initial thoughts following the announcement on Thursday the 1st of June. Isn't there any common ground to be found in this debate on the Paris climate accord. – Stefano Bachovich – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit.

Here's my response:

Paris Climate Accord: Why Both the Left and Right Should Want Out!

Set aside the philosophical and scientific arguments about climate change. There's plenty remaining that liberals and conservatives can agree on. If the following things were considered, both sides could support Trump's "Paris withdrawal" and move on to rational programs:

- The Paris climate accord was a treaty. The U.S. was an outlier by not bringing it to the Senate for approval, as is constitutionally required. Other countries did have it ratified.
- Trump could have taken the easy way out by submitting the accord to the Senate for ratification where it was DOA. Trump thereby kept the concept of renegotiation alive.
- The U.S. already leads in CO2 emission improvement, even without the agreement.
- Several large countries were exempt from the agreement's requirements until 2030, thereby effecting a "wealth transfer" from the U.S. to less developed economies – e.g. China, India, et al.
- U.N. officials have, over the last decade been frequently quoted stating the real goal of these climate agreements would be massive wealth transfer.
- Worldwide CO2 emission reduction will be heavily dependent on clean natural gas. The ideology of this agreement did not bode well for exploiting natural gas.
- For those who are against the use of coal, the agreement doesn't introduce a quick reduction in coal production and usage – rather it eliminates it in the U.S. and moves it to developing countries.
- The agreement doesn't adequately exploit the potential for a nuclear solution. Nuclear energy is vital to any solution that makes a dramatic reduction in CO2 emissions.

An advantage has been gained that can be shared by the entire political spectrum.