



We'll match all the cash back you've earned at the end of your first year.*

SPIN AGAIN

*See Terms. Only for new card



The Paris climate accord attempts the Herculean task of bringing together the three E's — environmental policy, energy policy and economic policy. Make no mistake: There are complex and nuanced scientific and political issues surrounding the three E's.

The accord, unfortunately, overreaches politically. Rather than staying focused on legitimate ways to quickly reduce large volumes of carbon dioxide, the accord ascribes climate change to humans, prescribes renewable energy as the solution and urges wealth redistribution as the mechanism to pay for it. Perhaps it's not a surprise that blue states in the United States support it and red states do not. Unfortunately, this skewed political approach serves mostly to highlight differences and polarize people and nations. More importantly, it will not solve the emissions challenge.

Perspectives on climate change range from complete human responsibility for current warming, resulting in major global impact, to proportionate influence of humans on natural climate change, recognizing the limited effect that the accord's emissions cuts will have on future warming — even if the cuts are fully implemented.

The 195 countries that signed the accord were motivated by various circumstances and desires. For example, some countries are not required to alter their current energy plans. Others will be paid to do just that. Some see climate change as having a negative impact on themselves. Many have a need for increased

Most people agree that global wealth inequality is unhealthy. Three billion people live in various states of deep poverty, with limited access to clean water, food, housing, education, health care or hope. The philosophies to address inequality range from full-scale wealth redistribution on the left to a growing global economy lifting undeveloped nations from poverty on the right. The accord moves hard left by urging a wealth-redistribution approach.

Research validates the relationship between access to energy and wealth, and the related relationship between lack of access to energy and poverty. Affordable and reliable energy is required to lift underdeveloped nations and impoverished people from poverty. Secure energy literally powers every aspect of modern society, and it underpins healthy and growing economies. Today, 86 percent of global energy comes from fossil fuels: oil, natural gas and coal.

The accord prescribes a rapid shift from "bad" fossil energy to "good" renewable energy. But no form of energy is "good" or "bad" environmentally. True, fossil fuels emit carbon dioxide when combusted for transportation and power generation, while wind and solar do not. But let's not kid ourselves. All forms of energy *at scale* have negative environmental impacts.

In addition to well-documented wildlife damage, a vast amount of land and mining will be needed to manufacture and install the necessary number of wind turbines, solar panels and solar mirrors to make a dent in global demand; to erect the transmission towers and power lines to distribute the electricity; and to manufacture and dispose of the very large batteries required to power electric cars and back up intermittent wind and solar. By labeling renewables as "good," the accord sides with political liberals.

Paris showed that it is possible to get many nations to sign a common environmental accord. Unfortunately, the accord conflated action on climate change with energy and wealth-inequality politics. An apolitical focus on emissions, one that avoids picking energy winners and payment schemes, could result in an agreement that would address emissions at scale. Addressing carbon emissions at scale and in the time frames required must include nuclear power, increased energy efficiency, natural gas and even coal, where the economics and geology allow the emissions to be captured and sequestered.

Underdeveloped and developing nations need access to *all forms* of energy so that they can create robust economies of their own and afford the cost of adaptation and environmental stewardship.

Scott Tinker is a geology professor and director of the Bureau of Economic Geology at the University of Texas at Austin. Email: scott.tinker@beg.utexas.edu

What's your view?

Got an opinion about this issue? [Send a letter to the editor](#), and you just might get published..

VIEW COMMENTS

COMMENTARY OPINION CLIMATE CHANGE ENERGY ENVIRONMENT

Get the most important D-FW News in Your Inbox

Sign up for our daily email newsletters

Get Headlines, Business, SportsDay, and GuideLive. [Change](#)...

- Daily Headlines
- Business Report
- SportsDay
- GuideLive (weekly)

SIGN UP NOW

2017 Top Medicare Plans

See Top Instant Rates Comparison. Compare Medicare Supplement Quotes! medigap.com/Medicare_Plans



OPINION

LOADING...

- About Us
- Careers
- Advertise
- Contact Us
- Special Sections

- FAQ
- Privacy Policy
- Terms of Service
- Site Map

©2017, The Dallas Morning News Inc. All Rights Reserved.

For the homeless,
the summer heat
could be deadly.

