

Frequently asked questions for collapse stopped, our future uncompromised

Contact: Birgit van Munster, Michael Wadleigh, +44 7538 416 407

OurFutureUncompromised@gmail.com

Q: What's wrong with the IPCC science, 'for 1.5°C cut global CO₂ 50% by 2030, net zero by 2050'?

A: Everything.

First, it is “cut by 10 years and 30 years from now” and we must shift from future targets to action now or the cuts will not happen;

Second, it is global one-size-fits-all which violates the UN principles of responsibility and capability; “Cut 50% by 2030” should read “cut 7.6% NOW this year, increasing with inaction, with developed nations reducing more and lesser developed nations reducing less or increasing”.

Third, what is hidden is that for a fifty-fifty chance to limit the warming to 1.5°C, (a) remove billions of tonnes of CO₂ from the atmosphere (negative emissions) which science warns may not be possible; (b) halve the predicted global population growth during this century and (c) reduce global emissions by 11.5% per year between 2020 and 2030, currently emissions are still increasing.

All of this is withheld from public knowledge.

Q: Won't Sustainable Development be achieved by the UN 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

A: No. SDGs are not sustainable development and not science, they are “wanted development” goals determined by politicians consulting millions of global citizens. They are good development goals and should be achieved - but they fail to address the massive reductions required in resource consumption and GHG emissions to actually achieve sustainable human development.

Q: How can we actually achieve Sustainable Development including holding Global Warming to 1.5°C / 2°C?

A: An agreement by UN's 197 nations is required based on science and responsibility; for example Sweden should reduce natural resource consumption 4%, reduce CO₂ emissions 6% for 2°C and 21% for 1.5°C per year now by law increasing with inaction; Tanzania can increase consumption 5%, increase CO₂ 3% for 2°C, 1% for 1.5°C per year – for all nations OurFutureUncompromised.org.

Q: What will achieve Sustainable Development?

A: “Sustainable Development” has been internationally agreed to be that “future generations” will not be “compromised” in their “need” for natural resources, nature from which all humans, products and life are made. The UN International Resource Panel (IRP), our best natural resource scientists have concluded that what is required is 7 tonnes per capita per year consumption by 2050; this includes all biomass, metals, minerals and fossil fuels but not fresh water and soil loss.

Q: How do we stop biodiversity and species loss?

A: Natural resource extraction and processing is currently responsible for more than 90% of global biodiversity loss (IRP), to stop the loss nations should limit their resource consumption to 7 tonnes per capita sustainable science limit by 2050.

Q: Shouldn't everyone not fly, not eat meat, stop all food waste, plastic pollution and the like, isn't this the answer?

A: No.

Aviation is a very small 1.5% of global greenhouse gas emissions (EDGAR), low meat diets reduces global GHG only 7% by 2050 (IPCC); food waste is a small 1.4% of global natural resource consumption and plastic pollution is a nearly invisible 1/12,000th. It is very unlikely that “everyone” - 7.7 billion humans - will voluntarily do these actions to realize these reductions.

All these are good actions but as you can see from these numbers, they are completely inadequate to achieve the objective of sustainable development including global warming held to 1.5°C / 2°C and for these, national laws are required into which reductions by these actions will contribute to the national reduction total.

Q: Why by national law, why not action by cities, companies, citizens?

A: To ‘save our future’ natural resource consumption and emissions must be limited. Limits require laws. No one questions the need for speed limit laws: one does not rely on voluntary action but on laws. There is no global government that can make global laws; 197 nations are the fewest numbers of entities that make laws, national laws, that coordinate and direct the actions of individuals, businesses, cities to achieve the required national consumption and emissions reductions.

Q: The reductions specified for Very High Developed countries are science - but are huge, aren't they impossible?

A: If they are “impossible” then the scientific evidence is that nature destruction and emissions limits will be exceeded causing social-economic collapse - as Einstein might have said, “The laws of man must obey the laws of nature, or man will not survive”.

Victory in war can cost up to 50% of GDP. However, highly developed rich nations intend to spend about 1-2% of GDP for the existential objective of sustainable development including climate stabilization – equal to the cost of just one cup of Starbucks coffee per person per day. This will likely ensure global social-economic collapse. But if 10% of GDP is spent - fairly distributed - “impossible” reductions are possible.

Q: Why aren't “pledges” used?

A: “Pledges”, “ambitions” and “intentions” are not real physical reality science; they may or may not happen. Actions specified for now this year can be increased or decreased next year if this year's real physical reality action is insufficient.

Q: Why per capita, why not national total?

A: The UN standard to evaluate or monitor is per capita. The UN Human Development ranking for example is based on life expectancy -, education - and income **per capita**. If “life expectancy”, “years of education”, “income” of all citizens are added together for a national total, it will become meaningless, the countries with the highest population will generally be ranked at the top; China, India and the like will tend to be number 1. This is not very useful.

Q: IPCC seems to never use per capita, only global or national totals.

A: IPCC is “Intergovernmental” and IPCC’s Summaries for Policymakers are approved line by line by governmental politicians who may and do fundamentally revise and reject parts of the science. Any single one government can insist on deletion or change on a purely political, not scientific basis. Governments of very high per capita emitting and consuming nations – including EU and US - do not view it in their interest to have per capita known. In comparison, IRP is the “International” Resource Panel, humanity’s global authority on natural resources and per capita resource use is central in their reports.

Q: What is “Our Future Uncompromised”?

A: It is science to realize the global existential UN objectives of sustainable development including climate stabilization.

Q: Who wrote the statement?

A: The statement is a distillation of the actions required by science to realize sustainable development and climate stabilization.

Q: Tell me about yourself.

A: My personal story is that to save my future I must demand that governments enact laws to reduce consumption and emissions now to the science limits, starting with the most responsible and capable nations like my own.

If you have more questions - Birgit van Munster, Michael Wadleigh, +44 7538 416 407
OurFutureUncompromised@gmail.com