The Trump administration has issued its first written notification that the US intends to withdraw from the 2015 Paris climate agreement. But in the notice to the United Nations the US state department said Washington would remain in the talks process.

President Donald Trump drew international condemnation in June when he first announced the US intention to withdraw. He said the deal "punished" the US and would cost millions of American jobs.

Friday’s announcement is seen as largely symbolic as no nation seeking to leave the pact can officially announce an intention to withdraw until 4 November 2019. The process of leaving then takes another year, meaning it would not be complete until just weeks after the US presidential election in 2020. Any new US president could then decide to rejoin the agreement.

"Today, the United States submitted a communication to the United Nations in its capacity as depositary for the Paris Agreement regarding the US intent to withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as it is eligible to do so," the US statement read.

"The United States will continue to participate in international climate change negotiations and meetings... to protect US interests and ensure all future policy options remain open to the administration."

In June, Mr Trump indicated he was open to another climate deal "on terms that are fair to the United States". However, key signatories to the accord quickly ruled that out. The Paris Agreement took decades to finalize. The US stance on climate change also caused divisions at the G20 summit in Germany last month.

Hawking: Trump’s climate stance could damage Earth
How has the world reacted?
Tech leaders defy Trump

A joint summit statement said it "took note of the decision of the United States of America to withdraw from the Paris Agreement". However, leaders of the other G20 members agreed the accord was "irreversible".

What was agreed in Paris?
Climate change, or global warming, refers to the damaging effect of gases, or emissions, released from industry, transportation, agriculture and other areas into the atmosphere.
Officials at the US Environmental Protection Agency are consulting global-warming sceptics as they weigh up a technical review.

EPA administrator Scott Pruitt rejects well-established climate science.

A sweeping US government report on the state of climate-change science is nearing the finish line, but researchers who wrote it aren’t ready to relax just yet. Federal scientists have twice reviewed the roughly 600-page document — which examines everything from shifting weather patterns to rising sea levels — as have the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Just one hurdle remains, but it may be the highest: final sign-off by top officials in President Donald Trump’s administration, many of whom are sceptical of climate science.

Although there have not yet been any signs of trouble, researchers are keeping a close eye on how the White House and federal agencies handle the science report — a technical prelude to the fourth National Climate Assessment, a legally mandated analysis of the causes and impacts of global warming that is due in 2018.

Many climate scientists are particularly uneasy about the potential for interference by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), one of 13 agencies that must approve the science report before its expected release in November. EPA administrator Scott Pruitt, who rejects well-established climate science, has raised the possibility of organizing an adversarial “red team–blue team” review of such research. And he has help from the Heartland Institute, a think tank in Chicago, Illinois, that promotes scepticism about climate change.

Related stories
• Seek climate advice through established routes
• How scientists reacted to the US leaving the Paris climate agreement
• Trump pulls United States out of Paris climate agreement

“We can’t allow science to be held hostage,” says Donald Wuebbles, a climate scientist at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and co-chair of the report. “I’m hopeful it won’t get to that, because it would look really bad for the administration to fight this.”

It wouldn’t be the first time that a Republican president had sought to stymie the United States’ national climate-assessment process. The administration of George W. Bush came under fire for ignoring the first National Climate Assessment, which was released by then-President Bill Clinton in 2000. After the Bush administration subsequently missed the legal deadline in 2004 to complete a second assessment, environmentalists sued the government in federal court to compel the report’s release — and won.

The message of the latest science report — that human-caused global warming poses urgent problems for the United States — isn’t likely to sit well with the White House. The Trump administration has sought to repeal environmental regulations and cut climate research. Energy secretary Rick Perry has joined Pruitt in questioning climate science. And Pruitt’s chief of staff, Ryan Jackson, once worked for Senator James Inhofe (Republican, Oklahoma), a prominent climate sceptic.

“It would look really bad for the administration to fight this.”

“This is going to be the first big test in the climate arena,” says Tammy Dickinson, who led the energy and environment division at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) under president Barack Obama. One major issue, she adds, is that Trump has yet to fill many positions at the OSTP — which has coordinated work on the last three government climate assessments — or high-level science posts at federal agencies that work on climate change.

At the EPA, rank-and-file staff say that they haven’t been told who will sign off on the science report, or how the OSTP will manage the final review process. Agency scientists told Nature that climate change has become taboo in their discussions with EPA leadership. The fact that agency leaders have consulted with climate sceptics has only added to the confusion.

One EPA official, who asked for anonymity because of career concerns, provided Nature with two lists circulating among Pruitt’s team that seem to have been compiled by the Heartland Institute. One list, labeled “climate scientists”, contains the names of more than 140 people, including many climate sceptics; the second names several dozen climate economists.

The Heartland Institute would not comment on the documents, but a spokesman confirmed that Heartland has provided the EPA with names of people for a climate science ‘red team’. Many agency researchers assume that Pruitt will use the lists to assemble that team, but some fear that it could be used to identify candidates for empty slots on the EPA’s Board of Scientific Counselors, which advises the agency’s research arm. An EPA spokeswoman declined to comment on the lists or the
Sir Richard Branson has said businesses and cities are firmly behind a transition to low-carbon energy, which made Trump’s decision to exit the Paris deal “very, very strange.”

Speaking in Brooklyn on Friday, the Virgin Group founder said businesses and cities were firmly behind a transition to low-carbon energy, which made Trump’s decision to exit the Paris deal “very, very strange.”

“With climate change, it’s America first and our beautiful globe last, and that seems incredibly odd,” said Branson. “I’ve got a feeling that the president is regretting what he did. Maybe his children and son in law [adviser Jared Kushner] are saying, ‘Look, I told you so.'”

On Sunday, French president Emmanuel Macron said he was hopeful that Trump would reverse his decision, according to the newspaper Dimanche.

“[Trump] told me that he would try to find a solution in the coming months,” Macron told the paper, referring to meetings the two leaders had this week in Paris. “We spoke in detail about the things that could make him come back to the Paris accord.”

The US is set to become one of only three sovereign nations in the world not to be part of the Paris accord, which aims to stem dangerous global warming. Of the other two, Nicaragua feels the agreement does not go far enough, and Syria is mired in a disastrous civil war.

Branson said his companies would join the “France 2017” campaign – a coalition of hundreds of businesses, cities and universities committed to keeping the US’s emissions reduction goals.

Companies from Apple and Facebook to oil giants Exxon and BP urged Trump to stick with the Paris agreement, only for the president to fulfill his election pledge to jettison the pact.

There’s no guarantee he’ll change his mind. Who knows what goes on there. The Paris decision was a bizarre mistake

Sir Richard Branson

“Trump had hundreds of the most influential business leaders in the world speaking to him and he ignored them, so there’s no guarantee that he’ll change his mind,” Branson said.

“Who knows what goes in there,” he added, pointing to his head. “The Paris decision was a bizarre mistake.”

“You have people in America who believe the world was made 5,000 years ago. There are some strange people out there who have got into heady positions in the American government. You have the strange position of a cabal of people with very influential positions in America making these decisions.”

Branson admitted that he was unlikely to sway Trump, given his previous criticism of the president. In October, the British entrepreneur recalled a one-on-one lunch several years ago during which the future president explained how he was going to destroy five people who were unwilling to help him after one of his bankruptcies.

Branson said the lunch was “bizarre” and showed Trump’s “vindictive streak.” However, he said he would advise Trump to drop his pro-fossil fuels stance and help phase out the ailing US coal industry.

The EPA is supposed to be using the best science out there,” she says. “They can’t just suddenly say the Earth is flat, CO2 is not a pollutant and coal is the best thing for the world.”
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“We are leaving governments behind, it’s completely inverted,” he said. “I believe we will find a way back into Paris. That’s not coming from any deep knowledge, but because of the engagement on the issue.”

Branson was in New York to promote DS Virgin Racing, which competes in the Formula E electric racing series. Another of his companies, Virgin Atlantic, is part of an airline industry responsible for around 2% of global carbon dioxide emissions. He said cleaner fuel and more efficient plane designs were getting “closer step by step”.

“I was told 10 years ago it wasn’t possible to get across the Atlantic with a plane carrying a battery powered by clean energy before 2050, because of the weight of it and so on,” he said.

“But the way things are moving, it’s quite possible that a battery driven plane could carry a plane full of passengers across the Atlantic by 2030. The airline industry could tick that box [on reducing emissions] before some other industries.”

Why Macron might be best bet to bring U.S. back to Paris climate deal

By Sophie Yeo July 15 at 8:12 AM
President Trump’s suggestion during his visit with French President Emmanuel Macron that “something could happen with respect to the Paris agreement” awakened hopes that he just might be willing to reverse the decision to pull the United States out of the landmark climate agreement.

Laurence Tubiana, the French official who was one of the architects of the agreement endorsed by about 195 countries, said the comments suggest that Macron had managed to broach the topic with the president — and that Trump just might have been willing to give him a receptive hearing.

“He is saying, ‘I am listening to you and I am ready to continue the conversation.’ What is the nature of the conversation is not known,” she told The Washington Post.

It won’t be that simple for the United States to get back into the agreement, if it really does exit — itself a long and involved process. And some diplomats warned Macron against giving away too much to try to get Trump back in.

Trump made the comments standing alongside Macron during a news conference in Paris, where the landmark deal was signed in 2015.

“Yeah, I mean, something could happen with respect to the Paris accord. We’ll see what happens,” Trump told reporters. “But we will talk about that over the coming period of time. And if it happens, that will be wonderful, and if it doesn’t, that will be okay, too. But we’ll see what happens.”
U.S. President Trump and French President Emmanuel Macron discussed Russia, China, the Paris climate agreement and terrorism at a joint news conference on July 13. (Reuters)

Macron had earlier said that he hopes "to be able to persuade" Trump not to withdraw the United States from the deal.

Tubiana acknowledged there was "nothing revolutionary" in the president's remarks. Other politicians and diplomats across Europe also warned against reading too much into Trump's words.

Even as he promised to withdraw from the accord on June 1, Trump said he would be willing to renegotiate the terms of the Paris agreement to create "a new deal that protects our country and its taxpayers."

Diplomats regarded Trump's "something" as yet another reference to reopening the deal — a proposition that has already been dismissed by European leaders, including Macron.

"Until further advice or interpretation is given from Washington, I wouldn't see this as differing from that slight opening he gave when announcing withdrawal," Vidar Helgesen, Norway's minister of climate and environment told The Washington Post. He added that renegotiation would "not be on the table".

He also suggested that Trump could have been referring to remaining in the Paris agreement on that basis that the United States could significantly weaken its U.N. climate targets, known as its nationally determined contribution. The United States would be legally entitled to do so, said Helgesen, although he added it would be "against the spirit" of the deal.

"Until further advice or interpretation is given from Washington, I wouldn't see this as differing from that slight opening he gave when announcing withdrawal," Vidar Helgesen, Norway's minister of climate and environment told The Washington Post. He added that renegotiation would "not be on the table".

Others were more dismissive of the president's efforts to appease. "Yes, 'something could happen'! The American president could come to his senses and realize that he has just thrown away the opportunity for the U.S.A. to lead the technological revolution that is about to usher in a zero-carbon economy," said Barry Gardiner, the U.K. Labour Party's shadow minister for international climate change.

Diplomats attributed any potential softening on the president's part to the influence of Macron.

"This is very much Trump being wooed by Macron, who seems to be very good at handling Trump as a person. He wanted to say something more mollifying than just repeating his previous statement. I think Trump has this desire to be liked. Part of this was just
Mr. Trump, the Climate Change Loner

President Emmanuel Macron of France tried this week during President Trump's visit to Paris to get him to reverse his decision to take America out of the landmark global agreement on climate change, struck in December 2015 and since ratified by 195 nations. It was a futile exercise, as he must have known it would be.

At one point, Mr. Trump seemed to leave the door open for some unspecified compromise. But nobody knows what that would be. And in any case it is likely to be meaningless, because there is zero chance that he would reaffirm President Barack Obama's commitment to make meaningful reductions in America's greenhouse gas emissions, or seek to re-establish the leadership role that Mr. Obama occupied and that Mr. Trump has now abdicated.

In short, despite Mr. Macron's efforts, the gap between Mr. Trump and the rest of the world on climate remains as wide and unbridgeable as it was at the Group of 20 summit, the week before, when the final communiqué contained a robust commitment from 19 of the world's leading economic powers to fight climate change and one pathetic little sentence in which the United States said it would "endeavor" to "use fossil fuels more cleanly and efficiently." Mr. Trump had apparently hoped for some support from other big fossil fuel producers, like Russia and Saudi Arabia. This was not forthcoming, heartening those who feared (and still fear) that Mr. Trump's betrayal of America's commitments would cause other countries to backslide as well.

The unanswered question is whether the goals set in the Paris accord can be reached without United States participation. To recap briefly, the accord sought to limit the rise in atmospheric temperatures to a degree Celsius above preindustrial levels and 1.5 degrees if possible. To that end, Mr. Obama pledged to reduce America's greenhouse gases by 26 to 28 percent by 2025, largely through greater fuel efficiency for cars and light trucks, limits on methane emissions from oil and gas wells, and new rules governing emissions from new and old coal-fired power plants.

These are the very measures that Mr. Trump, through various executive orders, has instructed his two principal lieutenants in this war on science and sanity — Scott Pruitt at the Environmental Protection Agency and Ryan Zinke at the Interior Department — to delay, revise or obliterate entirely. He has issued further instructions to ramp up production of fossil fuels — coal, oil and natural gas — that are the main creators of carbon dioxide. Both men have taken to this task with speed and evident delight.

It makes one wonder what could conceivably change Mr. Trump's mind. He seems impervious to the broadly accepted science of global warming, and wholly unimpressed by evidence that the jobs he has promised his followers lie not in dying industries like coal mining but in renewables like wind and solar. Perhaps the giant iceberg that broke free of Antarctica will ring a little bell. The calving might or might not be related to climate change, and it will not by itself raise sea levels, since the shelf was already sitting in the water. But shelves hold back land-based glaciers, and when the shelves go, the glaciers tend to follow. In any case, nature has sent a message.

A more promising scenario is that someday Mr. Trump will awaken to the fact that the leaders of the world, who again and again have demonstratively turned their backs on him, regard him with astonishment and dismay. That on environmental issues he has turned the United States into a pariah. That he is as alone in the world as he seems to be.

But we can't bet on that either. We can hope, though, that the rest of the world will keep pushing, and that market forces and the march of technology will achieve the cleaner energy future that Mr. Trump seems unable to embrace.
French President Emmanuel Macron said he “respected” Donald Trump’s decision to pull out of the Paris climate accord but that France would remain committed.

“When we know what our differences are,” Mr Macron said in Paris on Thursday, adding that it was important to move forward.

Mr Trump then hinted that the US could shift its position but failed to elaborate.

“Something could happen with respect to the Paris accord,” he said.

Mr Trump added: “We'll see what happens.”

The US president withdrew from the 2015 Paris climate agreement last month, citing moves to negotiate a new “fair” deal that would not disadvantage US businesses.

Has Trump changed his mind about Paris?

Watch: Trump's awkward handshakes

Trump: Mood in the White House is ‘fantastic’

Unanswered questions for Trump Jr

Mr Macron said it was right to put the climate issue to one side while the two leaders discussed how they could work together on other matters such as the ceasefire in Syria and trade partnerships.

“We have disagreements. Mr Trump needed election pledges that he took to his supporters and I had pledges - should this hinder progress on all issues? No,” Mr Macron said.

Mr Macron and Mr Trump then talked about their countries’ joint efforts to combat terrorism and in particular the so-called Islamic State group in Syria and Iraq.

“The US is extremely involved in the Iraq war,” Mr Macron said, “I would like to thank the president for everything done by American troops in this area.”

“We agreed to continue our joint work,” he added, “in particular building the post-war roadmap.”

Mr Macron said that France would seek to “undertake several robust initiatives” to help produce greater stability and “control over the region”.

The US president then visited the tomb of Napoleon before Friday’s Bastille Day celebrations.

Air Force One touched down at Orly airport in Paris earlier on Thursday; Mr Trump and the First Lady emerging from their flight across the Atlantic in an effort to help strengthen US-France relations.

“Emmanuel, nice to see you, this is so beautiful,” Mr Trump said as he was met by Mr Macron at the Hotel des Invalides, near the site of Napoleon’s tomb.

Despite their clear differences, Paris has emphasised that Mr Macron will work to reaffirm historic ties between the two allies to prevent the US from being isolated.

Following the ceremony at Les Invalides the leaders moved on to the Élysée Palace.

Mr Trump will also have dinner with Mr Macron at the Eiffel Tower and watch the Bastille Day parade on the Champs-Élysées.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of US forces entering World War One, and for this occasion US and French troops will be marching together in the parade.

Speaking to the BBC, the former US diplomat and state department official, William Jordan, said the visit was likely to be viewed by Mr Trump as an opportunity for the US president to be “taken seriously in the world”.

“I think that there's a lot of symbolism in this,” he said, adding: “I doubt that there's going to be very much more beyond substantive discussion.”

Demonstrations are expected. French protesters have planned a “No Trump Zone” at the Place de la République. The Facebook page for the event states: “Trump is not welcome in Paris.”

Mr Trump’s visit comes amid fresh allegations of Russian interference in the 2016 US presidential election, with his eldest son admitting he held a “nonsense” meeting that had promised Russian government information about his father’s democratic rival Hillary Clinton.

Mr Trump has since described the mood in the White House as “fantastic” and told Reuters that the administration was “functioning beautifully”.

Federal court blocks Trump EPA on air pollution
An appeals court Monday struck down the Environmental Protection Agency’s 90-day suspension of new emission standards on oil and gas wells, a decision that could set back the Trump administration’s broad legal strategy for rolling back Obama-era rules.

In a 2-to-1 ruling, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit concluded that the EPA had the right to reconsider a 2016 rule limiting methane and smog-forming pollutants emitted by oil and gas wells but could not delay the effective date while it sought to rewrite the regulation.

The agency has proposed extending the initial delay to two years. Next Monday, there will be a separate administrative public hearing on that suspension.

"The court’s ruling is yet another reminder, now in the context of environmental protection, that the federal judiciary remains a significant obstacle to the president’s desire to order immediate change," Richard Lazarus, an environmental-law professor at Harvard Law School, said in an email.

"The D.C. Circuit’s ruling today makes clear that neither the president nor his EPA administrator, Scott Pruitt, can by fiat unilaterally and instantaneously repeal or otherwise stay the effectiveness of the environmental protection rules put into place during the Obama administration," he added.
The EPA, along with the American Petroleum Institute, had argued that the stay Pruitt imposed last month was not subject to judicial review, because it did not constitute final action on the rule. In a recent interview with The Washington Post, Pruitt said, "Just because you provide a time for implementation or compliance that’s longer doesn’t mean that you’re going to necessarily reverse or redirect the rule."

But the court rejected that interpretation, writing, "EPA’s stay, in other words, is essentially an order delaying the rule’s effective date, and this court has held that such orders are tantamount to amending or revoking a rule."

The ruling could affect myriad agencies that have delayed the Obama administration’s regulations, some for long periods. And it underscores the extent to which activists are turning to the courts to block President Trump’s most ambitious policy shifts.

Last month, for example, the Interior Department announced that it would delay compliance with a rule finalized in November that would limit methane burned off from drilling operations on federal and tribal lands. And the Labor Department just proposed delaying until December a rule that was set to take effect July 1 that would require companies to electronically report injuries and illnesses.

“The court says you can consider changing the rules but you have to do it the normal way, with a comment period,” said David Doniger, director of the climate and clean-air program at the Natural Resources Defense Council. “You can’t yank it out of existence on your say-so.”

Lazarus added, “Changing the rules midstream can occur only after a thorough administrative review, including public notice and opportunity to comment, that ensures that there are good reasons for the change, backed up by sound policy and science.”

EPA spokeswoman Amy Graham said in an email that the agency was “reviewing the opinion and examining our options” in light of the decision.

Executive actions issued by Trump, which have the full force of law. One is in the works. One was tried and failed.

Cabinet-level agency decisions from Trump’s executive branch. 23 more are in the works.

Congressional Review Acts targeting recently issued regulations. 20 were tried and failed.

New legislation passed by Congress, which could affect old laws. Two more are in the works.

Presidential Trump made climate change skeptic Scott Pruitt the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. Here’s what you need to know about him and his plans for the agency. (Photo: Jabin Botsford/The Washington Post)

The rule the EPA had sought to suspend had imposed the first-ever federal limits on leaks of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, from oil and natural-gas wells. It applied only to new or modified wells. The agency had previously projected that the rule would prevent 11 million metric tons of carbon-dioxide-equivalent emissions by 2025. Doniger said it would, so far, apply to about 11,000 wells drilled since September 2015.

Many of the industry’s largest companies have been working with the Environmental Defense Fund to measure leakage through the natural-gas system, including wells, pipelines, power plants and homes. The EDF said that reducing leaks would keep large quantities of smog-forming volatile organic compounds, cancer-causing benzene, and methane from being emitted into the air.

Pruitt has moved to suspend or revoke several other rules adopted during the Obama administration, including a two-year delay on a
regulation aimed at minimizing chemical accidents like the 2013 ammonium nitrate explosion at a plant in West, Tex.

Monday’s court ruling was sharply worded at points, with the judges dismissing “the flimsiness” of the EPA’s “claim that regulated entities had no opportunity to comment” on one aspect of the methane rule.

“The administrative record thus makes clear that industry groups had ample opportunity to comment on all four issues on which EPA granted reconsideration, and indeed, that in several instances the agency incorporated those comments directly into the final rule,” the judges wrote.

Reid Porter, a spokesman for the American Petroleum Institute, said in an email that the suspension of the rule would have allowed for "regulatory certainty" and that an EPA report in March concluded that methane emissions from petroleum production had already declined roughly 8 percent from 2014 levels.

"API supports revision of the 2016 New Source Performance Standards, and we are hopeful that the eventual outcome recognizes the science, allowing for revisions to the flawed rule," Porter said.

Even as one aspect of the administration’s push to promote domestic energy production faced a legal setback Monday, it advanced on a separate front. The Interior Department launched a new offshore-leasing planning process for 2019 to 2024, a move that could open up new areas for drilling in the Arctic, Atlantic and Pacific oceans, as well as the Gulf of Mexico.

In a Federal Register notice published Friday, the Interior Department invited public comment on a plan that would "replace the 2017-2022 Program" established during the Obama administration and represent "a key aspect of the implementation of President Donald J. Trump’s America-First Offshore Energy Strategy."

Brady Dennis contributed to this report.

Correction: An earlier version of this article said that the court struck down a two-year delay of the 2016 methane rule, not the EPA’s initial 90-day delay of the rule.

Merkel: Hamburg G20 to focus on Paris climate deal
Angela Merkel says tackling climate change remains a priority for Europe

Speaking to parliament on Thursday, Mrs Merkel also took a strong line on Mr Trump and his decision on climate change.

"The differences are obvious and it would be dishonest to try to cover that up. That I won't do," she said.

"The European Union unconditionally stands by its agreement in Paris and will implement it speedily and with determination.

"More than that: since the decision of the United States to leave the Paris climate agreement, we are more determined than ever to make it a success."

Taking what appeared to be a second swipe at Mr Trump, Mrs Merkel went on to say: "Those who think that the problems of this world can be solved with isolationism or protectionism are terribly wrong."

Mr Trump pulled the US out of the deal on 1 June, saying the Paris agreement was a deal that aimed to hobble, disadvantage and impoverish the US.

He claimed the agreement would cost the US $3tn in lost GDP and 6.5 million jobs - while rival economies like China and India were treated more favourably.

Mr Trump said he wanted to negotiate a "fair" deal for the US.

The decision places the US as one of just three countries which has not signed up to the deal. Nicaragua - which felt the agreement did not go far enough to tackle climate change - and Syria are the other two.

Political climate ‘not right’ for Erdogan rally

Mr Trump is not the only world leader Mrs Merkel could end up upsetting at the G20.

Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has asked to hold a political rally while he is in Hamburg.

However, according to Deutsche Welle, German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel has said "the political climate" is not right for any rally to go ahead.

The comment comes after a row broke out between the two countries earlier this year. It began when Mr Erdogan’s ministers were prevented from campaigning in Germany, where 1.4m Turks were eligible to vote, for an April referendum that broadened his constitutional powers.

At the time, he accused Berlin of “Nazi-style” behaviour.

President Erdogan has already been angered by German criticism of his crackdown on opponents following a coup attempt in 2016.

Schwarzenegger and Macron join forces in swipe at Trump
Schwarzenegger backs Macron in Trump fight

French President Emmanuel Macron has taken another swipe at Donald Trump over the US president’s policy on climate change - this time backed up by the muscle of Arnold Schwarzenegger.

In a video on social media, Mr Macron is joined by the Terminator star as he vows to “make the planet great again”.

“Make America great again” was Mr Trump’s presidential campaign slogan.

Mr Macron has been critical of the US president’s decision to withdraw from the 2015 Paris climate agreement.

Could this latest development, exposed in a post on Twitter on Friday, be the start of a new “political bromance”?

Speaking into his phone camera, Mr Schwarzenegger said that he and Mr Macron had been “talking about environmental issues and a green future” together.

The footage was posted on the social media site with the former film star and California governor saying he was “truly honoured” to meet Mr Macron, adding that the pair would “work together for a clean energy future”.

The 10-second clip runs for the full duration with the caption: “With President Macron, a great leader!”

Post-ABC poll: Nearly 6 in 10 oppose Trump scrapping Paris agreement

By Scott Clement and Brady Dennis
June 5 at 3:00 PM

Most Americans oppose President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, with a majority saying the move will damage the United States’ global leadership, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

Opposition to Trump’s decision outpaces support for it by a roughly 2-to-1 margin, with 59 percent opposing the move and 28 percent in support. The reactions also break down sharply along partisan lines, though Republicans are not as united in support of the withdrawal as Democrats are in opposition of it. A 67 percent majority of Republicans support Trump’s action, but that drops to 22 percent among political independents and 8 percent of Democrats. Just over 6 in 10 independents and 8 in 10 Democrats oppose Trump’s action.

Most oppose Trump decision to withdraw from major climate agreement

Q: Do you support or oppose Donald Trump’s decision to withdraw from the main international agreement that tries to address climate change?
WASHINGTON POST

The survey also finds broad skepticism toward Trump's argument that leaving the Paris agreement will benefit the U.S. economy. While 32 percent of respondents say his action will help the nation's economy, 42 percent say it will hurt and 20 percent say it will make no difference. On a separate question, slightly more people surveyed say that exiting the climate accord will cost jobs, such as those in renewable energy, than it will create jobs in the coal, oil and gas sectors.

Trump's decision to exit the landmark Paris climate agreement — a pact signed by more than 190 countries — drew criticism last week from U.S. allies, major companies and mayors of numerous U.S. cities, all of whom underscored their commitment to what they called the necessary task of combating climate change. Trump argued that the nonbinding agreement imposed "draconian financial and economic burdens on our country" and predicted it would cost Americans millions of jobs and the U.S. economy trillions of dollars — a stance critics quickly noted did not consider the health benefits from cutting emissions and the potential economic benefits of investments in clean energy.

[Fact-checking President Trump’s claims on the Paris climate-change deal]

On Sunday, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt said the Paris agreement was "a bad deal for this country" in an interview with NBC's "Meet the Press." "It's clear that the demerits, the efficacy both in environmental outcomes as well as the cost to us from a jobs perspective was a bad deal for this country," Pruitt said, arguing that the United States has already accomplished a great deal in reducing its carbon footprint.

Most Republicans support Trump exiting climate agreement, while most Democrats and independents are opposed

Q: Do you support or oppose Donald Trump’s decision to withdraw from the main international agreement that tries to address climate change?

Source: Washington Post-ABC News poll June 2-4, error margin +/- 5 percentage points among 527 adults
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The Paris deal essentially represented a promise by countries to hold the planet's warming to "well below" 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, and to aspire to a 1.5-degree limit if possible, in an effort to stave off the worst effects of global warming. Under
the deal, countries would set their own targets — and their own approaches — for reducing their emissions, with the aim of increasing the ambition of their targets over time. The United States, for instance, had agreed to cut greenhouse gases to 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.

"Someday we may see this as the moment when we decided to save our planet," President Barack Obama said last September as he and Chinese President Xi Jinping formally joined the Paris climate accord, a move that compelled other countries to follow suit and led to the landmark deal officially entering into force that fall. He added at the time, "History will judge today's efforts as pivotal."

With Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris agreement, the United States is abandoning its role as a global leader in the fight against climate change and instead joining only two other countries not participating in the accord: Syria, which is in mired in civil war, and Nicaragua, which refused to join because its leaders said the Paris deal did not go far enough to combat global warming.

Beyond economic concerns, the Post-ABC poll finds 55 percent saying Trump's decision will hurt U.S. leadership in the world, while 18 percent say it will help and 23 percent expect no impact. Even supporters of Trump's action expressed mixed views on this question, with 48 percent saying Trump's action will boost U.S. leadership, while 48 percent think it will make no difference or will harm the nation's standing. Among those who oppose Trump's decision, 77 percent say it will hurt American leadership.

More expect leaving climate agreement will hurt than help economy, U.S. leadership and international climate efforts

Q: Do you think Trump's decision will do more to help [ITEM], hurt it, or make no difference? Percent saying each "hurt"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Hurt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. leadership in the world</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l efforts to address climate change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. economy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage saying leaving climate agreement will "make no difference" or have no opinion not shown.

Source: Washington Post-ABC News poll June 2-4, error margin ±/– 6 percentage points among 527 adults
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Republicans are largely optimistic about the economic benefits of leaving the climate agreement, with more than three-quarters saying Trump's decision will help the economy and 73 percent saying it will create more jobs like those in traditional energy than it will cost in the renewable-energy sector.

The Energy 202 newsletter
Your daily guide to the energy and environment debate.

Independents are much more pessimistic on these questions, with just over one-quarter (26 percent) saying that leaving the agreement will help the economy and 33 percent saying it will create more jobs than it costs. As expected, Democrats are even more critical, with clear majorities saying that abandoning the Paris accord will cost jobs and hurt the economy.

The percentage of Americans who expect leaving the agreement will have negative consequences for international efforts to combat climate change and U.S. leadership more broadly is higher than the share who foresee positive consequences.

The Post-ABC poll was conducted Friday to Sunday among a random national sample of 527 adults, including users of cellular and
landline phones. The margin of sampling error for overall results is plus or minus five percentage points.

Emily Guskin contributed to this report.

WASHINGTON POST-ABC NEWS POLL JUNE 2-4, 2017

Most Americans oppose Trump's withdrawal from Paris Accord

Q: Do you support or oppose Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the main international agreement that tries to address climate change? Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Overall, do you think Trump's decision will help international efforts to address climate change, hurt it, or make no difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Hurt</th>
<th>Make no difference</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Overall, do you think Trump's decision will help the U.S. economy, hurt it, or make no difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Hurt</th>
<th>Make no difference</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Overall, do you think Trump's decision will help U.S. leadership in the world, hurt it, or make no difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Hurt</th>
<th>Make no difference</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let Trump claim a better deal on climate

If we can stomach it, a 'renegotiation' of the Paris Agreement could help us all, says Elliot Diringer.

14 June 2017

It was perhaps inevitable that Donald Trump would stand on the White House lawn to proclaim that the United States was quitting the Paris Agreement, our best hope ever for tackling climate change. It’s also plausible that the United States will not actually withdraw.

Like so many others, I was distressed at the images and words coming from the Rose Garden earlier this month. Having attended the 1992 Earth Summit where the global climate effort was born, spent years helping negotiators navigate their way to the 2015 Paris Agreement, and rallied companies to support the United States staying in, I could hardly bear to watch.

Trump was spurning fellow world leaders, the chief executives of many of the world’s largest companies, and a strong majority of Americans — for no evident reason other than to gratify his voting base, or simply to prove that he could.

Related stories

• How scientists reacted to the US leaving the Paris climate
The French video adds: “Major US companies from all sectors such as Exxon Mobil, Schneider Electric or Microsoft, disagree. It undermines US competitiveness and jobs.”

The French video goes on to refute the main arguments in the US video using new slides with text edits. For example, the US version asserts that the climate deal is a bad deal for America and the world. In the UN-brokered deal, which seeks to limit global temperature rises by 2100 to 2 degrees Celsius above levels recorded before industrialization.

The video, posted on Twitter by the French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, is France’s latest challenge of President Donald Trump’s decision to pull the United States out of the Paris climate accord. This time, French officials remade a White House video by editing captions that explain why the Paris climate accord was a “bad deal” for the US.

France taunts US by editing White House video on climate deal

By Hilary Clarke, CNN

Updated 1852 GMT (0252 HKT) June 3, 2017


Story highlights

French video “corrects” White House climate deal assertions

“Leaving the Paris Accord is a bad deal for America,” one caption reads (CNN) France is taunting the US on the Paris Agreement -- again.

This time, French officials remade a White House video by editing captions that explain why the Paris climate accord was a “bad deal” for the US.

The video, posted on Twitter by the French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, is France’s latest challenge of President Donald Trump’s decision to pull the United States out of the United Nations-brokered deal, which seeks to limit global temperature rises by 2100 to 2 degrees Celsius above levels recorded before industrialization.

In the original 45-second US video, the first slide reads, “The Paris Accord is a bad deal for America.” The new French version tweaks that line to read, “Leaving the Paris Accord is a bad deal for America and the world.”

WATCH the original White House video

The French video goes on to refute the main arguments in the US video using new slides with text edits. For example, the US version asserts that the climate deal undermines US competitiveness and jobs.

The French video adds: “Major US companies from all sectors such as Exxon Mobil, Schneider Electric or Microsoft, disagree.”

In the meantime, Trump says he is willing to rework the deal. That opening, if properly navigated, could produce another dramatic proclamation, this one keeping the United States in.

“The greater obstacle may be our own visceral aversion to letting Trump ‘get his way’.”

To be clear, the basic terms of Paris are not open for renegotiation. Other countries regard them as a sensible balancing of national interests against an urgent common threat. And they are weary of accommodating the vagaries of US climate politics. After all, this agreement, like the Kyoto Protocol, was designed largely to US specifications.

But there is a way to preserve the core agreement and still allow the president to declare that he’s secured a better deal.

A fundamental feature of the Paris Agreement is that countries’ individual contributions are “nationally determined”. Although the accord discourages parties from weakening their goals, it doesn’t forbid them from doing so. If President Trump doesn’t like former president Barack Obama’s target of shrinking greenhouse-gas emissions to 26–28% below 2005 levels in 2025, he’s free to change it.

Although many are loath to encourage a move so clearly contravening the spirit of the Paris Agreement, some of the countries most vulnerable to climate change openly acknowledge the option. Thoriq Ibrahim, environment and energy minister for the Maldives and chair of the Alliance of Small Island States, said, “If the US wishes to change its contribution, that would be unfortunate but is its prerogative.”

Why would the Maldives or anyone else be open to a weaker US target? For the same reasons so many of us worked so furiously to persuade Trump to stay in. For now, his announcement may have a galvanizing effect. But over time, the formal exit of the world’s largest economy risks corroding global ambition.

Today’s strong momentum to decarbonize can be only a start. We need a wholesale transformation of energy and transportation systems over the coming decades to even approach the Paris goal of keeping warming below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels. Countries will make their best efforts only if they’re confident that others, especially major competitors, will too.

That’s how Paris works: by strengthening confidence that everyone’s doing their part.

If the United States walks away, other countries will remain, but they’re likely to be less ambitious in meeting their initial targets, and in the next ones they’re due to set in 2020. Staying in, on the other hand, would also encourage US action by forcing a national conversation every five years around climate goals and measures. Better, on the whole, for the United States to be in than out.

How would this benefit Trump? The president has shown that he’s motivated more by the ‘deal’ than its substance, and that his extreme opening positions are just that. In the international realm alone, he’s retreated from his threat to quit the North American Free Trade Agreement, his promise to move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, his currency-manipulation changes against China, and his dismissal of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as obsolete. With his Rose Garden speech, Trump checked one box and drew another. He fulfilled his campaign pledge to leave Paris, and he told Americans he’s now going for a better deal. Coming back with a reduced target could be enticing precisely because it would allow him to claim another win.

The forces within the administration that goaded him to withdraw would no doubt persist. But the greater obstacle may be our own visceral aversion to letting Trump ‘get his way’. Our choice, in the end, may be between indulging a prideful charade or letting the United States leave. I, for one, hope we manage to keep Paris whole.
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Climate change: A patchwork of emissions cuts

Trump pulls United States out of Paris climate agreement

Climate change: A patchwork of emissions cuts

The ensuing global outrage won’t quickly subside. Nor, let us hope, will the groundswell of renewed climate commitment. Country after country has reaffirmed its support for Paris, and a spontaneous ‘We Are Still In’ campaign by US cities, states and companies offers hope that the United States can still get close to its Paris goal. The message from many is clear: forget Trump, we’ll do it without him.

It is better, I think, not to count him out yet.

Trump did not declare a clean break from the global climate effort. The United States remains a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the treaty underlying the Paris Agreement. (It also did when president George W. Bush rejected the 1997 Kyoto Protocol; had the United States not stayed then, Paris would probably never have emerged.) And the earliest the country can technically depart the Paris Agreement is 4 November 2020.

To be clear, the basic terms of Paris are not open for renegotiation. Other countries regard them as a sensible balancing of national interests against an urgent common threat. And they are weary of accommodating the vagaries of US climate politics. After all, this agreement, like the Kyoto Protocol, was designed largely to US specifications.

But there is a way to preserve the core agreement and still allow the president to declare that he’s secured a better deal.

A fundamental feature of the Paris Agreement is that countries’ individual contributions are “nationally determined”. Although the accord discourages parties from weakening their goals, it doesn’t forbid them from doing so. If President Trump doesn’t like former president Barack Obama’s target of shrinking greenhouse-gas emissions to 26–28% below 2005 levels in 2025, he’s free to change it.

Although many are loath to encourage a move so clearly contravening the spirit of the Paris Agreement, some of the countries most vulnerable to climate change openly acknowledge the option. Thoriq Ibrahim, environment and energy minister for the Maldives and chair of the Alliance of Small Island States, said, “If the US wishes to change its contribution, that would be unfortunate but is its prerogative.”

Why would the Maldives or anyone else be open to a weaker US target? For the same reasons so many of us worked so furiously to persuade Trump to stay in. For now, his announcement may have a galvanizing effect. But over time, the formal exit of the world’s largest economy risks corroding global ambition.

Today’s strong momentum to decarbonize can be only a start. We need a wholesale transformation of energy and transportation systems over the coming decades to even approach the Paris goal of keeping warming below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels. Countries will make their best efforts only if they’re confident that others, especially major competitors, will too. That’s how Paris works: by strengthening confidence that everyone’s doing their part.

If the United States walks away, other countries will remain, but they’re likely to be less ambitious in meeting their initial targets, and in the next ones they’re due to set in 2020. Staying in, on the other hand, would also encourage US action by forcing a national conversation every five years around climate goals and measures. Better, on the whole, for the United States to be in than out.

How would this benefit Trump? The president has shown that he’s motivated more by the ‘deal’ than its substance, and that his extreme opening positions are just that. In the international realm alone, he’s retreated from his threat to quit the North American Free Trade Agreement, his promise to move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, his currency-manipulation changes against China, and his dismissal of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as obsolete. With his Rose Garden speech, Trump checked one box and drew another. He fulfilled his campaign pledge to leave Paris, and he told Americans he’s now going for a better deal. Coming back with a reduced target could be enticing precisely because it would allow him to claim another win.

The forces within the administration that goaded him to withdraw would no doubt persist. But the greater obstacle may be our own visceral aversion to letting Trump ‘get his way’. Our choice, in the end, may be between indulging a prideful charade or letting the United States leave. I, for one, hope we manage to keep Paris whole.
Where the White House video claims the United States set up a $3 billion UN "slush fund," the French video points out that the US financial commitment to the "green climate" fund is less, per capita, than that of many other countries, including Germany and France.

Other edits include swapping "badly negotiated" for "comprehensively negotiated."

**MIT agrees with France**

In fact, the President misinterpreted MIT’s data, showing "a complete misunderstanding of the climate problem," said John Reilly, the co-director of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change and one of the study’s authors.

Trump in announcing his decision Thursday to pull out of the deal said, "Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a two-tenths-of-one-degree-Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100."

"The whole statement seemed to suggest a complete misunderstanding of the climate problem," Reilly said. "I think Paris was a very good deal for the United States, contrary to what they are claiming," Reilly told CNN.

"This one small step with Paris is a necessary step," he added. "It is an incredibly important step. If we don’t take the step, then we aren’t prepared to take the next step."

**France’s Emmanuel Macron: Birth of the anti-Trump?**

Emmanuel Macron has just won the rare distinction of being the most re-tweeted French person in history.

In less than 24 hours, his Trump-defying message "make our planet great again" was shared more than 140,000 times, easily ousting the previous record-holder, the rather less high-minded TV presenter Cyril Hanouna. One fifth of the re-tweets were in the US.

It is proof yet again that what we witnessed from the Elysee on Thursday was a master class in communications.

https://www.pscp.tv/w/1jMKgcdLycKL

**A growing fan club**

In giving his TV reaction to the US president, not only did Macron break brazenly with longstanding convention, according to which French presidents never speak publicly in English, but he even had the chutzpah to subvert the US leader’s personal campaign slogan.

"Make our planet great again" was a provocation dressed up as a call to virtue. As a catchphrase for the faithful, it was irresistible.

By tweeting it, Macron took one more step down his road to investiture as that long-awaited international figure: the anti-Trump.
The French leader has a growing fan club: in France, the US and across the globe, among people who see him as the polar opposite, the perfect antithesis of his counterpart in the White House. These people love the fact that with the arrival of Macron, the existing order appears to have been turned on its head. It used to be France that was old, inward-looking and incapable of regeneration, and America that was the land of youth, energy and leadership. But where is that caricature now?

And they adore the way that Macron had the nerve to face down Trump in the Brussels handshake. At last, they feel, we have a champion with the guts and the conviction to challenge the Trumpian order. Macron himself never planned any of this. When he first thought of running for the presidency, the chances of a Trump in the White House seemed too ludicrous to contemplate.

But not for the first time, the stars seem to have aligned for France’s boy-prodigy. Just as in domestic politics doors seemed to open miraculously for President Macron, so in the world of international affairs shifts of power and ideology are also working in his favour - for now.

Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi has vowed his country will go “above and beyond” the 2015 Paris accord on combating climate change. Speaking at a news conference with French President Emmanuel Macron, Mr Modi described the agreement as part of “our duty to protect Mother Earth”.

Several global leaders have criticised President Donald Trump’s decision to withdraw the US from the Paris accord. Mr Trump said the deal would impoverished the US and cost American jobs. The Paris agreement commits the US and 194 other countries to keeping rising global temperatures “well below” 2°C above pre-industrial levels and “endeavour to limit” them even more, to 1.5°C.
China and the European Union have restated their commitment to the agreement, while Mr Macron called Mr Trump’s decision a “mistake both for the US and for our planet”.

Speaking after a meeting with Mr Macron, Mr Modi said France and India had “worked shoulder to shoulder” on the Paris accord. “The Paris agreement is the common heritage of the world. It is a gift that this generation can give,” Mr Modi said. India is the world’s fourth-biggest emitter of carbon dioxide, after China, the US and the EU.

Michael Bloomberg: I’ll make sure UN gets $15 million it needs for Paris agreement

Billionaire Michael Bloomberg says he is ready to help foot the bill for the Paris Climate Agreement after President Trump announced his decision to pull the United States out of it. Bloomberg Philanthropies said Friday it will pull together $15 million to "support the operations" of the United Nation’s Framework Convention on Climate Change, the arm of the UN that coordinates the Paris pact. The $15 million would cover the U.S. share of the convention’s operating budget, according to Bloomberg spokesperson Carl Pope. The money will come from Bloomberg Philanthropies and its partners. "The pledge aims to fill a significant funding gap that comes as a result of President Donald Trump's announced withdrawal from the Paris agreement and proposed steep budget cuts for international programs, including on climate," the Bloomberg Philanthropies statement reads.

During Trump’s speech Thursday, he claimed that U.S. contributions to the Green Climate Fund -- a pool of money the United Nations uses to help countries implement clean energy tech -- and other environmental initiatives have placed a "draconian" burden on the United States. He vowed to stop making payments to the United Nations for such purposes. Bloomberg, the former New York City mayor who Forbes estimates has amassed a $50 billion fortune, said on Twitter the world "can't wait for governments to act on climate change."

We can’t wait for national governments to act on climate change. For solutions, look to cities. #ClimateofHope

Patricia Espinosa, the executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, called the Bloomberg Philanthropies financial commitment "crucial." "In order to achieve Paris in full and deliver a low emissions, resilient and more secure future for every man, woman and child, it is very encouraging to see that all actors reaffirm their willingness to work together," Espinosa said.

Bloomberg's charitable organization has long worked on environmental initiatives. Bloomberg Philanthropies' Clean Energy initiative, for example, has helped fund efforts to take coal-fired power plants offline. Bloomberg has been associated with both the Democratic and Republican parties. He now identifies as an independent. Bloomberg
is also the founder and CEO of Bloomberg -- a media and financial software company.

**Trump climate deal: US can fulfil pledges, says Michael Bloomberg**

The US can still meet its commitments to fight climate change, despite President Donald Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris accord, former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg has said.

He argued this could be done “through partnerships among cities, states and businesses”, saying Americans would not let Washington stand in their way.

Mr Bloomberg is the UN special envoy for cities and climate change.

Mr Trump said the 2015 Paris agreement would cost American jobs.

His decision, announced on Thursday, triggered widespread international condemnation.

China, the EU and India, which along with the US make up the four biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, restated their commitment to the accord.

It commits the US and 194 other countries to keeping rising global temperatures “well below” 2 degrees C above pre-industrial levels and “endeavour to limit” them even more, to 1.5C. The UN World Meteorological Organisation said that, in the worst scenario, the US pullout could add 0.3C to global temperatures by the end of the century.

“Americans don’t need Washington to meet our Paris commitments, and Americans are not going to let Washington stand in the way of fulfilling it,” Bloomberg said, following talks with French President Emmanuel Macron in Paris.

“I want the world to know that the US will meet its Paris commitments and that through partnerships among cities, states and businesses we will seek to remain part of the Paris agreement process.

“We are already halfway there and we can accelerate our process further even without any support from Washington,” Mr Bloomberg added.

**Trump ’does believe in climate change’, as US ambassador to UN**

US President Donald Trump “believes the climate is changing and he believes pollutants are part of the equation,” says the US ambassador to the UN. He know “the US has to be responsible for it and that’s what we’re going to do,” said Nikki Haley.

The president provoked widespread condemnation when he announced the US would withdraw from the Paris climate change agreement.

The US becomes one of only three countries outside its framework.

When he made the announcement, Mr Trump said the deal would hurt the US economy. He made no mention of climate change science.

During his election campaign, Mr Trump had said that climate change was a hoax and, since his announcement on Thursday, has avoided questions on the subject, as has White House press secretary Sean Spicer.

“Just because the US got out of a club doesn’t mean we aren’t going to care about the environment!” Ms Haley told CNN, adding that the terms of the Paris agreement, reached in 2015, were “too onerous”.

Scott Pruitt, the head of the US Environmental Protection Agency, said: “The world applauded when we joined Paris. And you know why? I think they applauded because they knew it would put this country at a disadvantage.”

Mr Trump said the agreement would cost the US $3tn (£2.3tn) in lost GDP and 6.5 million jobs - while rival economies like China and India were treated more favourably.

The president is “absolutely intent on making sure that we have clean air, clean water, that he makes sure that we’re doing everything we can to keep America’s moral compass in the world when it comes to the environment,” said Ms Haley.

Only war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, which believes the accords don’t go far enough, failed to sign the Paris agreement.

China, the EU and India, which along with the US make up the four biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, have restated their commitment to the accord.

“Just because the US got out of a club doesn’t mean we aren’t going to care about the environment!” Ms Haley told CNN, adding that the terms of the Paris agreement, reached in 2015, were “too onerous”.

Only war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, which believes the accords don’t go far enough, failed to sign the Paris agreement.

China, the EU and India, which along with the US make up the four biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, have restated their commitment to the accord.

“Just because the US got out of a club doesn’t mean we aren’t going to care about the environment!” Ms Haley told CNN, adding that the terms of the Paris agreement, reached in 2015, were “too onerous”.

Only war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, which believes the accords don’t go far enough, failed to sign the Paris agreement.
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“Just because the US got out of a club doesn’t mean we aren’t going to care about the environment!” Ms Haley told CNN, adding that the terms of the Paris agreement, reached in 2015, were “too onerous”.

Only war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, which believes the accords don’t go far enough, failed to sign the Paris agreement.

China, the EU and India, which along with the US make up the four biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, have restated their commitment to the accord.
China, the EU and India, which along with the US make up the four biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, have restated their commitment to the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change.

Top EU official Donald Tusk said at a summit with China that Brussels and Beijing would step up co-operation.

Mr Trump announced the US was leaving for economic reasons, saying the deal would cost American jobs.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said the US would still curb emissions.

Amid widespread international condemnation of the US decision, Russian President Vladimir Putin said he would "not judge" Mr Trump.

The Paris agreement commits the US and 194 other countries to keeping rising global temperatures "well below" 2°C above pre-industrial levels and "endeavour to limit" them even more, to 1.5°C.

The UN World Meteorological Organisation said on Friday that, in the worst scenario, the US pullout could add 0.3°C to global temperatures by the end of the century.

The big question the White House won’t answer
Will US cities take on the climate challenge?

What do the EU and China say?

European Council President Donald Tusk said after meeting Chinese Premier Li Keqiang that the two powers took their responsibilities seriously.

"Today, China and Europe have demonstrated solidarity with future generations and responsibility for the whole planet," he told reporters at a joint news conference.

Scientists dispute Trump climate data

Why is business as angry at the decision?

May accused of "subservience" to Trump

A spokeswoman for the Chinese foreign ministry, Hua Chunying, said China was ready to take a leading role in the fight against climate change.
"In the future, China will continue to tackle climate change in all ways, will proactively participate in the multilateral process of tackling climate change and resolutely uphold the global climate management process," she said.

Indian Environment Minister Harsh Vardhan said: "As far as the Paris accord is concerned... our government is committed, irrespective of the stand of anyone, anywhere in the world."

The group of the world's 48 least developed countries accused Mr Trump of showing disregard for millions of lives.

Scientists have warned the poorest countries across the globe will be the hardest hit by climate change as they lack capacity to cope with extreme weather events.

"Will China take over US role?"

Mr Trump characterised the Paris agreement as a deal that aimed to hobble, disadvantage and impoverish the US.

He said it would cost the US $3tn (£2.3tn) in lost GDP and 6.5 million jobs - while rival economies like China and India were treated more favourably.

Mr Trump said he was fulfilling his "solemn duty to protect America and its citizens".

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said the US had a "terrific record on reducing our own greenhouse gas emissions".

The head of the US Environmental Protection Agency, Scott Pruitt, said exiting the Paris Agreement did not mean disengagement.

"The president said yesterday that Paris represents a bad deal for this country," he told reporters at the White House.

"It doesn’t mean that we’re not going to continue the discussion to export our innovation, to export our technology to the rest of the world, to demonstrate how we do it better here."

Five effects of US pullout

How has the world reacted?

Tech leaders defy Trump

The Russian president said he thought the US did not need not to abandon the Paris Agreement because it was a "framework".  

"The president said yesterday that Paris represents a bad deal for this country," he told reporters at the White House.

"It doesn’t mean that we’re not going to continue the discussion to export our innovation, to export our technology to the rest of the world, to demonstrate how we do it better here."
Can it all be renegotiated?

Under the terms of the agreement, the US cannot complete its withdrawal until just weeks after the US presidential election in 2020. US payments to the UN Green Climate Fund, which helps developing countries cope with the effects of climate change, will stop. The US has reportedly so far paid $1bn (£780m) of a $3bn pledge.

Will this hurt Trump?

World media look to green future sans US

What are they saying in America?

The Democratic governors of New York, California and Washington states all quickly vowed to respect the terms of the Paris deal.
However, Republican congressional leaders and the US coal industry backed the move, with Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell supporting Mr Trump “for dealing yet another significant blow to the Obama administration’s assault on domestic energy production and jobs”.

Trump climate deal pullout: The global reaction

President Donald Trump’s announcement that the US is withdrawing from the 2015 Paris climate agreement has drawn strong reaction from supporters and opponents inside America and around the world.

Former President Barack Obama, who negotiated the Paris deal for the US

“[The nations that remain in the Paris Agreement] will be the nations that reap the benefits in jobs and industries created. I believe the United States of America should be at the front of the pack. But even in the absence of American leadership, even as this Administration joins a small handful of nations that reject the future; I’m confident that our states, cities, and businesses will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we’ve got.”

French President Emmanuel Macron

“Tell me firmly tonight: We will not renegotiate a less ambitious accord. There is no way. Don’t be mistaken on climate; there is no plan B because there is no planet B.”

Elon Musk, entrepreneur and Tesla Inc CEO who had served on a White House advisory council
"Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world."
@elonmusk
US Senator Bernie Sanders, former Democratic presidential candidate

"At this moment, when climate change is already causing devastating harm around the world, we do not have the moral right to turn our backs on efforts to preserve the planet for future generations."
Democratic Mayor of New York, Bill de Blasio

"President Trump can turn his back on the world, but the world cannot ignore the very real threat of climate change. This decision is an immoral assault on the public health, safety and security of everyone on this planet. On behalf of the people of New York City, and alongside mayors across the country, I am committing to honour the goals of the Paris agreement with an executive order in the coming days, so our city can remain a home for generations to come."
Democratic former US Secretary of State John Kerry

"The president who promised "America First" has taken a self-destructive step that puts our nation last. This is an unprecedented forfeiture of American leadership which will cost us influence, cost us jobs, and invite other countries to walk away from solving humanity's most existential crisis. It isolates the United States after we had united the world."
Republican US House Speaker Paul Ryan

"The Paris climate agreement was simply a raw deal for America. Signed by President Obama without Senate ratification, it would have driven up the cost of energy, hitting middle-class and low-income Americans the hardest.

"I commend President Trump for fulfilling his commitment to the American people and withdrawing from this bad deal."
US Senate Democratic Leader Chuck Schumer

"President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement is a devastating failure of historic proportions. Future generations will look back on President Trump's decisions as one of the worst policy moves made in the 21st century because of the huge damage to our economy, our environment and our geopolitical standing."
Republican Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell

"I applaud President Trump and his administration for dealing yet another significant blow to the Obama administration's assault on domestic energy production and jobs. President Obama made commitments in this deal based on a costly power plan that we knew at the time was on shaky legal ground. By withdrawing from this unattainable mandate, President Trump has reiterated his commitment to protecting middle-class families across the country and workers throughout coal country from higher energy prices and potential job loss."
Peabody Energy, largest coal mining firm in the US

"Peabody supports the administration's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. We believe that abiding by the accord, without significant changes, would have substantially impacted the US economy, increased electricity costs and required the power sector to rely on less diverse and more intermittent energy. Peabody continues to advocate for greater use of technology to meet the world's need for energy security, economic growth and energy solutions through high efficiency low emissions coal-burned power plants and research and development funding for carbon capture."
Paul Bailey, president of the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCC)

"We support President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. The previous administration voluntarily to met one of the most stringent goals of any country in the world, while many other countries do far less to reduce their emissions. Meeting President Obama's goal would have led to more regulations, higher energy prices, and dependence on less reliable energy sources."
UK Prime Minister Theresa May - a Downing Street statement
"The Prime Minister expressed her disappointment with the decision and stressed that the UK remained committed to the Paris Agreement. "The Paris Agreement provides the right global framework for protecting the prosperity and security of future generations, while keeping energy affordable and secure for our citizens and businesses."

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres (via spokesman Stephane Dujarric)
"The decision by the United States to withdraw from the Paris Agreement on climate change is a major disappointment for global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote global security. "It is crucial that the United States remains a leader on environmental issues."

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau

"We are deeply disappointed that the United States federal government has decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. Canada is unwavering in our commitment to fight climate change and support clean economic growth."

European Commission climate action commissioner Miguel Arias Cañete
"Today is a sad day for the global community, as a key partner turns its back on the fight against climate change. The EU deeply regrets the unilateral decision by the Trump administration to withdraw the US from the Paris Agreement."

Anne Hidalgo, Mayor of Paris

"No matter what decision is made by the White House, cities are honouring their responsibilities to implement the Paris Agreement. There is no alternative for the future of our planet."

President Frank Bainimarama of Fiji, which is organising the next UN annual climate meeting, COP23
"The decision by the Trump Administration to withdraw from the Paris Agreement on climate change is deeply disappointing, especially for the citizens of vulnerable nations throughout the world. "As incoming President of COP23, I did what I could - along with many leaders around the world - to try to persuade President Trump to remain standing shoulder-to-shoulder with us as, together, we tackle the greatest challenge our planet has ever faced. While the loss of America's leadership is unfortunate, this is a struggle that is far from over."

Hilda Heine, President of the under-threat Marshall Islands

"Today's decision is not only disappointing but also highly concerning for those of us who live on the front line of climate change. "The rest of the world remains firmly committed to the Paris Agreement and our own commitment to it, and that of our wider Pacific family, will never waiver."

**Bucking Trump, These Cities, States and Companies Commit to Paris Accord**

By HIROKO TABUCHI and HENRY FOUNTAIN

**JUNE 1, 2017**
Representatives of American cities, states and companies are preparing to submit a plan to the United Nations pledging to meet the United States’ greenhouse gas emissions targets under the Paris climate accord, despite President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the agreement.

The unnamed group — which, so far, includes 30 mayors, three governors, more than 80 university presidents and more than 100 businesses — is negotiating with the United Nations to have its submission accepted alongside contributions to the Paris climate deal by other nations.

“We're going to do everything America would have done if it had stayed committed,” Michael Bloomberg, the former New York City mayor who is coordinating the effort, said in an interview.

How Cities and States Reacted to Trump's Decision to Exit the Paris Climate Deal
President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement drew immediate reaction from big-city mayors, governors and Congress members.

By redoubling their climate efforts, he said, cities, states and corporations could achieve, or even surpass, the pledge of the administration of former President Barack Obama to reduce America’s planet-warming greenhouse gas emissions 26 percent by 2025, from their levels in 2005.

It was unclear how, exactly, that submission to the United Nations would take place. Christiana Figueres, a former top United Nations climate official, said there was currently no formal mechanism for entities that were not countries to be full parties to the Paris accord.

Ms. Figueres, who described the Trump administration’s decision to withdraw as a “vacuous political melodrama,” said the American government was required to continue reporting its emissions to the United Nations because a formal withdrawal would not take place for several years.

But Ms. Figueres, the executive secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change until last year, said the Bloomberg group’s submission could be included in future reports the United Nations compiled on the progress made by the signatories of the Paris deal.

There are 195 countries committed to reducing their greenhouse gas emissions as part of the 2015 agreement.

Still, producing what Mr. Bloomberg described as a “parallel” pledge would indicate that leadership in the fight against climate change in the United States had shifted from the federal government to lower levels of government, academia and industry.

Mr. Bloomberg, a United Nations envoy on climate, is a political independent who has been among the critics of Mr. Trump’s climate and energy policies.

Mayors of cities including Los Angeles, Atlanta and Salt Lake City have signed on — along with Pittsburgh, which Mr. Trump mentioned in his speech announcing the withdrawal — as have Hewlett-Packard, Mars and dozens of other companies.

Eighthy-two presidents and chancellors of universities including Emory & Henry College, Brandeis and Wesleyan are also participating, the organizers said.

Mr. Trump’s plan to pull out of the Paris agreement was motivating more local and state governments, as well as businesses, to commit to the climate change fight, said Robert C. Orr, one of the architects of the 2015 Paris agreement as the United Nations secretary-general’s lead climate adviser.

On Thursday, Gov. Jay Inslee of Washington, Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo of New York and Gov. Jerry Brown of California, all Democrats, said they were beginning a separate alliance of states committed to upholding the Paris accord.

“The electric jolt of the last 48 hours is accelerating this process that was already underway,” said Mr. Orr, who is now dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland. “It’s not just the volume of actors that is increasing, it’s that they are starting to coordinate in a much more integral way.”

The United States is about halfway to its 2025 emissions reduction target, Mr. Orr said. Of the remaining reductions, the federal government — through regulations like gas mileage standards for vehicles — could affect about half.

But in a draft letter to Antonio Guterres, the United Nations secretary-general, Mr. Bloomberg expressed confidence that “non-national actors” could achieve the 2025 goal alone.

“While the executive branch of the U.S. government speaks on behalf of our nation in matters of foreign affairs, it does not determine many aspects of whether and how the United States takes action on climate change,” he wrote.

“The bulk of the decisions which drive U.S. climate action in the aggregate are made by cities, states, businesses, and civil society,” he wrote. “Collectively, these actors remain committed to the Paris accord.”

Cities and states can reduce emissions in many ways, including negotiating contracts with local utilities to supply greater amounts of renewable energy, building rapid transit programs and other infrastructure projects like improved wastewater treatment. Similarly, corporations can take measures like buying renewable energy for their offices and factories, or making sure their supply chains are climate-friendly.

Governor Inslee said that states held significant sway over emissions. Washington, for example, has adopted a cap on carbon pollution, has invested in growing clean energy jobs and subsidizes electric vehicle purchases and charging stations.
“Our states will move forward, even if the president wants to go backward,” he said in a telephone interview.

America’s biggest corporations have been bracing for the United States to exit from the Paris climate accord, a move executives and analysts say would bring few tangible benefits to businesses — but plenty of backlash.

Multinational companies will still need to follow ever-stricter emissions laws that other countries are adopting, no matter the location of their headquarters. Automakers like Ford Motor and General Motors would still need to build cars that meet stringent fuel economy and emissions standards in the European Union, Japan and even China, not to mention California.

American companies also face the wrath of overseas consumers for abandoning what has been a popular global agreement — customers who could buy more Renaults instead of Chevrolets or Reeboks instead of Nikes.

“Pulling out of Paris would be the worst thing for brand America since Abu Ghraib,” said Nigel Purvis, a top environmental negotiator in the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations and the chief executive of Climate Advisers, a consulting firm.

“Mars stands by the Paris Climate Agreement,” said Grant Reid, the chief executive of Mars. The company, best known for its candies, remained committed, he said, to achieving “the carbon reduction targets the planet needs.”

Global warming is having a significant impact in Utah, she said, especially on water availability and quality. “We feel very strongly that we have an obligation to make sure we keep moving in the right direction on this issue,” she said.

“We really have to make choices that reflect our long-term goals, that really address long-term issues of today,” she added.
Buildings in the US and in other countries lit up bright green Thursday night in support of the Paris climate accord.

This comes on the heels of President Trump announcing that he was withdrawing the US from the Paris Agreement, but this didn’t stop some US governors and mayors from taking a stand.

New York Governor Andrew Cuomo directed that both the One World Trade Center and the Kosciuszko Bridge to be lit green in solidarity.

"The White House’s reckless decision to withdraw from the Paris Accord has devastating repercussions not only for the United States, but for our planet," Governor Cuomo said in a press release. "This administration is abdicating its leadership and taking a backseat to other countries in the global fight against climate change."
World: the Empire State stands with you. New York shines green for our planet, our health and our children’s future. #ParisAgreement

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio and Boston Mayor Marty Walsh also showed support by lighting up their city halls.

View image on Twitter
City Hall shines green tonight because New York City will honor the goals of the #ParisAgreement.
Mayor @marty_walsh shows support for the #ParisAgreement with City Hall's green LEDs tonight. Thanks Chief @patrickbrophy9 & @Boston_PFD.

In Washington, just steps away from the White House, the Wilson Building was also lit up green. Mayor Muriel Bowser tweeted that it was “in honor of DC’s continued commitment” to the Paris Agreement.

The Wilson Building lit green in honor of our commitment to combatting climate change.
The show of solidarity extended beyond the US, with Mexico City and Montreal, Canada and others also joining in.

Mexico City lighted city hall & monuments green to express his commitment to the #ParisAgreement #Cities4Climate
Paris agreement: Europe and China vow to keep fighting global warming

Beijing and Brussels join leaders around world in show of solidarity after Trump’s announces US pullout from climate accord
European and Chinese leaders have pledged to continue to combat global warming as widespread condemnation met Donald Trump’s announcement he was pulling the US out of the Paris climate accord.

The German chancellor, Angela Merkel, said Trump “can’t and won’t stop all of those of us who feel obliged to protect the planet.” She said the move was “extremely regrettable and that’s putting it very mildly.”

Leaders from around the world, major businesses and city mayors across America have criticised Trump’s decision, announced on Thursday, to withdraw the US from the global deal to cut greenhouse gas emissions agreed in Paris in December 2015.

Li Keqiang, the Chinese premier, joined Jean Claude Juncker, the European commission president, on Friday in a show of solidarity at an EU-China summit in Brussels. Both spoke of the importance of continued international cooperation to defeat global warming.

Junker said: “Our relationship is founded on a shared commitment to openness and working together as part of a rules-based international system, and I am glad we can be here today to say this loud and clear. There is no reverse gear to the energy transition. There is no backsliding from the Paris agreement.”

Li added: “The future of China and Europe will be brilliant and splendid.”

Merkel, speaking at a press conference in Berlin, said Germany would not sway from the goals set out in the Paris agreement. “Nothing can or will stop us,” she said, appearing visibly moved. “The road – there’s no doubt about it – is stony, but I am also convinced of the fact we cannot retrace our steps.”

She there were many other partners willing to work together and was “enthused” by the response from US companies who were supportive of the deal. “We need this Paris agreement in order to save our creation,” she said.

Trump’s decision to withdraw the US from the Paris accord means the world’s second largest emitter of greenhouse gases joins Syria and Nicaragua as the only countries not to be party to it.

In an announcement made in the White House garden, he said: “The Paris deal hamstrings the United States while empowering some of the world’s top polluting countries … That’s not going to happen while I’m president, I’m sorry.”

He added: “I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”

The leaders of France, Germany and Italy responded with a joint statement that said they regretted the US decision to withdraw from the accord, but affirmed “our strongest commitment” to implement its measures and encouraged “all our partners to speed up their action to combat climate change”.

Emmanuel Macron, the French president, said in an unprecedented English-language speech from the Elysée Palace, that he believed Trump had made a mistake. “I do respect this decision but I do think it is an actual mistake both for the US and for our planet.”

Trump’s predecessor, Barack Obama, issued a rare statement saying the new administration had joined “a small handful of nations that reject the future”. He said that US states, cities and businesses “will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we’ve got.”

Former vice-president Al Gore called the move “reckless and indefensible”, while among the business leaders to express regret over the move was Jeff Immelt, the chair and CEO of General Electric, who said “climate change is real” and “industry must now lead”.

When can the US withdraw from the Paris climate deal?

The US can pull out of the Paris agreement no earlier than 3 November 2020 – which happens to be the day of the next US presidential election. This is because article 28 of the Paris agreement, which the Trump administration says it will abide by, states that a nation can only submit a withdrawal three years after the agreement entered into force – 4 November 2016. This withdrawal then takes effect one year later.

Merkel, speaking at a press conference in Berlin, said Germany would not sway from the goals set out in the Paris agreement. “Nothing can or will stop us,” she said, appearing visibly moved. “The road – there’s no doubt about it – is stony, but I am also convinced of the fact we cannot retrace our steps.”

She there were many other partners willing to work together and was “enthused” by the response from US companies who were supportive of the deal. “We need this Paris agreement in order to save our creation,” she said.

Trump’s decision to withdraw the US from the Paris accord means the world’s second largest emitter of greenhouse gases joins Syria and Nicaragua as the only countries not to be party to it.

In an announcement made in the White House garden, he said: “The Paris deal hamstrings the United States while empowering some of the world’s top polluting countries … That’s not going to happen while I’m president, I’m sorry.”

He added: “I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”

The leaders of France, Germany and Italy responded with a joint statement that said they regretted the US decision to withdraw from the accord, but affirmed “our strongest commitment” to implement its measures and encouraged “all our partners to speed up their action to combat climate change”.

Analysis Paris climate deal: what was agreed and does it matter if US withdraws?

The US is the only country to argue that the accord demands too much of signatory nations.

Read more

Emmanuel Macron, the French president, said in an unprecedented English-language speech from the Elysée Palace, that he believed Trump had made a mistake. “I do respect this decision but I do think it is an actual mistake both for the US and for our planet.”

“Wherever we live, wherever we are, we all share the same responsibility: make our planet great again,” he added.

Downing Street issued a later statement saying the British prime minister, Theresa May, had told Trump of her “disappointment” but Downing Street sources would not say whether May had been asked to sign the declaration from the other European G7 countries.

The Labour leader, Jeremy Corbyn, accused her of “subservience to Trump”.

Trump’s predecessor, Barack Obama, issued a rare statement saying the new administration had joined “a small handful of nations that reject the future”. He said that US states, cities and businesses “will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we’ve got.”

Former vice-president Al Gore called the move “reckless and indefensible”, while among the business leaders to express regret over the move was Jeff Immelt, the chair and CEO of General Electric, who said “climate change is real” and “industry must now lead”.

When can the US withdraw from the Paris climate deal?
The Pittsburgh mayor, Bill Peduto, said he would issue an executive order on Friday pledging the city would follow through on carbon reduction goals. “In cities across America, you’ll see mayors standing up and saying, ‘We got this,’” he told CNN.

Fiji’s prime minister, Voreqe Bainimarama, who in November will chair an annual climate summit in Germany, said the decision was a grave disappointment for places such as his Pacific island nation and US coastal cities such as New York and Miami that are vulnerable to climate change.

Japan, Australia, New Zealand and South Korea also regretted the US move and reiterated their commitment to implement the agreement. Former Mexican president Vicente Fox, who has often clashed with Trump, said on Twitter the US president was “declaring war on the planet itself”.

Trump’s decision risks destabilising the Paris deal, with remaining participants faced with the choice of trying to make up the shortfall in emissions cuts or following the US’s lead and abandoning the agreement. In 2015, nearly 200 countries agreed to curb greenhouse gas emissions in order to prevent the runaway climate change that would occur should temperatures spiral 2C or more above the pre-industrial era.

The US emissions reduction pledge accounts for a fifth of the global emissions to be avoided by 2030, with an analysis by not-for-profit group Climate Interactive showing that a regression to “business as usual” emissions by the US could warm the world by an additional 0.5C by 2050. This would help push global temperature rise well beyond 2C, causing punishing heatwaves, a rise in sea level, displacement of millions of people and the loss of ecosystems such as coral reefs.

Prof John Schellnhuber, a climate scientist and former adviser to the EU, Angela Merkel and the pope, said the US would be the loser from its withdrawal. “China and Europe have become world leaders on the path towards green development already and will strengthen their position if the US slips back. The Washington people around Trump fail to recognise that the climate wars are over, while the race for sustainable prosperity is on.”

Trump followed through with his campaign pledge to “cancel” US involvement in the Paris accord following months of conflicting signals over whether he would do so or just scale back the US ambition to cut emissions.

The withdrawal represents a victory for the nationalist elements in Trump’s administration, such as his strategist Steve Bannon, who have argued the Paris deal undermines an “America first” approach, harms domestic coal production and hinders efforts to repeal Barack Obama-era regulations such as the Clean Power Plan.

Trump sought to frame his decision as part of this nationalist agenda. “The Paris agreement handicaps the United States economy in order to win praise from the very foreign capitals and global activists that have long sought to gain wealth at our country’s expense,” he said. “They don’t put America first. I do, and I always will.”

The anti-agreement faction had jockeyed for Trump’s favour over a rival school of thought, including the secretary of state, Rex Tillerson, and Ivanka Trump, the president’s daughter and adviser, that argued the US should remain in the Paris deal in order to preserve its diplomatic influence.

President’s Paris climate speech annotated: Trump’s claims analysed

Administration officials were also unable to offer revised US carbon emission targets or say what changes to the global landmark accord would persuade Trump to re-enter it. But they did offer assurance that America will abide by the lengthy exit process outlined in the deal, routing three-and-a-half years to formally withdraw.

Trump announced on Thursday the US would join Nicaragua and Syria as the only countries to shun the Paris agreement, characterising it as “a reassertion of America’s sovereignty” and saying he was
“elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris”. There was a chorus of condemnation from world leaders, former president Barack Obama and Trump’s defeated election opponent Hillary Clinton, who branded it “a historic mistake”.

Shortly after Trump spoke in the Rose Garden at the White House to applause from supporters, two senior administration officials briefed reporters in the rear wing. The officials, who did not wish to be named, said nothing to alter perceptions of the US president as a climate change denier when asked whether he believed human activity was a contributory factor.

One official replied: “So I think the fact that the president in his speech today said he wants to come back and renegotiate a better deal for the United States and for the world, I think speaks for itself.”

The journalist shot back: “So is that a yes? Is it a yes or no question?”

The official said: “Again, I think that speaks for itself.”

The journalist pressed: “It doesn’t speak for itself, so is that a yes? Does he believe human activity contributes to climate change?”

The official said: “I have not talked to the president about his personal views on whether – I was not with the president on his trip. I did not talk to the president about his personal views on what is contributing to climate change.”

The investigations swirling around Donald Trump – a short guide

Read more

The official insisted his own views were irrelevant, while a White House staff member interjected: “Can we stay on topic please?” The official echoed: “Can we stay on topic please?” – implying that Trump’s views on the causes of climate change were irrelevant to the Paris decision.

On 27 March the same official praised Trump’s views when questioned by the Guardian. This week Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, also said he had not asked the president’s opinion on the matter. Scott Pruitt, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, has said he “would not agree” that carbon from human activity is the primary cause of global warming while, in 2014, Trump referred to it as a “hoax”.

On Thursday, in a speech that kept a campaign pledge and echoed the fiery “America first” nationalism of his inaugural address, Trump said: “As of today, the United States will cease all implementation of the non-binding Paris accord.”

During Obama’s tenure, the US had agreed under the accord to reduce emissions by more than a quarter below 2005 levels by 2025. The administration officials declined to specify new targets or give even a rough estimate of America’s intended nationally determined contribution to limiting greenhouse gas emissions. But they pointed to America’s existing record. “I think leading the world is pretty good, right?” one said. “I think that speaks for itself.”

The Paris accord came into effect on 4 November 2016. It makes provision for parties to withdraw, but notice can be given only three years after it kicks in. Withdrawal would take effect a year after that, meaning November 2020, a date that coincides with the next US presidential election – raising the prospect that the issue remains alive during the campaign.

“First of all, the whole withdrawal process will be consistent with the Paris agreement,” an official said. “So the Paris agreement has to be in force for three years before you can actually submit a notice formally for withdrawal, which takes at least a year.”

“Shortsighted, wrong”: Apple, Facebook among tech giants to reject Paris pullout

Read more

“During this period, the United States will not acknowledge or do anything to implement the current pledge put down by President Obama. Now what’s the negotiating process? I think that’s going to be determined by the president as we move forward.”

The leaders of France, Germany and Italy joined to express regret at Trump’s decision and insisted the agreement “cannot be renegotiated”. One of the administration officials responded: “If you look at the Europeans, if you look at other major economies or allies or partners, they have a strong interest in finding common ground with the United States and again, we don’t want to get out ahead of ourselves here on what may be discussed or not.”

“There are a lot of different issues related to the international climate agenda that may not necessarily fall into the Paris bucket per se.”

He added: “If the president is very sincere when he says he wants a better deal, he wants to negotiate, potentially bringing us back in Paris depending on what that looks like… I think it’s a little bit more nuanced than stay in or not.”

Officials at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) challenged a set of talking points issued to support Trump’s decision as misleading. A statement from MIT said: “The relevant MIT researchers believe that the Paris agreement is an unprecedented and vital effort by nearly 200 countries to respond to the urgent threat of global climate change.”

Trump to planet: Drop dead

By David A. Andelman
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David A. Andelman: By exiting climate pact, Trump has isolated US from rest of world

Andelman: Worse, he has undermined trust in US ability to keep its promises, honor treaties

“America First” is becoming increasingly America alone. Somehow, Donald Trump has managed, with a single, desperate and ill-conceived stroke, to sever the United States from the rest of the world.
I was astonished 18 months ago to witness at the Le Bourget conference center outside Paris the extraordinary spectacle of nearly 200 countries actually agreeing on one central aspect of life on our planet—the need to control the pollutants that are wreaking havoc on our decaying atmosphere and our climate.

Suddenly, now, it’s the United States against everyone else on Earth.

It didn’t have to be that way. Short of a total withdrawal—an in-your-face slap to every world leader who signed the COP21 climate accord—were any number of half-measures. Indeed, Trump had already taken several of them.

He effectively neutered the Paris Agreement through a series of executive orders, including his March 28 order that directed the Environmental Protection Agency to begin the process of withdrawing the Obama-era Clean Power Plan and reviving the nation’s coal industry. “C’mon fellas,” Trump beam[ed triumphantly to a group of coal miners at the signing ceremony. “You know what this is? You know what this says? You’re going back to work.”

This assumed there’d be many customers for the coal these workers would now be authorized to mine. But, according to a CNN report this week, there has been no boom in coal jobs since the signing of the executive order.

Notably, the climate pact did not require formal national ratification as a treaty. It might not have gotten through the Senate, even back then. But it would have been more difficult to abrogate unilaterally, as the President has now done, since only Congress would have the power to retire from a formal treaty it had ratified.

Indeed, there are no formal penalties for nations that violate COP21. Even so, it would be impossible for the United States to formally withdraw from the pact before November 2019 unless it also withdrew from the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change—effectively thumbing our noses at not only climate change but the entire UN process, sadly not an impossible eventualit[y.

We might have been able to survive a hostile NATO, even a skeptical G7. But consider the consequences of our reneging on our commitments to COP21. Let’s start with boycotts of goods from America produced in climate-denying factories, even tariffs against all such products; denials of American companies seeking to acquire or partner with foreign firms in virtually every industry. There would be considerable motivation to have World Trade Organization rules restructured to make certain that no companies from the United States would ever again be able to do business in the international marketplace. To date, more than 300 American companies have already gone on the record opposing withdrawal, including Tesla’s Elon Musk; pledging to withdraw from all Trump advisory councils.

None of this is likely to happen immediately. Seas will not begin to rise uncontrollably. We can manage our sharply increased intensity of dramatic weather events. We can even—as millions of Chinese must do—breathe through masks when pollution become heavy enough to cut.

But when might we really begin to worry about our position on the planet? Just hours before the President’s Rose Garden speech, the European Union and China announced they’d be teaming up: “Our successful cooperation on issues like emissions trading and clean technologies are bearing fruit. Now is the time to further strengthen these ties to keep the wheels turning for ambitious global climate action.” Still, in the wake of the Trump decision, the United States risks being labeled “America the Ugly,” while scientists, motivated by their own desire to preserve the deteriorating environment, will be accumulating any possible evidence of our contributions to the global environmental crisis.

Recall, for a moment, Chernobyl. When the atomic cloud from the catastrophic meltdown of that Soviet nuclear plant in Ukraine began drifting westward across Europe and the entire Northern Hemisphere, the Kremlin remained unresponsive. The Soviet Union suffered an international ostracism that took years to repair. And that was a single cloud from a single event.

H.R. McMaster, the White House national security adviser who has morphed almost overnight from a respected general and global thinker to a Trump apologist, observed with fellow White House adviser Gary D. Cohn after the President’s first trip across Western Europe that “America first does not mean America alone.” Clearly both had little understanding of what awaits our country on the global scene once it sinks in what Trump’s actions are doing to the rest of the global population—the air and water we all breathe and consume.

For there is a far broader and deeper issue at stake here. The question now is one that even German Chancellor Angela Merkel danced around after Trump’s comments at NATO. How can any nation ever trust America again? If America’s elected President has such profound powers to wreak havoc on the world in this fashion all but unilaterally and with a stroke of a pen or a poorly worded tweet, how can any nation take our word on any international agreement we might sign?

Trump now risks plunging America into the position of the lone bully in the lunchroom—sitting all by himself as the world passes him by, lashing out sporadically in a fit of pique or violence (S9 Tomahawks in Syria). Our paramount fear should be that “Trump World” will last an irrevocably long time for the planet.
Americans overwhelmingly believe that global warming is happening, and that carbon emissions should be scaled back. But fewer are sure that the changes will harm them personally. New data released by the Yale Program on Climate Communication gives the most detailed view yet of public opinion on global warming.

Americans want to restrict carbon emissions from coal power plants. The White House and Congress may do the opposite.

MLT:

Percentage of adults per congressional district who support strict CO2 limits on existing coal-fired power plants

In every congressional district, a majority of adults supports limiting carbon dioxide emissions from existing coal-fired power plants. But many Republicans in Congress (and some Democrats) agree with President Trump, who this week may move to kill an Obama administration plan that would have scaled back the nation’s greenhouse gas emissions.

Nationally, about seven in 10 Americans support regulating carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants — and 75 percent support regulating CO2 as a pollutant more generally. But lawmakers are unlikely to change direction soon.

Bob Inglis, a former Republican congressman from South Carolina, warned that committed activists — like the Tea Party — can shape politicians’ approaches to issues like climate change. “Those are the ones who can take you out at the next primary,” he said. Mr. Inglis lost his primary in 2010 to Trey Gowdy, a Tea Party candidate who attacked his climate views.

Most people think that climate change will harm Americans, but they don’t think it will happen to them.

Most people know climate change is happening, and a majority agrees it is harming people in the United States. But most don’t believe it will harm them. Part of this is the problem of risk perception. Global warming is precisely the kind of threat humans are awful at dealing with: a problem with enormous consequences over the long term, but little that is sharply visible on a personal level in the short term. Humans are hard-wired for quick fight-or-flight reactions in the face of an imminent threat, but not highly motivated to act against slow-moving and somewhat abstract problems, even if the challenges that they pose are ultimately dire.
Texas and Florida are vulnerable to climate change, but residents are split on how much to worry about it.

The effects of climate change, including sunny-day flooding, are being felt across Florida. But the state shows a distinct north-south split in the level of concern over global warming, and it is not a simple Democrat-versus-Republican distinction, said State Representative Kristin D. Jacobs, a Democrat. Four southeast Florida counties — Miami-Dade, Broward, and Monroe and Palm Beach — stand out because of their concerted effort to work on climate issues together and to discuss it in nonpartisan terms.

South and West Texas, as well as the state’s Gulf Coast, are more worried about climate change than the rest of the state — and politics alone cannot explain it. South Texas favors Democrats, West Texas is decidedly more mixed, and the Gulf Coast in November 2016 was solid Trump territory.

One thing is shared by those disparate parts of the state: They have felt the brunt of shifting weather patterns, including rising temperatures, coastal hurricanes and western droughts so long and severe that some West Texas towns now recycle wastewater for drinking. The state’s highest concentrations of Latinos can be found in the south and west, which may also partly explain the difference in climate views. Roberto Suro, a professor of public policy and journalism at the University of Southern California, suggested age as a possible factor. Latinos are “a young population with the median age significantly younger than the white population, and younger still than the African-American population,” he said, noting that young people have embraced climate science to a greater extent than their elders.

Everybody talks about the weather. But the climate? Only in some places.

Thirty three percent of Americans surveyed said they discuss global warming at least occasionally with friends and family — and 31 percent said they never do. But there are distinct regional patterns.

In the West, much of which has been affected by drought and wildfires, residents are more likely to talk about climate change. New England states, and not just the liberals of Massachusetts and Vermont, talk more about the climate, as well, along with coastal South Carolina, which lies in a path many hurricanes have taken.

But aside from Southeast Florida, which has put so much effort into making discussion of climate change a priority, much of the rest of the Atlantic Coast is less likely to engage in climate discussions, despite recent increases in tidal flooding.

Source: Yale Program on Climate Change Communication

Top CEOs tell the CEO president: You're wrong on Paris

by Julia Horowitz @juliakhorowitz

June 1, 2017: 6:56 PM ET
General Electric CEO Jeff Immelt is not happy with President Trump. And he’s not alone. Dozens of top executives urged Trump not to pull the U.S. out of the Paris climate agreement. Now, many are voicing their displeasure.

"Disappointed with today's decision on the Paris Agreement. Climate change is real. Industry must now lead and not depend on government," Immelt said on Twitter shortly after Trump’s announcement.

Elon Musk, the CEO of Tesla (TSLA) and SpaceX, announced that he's quitting the president's business advisory councils because of the decision.

"Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world," he said on Twitter.

Marc Benioff, the chief executive at Salesforce (CRM, Tech30), also voiced his disappointment.

"Deeply disappointed by President's decision to withdraw from Paris Agreement. We will double our efforts to fight climate change," he said.

View image on Twitter
Marc Benioff
Follow @Benioff
Deeply disappointed by President's decision to withdraw from Paris Agreement. We will double our efforts to fight climate change.

Microsoft (MSFT, Tech30) president Brad Smith echoed those sentiments. "We're disappointed with the decision to exit the Paris Agreement. Microsoft remains committed to doing our part to achieve its goals," he said.

Follow BradSmith
@BradSmi
We're disappointed with the decision to exit the Paris Agreement. Microsoft remains committed to doing our part to achieve its goals.

Sundar Pichai
Follow @sundarpichai
Disappointed with today's decision. Google will keep working hard for a cleaner, more prosperous future for all.

Meanwhile, over on Facebook (FB, Tech30), CEO Mark Zuckerberg shared his own chagrin. "Withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement is bad for the environment, bad for the economy, and it puts our children's future at risk," Zuckerberg said.

This Facebook post is no longer available. It may have been removed, or the privacy settings of the post may have changed.

In recent months, hundreds of companies have lobbied the Trump administration to remain in the agreement. Apple (AAPL, Tech30), Starbucks (SBUX), Gap (GPS), Nike (NKE), Adidas (ADDDF), L'Oreal (LRLCF) and Monsanto (MON) all voiced their support for the Paris deal.

Related: Elon Musk to Trump: You quit Paris, so I quit you
Even oil companies like ExxonMobil (XOM) and Chevron (CVX) gave their backing. Exxon CEO Darren Woods wrote Trump a personal letter earlier this month asking him to remain in the pact, saying it ensures the U.S. is "well positioned to compete."
Why Are These CEOs Still Standing With Trump on Climate?

Many prominent business executives have advocated for policies to address climate change. They've made the case not just on environmental grounds but on commercial ones, saying that American competitiveness would suffer if the United States abdicated leadership on climate.

Now that President Trump has ignored that advice and decided to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement, executives who disagree with him ought to stand up for what they believe. Otherwise, they are lending their own credibility and implicit support, and that of their companies, to his environmentally, diplomatically, and economically self-defeating position.

Some of the most powerful corporate honchos are on the president’s advisory panels: the Strategic and Policy Forum and the Manufacturing Jobs Initiative. Why? If they won’t distance themselves from this White House over its radical position on climate, what would it take?

Below, we are tracking statements from all executives who are part of these groups. The list will be updated.

Will Leave

Bob Iger
Chairman and CEO, The Walt Disney Company

Tweeted: “As a matter of principle, I’ve resigned from the President’s Council over the ParisAgreement withdrawal.”

Elon Musk
CEO and CTO of SpaceX, CEO of Tesla Inc., co-chairman of OpenAI

Tweeted: “Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world.”

Will Remain

Alex Gorsky
Johnson & Johnson

Corporate statement on climate change

“We have established science-based goals to decrease our carbon footprint and we remain committed to achieving them.”
On Trump’s committee
A spokesperson said Mr. Gorsky will remain on the committee.

Andrew Liveris
President, Chairman and CEO, The Dow Chemical Company
Corporate statement on climate change
“The world needs to dramatically reduce its energy-related carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions.”
On Trump’s committee
A spokesperson said he “is fully committed to working with President Trump and his Administration on issues of critical importance to the economy.”

Bill Brown
Chairman, president and CEO, Harris Corporation
Corporate statement on climate change
“Our company’s values of excellence and integrity in all aspects of our business dealings extend to environmental conservation.”
On Trump’s committee
“It is important for industry to remain engaged with the new Administration on issues critical to our economy.”

Brian Krzanich
CEO, Intel Corporation
Corporate statement on climate change
“Intel believes that climate change is a serious [...] challenge that warrants a serious societal response, and this belief is reflected in our own stewardship actions.”
On Trump’s committee
Told CNBC: “We need to engage and what I’ll do is I’ll spend time in there talking about—what are we going to do, how do we get back in?”

Denise Morrison
Campbell Soup Company
Corporate statement on climate change
“Our primary 2020 sustainability goal is to reduce our environmental footprint — defined as water and GHG emissions per tonne of food produced — by 50 percent.”
On Trump's committee
"Ms. Morrison will continue to participate in the President’s Manufacturing Jobs Initiative, as we recognize the importance of growing the U.S. economy and creating manufacturing jobs."

Doug McMillon
President and CEO, Walmart Stores
Corporate statement on climate change
"Addressing climate change is a win-win: good for society and good for Walmart."
On Trump's committee
A spokesperson said "It is important to engage with the advisory committee and Doug will continue to be involved."

Ginni Rometty
Chairwoman, president, and CEO, IBM
Corporate statement on climate change
"IBM has been a leader in addressing climate change."
On Trump's committee
An IBM spokesperson said "IBM believes we can make a constructive contribution by having a direct dialogue with the Administration – as we do with governments around the world."

Indra Nooyi
Chairwoman and CEO, PepsiCo.
Corporate statement on climate change
"Climate change is one of the most important issues of our time and requires coordinated global action."
On Trump’s committee
Did not indicate any change to her involvement in a statement.

Jamie Dimon
Chairman, president, and CEO, JPMorgan Chase
Corporate statement on climate change

“Long-term economic growth depends on meeting society’s [...] needs in ever more sustainable ways.”

On Trump’s committee

“I absolutely disagree with the Administration on this issue, but we have a responsibility to engage our elected officials to work constructively and advocate for policies that improve people’s lives and protect our environment.”

Jeff Fettig
Chairman and CEO, Whirlpool Corporation

Corporate statement on climate change

“The company remains committed to finding those operational initiatives and product innovations that benefit consumers and the planet alike.”

On Trump’s committee

A statement read: “We will continue to provide fact based input to this Initiative to help the U.S. strengthen jobs.”

Kevin Plank
CEO and chairman, Under Armour

Corporate statement on climate change

“Climate change is real and must be taken seriously.”

On Trump’s committee

Did not indicate any change to his involvement in a statement.

Larry Fink
Chairman and CEO, BlackRock

Corporate statement on climate change

“The Paris agreement is a critical step forward in addressing climate change.”

On Trump’s committee

“I will continue on the CEO forum as long as I believe there is the potential to have a positive impact.”

Mark Sutton
Chairman and CEO, International Paper

Corporate statement on climate change

“You are never going to agree with all decisions that are made by elected officials, that’s why it’s best that we continue to engage with the administration and work constructively toward the best possible outcomes.”
Mary Barra  
Chairwoman and CEO, General Motors  
Corporate statement on climate change  
“GM recognizes that by taking bold climate action it will benefit its customers and communities through cleaner air.”  
On Trump’s committee  
A spokesperson said the committee provides “a seat at an important table to contribute to a constructive dialogue about key policy issues.”

Michael Dell  
CEO, Dell Technologies  
Corporate statement on climate change  
“Climate change is an issue of concern to Dell.”  
On Trump’s committee  
A spokesperson said Mr. Dell would remain “to share our perspective on policy issues that affect our company, our customers and our employees.”

Rich Kyle  
President and CEO, The Timken Company  
Corporate statement on climate change  
“Timken embraces environmental sustainability as we continually strive for greater efficiency in our operations and for our customers.”  
On Trump’s committee  
Did not indicate any change to his involvement in a statement.

Rich Lesser  
President and CEO, The Boston Consulting Group  
Corporate statement on climate change  
“Climate change is real and the substantial negative impact that it will have on our world is supported by clear and robust science.”  
On Trump’s committee  
A statement read: “We currently expect that Rich will continue to be involved as an external advisor through the Forum.”
Thea Lee
Deputy Chief of Staff, the A.F.L.-C.I.O.
Corporate statement on climate change
“Pulling out of the Paris climate agreement is a decision to abandon a cleaner future powered by good jobs.”
On Trump’s committee
Did not indicate any change to her involvement in a statement.

Scott Paul
President, Alliance for American Manufacturing
Corporate statement on climate change
“Our stakeholders are committed to leading on sustainable and responsible manufacturing”
On Trump’s committee
“I have had profound disagreements with the Trump administration on several issues, but stepping away from an advisory role on manufacturing policy doesn’t make sense.”

Richard Trumka
President, the A.F.L.-C.I.O.
Corporate statement on climate change
“Pulling out of the Paris climate agreement is a decision to abandon a cleaner future powered by good jobs.”
On Trump’s committee
Did not indicate any change to his involvement in a statement.

Toby Cosgrove
President and CEO, Cleveland Clinic
Corporate statement on climate change
“Climate change threatens the health of the world’s population in a direct way.”
On Trump’s committee
A spokesperson said there was no change to his role at this time.
How scientists reacted to the US leaving the Paris climate agreement

What the United States' departure from the historic pact means for efforts to fight global warming.

Benjamin Santer, climate scientist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California:
In Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar", Brutus said these famous lines: "There is a tide in the affairs of men. Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; Omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Today, the United States pulled out of the Paris climate agreement and missed the rising tide. Far from "Making America Great Again", this decision condemns the United States to becoming one of the "has-beens" of history. We will become increasingly irrelevant to the rest of the world. They are going forward; we are going backward.

JPascal van Ypersele @JPvanYpersele
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Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany:
It will not substantially hamper global climate progress if the USA really quits the Paris agreement, but it will hurt the American economy and society alike. China and Europe have become world leaders on the path towards green development already and will strengthen their position if the US slips back at the national level. Innovative states such as California, the world's sixth largest economy, will keep going for climate action, however. The Washington people around Trump hide in the trenches of the past instead of building the future. They fail to recognize that the climate wars are over, while the race for sustainable prosperity is on.

David Victor, climate-policy expert at the University of California, San Diego:
The odds of other countries renegotiating Paris are low to zero. The whole structure of the Paris agreement is to allow countries to set their own commitments. So there is nobody to negotiate with if a country needs to adjust. This claim that the problem with Paris is that the deal wasn’t struck properly is a disingenuous argument that is not informed by how Paris actually works nor by any reality about how the world actually crafts big complex deals.

A crow takes flight above a coal mound at the SunCoke Energy Partners LP Ceredo Terminal in Ceredo, West Virginia.

Glen Peters, climate-policy expert at the Center for International Climate and Environmental Research in Oslo:
It seems that Trump and his advisors have completely misconceived what the Paris agreement is. All his reasons for pulling out were basically the concessions that forged the path to the creation of the Paris agreement. Paris is the agreement that Trump desires!

The genius of Paris is to allow countries to put forward emission pledges that countries feel they can meet (Nationally Determined Contributions). The US pledge was put forward by the US, alone. Counties are already enacting their emission pledges, and — as could be expected by design of the Paris agreement — most countries...
show signs of exceeding their conservative emission pledges. China looks like it may peak its emissions a decade earlier than pledged. India has slowed down on coal consumption and sped up on solar deployment. Even the US has made great strides in the last decade, and was poised to make more.

The irony is that Paris is working, because it is designed to be flexible to the national circumstances that Trump himself champions!

Benjamin Sanderson, climate modeller at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado:

A complete failure of the agreement at this point, with business-as-usual growth for another decade, would almost certainly commit the planet to significantly more warming than the Paris goals, and the human consequences of this would be catastrophic. However, some major remaining signatories have expressed a commitment to increasing mitigation goals, and within the US many states, cities and some of the country’s largest companies are committed to mitigation irrespective of the US participation in the agreement.

Decisions made today are made in the context of confident projections of future warming with continued emissions, but clearly there is more to do to better characterize the human and economic consequences of delaying action on climate change and how to frame these issues in the context of other concerns. The role of the scientific community is more important than ever; both to continue to provide the best possible research to inform decisions, but also to communicate any risks associated with further emissions in a publicly accessible fashion.

 Nature doi:10.1038/nature.2017.22098
WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Donald Trump said the United States "will continue to be the cleanest and most environmentally friendly country on Earth" as he announced a U.S. pullout from an international accord designed to curb climate change.

But facts muddy that claim.

Data show that the U.S. is among the dirtiest countries when it comes to heat-trapping carbon pollution. One nation that has cleaner air in nearly every way is Sweden.

"The U.S. is well behind other countries in having the cleanest and most sustainable environment," University of Michigan environmental scientist Rosina Bierbaum said in an email.

The U.S. emits more carbon dioxide than any other nation except China. In 2014, the U.S. spewed 237 times more carbon dioxide into the air than Sweden, according to figures by the U.S. Department of Energy's Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

"On pretty much any climate-related indicator, the U.S. will not look good," said Glen Peters, a Norwegian climate scientist who is part of the Global Carbon Project that ranks worldwide emissions.

The U.S. is No. 2 in per person carbon dioxide pollution, behind Luxembourg, among 35 developed nations plus China, India and Brazil, Energy Department data show. That's 19.1 tons (17.3 metric tons) of carbon dioxide per year for the average American, compared with 4.9 tons (4.5 metric tons) for the average Swede.

Taking into account economics, the U.S. ranks 10th highest in carbon pollution per gross domestic product behind China, India, Russia, Estonia, Poland, South Korea, the Czech Republic, Mexico and Turkey, according to the International Energy Agency. The U.S. spews almost five times more carbon dioxide per dollar in the economy than Sweden.

Because carbon dioxide stays in the atmosphere for more than a century, scientists and regulators say it's more important to look at historical emissions. Since 1870, the U.S. has produced about one-quarter of the world's carbon dioxide - twice as much as China - and that makes it the biggest polluter in the world by far, Peters said.

In some traditional air pollution measurements, the United States is cleaner than most nations, said William K. Reilly, who headed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under Republican President George H.W. Bush.

But "when the problem he is dealing with is carbon dioxide, we are notably not better than the rest of the world," said Reilly, adding that Trump is "just wrong."

The U.S. is better than most of the world when it comes to dangerous soot or fine particles. Among industrialized countries, the U.S. tied for sixth cleanest, according to the Health Effects Institute.

"There are a number of countries that have cleaner air in terms of major industrial nations. We are certainly in the top tier," said Dan Greenbaum, the group's president. "Clearly, countries like China and India are much, much worse than we are."

The U.S. leads in helping people fight for a clean environment by having laws and procedures that allow citizens to sue to enforce pollution protections and get information, said Princeton University climate scientist and international affairs professor Michael Oppenheimer.

Other countries are far ahead of the U.S. in cleaner energy, especially Germany, which on occasion is fueled fully by renewables, Oppenheimer said.

Reilly, the former EPA head, recalled how the U.S. took environmental leadership 25 years ago this month as it became the first industrial country to ratify the first climate treaty. "Now we turn the page," Reilly said. "We'll see where it goes."
President Trump yesterday said that under the Paris Agreement, China has a green light to spew more coal, while the United States must cut carbon. It’s one of the many facts he got wrong, experts say. Credit: LMC19/Pixabay; CC BY-SA 2.0

President Trump justified his decision yesterday to leave a global climate accord with debunked conservative talking points and studies funded by groups with ties to the fossil fuel industry.

He claimed the Paris Agreement would make America the laughingstock of the world, costing the country 2.7 million jobs. He said China and India could build coal plants with abandon, while the United States would be forced to shutter its own. Factories would close. Energy prices would skyrocket. Brownouts and blackouts could spread across the power grid, forcing families to go without electricity.

“In short, the agreement doesn’t eliminate coal jobs. It just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States, and ships them to foreign countries,” Trump said. “The rest of the world applauded when we signed the Paris Agreement. They went wild. They were so happy — for the simple reason that it put our country, the United States of America, which we all love, at a very, very big economic disadvantage.”

The picture Trump painted is a terrifying one. It’s also incredibly unlikely, according to economic studies and analyses of how the Paris deal would work.

From the costs and benefits to the global impacts, the president cherry-picked his talking points to support withdrawing from the agreement.

Below are some of his statements deserving scrutiny:

“Compliance with the terms of the Paris accord and the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States could cost America as much as 2.7 million lost jobs by 2025, according to the National Economic Research Associates. This includes 440,000 fewer manufacturing jobs. ... By 2040, the cost to the economy at this time would be close to $3 trillion in lost GDP and 6.5 million industrial jobs, while households would have $7,000 less income, and in many cases much worse than that.”

The report Trump referenced was written by NERA for the American Council for Capital Formation, a pro-business think tank, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Institute for 21st Century Energy, which has oil and gas and coal companies as members.

NERA argues that the United States wouldn’t be able to meet its Paris commitment without cutting greenhouse gases from the industrial sector, one of the toughest areas in which to limit emissions.

The report considered capping emissions from electricity, transportation, industry and all other sectors. Companies could trade emissions allowances within those sectors but not among them. That would mean much higher costs.

The $3 trillion gross domestic product loss Trump referenced sounds huge. But NERA found GDP loss could range widely depending on the scenario, from half a percent in 2025 to up to 10 percent in 2040.

It’s hard to find a study on the Paris pledge that isn’t funded by either opponents or supporters of the deal. But looking at the numbers from the other side provides some perspective.

Resources for the Future, in comparison, applied a carbon tax across all sectors and found that the economic cost could be far lower, between 0.2 percent and 0.35 percent of GDP in 2025.

Climate advocates also frequently note that it isn’t fair to consider the costs of action without also considering the societal costs of inaction.

“At 1 percent growth, renewable sources of energy can meet some of our domestic demand. But at 3 or 4 percent growth, which I expect, we need all forms of available American energy, or our country will be at grave risk of brownouts and blackouts. Our businesses will come to a halt in many cases. And the American family will suffer the consequences in the form of lost jobs and a very diminished quality of life.”

Trump cast doubt on renewable energy’s ability to power the country in a high-economic-growth scenario.

The president is technically correct that the United States will need all forms of energy, said William Hogan, research director of the Harvard Electricity Policy Group. But that’s because even the most optimistic scenarios don’t envision a grid powered entirely by renewables until far into the future.

The question with renewables is less one of reliability and more one of cost, he said.

“The blackouts and brownouts are not consistent with how we operate the system,” he added. A series of recent studies have found that the U.S. grid could operate reliably with large amounts of renewable generation. A National Renewable Energy Laboratory study from last year concluded that the Eastern Interconnection could operate with 30 percent penetrations of wind and renewable generation. A 2016 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration study found that the U.S. power sector could cut carbon emissions by 80 percent without increasing costs.

Additionally, when federal electricity regulators examined the potential impacts of the Obama administration’s power-sector climate standards, they found that existing safeguards could prevent power supply disruptions.

“The mines are starting to open up, having a big opening in two weeks, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, so many places. A big opening of a brand-new mine. It’s unheard of. For many, many years, that hasn’t happened. They asked me if I’d go. I’m going to try.”

After hundreds of closures in recent years, Trump said mines are opening, as he promised on the campaign trail.

The “big” opening later this month is likely a reference to the Acosta Deep mine in southwestern Pennsylvania.

The 70-worker operation would harvest metallurgical coal, which is used to make steel. It is one of three metallurgical mines to come online during a recent price surge.

But rebounds for metallurgical coal are not representative of the industry at large. Metallurgical coal makes up less than 10 percent of U.S. production.

“From a practical point of view, that doesn’t make any difference to what is going to happen in the next five, six years,” Wood Mackenzie analyst Matt Preston said.

U.S. coal production and employment may be up slightly in early 2017. But they remain well below levels in 2015, the second-worst year on record.

Preston said all signs point to the coal market continuing to shrink.

“Maybe a little of a revival this year and next year, then plant retirements begin to kick in,” he said. “No one’s thinking we need to build new coal plants.”

Trump also said the Paris Agreement “effectively blocks the development of clean coal in America,” while allowing China and India to increase their coal use.

But the agreement doesn’t dictate the energy sources that a member nation must use, nor does it limit funding for any technology.

In fact, since the Paris Agreement took effect, the United States launched the world’s largest carbon capture and sequestration system retrofit on a coal-fired power plant, Petra Nova, earlier this year.
“Under the agreement, China will be able to increase these emissions by a staggering number of years, 13. They can do whatever they want for 13 years. Not us. India makes its participation contingent on receiving billions and billions and billions of dollars in foreign aid from developed countries. There are many other examples. But the bottom line is that the Paris accord is very unfair at the highest level to the United States.”

China is making strides under the Paris pledge, even if they don’t look the same as in the United States. China plans to stop growing emissions no later than 2030, and most analyses show the country’s emissions peaking in the mid-2020s. To reach its goal, China will need to build new green power infrastructure equal to the size of the entire U.S. electric grid. China has already begun that work and is on track to have an economywide price on carbon this year.

Additionally, China has pledged $3.1 billion in aid to climate-vulnerable countries, compared with the $3 billion pledge to the U.N. Green Climate Fund that the United States won’t honor.

“Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a two-tenths of 1 degree — think of that, this much — Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100.”

White House officials said this figure came from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Researchers from the Climate Interactive project, which collaborates with MIT, quickly refuted Trump’s point.

In fact, the MIT research to which the president referred showed that the Paris Agreement could lower the expected temperature increase by 0.6 to 1.1 C.

The Trump administration essentially pulled one piece of data out of the study and removed all context before inserting it into a factually inaccurate and entirely different claim, said John Reilly, co-director of the Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change at MIT and author of the study. He said his study showed Paris was an important agreement that could shave off an entire degree of warming, but that climate skeptics have tried to make a similar false claim in the past. He said that if anything, the study shows an argument for remaining in Paris.

“The idea of withdrawing from it makes no sense at all,” he said. “If he wants to negotiate something, he can negotiate the succeeding agreement, and there is nothing to say within the scope of the Paris Agreement you can’t put forward a much more aggressive policy for the United States over that period and ask other countries to come up with even more.”

“Exiting the agreement protects the United States from future intrusions on the United States’ sovereignty and massive future legal liability. Believe me, we have massive legal liability if we stay in.”

In the Paris Agreement, countries put forward their own commitments, known as nationally determined contributions. They are nonbinding, and there are no enforcement mechanisms if a country falls short. And the vast majority of international legal experts say they can be rescinded and lowered at will.

Trump may have gotten this idea from Republican senators who have suggested that staying in the Paris Agreement could force the United States into an economywide cap-and-trade system. In a recent letter to Trump, they argued that climate action supporters could sue the administration to write a regulation under Section 115 of the Clean Air Act if the United States remained in the deal.

EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt also required some fact-checking.

“Before the Paris Accord was ever signed, America had reduced its CO2 footprint to levels of the early 1990s. In fact, between the years 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced its carbon emissions by more than 18 percent, and this was accomplished largely by American innovation and technology from the private sector rather than government mandate.”

It’s important to look at the years Pruitt picks to judge emissions levels.

Greenhouse gas emissions, including carbon, increased 7 percent between 1990 and 2014, according to EPA data. Carbon dioxide from human activities went up 9 percent.

Emissions increased before 2000, which makes the reduction between 2000 and 2014 look more substantial. The fairer comparison might be to look at emissions reductions next to GDP. Since the 1990s, emissions per dollar of GDP have declined 40 percent.

Reporters Jean Chemnick and Niina Heikkinen contributed.

Reprinted from Climatewire with permission from E&E News. E&E provides daily coverage of essential energy and environmental news at www.eenews.net.

9 Times Trump Twisted Facts In His Speech Quitting Paris Accord

The president never even mentioned, you know, global warming.

By Alexander C. Kaufman Huffington

President Donald Trump announced plans to withdraw from the Paris climate accord on Thursday with a White House speech that made the historic agreement sound like a trade deal, which it isn’t. But that was just one of the thorns in his Rose Garden statement.

The nonbinding pact to reduce planet-warming emissions, approved by every country but Syria and Nicaragua, commits its signatories to slashing greenhouse gas outputs and coming back to the negotiating table every five years to seek more ambitious goals with the hope of staving off the most catastrophic effects of global warming.

Trump did not discuss climate science nor the dire consensus among nearly all peer-reviewed climatologists that emissions from burning fossil fuels, industrial farming and deforestation have put the planet on course to warm beyond the point where the climate will be irreversibly changed by the end of the century.

By that sheer omission alone, the speech was misleading. Here are nine more things that Trump got wrong:

1. “The cost to the economy at this time would be close to $3 trillion in lost GDP.”

That estimate came from a report that “does not take into account potential benefits from avoided emissions.” The study was paid for by the American Council for Capital Formation and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce — two groups that represent major polluters and have long lobbed against climate policies. The assessment outlined in the report is based on what the Natural Resources Defense Council in March described as “a fictional scenario that does not reflect any current proposals or realistic plans to achieve our climate goals.”
“By design, the Chamber study intentionally imposes the most stringent greenhouse gas regulations on the sectors that would face the highest costs per ton of GHG reduction,” Kevin Steinberger and Amanda Levin, experts at the NRDC, wrote in a blog post. “This scenario greatly exaggerates the likely costs of any future program to achieve the economy-wide reductions set forth in the Paris Agreement, because any real program to meet those goals would be designed with cost-saving flexibility the Chamber deliberately left out.”

2. “Exiting the agreement protects the United States from future intrusions on the United States’ sovereignty and massive future legal liability. Believe me, we have massive legal liability if we stay in.”

The Paris Agreement is legally nonbinding, meaning the United States can’t be punished for failing to meet the 26 percent to 28 percent commitment made in 2015. Despite arguments from the White House to the contrary, legal experts said the U.S. could have negotiated a lower emissions target while remaining in the voluntary agreement.

KEVIN LAMARQUE / REUTERS
President Trump made good on his campaign promise to withdraw from the pact.

3. China “can do whatever they want for 13 years. Not us.”

The implication here is that China plans to continue increasing its emissions. But a study last year found that Chinese emission have peaked and were forecast to fall by 1 percent in 2017. The accuracy of official Chinese data is often called into question, with good reason. But a handful of independent studies over the past three years have corroborated the decline in Chinese emissions.

Backing this up, China has aggressively moved to invest in renewable energy over the past few years. In January, the country set aside $360 billion for clean energy investment over the next four years and canceled plans for 103 new coal-fired power plants. As a result, China’s own coal mining regions are suffering thousands of job losses.

4. “In short, the agreement doesn’t eliminate coal jobs. It just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States, and ships them to foreign countries.”

For starters, the text of the Paris Agreement never mentions coal. And while President Barack Obama’s plan to limit emissions from coal-fired plants in the U.S. may not have helped the struggling industry, its own executives admit that competition from natural gas and declining demand abroad is responsible for the loss of coal mining jobs.

To make any sort of comeback, the coal industry needs to export to countries such as India, where coal remains a popular fuel source. The diplomatic repudiation that comes with backing out the Paris Agreement could make that more difficult.

“The future is foreign markets, so the last thing you want to do if you are a coal company is to give up a US seat in the international climate discussions and let the Europeans control the agenda,” a U.S. official told The Independent in April.

5. “This agreement is less about the climate and more about other countries gaining a financial advantage over the United States.”

The absurdity of this statement aside, the U.S. took the lead in brokering the Paris Agreement in order to attain more favorable terms for America than existed in previous climate deals. Under the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, for example, developing countries were excluded from slashing emissions. That was part of President George W. Bush’s justification for refusing to implement the deal in 2001.

“But in the case of Paris, it’s inexplicable why we would be leaving,” Susan Biniaz, the State Department’s former lawyer on climate change issues, told HuffPost Thursday. “We negotiated it largely to U.S. specifications and to fix the Kyoto problems.”

6. “Yet, under this agreement, we are effectively putting these [energy] reserves under lock and key, taking away the great wealth of our nation — it’s great wealth, it’s phenomenal wealth.”
Natural gas, made cheap by a drilling technique known as hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, is largely responsible for the U.S. already shrinking its carbon footprint by 12 percent below 2005 levels. (The country committed to lowering that number to 26 percent to 28 percent under the Paris Agreement. Nothing in the accord prevented the U.S. from extracting fossil fuels. There are ways to extract oil and gas responsibly. The problem is the Trump administration doesn’t seem keen on doing that. In one of its first moves, the Trump EPA scrapped a rule requiring oil and gas companies to report leaks of methane, a potent natural gas that can trap 30 times as much heat in the atmosphere as carbon dioxide.

7. “At 1 percent growth, renewable sources of energy can meet some of our domestic demand. But at 3 or 4 percent growth, which I expect, we need all forms of available American energy, or our country will be at grave risk of brownouts and blackouts. Our businesses will come to a halt in many cases. And the American family will suffer the consequences in the form of lost jobs and a very diminished quality of life.”

This appears to be based on a controversial study led by Energy Secretary Rick Perry into power grid reliability. For starters, the study failed to consult any actual grid operators. The report is being run by a right-wing think tank operative. As Vox’s David Roberts points out, the entire review is a political attack on renewables that depicts zero-emissions energy sources as “unreliable” now that it is no longer possible to argue that they can’t compete on price. Moreover, the real source of base-load problems, as Roberts notes, is natural gas, though it’s unlikely that anyone in the Trump administration would anger gas companies by concluding this.

8. “Beyond the severe energy restrictions inflicted by the Paris accord, it includes yet another scheme to redistribute wealth out of the United States through the so-called Green Climate Fund — nice name — which calls for developed countries to send $100 billion to developing countries all on top of America’s existing and massive foreign aid payments. So we’re going to be paying billions and billions and billions of dollars, and we’re already way ahead of anybody else.”

The U.S. committed just $3 billion to the fund under Obama. So far, $1 billion has been paid. That’s worth the same as 62 miles of a border wall that could stretch more than 1,000 miles.

9. “I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”

During the 2016 presidential election, Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton won Pittsburgh with 80 percent of the vote. By contrast, Trump won the Texas county that includes Paris by 78 percent, with 14,561 votes to Clinton’s 3,583.

The US abandoning the global climate deal brings risks, but the unity of the rest of the world and plummeting green energy costs are reasons for hope.
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China and EU strengthen promise to Paris deal with US poised to step away

Read more

Even a flattening of the decline in US carbon emissions – if not compensated for by other nations – will slow progress and might bump up global warming by a tenth of a degree or two. That could be enough to push the most vulnerable nations under the waves of a rising ocean.

Alternatively, other countries could punish the US with heavy carbon taxes on its exports. But that would prompt retaliation, with unpredictable consequences.

The US has also been a major funder of climate aid programmes, which have been vital in winning over developing nations that view global warming as a crisis inflicted on them by industrialised nations. Billions more will have to be contributed by the richest nations.

But the breakthrough in Paris – getting the unanimous agreement of 196 nations to tackle climate change together – remains a deceptively solid foundation for beating global warming, a task that will take decades not years.

German environment minister Barbara Hendricks said on Thursday: “The world’s climate will survive for eight years without the US.” But, despite the good reasons for optimism, a one-term Trump presidency would be even safer.

Full Transcript: John Kerry on Trump's climate agreement decision

Then-Secretary of State John Kerry -- with his granddaughter on his lap -- signed the Paris climate agreement last year. After President Donald Trump announced on Thursday that the U.S. will withdraw from the agreement, Kerry took to Facebook to criticize the decision.

He accused Mr. Trump of "unilaterally walking backwards from science and backwards from leadership on behalf of polluters and fringe ideologues," and said it "may be the most self-defeating action in American history."

Kerry spoke with CBS News' Anthony Mason on June 1, 2017, on "CBS Evening News." What follows is a full transcript of the interview.

ANTHONY MASON: Mr. Secretary, you call this an unprecedented forfeiture of American leadership. What do you mean?

SEC. JOHN KERRY: Well when 195 countries come together working for decades and the United States of America takes the leadership in order to join with China, the two largest emitters in the world, of carbon emissions, to say we must begin to reduce, and then to have a president stand up and simply unilaterally walk away from that, without scientific basis, not based on facts in terms of our economy. The truth is the president... no country is required by this agreement to do anything except what that country decided to do for itself. So Donald Trump is not telling the truth to the American people when he says 'we have this huge burden that's been imposed on us by other nations,' no. We agreed to what we would do. We designed it. It's voluntary and the president of the Unites States could simply have changed that without walking away from the whole agreement.

MASON: The president portrayed it in economic terms and said it gave other nations a financial advantage.

KERRY: No. That's just not true. The fastest growing job in America, the biggest single job is wind turbine technician. 2.6 million clean energy jobs have been created in America and guess what, half of them, 50 percent, are in states that Donald Trump won. He's going to hurt those people. He's going to hurt those states. America is going to lose economic leadership in this.

MASON: So do you think we have something to lose if we back out?

KERRY: We have indeed. Do you think American businesses will flourish when they knock on the door of a country and say well we want to give you solar tech... they're going to say w'ell you guys just walked away from the deal. You guys aren't committed to this.' That's why major...
companies, among them, Exxon Mobile, major Fortune 500 companies, all supported staying in the Paris agreement. Because they know what this means in terms of their job base, their growth and the economy.

MASON: The president said he was elected by the people of Pittsburgh, not the people of Paris.

Kerry: Well indeed absolutely true but there’s nothing in... what America has agreed to do in this that Paris dictated. There's nothing in what America agreed to do in this agreement that came from France or came from Britain or any other country. We are doing what America decided we could do and should do that was appropriate.

KERRY: He said he would honor the timetable for withdrawal which would in effect take past the next election.

KERRY: Well he said as of today he will stop the implementation. So it depends on what Scott Pruitt and the EPA and others continue to do. Tell me, where is the constituency in America to put coal sludge back into rivers and lakes? But that’s what he’s done. He's signed the executive order to do that. Where is the constituency to reduce the ability of cars to maintain lower automobile emissions? Why would you want to get rid of that? What Donald Trump is doing is serving the polluters and serving a narrow group of ideological interests. That’s not leadership. That's abdication of responsibility, and this step does not make America first. It makes America last.

MASON: Mr. Secretary, thank you

KERRY: Thank you.
But if there was regret, it was mixed with not a little gloating.

Citing environmentalists, Xinhua called Trump "reckless and foolish," and said he was isolating the United States. China Daily denounced the "single action of just one man" that can change the course of the world, drawing a direct parallel with former president George W. Bush and decisions taken in the name of the war on terror.

But the clearest denunciation came, as it often does, from nationalist tabloid Global Times, a state-owned paper whose editorials don’t represent official policy but do often represent a strain of thinking within the Communist Party.

Hours before Trump made his announcement, it said America’s "selfishness and irresponsibility will be made clear to the world, crippling the country’s world leadership."

Pointing out that the United States joined only Syria and Nicaragua in rejecting the accord, it argued that “the Trump administration doesn’t care about putting the U.S.’s reputation at risk.”

There is a certain irony in the world’s biggest source of greenhouse gases rounding on the United States for turning its back on a climate change accord, especially when China’s promises under that accord are not particularly ambitious — while U.S. emissions are already falling.

As Trump himself pointed out in an attempt to justify his decision, China has only promised to cap carbon emissions by 2030, giving it theoretical carte blanche to raise its emissions levels every year for the next 13.

Yet Trump also failed to mention other important points: that Western nations are historically much more culpable than developing nations for global carbon emissions, and on a per capita basis continues to be by far the worst offender.

He also failed to mention that China’s emissions have been stable or falling since 2013, and are forecast to fall by around 1 percent this year. Coal consumption fell by around 1.3 percent last year, the third annual fall in a row, while China is “smashing records” for solar panel installations, installing enough panels to cover three football pitches every single hour of the year, according to Greenpeace.

It is a dramatic development that has helped halt the rise of global CO2 emissions for the first time since a global climate change treaty was first signed almost three decades ago, the environmental advocacy group said.

It is also the sort of record that has prompted some environmentalists to talk of China taking over a leadership role vacated by the United States.

In Europe this week, Premier Li Keqiang appears to be grasping that challenge — or exploiting that vacuum.

He will join with the European Union on Friday in a commitment to cut back on fossil fuels, develop more green technology and help raise $100 billion a year by 2020 to help poorer countries cut their emissions, Reuters reported.

There are parallels as well to China’s attempt to portray itself as a champion of economic globalization, with President Xi Jinping attempting to seize that mantle in a speech at the World Economic Forum in Davos in January as the United States threatened to become more protectionist.

Yet talk of China as a leader in trade and globalization overlooks one massive contradiction: its own increasingly protectionist attitude at home. Similarly, talk of Beijing as a leader in climate change also overlooks some uncomfortable facts.

As Greenpeace clean air campaigner Lauri Myllyvirta pointed out in a series of tweets on Thursday, leadership can involve taking action at home, symbolic or rhetorical steps, provision of finance to drive carbon cuts or diplomatic efforts.

“China has merits on all aspects but is no means a saint,” he tweeted.

China has been vocal in defending the Paris accord, and has become the world’s number one manufacturer, developer and exporter of renewable energy. But it remains by far the world’s leading polluter, has one of the world’s most CO2-intensive economic models, and continues to subsidize “dirty” sectors.
And it is building dozens of polluting, subsidized coal plants in other countries, that could lock them into a dirty development path, Myllyvirta said.

Today's WorldView
What's most important from where the world meets Washington

In a commentary piece, Xinhua argued that Trump's decision to quit the Paris accord would "leave a fairly big shoe for a single country to fill," while the Global Times claimed that China is "not interested in discussions about the leadership of fighting climate change."

Under President Obama, cooperation between the world's two largest polluters had been widely seen as a major achievement and a bright spot in relations between the two countries. This week, it is more likely to be seen as contest, and a point of friction.

Yet seeing climate change largely in geopolitical terms, as a battle for supremacy between American and Chinese leadership, could be missing the point.

“We don’t need one perfect leader, need lots of countries, states, firms to step up, laud progress and expose unhelpful policies,” Myllyvirta tweeted.

The Terminator: Arnold Schwarzenegger slams Trump's Paris Accord decision: 'Only I can go back in time'

3:17 PM Friday Jun 2, 2017

Arnold Schwarzenegger has become the latest famous name to attack Donald Trump over his Paris withdrawal, saying: "One man cannot go back in time - only I can do that."

But the Terminator star had a serious message on climate change, telling the President in a powerful video message "one man cannot stop our clean energy revolution" or "destroy our progress."

The former Governor of California said that as a public servant, the President’s first responsibility was to "protect the people", 200,000 of whom die each year from air pollution in the US alone.

"Please Mr President, choose the future," he begged. "No one remembers the people who told President Kennedy not to go to the Moon. We remember the great leaders.

"The great leaders that don't walk backwards into the past but great leaders that charge forward towards the future."

Trump is withdrawing the US from the Paris agreement to curb climate change, in a move critics have slammed as "catastrophic" and "reckless".

This puts the US at odds with 194 countries - including Australia and New Zealand - that signed up to the deal in 2015, which is designed to slow global warming and rising sea levels.

Barack Obama was quick to attack the decision, as did former vice president Al Gore, who said the withdrawal was "reckless and indefensible". Hillary Clinton tweeted that it was a "historic mistake".

What President Trump did today by withdrawing from the Paris Climate Accord is an international disgrace. pic.twitter.com/ZjBMOiABDj

— Bernie Sanders (@SenSanders) June 1, 2017

John Kerry, a co-signer of the Paris accord, said the President had taken "a self-destructive step" that put America last. The former Secretary of State called the move "an unprecedented forfeiture of American leadership which will cost us influence, cost us jobs and invite other countries to walk away from solving humanity's most existential crisis."

He said the decision was "an ignorant, cynical appeal to an anti-science, special-interest faction far outside the mainstream."
CNN columnist John D Sutter categorised the pullout as “catastrophic both for this country and the planet”.

Trump lied throughout his climate speech this afternoon, so we made him a very special splash.

— HuffPost (@HuffPost) Jun 2, 2017

German news magazine Der Spiegel tweeted an image of its cover with the headline, “The end of the world as we know it” and the caption “America first! Earth last!”

The front page of the New York Daily News was equally direct, claiming Trump had told the world to “drop dead”.

Here’s Friday’s front page...


World leaders also turned on the US. French President Emmanuel Macron, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Italian Premier Paolo Gentiloni said in a joint statement on Thursday that they noted “with regret” the US decision to pull out of the 2015 agreement.

They added that the course charted by the accord is “irreversible and we firmly believe that the Paris Agreement cannot be renegotiated.”
America First!
Earth Last!
#ParisAgreement
— DER SPIEGEL (@DerSPIEGEL) June 1, 2017

Mexico said in a statement: "Efforts to slow climate change are a moral imperative, because we owe it to future generations."

The White House said Trump spoke with the leaders of Germany, France, Canada and Britain on Thursday to explain his decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accord and thanked the leaders for their "frank, substantive discussions" with him.

The announcement, made Thursday afternoon in the White House Rose Garden, fulfills Trump's election promise to pull out of the pact, which he has described as a job killer.

"As of today, the United States will cease all implementation of the non-binding Paris accord and the draconian financial and economic burdens the agreement imposes on our country," Trump said.

"So we're getting out and we'll start to negotiate and we will see if we can make a deal that's fair. And if we can, that's great. And if we can't, that's fine," he said.

Trump suggested that other nations were "laughing" at America and that the accord was "about other countries gaining an advantage over the United States".

"At what point does America get demeaned? At what point do they start laughing at us as a country?" Trump said.

"We want fair treatment for our citizens and we want fair treatment for our taxpayers.

"We don't want other leaders and other countries laughing at us anymore, and they won't be, they won't be.

A historic mistake. The world is moving forward together on climate change. Paris withdrawal leaves American workers & families behind.
— Hillary Clinton (@HillaryClinton) June 1, 2017

"I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris."

But the Mayor of Pittsburgh, has shot back on Twitter, slamming Trump's decision.

As the Mayor of Pittsburgh, I can assure you that we will follow the guidelines of the Paris Agreement for our people, our economy & future. https://t.co/Zy85GTs18C
— bill peduto (@BillPeduto) June 1, 2017

The Mayor of New York City, Bill de Blasio, did the same.

On behalf of New York City, I will commit to honor the goals of the Paris agreement with an Executive Order in the coming days.
— Bill de Blasio (@NYCMayor) June 1, 2017

Washington Governor Jay Inslee told reporters that states are free to act on their own to reduce pollution. Inslee said Washington state, New York and California are forming the United States Climate Alliance, a coalition that will convene states committed to working to uphold the Paris climate agreement.

Virginia Governor Terry McAuliffe said Trump's decision was a "disgrace".
US president ditches current agreement: "We're getting out, but we'll start to negotiate and we'll see if we can make a deal that's fair"

The withdrawal put the US in a dubious club with Nicaragua and Syria as the only countries to reject the agreement.

Trump's announcement was met with applause from the crowd of supporters gathered in the Rose Garden. The President said the US would endeavor to either re-enter the Paris accord or propose a new deal "on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its taxpayers."

"As President, I can put no other consideration before the wellbeing of American citizens," he said.

"The Paris climate agreement is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States to the exclusive benefit of other countries, leaving American workers - who I love - and taxpayers to absorb the cost in terms of lost jobs, lower wages, shuttered factories and vastly diminished economic production."

The decision means the US will pull out of the Green Climate Fund, which Trump said cost the country "a vast fortune."

Citing a study by the National Economic Research Associates (NERA), the President said compliance with the existing deal would cost the US as many as 2.7 million jobs by 2025.

He said the agreement would "decimate" the coal, steel and manufacturing industries.

Trump stressed that he "cares deeply" about the environment. "Not only does this deal subject our citizens to harsh economic restrictions, it fails to live up to our environmental ideals," he said.

"As someone who cares deeply about the environment, which I do, I cannot in good conscience support a deal that prejudices the United States - the world's leader in environmental protection - while imposing meaningless obligations on the world's leading polluters."

Trump said China had been given a free pass to increase its carbon emissions for a "staggering" 15 years.

Obama said the withdrawal meant the Trump administration had made the US one of "a small handful of nations that reject the future."

"I'm confident that our states, cities and businesses will step up and do even more to lead the way and help protect for future generations the one planet we've got," he said in a statement.

Gore, who starred in the climate change documentary An Inconvenient Truth, said the decision "undermines America's standing in the world and threatens to damage humanity's ability to solve the climate crisis in time."

Even oil companies have voiced opposition to pulling out of the agreement, with Exxon Mobil Corp and ConocoPhillips arguing that the US is better off with a seat at the table so it can influence global efforts to curb emissions, Bloomberg reports.

Walt Disney CEO Bob Iger and Tesla boss Elon Musk both announced their resignation from the President's Council over the withdrawal.

The FACTS:

- "As the Mayor of Pittsburgh, I can assure you that we will follow the guidelines of the Paris Agreement for our people, our economy & future."

- "According to a study by NERA Consulting, meeting the Obama administration's requirements in the Paris Accord would cost the U.S. economy nearly $3 trillion over the next several decades. By 2040, our economy would lose 6.5 million industrial sector jobs - including 3.1 million manufacturing sector jobs."
Macron: Trump made a ‘mistake’

Here’s Macron, speaking in English.

“I do respect this decision, but I do think it is an actual mistake both for the US and for our planet. I just said President Trump in a few words a few minutes ago this assessment.

“Tonight I wish to tell the United States, France believes in you. The world believes in you…”

---

The view from Australia

Gabrielle Chan

The Turnbull government has recommitted to Australia’s emissions targets in the Paris Agreement after Donald Trump’s withdrawal but faces internal division as conservative MPs celebrated the decision.

Energy and environment minister Josh Frydenberg said he was disappointed with Trump’s decision but reiterated the Turnbull government’s full commitment to the Paris Accord.

“We reiterate our full commitment to the Paris Accord,” Frydenberg told the ABC. “We believe that the targets we agreed to, the 26% to 28% reduction in emissions by 2030 on 2005 levels are reasonable, are achievable.

“I do believe that it is still a very meaningful agreement. You have more than 190 countries that signed on and in record time, 146 countries have ratified. So even without the US, around 70% of the world’s emissions are covered by that agreement.”

But Liberal MP and chair of the backbench environment committee, Craig Kelly, who was at the forefront of the campaign which forced Frydenberg to rule out any form of carbon trading, had “champagne on ice” waiting for the US withdrawal.

Early on Friday morning, he posted “THEY’RE OUT”, welcoming the decision with a video of Whitney Houston singing the Star Spangled Banner.

“There is a more efficient way to generate energy than using fossil fuels, it’s just that mankind hasn’t yet worked it out,” Kelly said.

“But if our history tells us anything, we are more likely to discover that new technology by combining free market capitalism with the wealth created by fossil fuels – than we are through central planning and government imposed regulations that destroy wealth.”

---

French president to speak live

New French president Emmanuel Macron isn’t going to bed until he’s had his say about Trump’s withdrawal, apparently. He was to have started speaking 20 minutes ago, we’ll report what we hear.
Emmanuel Macron

Je m'exprimera en direct à 23h à propos de la décision du Président Trump de retirer les États-Unis des accords de Paris sur le climat.

Reaction, cont’d

House minority leader Nancy Pelosi: “abandoning America’s leadership”:

Pulling out of the Paris Accord defies the overwhelming support for action from credible scientists, the governments of 194 different countries and many religious groups. Faith leaders from Pope Francis to the evangelical community have urged us to act to preserve the beauty of God’s creation.

“By walking away from this pact, President Trump is abandoning America’s leadership position in the fight against the climate crisis and is sending a strong message to the rest of the world to create, design and manufacture clean energy solutions and create jobs elsewhere. If President Trump wants nations like China and India to take stronger and swifter action on climate, then he should do so through the accountability and enforcement provisions in the Paris Agreement, not by breaking our word and storming out of the room.”

The view from Russia

Alec Luhn

Trump’s withdrawal announcement came in the late evening in Russia, and official commentary was not immediately available. But Vladimir Putin’s spokesman Dmitry Peskov said earlier on Thursday that Russia “attaches great importance” to the Paris climate accord, and a US withdrawal could complicate the agreement’s implementation.

“Of course, the effectiveness and realization of this convention will be hampered without key participants,” Peskov told journalists. “There is no alternative (to the accord) at this time.”

The Russian television station Ren TV warned that climate change “could turn into a real catastrophe” after the US withdrawal.

In a statement last year, the foreign ministry said Moscow signing the Paris accord “reaffirms Russia’s commitment to the joint objectives of the international community in global warming”.

But in the past, climate change has often been seen as beneficial for Russia, which has been rushing to develop military bases, shipping routes and oil and gas fields in the Arctic as the region warms. Even though climate change has exacerbated forest fires and thawed permafrost in Russia, according to scientists, the issue has not been widely covered by state media here.

Putin, who once joked that Russians would spend less on fur coats, said at an Arctic forum in March that climate change would “continue anyway and anyhow” and skeptics “may not be at all silly.”

“Climate change brings in more favorable conditions and improves the economic potential of this region,” Putin said.

Astronaut Scott Kelly:

Scott Kelly (@StationCDRKelly)

Withdrawing from the #ParisAgreement will be devastating to our planet. Paris and Pittsburgh share the same environment after all. pic.twitter.com/QNO5vHtmEF

June 1, 2017

Obama’s official photographer: View image on Twitter
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Florida Representative Charlie Crist: ‘heartbroken’

Follow Charlie Crist

@CharlieCrist

I am heartbroken by this decision. Actively deciding to not protect our environment? Shameful.
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Europe says no 'renegotiation' of Paris deal

It looks like Trump's plan to "renegotiate" the Paris deal may be a sham plan:
BREAKING: France, Germany, Italy issue joint statement saying Paris climate accord can’t be renegotiated.

Merkel ‘regrets’ Trump move

BREAKING: German Chancellor Angela Merkel says she regrets US climate move, will keep working to ‘save our Earth.’
"One of the most important contracts in the history of humanity saw 195 countries committing in 2015 to save the planet for our children. But now the man in the White House is putting the project at risk. Is he a danger for us all?" the paper asks in an editorial.

Martin Schulz, leader of the Social Democrats and the party’s candidate for September’s elections tweeted: “You can withdraw from a climate agreement but not from climate change, Mr Trump. Reality isn’t just another statesman you shove away”.

The opposition Green Party tweeted: “Trump leaves the Paris agreement. A hard defeat for climate protection. All the more decisively will we now fight for our planet.”

Cem Özdemir, joint leader of the Greens tweeted: “Trump doesn’t know what he’s doing. We do!”, and went on to promote a joint climate union between the EU and US states and cities. “Let’s work on climate protection”, he said.

But German climate experts were generally of the opinion that whether Trump’s government was in or out of the Paris agreement, the effect would be the same.

“In any case the members of this government are for personal and political reasons not interested in making laws to protect the environment - of whatever kind - which they see as getting in the way of doing business,” said Matthias Ruth, a German professor at the Northeastern University in Boston.

Lukas Hermwille, scientific researcher in the field of international climate policy at the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, drew attention to the fact that the exit from the agreement would anyway only come into effect in around three years’ time “ironically,” he told Die Welt, “on the day after the next US presidential election”. But Trump could still spend the rest of his time in office torpedoing climate protection from the inside-out, he added.

Pittsburgh rejects Trump embrace

“I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris,” Trump said.

The line has ticked off a lot of Pittsburghers.
@realDonaldTrump Pittsburgh is one of the greenest cities in America. Miss us.

8:00 AM - 2 Jun 2017

Green Living In America's "Steel City"
View from the U.S. Steel Tower, Pittsburgh's tallest skyscraper Time-honored "steel town" Pittsburgh, PA has officially gone green. America's former industrial center is now a hub for sustainable...

forbes.com

Matt Viser (@mviser)
June 1, 2017

President Donald Trump should not remove the United States from the Paris climate agreement. Forged in 2015 with 194 other nations as part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the accord is the best arrangement for controlling the global pollution that contributes to global warming. Mr. Trump's goal of placing America's interests first will not be advanced by joining the company of the only other two countries that declined affiliation with the accord: Syria and Nicaragua.

Lucia Graves (@lucia_graves)
Trump says he's doing this for Pittsburgh? Here's what the Post-Gazette's editorial board says about Paris: pic.twitter.com/hwvyTWKuLL
June 1, 2017

John Cheese (@johncheese)
Holy shit, The Weather Channel is NOT fucking around! pic.twitter.com/izow7eNAwH
Reactions, cont’d

Jeff Immelt (@JeffImmelt)
Disappointed with today’s decision on the Paris Agreement. Climate change is real. Industry must now lead and not depend on government.

Senator Bob Casey (@SenBobCasey)
Earlier this year I held a town hall in Pittsburgh & the residents in attendance called for action on climate change. Cc: @realDonaldTrump

Elon Musk (@elonmusk)
Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world.

Lindsey Graham (@LindseyGrahamSC)
I support President Trump’s desire to re-enter the Paris Accord after the agreement becomes a better deal for America and business.

The mayor of Pittsburgh:

bill peduto (@billpeduto)
The United States joins Syria, Nicaragua & Russia in deciding not to participate with world’s Paris Agreement. It’s now up to cities to lead

Marin Cogan (@marincogan)
If you’re still talking about Pittsburgh as a gritty old steel town, just know that you have absolutely no idea what you’re talking about.

Jennifer Epstein (@jeneps)
The Rose Garden band pic.twitter.com/QMZac0TH4D

Oliver Milman (@olliemilman)
It’s official: Trump announces US exit from Paris climate agreement. But adds “we will start to renegotiate” terms for possible re-entry

A reminder that Paris took around 20 years of proceeding work, is voluntary and had nearly 200 countries on board

This is prob the US’ worst self inflicted wound of modern times, it harms environmental, economic and diplomatic standing for years to come

A future president can reverse this but America’s standing in the world will take a while to recover. Those renewable jobs will go OS & emissions cuts will slow at a time when they must accelerate if we are to avoid the worst in sea level rise, heatwaves, loss of reefs etc

In terms of profound consequence Trump won’t do anything as severe as this in his presidency.

Donald Trump confirms US will quit Paris climate agreement

World’s second largest greenhouse gas emitter will remove itself from global treaty as Trump claims accord ‘will harm’ American jobs

Live coverage: Trump announces US will withdraw from Paris climate deal
Donald Trump has confirmed that he will withdraw the US from the Paris climate agreement, in effect ensuring the world’s second largest emitter of greenhouse gases will quit the international effort to address dangerous global warming.

The US will remove itself from the deal, joining Syria and Nicaragua as the only countries not party to the Paris agreement. There will be no penalty for leaving, with the Paris deal based upon the premise of voluntary emissions reductions by participating countries.

Analysis The Paris deal pullout is more damaging to the US than the climate

Damian Carrington: The US abandoning the global climate deal brings risks, but the unity of the rest of the world and plummeting green energy costs are reasons for hope

Read more

“In order to fulfil my solemn duty to the United States and its citizens, the US will withdraw from the Paris climate accord, but begin negotiations to re-enter either the Paris accord or a really entirely new transaction, on terms that are fair to the United States,” the US president told press in the White House rose garden on Thursday.

“We will start to negotiate, and we will see if we can make a deal that’s fair,” Trump said. “If we can, that’s great. If we can’t, that’s fine.”

But Italy, France and Germany issued a joint statement shortly after Trump’s speech saying they believed the treaty could not be renegotiated.

Trump told the crowd outside the White House: “The fact that the Paris deal hamstrings the United States while empowering some of the world’s top polluting countries should expel any doubt as to why foreign lobbyists should wish to keep our beautiful country tied up and bound down ... That’s not going to happen while I’m president, I’m sorry.”

He added: “I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”

World leaders reject Trump’s claim Paris climate deal can be renegotiated

Read more

Trump’s predecessor, Barack Obama, issued a rare statement saying the new administration had joined “a small handful of nations that reject the future”. But he said that US states, cities and businesses “will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we’ve got.”

Former vice-president Al Gore called the move “reckless and indefensible”, while among the business leaders to express regret over the move was Jeff Immelt, chair and CEO of General Electric, who said “climate change is real” and “industry must now lead”.

Trump, who spoke after being introduced by a warm-up band playing the George Gershwin classic Summertime, argued that the Paris agreement disadvantaged the US to the benefit of other countries, leaving workers and taxpayers to absorb the costs and suffer job losses and factory closures. As of today, he said, the US will cease implementation of the nationally determined contribution and green climate fund, “which is costing the US a vast fortune”.

In 2015, nearly 200 countries agreed to curb greenhouse gas emissions in order to prevent the runaway climate change that would occur should temperatures spiral 2°C or more above the pre-industrial era.

Of the 197 parties to have signed the Paris agreement, 147 have ratified it

Percentage of global emissions

Guardian graphic | Source: Climate analytics.org. Note: Data as of 7 May 2017

Trump’s decision risks destabilizing the Paris deal, with remaining participants faced with the choice of trying to make up the shortfall in emissions cuts or following the US’s lead and abandoning the agreement.

The US emissions reduction pledge accounts for a fifth of the global emissions to be avoided by 2020, with an analysis by not-for-profit group Climate Interactive showing that a regression to “business as usual” emissions by the US could warm the world by an additional 0.3°C by 2100. This would help push the global temperature rise well beyond 2°C, causing punishing heatwaves, sea level rise, displacement of millions of people and the loss of ecosystems such as coral reefs.

The US withdrawal would not, though, doom global efforts to fight climate change, said Christian Florsch, the former UN climate chief who delivered the Paris agreement. “States, cities, corporations, investors have been moving in this direction for several years and the dropping prices of renewables versus high cost of health impacts from fossil fuels, guarantees the continuation of the transition.”
The investigations swirling around Donald Trump – a short guide

Read more

The US will be the loser from its withdrawal, said Prof John Schellnhuber, a climate scientist and former adviser to the EU, Angela Merkel and the pope. “It will not substantially hamper global climate progress but it will hurt the American economy and society alike,” he said. “China and Europe have become world leaders on the path towards green development already and will strengthen their position if the US slips back. The Washington people around Trump fail to recognise that the climate wars are over, while the race for sustainable prosperity is on.”

“President Trump is putting his country on the wrong side of history,” said Laurence Tubiana, France’s climate ambassador during the negotiation of the Paris deal.

John Kasietch, the governor of Ohio and a frequent critic of Trump, said he shared concerns about “flaws” in the treaty. “I’m convinced we can correct them and improve the agreement, however,” he said, “by showing leadership and constructively engaging with like-minded nations, not by joining the ranks of holdouts like Syria and Nicaragua.”

Bernie Sanders, the leftwing senator and former Democratic presidential hopeful, called the move an “international disgrace” and an “abdication of American leadership.”

But House-speaker Paul Ryan, the most senior Republican in Congress, threw his support behind Trump’s decision, saying the Paris accord was “simply a new deal for America”.

“In order to unleash the power of the American economy, our government must encourage production of American energy,” Ryan said in a statement. “I commend President Trump for fulfilling his commitment to the American people and withdrawing from this bad deal.”

Conflicting signals

Trump followed through with his campaign pledge to “cancel” US involvement in the Paris accord following months of conflicting signals over whether he would do so or just scale back the US ambition to cut emissions.

The withdrawal represents a victory for the nationalist elements in Trump’s administration, such as his strategist Steve Bannon, who have argued the Paris deal undermines an “America first” approach, hampers domestic coal production and hinders efforts to repeal Barack Obama-era regulations such as the Clean Power Plan. On Tuesday, Trump met with Scott Pruitt, the Environmental Protection Agency head who has called Paris a “bad deal” that should be discarded.

In his speech, Trump sought to frame his decision as part of this nationalist agenda. “The Paris agreement handicaps the United States economy in order to win praise from the very foreign capitals and global activists that have long sought to gain wealth at our country’s expense,” he said. “They don’t put America first. I do, and I always will.”

A group of 22 Republican senators, headed by majority leader Mitch McConnell, backed the anti-Paris view in a letter to Trump that urged a “clean exit” from the Paris deal, which they said added a “regulatory burden” upon the US.

Analysis

The Republicans who urged Trump to pull out of Paris deal are big oil darlings

Trump’s biggest advocates were a letter to the president when he was said to be on the fence about backing out. They received more than $10m from oil, gas and coal companies in the past three election cycles.

The anti-agreement faction had already pocketed for Trump’s favour over a rival school of thought, including secretary of state Rex Tillerson and Ivanka Trump, the president’s daughter and adviser, that argued the US should remain in the Paris deal in order to preserve its diplomatic influence.

Hundreds of large businesses, including Apple, Google and Walmart, also threw their weight behind the deal, with even fossil fuel firms such as ExxonMobil, BP and Shell supporting the accord as the best way to transition to a low-carbon economy and stave off the perils of climate change.

In a bid to calm the frayed nerves of countries most at risk from rising temperatures, the EU and China announced an alliance to stay the course earlier on Wednesday. Their joint declaration called climate change a “national security issue” and a “multiplying factor of social and political fragility.” The Paris pact is a “historic achievement” and “irreversible,” the document says.

“It is absolutely essential that the world implements the Paris agreement,” said UN secretary general Antonio Guterres. “If one country decides to leave a void, I can guarantee someone else will occupy it.”

Environmental groups were scathing of Trump’s decision, with more than 20,000 members of the Sierra Club calling the White House within hours of reports that the president had opted to exit the deal. “Donald Trump has made a historic mistake which our grandchildren will look back on with stunned dismay at how a world leader could be so divorced from reality and morality,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the Sierra Club.

Bill de Blasio, the mayor of New York City, said he will sign an order committing the city to the Paris accord due to the “destructive power” of disasters like Hurricane Sandy.

Additional reporting by Tom McCarthy, David Smith and Sabrina Siddiqui

Trump pulls US out of Paris climate accord
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Henry Cooke

Try watching this video on www.youtube.com

What you need to know:

• Trump is pulling the United States out of the Paris agreement to fight climate change, fulfilling a campaign promise, saying “I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”
• He says he will try to negotiate a new deal that is “fair” to the United States - but France, Germany, and Italy have issued a statement saying the deal will not be renegotiated.
• French president Macron invited US researchers to find a “second home” in France. He said the whole world shared the responsibility to “make our planet great again.”
• The Paris agreement, signed by almost every country in the world and ratified by most, aimed to limit the average temperature rise to 2C above pre-industrial levels.
• Trump characterised the agreement as “massive redistribution of United States wealth to other countries.” He said the deal was drawn up to weaken the United States.
• Watch a livestream of the announcement above.
• Barack Obama said Trump was making America join a “small handful of nations that reject the future.”
• Those other nations that are rejecting the deal? Nicaragua and Syria - and Nicaragua rejected it because it didn’t go far enough.
• Deputy PM and climate change minister Paula Bennett said the move was “disappointing”. Greens co-leader James Shaw said the NZ government needed to do more to fight climate change.
Here's a video of French President Emmanuel Macron making his statement in English.

Emmanuel Macron @EmmanuelMacron
Statement from Emmanuel Macron, president of France.
pscp.tv

99 Retweets
66 likes
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"It is one of the major issues of our time. It is already changing our daily lives," Macron said.

"If we do nothing our children will know a world of migrations, of wars, of shortage."
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"There is no plan B, there is no planet B," Macron said.
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"We will succeed," says Macron, "because we are fully committed."

"Because wherever we are we all share the same responsibility - make our planet great again."
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"I know your history, our common history," Macron continues.
He says all scientists and others disappointed in the decision will find a "second homeland" in France. He invites them to come to France and work for solutions.

"I assure you we will not give up the fight."

French President Emmanuel Macron is making a live address.

"Tonight, I wish to tell the people of the United States, France believes in you."*

Generation Zero, a Kiwi youth climate action group, have issued this statement to Stuff:

"Trump deciding to pull out of the Paris agreement means the rest of the world, including New Zealand, must step up in America's absence."

"We are hopeful the remaining members will continue to address the challenges of climate change and seize the opportunity to secure the economic benefits of moving to a clean economy."

"Today's announcement shows the danger of climate change becoming a partisan political football."

Matthew Nussbaum

NEWS: senior administration officials still won't say if Trump believes human activity causes climate change; they called question off topic
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German Chancellor Angela Merkel rang Trump immediately to express her regret, her spokesman says. During the conversation she stressed that Germany would stick to the agreement.

After that conversation she rang French president Emmanuel Macron, who subsequently rang Trump. Germany, France, and Italy put out a joint statement condemning the move and saying the deal would not be renegotiated.

UK Prime Minister Theresa May did not join with France, Italy, and the UK to condemn the move. Asked about the move before it happened on the campaign trail, May told The Independent: "It's up to the President of the United States to decide what position the United States is going to take on this matter."
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As noted in the tweet below, France, Germany, and Italy are all saying that the deal cannot be renegotiated.

“We the Heads of State and of Government of France, Germany, and Italy, take note with regret of the decisions by the United States of America to withdraw from the universal agreement on climate change,” the joint-statement reads.

“We deem the momentum generated in Paris in December 2015 irreversible and we firmly believe that the Paris Agreement cannot be renegotiated, since it is a vital instrument for our planet, societies and economies.”
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View image on Twitter

We, the Heads of State and of Government of France, Germany and Italy, take note with regret of the decision by the United States of America to withdraw from the universal agreement on climate change.

The Paris Agreement remains a cornerstone in the cooperation between our countries, for effectively and timely tackling climate change and for implementing the 2030 Agenda sustainable development goals.

We deem the momentum generated in Paris in December 2015 irreversible and we firmly believe that the Paris Agreement cannot be renegotiated, since it is a vital instrument for our planet, societies and economies.

We are convinced that the implementation of the Paris Agreement offers substantial economic opportunities for prosperity and growth in our countries and on a global scale.

We therefore reaffirm our strongest commitment to swiftly implement the Paris Agreement, including its climate finance goals and we encourage all our partners to speed up their action to combat climate change.

We will step up efforts to support developing countries, in particular the poorest and most vulnerable, in achieving their mitigation and adaptation goals.

Follow

Jeremy Cliffe
@JeremyCliffe

Full response to Trump's Paris announcement from the leaders of France, Germany and Italy:

We, the Heads of State and of Government of France, Germany and Italy, take note with regret of the decision by the United States of America to withdraw from the universal agreement on climate change.

The Paris Agreement remains a cornerstone in the cooperation between our countries, for effectively and timely tackling climate change and for implementing the 2030 Agenda sustainable development goals.

We deem the momentum generated in Paris in December 2015 irreversible and we firmly believe that the Paris Agreement cannot be renegotiated, since it is a vital instrument for our planet, societies and economies.

We are convinced that the implementation of the Paris Agreement offers substantial economic opportunities for prosperity and growth in our countries and on a global scale.

We therefore reaffirm our strongest commitment to swiftly implement the Paris Agreement, including its climate finance goals and we encourage all our partners to speed up their action to combat climate change.

We will step up efforts to support developing countries, in particular the poorest and most vulnerable, in achieving their mitigation and adaptation goals.
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Here's Trump announcing the change. credit: Reuters

Here's Trump leaving the rose garden. credit: Reuters
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In the case of Nicaragua, the argument actually went the other way. As world leaders gathered in the French capital in November 2015 to reach an agreement on fighting climate change, Nicaragua’s lead envoy explained to reporters that the country would not support the agreed-upon plan as it hinged on voluntary pledges and would not punish those who failed to meet them. That was simply not enough, Paul Oquist argued.

“We’re not going to submit because voluntary responsibility is a path to failure,” Oquist told the website Climate Home on Nov. 30. “We don’t want to be an accomplice to taking the world to 3 to 4 degrees and the death and destruction that represents.”

Greens co-leader James Shaw has put out a statement:

New Zealand must join with other countries and step up as a climate leader in the wake of the US decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement, the Green Party said today.

This morning President Donald Trump announced the United States would withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement, joining just two other countries – Nicaragua and Syria – who have rejected the global accord.

“The US might be abdicating its moral leadership on climate change, but New Zealand should join with world leaders today and promise to put the environment and future generations first,” said Green Party Co-leader James Shaw.

“As long as the rest of the world stands united I am confident that global action on climate change will continue over the next four years.

“New Zealand should join with China, the European Union and other countries promising to accelerate efforts to reduce climate pollution.

“National should not use the US decision as an excuse to continue to do nothing on climate change, or worse to justify plans to open new coal mines and expand risky oil and gas exploration in New Zealand waters.

“There is simply too much at stake in New Zealand for us to sit on our hands and do nothing. Climate change will see our farmers facing longer, more severe droughts and all of us experiencing more frequent intense storms and flooding.

“Starting the transition away from pollution-intensive industries is also in our best interest. Investing in modern public transport, clean energy and sustainable farming is good for jobs, our health, and our environment.

“We should be taking action to create a cleaner economy and healthier environment irrespective of what happens in the US,” said Mr Shaw.
Withdrawning from the #ParisAgreement will be devastating to our planet. Paris and Pittsburgh share the same environment after all.

Follow
Scott Kelly
@StationCDRKelly
Withdrawing from the #ParisAgreement will be devastating to our planet. Paris and Pittsburgh share the same environment after all.
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Follow
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@AP
BREAKING: France, Germany, Italy issue joint statement saying Paris climate accord can't be renegotiated.

Jun 2, 2017 8:46 Am
Henry Cooke

Stuff political reporter Stacey Kirk asked Climate Change Minister Paula Bennett what it would mean if Trump pulled out of the Paris accord yesterday.

"It would be disappointing if the US chose to withdraw from the Paris Agreement," Bennett said.

"New Zealand is committed to playing its part in the global climate change response. We have an ambitious work programme underway to implement our own commitments under the Paris Agreement."

"The clear message from around the world is the global community intends to press ahead with the Paris agenda. Most recently, leaders of the G7 reaffirmed their strong commitment to swiftly implementing the Paris Agreement."

"The Paris Agreement leaves it to governments to determine their own targets, and these have been formally submitted to the UN. Given the US is yet to make a decision, it is too early to say how any change in its position would affect other countries' targets over the longer-term."

The statement she made today was very similar.
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Flash from AP:

German Chancellor Angela Merkel says she regrets US climate move, will keep working to "save our Earth".

Other Germans are slightly less measured. Here's the Berliner Kurier's front page, which I can't actually print in full as this is a family website. It begins "Earth to Trump."

credit: @Berliner_Kurier
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Quite a few people talking about the fact that Trump's daughter Ivanka and her husband Jared did not appear to be present. Leaks suggest they were part of the main force arguing for the US to stay in.

Follow
Jennifer Epstein
@jeneps
Can't see full colonnade but from my point of view in front row of press area, no sign of Ivanka or Jared in the Rose Garden
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Below are reported "draft tweets" handed out by the Trump administration to allied Republicans:

Draft Tweets
- RT to tell @ POTUS you stand with his decision to put America first! #ParisClimateDeal
- @ POTUS you support his decision to put taxpayers first!
- The @ POTUS you support his decision to put taxpayers first!
- The US doesn't answer to foreign bureaucrats! Other countries pay nothing, while U.S. shoulders the burden #ParisClimateDeal

Follow
Zeke Miller
@ZekeJMiller
The @GOP's "draft tweets" for allies on the Paris accord
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Weather.com is going very hard.
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Trump said that he was "elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris."

Pittsburgh's mayor has responded:
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Left leaning and huge state California - which has also signalled a new course on healthcare - is set to resist this move by Trump. Governor Jerry Brown says the state will "resist this misguided and insane course of action."

California by itself is the sixth largest economy in the world by some estimates, so this could be quite consequential.

Full statement is below:
GOVERNOR BROWN ISSUES STATEMENT ON WHITE HOUSE PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

6-1-2017

SACRAMENTO – In response to President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement, Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. issued the following statement today:

"Donald Trump has absolutely chosen the wrong course. He's wrong on the facts. America's economy is boosted by following the Paris Agreement. He's wrong on the science. Totally wrong. California will resist this misguided and insane course of action. Trump is AWOL, but California is on the field, ready for battle."

Building on the global momentum to combat climate change and continuing California's leading role in broadening collaboration amongst subnational leaders, Governor Brown will travel to China tomorrow to strengthen California's long-standing climate, clean energy and economic ties with the nation. The Governor will also attend the 2017 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP23) in Bonn, Germany to represent subnational jurisdictions that remain committed to climate action.

California, the sixth-largest economy in the world, has advanced its nation-leading climate goals while also growing the economy. In the last seven years, California has created 2.3 million new jobs – outpacing most of the United States – cut its unemployment rate in half, eliminated a $27 billion budget deficit and has seen its credit rating rise to the highest in more than a decade.

California's Leadership on Climate Change

Governor Brown attended the United Nations' 2015 Climate Conference (COP21) at the invitation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Executive Secretary and France's Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development. Over the course of the conference, the Governor met with the UN Secretary-General, China's Special Envoy on Climate Change, France's Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy, the U.S. Energy Secretary and former Vice President Al Gore, and participated in a number of events with other world leaders. Last April, the Governor traveled to the United Nations Headquarters in New York to participate in events marking the first day parties signed on to the Paris Climate Agreement.

California's ambitious climate action includes the Under2 Coalition – an international pact among cities, states and countries to limit the increase in global average temperature to below 2 degrees Celsius, the level of potentially catastrophic consequences – formed in 2015 by California and Baden-Württemberg, Germany in the lead up to COP21. The growing coalition now includes 170 jurisdictions on six continents that collectively represent more than 1.18 billion people and $27.5 trillion GDP – equivalent to 16 percent of the global population and 37 percent of the global economy.

Eighteen U.S. jurisdictions have joined the Under2 Coalition, representing 89 million people and 28 percent of the U.S. population. The Governor's upcoming trip to China includes meetings in Sichuan and Jiangsu, the first Chinese provinces to join the Under2 Coalition.

In March, Governor Brown reaffirmed California's commitment to exceed the targets of the Clean Power Plan and the state's efforts to curb carbon pollution, which include establishing the most ambitious greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in North America and the nation's toughest restrictions on destructive super pollutants. The Governor has also signed legislation that directs cap-and-trade funds to greenhouse gas reducing programs which benefit disadvantaged communities, support clean transportation and protect natural ecosystems.

This action builds on landmark legislation the Governor signed in October 2015 to generate half of the state's electricity from renewable sources by 2030 and double the rate of energy efficiency savings in California buildings. Governor Brown has also committed to reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks by up to 50 percent within the next 15 years; make heating fuels cleaner; and manage farmland and rangelands, forests and wetlands so they can store carbon.

The Governor has traveled to the United Nations headquarters in New York, the Vatican in Italy and the Climate Summit of the Americas in Toronto, Canada to call on other leaders to join California in the fight against climate change. These efforts build on a number of other international climate change agreements with leaders from the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Mexico, China, North America, Japan, Israel, Peru, Chile, Australia, Scotland and Sweden and Governor Brown's efforts to gather hundreds of world-renowned researchers and scientists around a groundbreaking call to action - called the consensus statement - which translates key scientific climate findings from disparate fields into one unified document.

###
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Here's a statement from Deputy-PM Paula Bennett, who is also the Climate Change Minister:

It is really disappointing the US has chosen to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, but New Zealand remains absolutely committed to it.

We have an ambitious work programme underway to implement our own commitments under the Paris Agreement.

The clear message from around the world is the global community will press ahead with the Paris agenda. Most recently, leaders of the G7 reaffirmed their strong commitment to swiftly implementing the Paris Agreement.
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Trump has called climate change a Chinese hoax for years. His remarks today about China and other nations “laughing” at America echoed that. Here’s a tweet of his from 2013.

@realDonaldTrump
China loved Obama’s climate change speech yesterday. They laughed! It hastens their takeover of us as the leading world economy.
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Many major American companies - who you might expect to be against the deal - wanted the US to stay in. Here’s an Intel statement on the move:

"Climate change is a real issue, and we firmly believe that the US should continue to participate in the Paris Climate Accord. Withdrawal won't change our investment in renewable energy, and we will continue to advocate for the US to engage."

@cwarzel
Here’s a statement from Intel on Trump pulling out of the Paris Accord:

"Climate change is a real issue, and we firmly believe that the US should continue to participate in the Paris Climate Accord. Withdrawal won't change our investment in renewable energy, and we will continue to advocate for the US to engage."

Here’s the CEO of General Electric:

@JeffImmelt
Disappointed with today’s decision on the Paris Agreement. Climate change is real. Industry must now lead and not depend on government.
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"We’ll be the cleanest," Pres. Trump says of U.S. "We're going to have the cleanest air. We're going to have the cleanest water."
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Tesla founder Elon Musk is leaving a presidential economic council in outrage. His tweet below:

@elonmusk
Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world.

Here's Al Gore on the withdrawal.

View image on Twitter

Statement by Former Vice President Al Gore on Today's Decision by the Trump Administration to Withdraw from the Paris Agreement

June 1, 2017

"Removing the United States from the Paris Agreement is a reckless and indefensible action. It undermines America's standing in the world and threatens to damage humanity's ability to solve the climate crisis in time. But make no mistake. If President Trump won't lead, the American people will.

Civic leaders, mayors, governors, CEOs, investors and the majority of the business community will take up this challenge. We are in the middle of a clean energy revolution that no single person or group can stop. President Trump's decision is profoundly in conflict with what the majority of Americans want from our president, but no matter what he does we will ensure that our inevitable transition to a clean energy economy continues."

###

Trump was at his most forceful while talking about America being "demeaned" by other nations.

He essentially painted a picture of the climate accord as a conspiratorial exercise set up by China and other nations to handicap US growth and humiliate them.

"At what point does America get demeaned. At what point does America get laughed at as a country," Trump said. "We don't want other countries laughing at us anymore, and they won't folks."

This part of the speech was very Steve Bannon/Breitbart-esque.

"With this action you have declared that the people are the rulers of this nation."

"We owe no apologies to any other countries," Pruitt says.

"Please no that I am thankful," Pruitt begins.

"America finally has a leader which answers only to the people."

EPA head Scott Pruitt has been called to the stage.

This speech started off fairly tight and has got fairly rambly. Trump has described a vast global conspiracy behind the climate accords, a conspiracy that seeks to weaken the United States rather than fight climate change.

The United States joins Syria and Nicaragua in rejecting the deal.

Here's some more reaction. First from one of the last remaining moderate Republican senators:

Climate change requires a global approach. I'm disappointed in the President's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement #mepolitics
And a full statement from Bernie Sanders. Haven't seen anything from Clinton yet.

**Sanders Statement on Paris Climate Agreement**

Thursday, June 1, 2017

WASHINGTON, June 1 — Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) issued the following statement after President Donald Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement:

"President Trump’s decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement is an abdication of American leadership and an international disgrace. At this moment, when climate change is already causing devastating harm around the world, we do not have the moral right to turn our backs on efforts to preserve this planet for future generations.

"The United States must play a leading role in the global campaign to stop climate change and transition rapidly away from fossil fuels to renewable and more efficient sources of energy. We must do this with or without the support of Donald Trump and the fossil fuel industry."

**Speaker Ryan on Paris Climate Agreement**

WASHINGTON— House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wi) issued the following statement on President Trump’s decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement:

"The Paris climate agreement was simply a raw deal for America. Signed by President Obama without Senate ratification, it would have driven up the cost of energy, hitting middle-class and low-income Americans the hardest. In order to unleash the power of the American economy, our government must encourage production of American energy. I commend President Trump for fulfilling his commitment to the American people and withdrawing from this bad deal."

**Schumer Statement on President Trump’s Decision to Withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement**

WASHINGTON, D.C. — U.S. Sen. Chuck Schumer released the below statement today following President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement:

"The idea of abdicating for a new deal is a delusion. If you truly believe in improving the Paris Agreement, you don’t back out — you work with our allies and others around the world. This has the same flavor ring as President Trump and Congressional Republicans’ false assertions that repealing the Affordable Care Act will improve healthcare. Democrats will do everything we can to undo what President Trump has done and prevent further regressions. I seriously hope the President reconsiders this awful decision.”

Bernie Sanders: Trump’s decision to withdraw from Paris climate deal “an abdication of American leadership and an international disgrace”

And here’s some support from House Speaker Paul Ryan.

Here's a reaction from the top Democrat in Congress Chuck Schumer, Senate minority leader.

He calls it a “devastating failure of historic proportions.”
@BraddJaffy
Schumer: “Future generations will look back on President Trump’s decision as one of the worst policy moves made in the 21st century”
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Trump says America will remain a world-leader on environmental issues.
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Trump invites Democrats to help him renegotiate America’s way back into Paris.
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Trump says the Paris accord risks “brownouts and blackouts, our businesses will come to a halt in many cases.”

There is absolutely no evidence of this.
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Trump says the Paris accord is “very unfair at the highest level to the United States.”

He says the Paris accord is hugely damaging economically but doesn’t do much for the environment. He says the United States will be the cleanest country in the world, with “the cleanest air, the cleanest water.”
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Trump says the agreement puts the huge natural reserves of energy the United States has under “lock and key”.

“The agreement is a massive redistribution of United States wealth to other countries.”

Jun 2, 2017 7:44 Am
Henry Cooke

Here’s the full quote of Trump pulling out:

“In order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris climate accord but begin negotiations to reenter either the Paris accord or an entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States.”
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@SenSanders

Bernie Sanders

Trump's decision to withdraw the US from the Paris climate agreement is an abdication of American leadership and an international disgrace.
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“The current agreement effectively blocks the development of clean coal in America.”
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Trump says the deal is actually bad for people who love the environment (“which I do”), because it sets a different standard for China and requires financial aid to India.
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President Obama has released a statement on the withdrawal - one of the first times he has chosen to directly rebuke his predecessor. See that statement below.
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View image on Twitter
Statement from President Barack Obama on the Paris Climate Agreement:
A year and a half ago, the world came together in Paris around the first-ever global agreement to set the world on a low-carbon course and protect the world we leave to our children.

It was steady, principled American leadership on the world stage that made that achievement possible. It was bold American ambition that encouraged dozens of other nations to set their sights higher as well. And what made that leadership and ambition possible was America’s private innovation and public investment in growing industries like wind and solar – industries that created some of the fastest new streams of good-paying jobs in recent years, and contributed to the longest streak of job creation in our history.

Simply put, the private sector already chose a low-carbon future. And for the nations that committed themselves to that future, the Paris Agreement opened the floodgates for businesses, scientists, and engineers to unleash high-tech, low-carbon investment and innovation on an unprecedented scale.

The nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will be the nations that reap the benefits in jobs and industries created. I believe the United States of America should be at the front of the pack. But even in the absence of American leadership; even as this Administration joins a small handful of nations that reject the future; I’m confident that our states, cities, and businesses will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we’ve got.

###
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“So we’re getting out but we’ll start to negotiate and we’ll see if we can make a deal that’s fair,” Trump reiterates.
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Trump says the Paris climate accord disadvantages the United States.
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“We will see if we can make a deal that is fair, and if we can that’s great, and if we can’t, that’s fine.”
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“But begin negotiations to re-enter either the Paris accord or a new transaction that is fair to the American people.”
Trump says U.S. to withdraw from Paris climate accord

By Valerie Volcovici and Jeff Mason | WASHINGTON

President Donald Trump on Thursday said he will withdraw the United States from the landmark 2015 global agreement to fight climate change, spurning pleas from U.S. allies and corporate leaders in an action that fulfilled a major campaign pledge.

"We're getting out," Trump said at a ceremony in the White House Rose Garden in which he decried the Paris accord's "draconian" financial and economic burdens. He said American withdrawal "represents a reassertion of American sovereignty."

Trump said the United States would begin negotiations either to re-enter the Paris accord or to have a new agreement "on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers."

With Trump's action, the United States will walk away from nearly every nation in the world on one of the pressing global issues of the 21st century. The pullout will align the United States with Syria and Nicaragua as the world's only non-participants in the accord.

Trump tapped into the "America First" message he used when he was elected president last year, saying, "I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris."

"We don't want other leaders and other countries laughing at us any more. And they won't be," Trump added.

"In order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris climate accord," Trump said.

The United States was one of 195 nations that agreed to the accord in Paris in December 2015, a deal that former U.S. President Barack Obama was instrumental in brokering.

Obama, in a statement, expressed regret over Trump's action.

"The nations that remain in the Paris agreement will be the nations that reap the benefits in jobs and industries created. I believe the United States of America should be at the front of the pack," Obama said.

"But even in the absence of American leadership; even as this administration joins a small handful of nations that reject the future; I'm confident that our states, cities, and businesses will step up and do even more to lead the way, and help protect for future generations the one planet we've got," Obama added.
Supporters of the accord condemned Trump’s move as an abdication of American leadership and an international disgrace.

“At this moment, when climate change is already causing devastating harm around the world, we do not have the moral right to turn our backs on efforts to preserve this planet for future generations,” said U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, who sought the Democratic presidential nomination last year.

“Ignoring reality and leaving the Paris agreement could go down as one of the worst foreign policy blunders in our nation’s history, isolating the U.S. further after Trump’s shockingly bad European trip,” Democratic Senator Sheldon Whitehouse added.

Under the pact, which was years in the making, nations both rich and poor committed to reducing emissions of so-called greenhouse gases generated by burning fossil fuels and blamed by scientists for warming the planet.

The United States had committed to reduce its emissions by 26 percent to 28 percent from 2005 levels by 2025. The United States, exceeded only by China in greenhouse gas emissions, accounts for more than 15 percent of the worldwide total.

Trump, who campaigned for president last year with an “America First” message, promised voters an American withdrawal.

U.S. supporters of the pact said any pullout by Trump would show that the United States can no longer be trusted to follow through on international commitments.

International leaders had pressed Trump not to abandon the accord. At their meeting last month, the pope gave Trump a signed copy of his 2015 encyclical letter that called for protecting the environment from the effects of climate change and backed scientific evidence that it is caused by human activity.

Despite pressure from allies in the Group of Seven rich nations at a meeting in Italy last week, Trump had refused to endorse the agreement, rebuffing leaders from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Britain.

Virtually every nation voluntarily committed to steps aimed at curbing global emissions of “greenhouse” gases such as carbon dioxide generated from burning of fossil fuels.

Leading climate scientists say the emissions trap heat in the atmosphere and have caused a warming planet, sea level rise, droughts and more frequent violent storms.

RELATED COVERAGE

- France, Italy, Germany defend Paris Accord, say cannot be renegotiated
- Trump rejects future in pulling out of Paris climate pact: Obama
- EU regrets U.S. withdrawal from climate deal, will seek other allies
- Paris mayor says Trump climate withdrawal ‘a mistake with fatal consequences’
- Musk to quit Trump advisory councils after Paris accord decision

Last year was the warmest since records began in the 19th century, as global average temperatures continued a rise dating back decades that scientists attribute to greenhouse gases.

They warned that U.S. withdrawal from the deal could speed up the effects of global climate change, worsening heat waves, floods, droughts and storms.
During the campaign, Trump said the accord would cost the U.S. economy trillions of dollars with no tangible benefit. Trump has expressed doubts about climate change, at times calling it a hoax to weaken U.S. industry.

CAMPAIGN PROMISE

The Republican vowed during the campaign to "cancel" the Paris deal within 100 days of becoming president on Jan. 20, part of an effort to bolster U.S. oil and coal industries.

China, which overtook the United States as the world's biggest emitter of greenhouse gases in 2007, and the European Union will seek on Friday to buttress the Paris agreement, with Li meeting top EU officials in Brussels.

In a statement backed by all 28 EU states, the EU and China were poised to commit to full implementation of the agreement, officials said.

Trump has already moved to dismantle Obama-era climate change regulations, including the U.S. Clean Power Plan aimed at reducing emissions from main coal-fired power plants.

Some U.S. states, including California, Washington and New York, have vowed to continue to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and continue engaging in the international climate agreement process.

Oil majors Shell and ExxonMobil Corp supported the Paris pact. Several big coal companies, including Cloud Peak Energy, had publicly urged Trump to stay in the deal as a way to help protect the industry's mining interests overseas, though others asked Trump to exit the accord to help ease regulatory pressures on domestic miners.

(Reporting by Valerie Volcovici, Timothy Gardner, Jeff Mason, and Roberta Rampton; Additional reporting by Robin Emmott and Robert-Jan Bartunek in Brussels, Michelle Nichols at the UN; Writing by Will Dunham; Editing by Nick Zieminski and Cynthia Osterman)

Tesla's Elon Musk is true to his word, will quit as Trump adviser after US pulls out of Paris deal

Tesla founder and chief executive Elon Musk says he will leave US President Donald Trump's presidential councils after Trump announced he will withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

Musk, who threatened to leave if the US withdrew from the deal, said Trump's decision was not good for any party.

Follow

Elon Musk

Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world.

Musk said previously that he had done all he could to advise the White House on the deal that was signed in 2016 by 195 countries.

As a technology executive who has cited climate change as a key reason behind his push for electric vehicles, Musk has a personal and professional stake in the United States' climate change policies.

Tesla CEO Elon Musk has quit his role as one of Trump’s advisers.

Paris climate deal: Trump announces US will withdraw
President Donald Trump has announced that the US is withdrawing from the 2015 Paris climate agreement. He said moves to negotiate a new "fair" deal that would not disadvantage US businesses and workers would begin.

Speaking in the White House Rose Garden, Mr Trump characterised the Paris agreement as a deal that aimed to hobble, disadvantage and impoverish the US. He claimed the agreement would cost the US $3tn in lost GDP and 6.5 million jobs - while rival economies like China and India were treated more favourably.

"In order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris climate accord... but begin negotiations to re-enter either the Paris accord or a really entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers," he said.

"So we're getting out but we will start to negotiate and we will see if we can make a deal that's fair."

Analysts say the US withdrawal will make it more difficult for the world to reach the goals that it set for itself in the Paris agreement. The US contributes about 15% of global emissions of carbon, but it is also a significant source of finance and technology for developing countries in their efforts to fight rising temperatures.

What will US withdrawal do? Analysis by BBC environment correspondent Matt McGrath

There's no doubt that a US pullout will make it more difficult for the world to reach the goals that it set for itself in the Paris agreement. The US contributes about 15% of global emissions of carbon, but it is also a significant source of finance and technology for developing countries in their efforts to fight rising temperatures.

There's also a question of moral leadership, which the US will be giving up, which may have consequences for other diplomatic efforts.

Michael Brune, from US environmentalist organisation the Sierra Club, said the withdrawal was a "historic mistake which our grandchildren will look back on with stunned dismay at how a world leader could be so divorced from reality and morality".

More on this from Matt

What is climate change?

Climate change, or global warming, refers to the damaging effect of gases, or emissions, released from industry and agriculture on the atmosphere. The Paris accord is meant to limit the global rise in temperature attributed to emissions.

What was agreed in Paris?

Climate change, or global warming, refers to the damaging effect of gases, or emissions, released from industry and agriculture on the atmosphere. The Paris accord is meant to limit the global rise in temperature attributed to emissions.

Countries agreed to:

- Keep global temperatures "well below" the level of 2C (3.6F) above pre-industrial times and "endeavour to limit" them even more, to 1.5C.
- Limit the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by human activity to the same levels that trees, soil and oceans can absorb naturally, beginning at some point between 2050 and 2100.
- Review each country's contribution to cutting emissions every five years so they scale up to the challenge.
Enable rich countries to help poorer nations by providing “climate finance” to adapt to climate change and switch to renewable energy

Trump announces U.S. will exit Paris climate deal

President Trump announced Thursday afternoon that he is withdrawing the United States from the landmark Paris climate agreement, a move that honors a campaign promise but risks rupturing global alliances and disappointing both environmentalists and corporate titans.

But Trump said he would seek to negotiate a new climate deal that is, in his view, “fair” to America’s interests.

"In order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris climate accord but begin negotiations to revise either the Paris accord or an entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers," Trump said.

"We’re getting out," he added, "but we will start to negotiate and we will see if we can make a deal that’s fair. If we can, that’s great. If we can’t, that’s fine."

Trump argued that the Paris agreement would "punish" the United States and instituted "onerous energy restrictions" that would stymie economic growth, especially in manufacturing industries. The president claimed that meeting the accord’s greenhouse gas emission standards would cost the United States close to $3 trillion in lost gross domestic product and 6.5 million industrial jobs.

The U.S. exit from the climate pact could raise doubts about the commitment of the world’s largest economy to curbing global warming and make it more difficult to hold other nations to their environmental commitments.

All but two countries — Nicaragua and Syria — signed onto the 2015 accord, which was a signature diplomatic achievement for President Barack Obama.

Trump was preparing to make his decision official in remarks from the Rose Garden at the White House. The atmosphere was celebratory, with a military band performing "Summertime" and other jazz hits as Cabinet members, White House staffs, conservative activists and other Trump supporters took their seats in the garden under the warm sun.

The Paris agreement has long divided the Trump administration, with the president taking much of the spring to make up his mind amid an intense campaign by both sides to influence his decision.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and Ivanka Trump, the president’s daughter and adviser, are among those who urged him to stay in the deal, arguing it would be beneficial to the United States to remain part of negotiations and meetings surrounding the agreement as a matter of leverage and influence.

White House chief strategist Stephen K. Bannon and Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt pushed for a withdrawal, which probably can’t actually be finalized until near the end of Trump’s term.

They, along with other hard-line conservatives, have sought to convince Trump that meeting the terms of the agreement would be harmful to the bottom lines of U.S. businesses and would jeopardize manufacturing jobs, especially in the Midwest and other regions
where Trump found deep support in last year’s election.

Introducing Trump at the Rose Garden, Vice President Pence said the climate decision was an example of the president putting what he sees as the interests of the United States above all else.

“Our president is choosing to put American jobs and American consumers first,” Pence said. “Our president is choosing to put American energy and American industry first. And by his action today, President Trump is choosing to put the forgotten men and women first.”

Condemnations of Trump’s decision from environmental leaders as well as Democrats on Capitol Hill arrived quickly Thursday afternoon.

“This decision shows a stunning disregard for the well-being of people and the planet,” said Andrew Steer, chief executive of the World Resources Institute. “President Trump will now have to answer for walking away from one of the most hard-fought and popular global achievements in recent memory.”

Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.), who regularly speaks from the Senate floor about the perils of global warming, said Trump was “betraying the country.”

“Ignoring reality and leaving the Paris Agreement could go down as one of the worst foreign policy blunders in our nation’s history, isolating the U.S. further after Trump’s shockingly bad European trip,” Whitehouse said in a statement. “Trump is betraying the country, in the service of Breitbart fake news, the shameless fossil fuel industry, and the Koch brothers’ climate denial operation. It’s sad.”

Gina McCarthy, Obama’s EPA administrator when the Paris agreement was negotiated, said in a statement, “It’s a disappointing and embarrassing day for the United States.”

“This decision makes zero sense from a public health or an economic perspective,” McCarthy continued. “It’s contrary to science and his obligation to protect America’s kids and future generations. It’s contrary to investors and CEOs saying we need to lean in on climate action, not bury our heads in the sand. And it’s contrary to... the vast majority of Americans calling for our country to do more.”

More than 190 nations agreed to the accord in December 2015 in Paris, and 147 have since formally ratified or otherwise joined it, including the United States — representing more than 80 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions.

It’s also heavily backed by U.S. and global corporations, including oil giants Royal Dutch Shell, ExxonMobil and BP. Large corporations, especially those operating in international markets, have had years to get used to the idea that there are likely to be reductions on carbon emissions, and they have been adapting their businesses accordingly for some time.
Withdrawing the United States from the agreement could take years due to the accord’s legal structure and language, but such a move would weaken its goals almost immediately. The United States is the world’s second-largest greenhouse gas emitter and would otherwise have accounted for 21 percent of the total emissions reductions achieved by the accord through 2030.

The Paris agreement is designed to set the world on a path toward keeping the warming of the planet “well below” a 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) rise above preindustrial temperatures, an amount of warming that scientists would consider “dangerous” climate change.

Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, a physicist who founded the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, said that the United States departing from the deal could make the planet a few tenths of a degree Celsius warmer, based on the assumption that the world carries ahead with its plans while the United States keeps on emitting greenhouse gases as usual. But he emphasized that’s still a significant increase — especially if the goal is ultimately to hold the planet to an even more

“It would mean the remaining distance between the guardrails and where we stand right now would be halved by the U.S. contribution,” Schellnhuber said. “And this is significant, because it’s a narrow escape anyway.”

Schellnhuber says he thinks that other countries would not follow the United States out of the accord, and instead are likely to keep on pushing to cut their emissions, meaning they may be able to offset the United States’ departure from the agreement.

But the diplomatic repercussions of a U.S. withdrawal could be vast, as demonstrated when European leaders last week pushed Trump to stay in the climate deal at the G-7 meeting in Italy. Trump appeared unswayed, and a communiqué coming out of the meeting pointedly failed to include the United States among G-7 countries backing the agreement.

Some environmentalists warned that pulling out of the deal will be disastrous.

“If Donald Trump pulls the United States out of the Paris Agreement he will be committing a traitorous act of war against the American people,” Billionaire environmental activist and mega-political donor Tom Steyer said in a statement. “Trump has abdicated American leadership and sent a clear message to both our allies and enemies alike: In the search for courageous and moral solutions to the challenges of the 21st century, don’t count on America to lead.”

EU, China stand firm behind Paris climate deal as Trump mulls US withdrawal

By Laura Smith-Spark, CNN

Updated 0947 GMT (1747 HKT) June 1, 2017

Trump has said often climate change isn’t real 01:36

Story highlights
EU and China say they are “joining forces to forge ahead” on Paris accord
At G7 summit, leaders expressed dismay at Trump’s climate stance

(CNN)EU leaders and China vowed to push forward together with the Paris Agreement on climate change Thursday, as the world waits to see whether US President Donald Trump will pull his country out of the landmark accord.

Trump has said he will announce his decision on the climate deal later Thursday. Two senior US officials familiar with Trump’s plans told CNN on Wednesday that the US President is expected to withdraw from the Paris accord.

Such a move would be a major break from international partners that would isolate the United States in global efforts to curb global warming.

Now EU and Chinese leaders have banded together in unusual alliance that emphasizes the absence of the United States from the playing field.

3 ways Trump could dump Paris climate agreement

EU Commissioner on Climate Action and Energy Miguel Arias Cañete also told CNN in a statement that the EU and China “are joining forces to forge ahead on the implementation of the Paris Agreement and accelerate the global transition to clean energy.

“No one should be left behind, but the EU and China have decided to move forward. Our successful cooperation on issues like emissions trading and clean technologies are bearing fruit. Now is the time to further strengthen these ties to keep the wheels turning for ambitious global climate action.”

EU, China stand firm behind Paris climate deal as Trump mulls US withdrawal

By Laura Smith-Spark, CNN

Updated 0947 GMT (1747 HKT) June 1, 2017

Trump has said often climate change isn’t real 01:36

Story highlights
EU and China say they are “joining forces to forge ahead” on Paris accord
At G7 summit, leaders expressed dismay at Trump’s climate stance

(CNN)EU leaders and China vowed to push forward together with the Paris Agreement on climate change Thursday, as the world waits to see whether US President Donald Trump will pull his country out of the landmark accord.

Trump has said he will announce his decision on the climate deal later Thursday. Two senior US officials familiar with Trump’s plans told CNN on Wednesday that the US President is expected to withdraw from the Paris accord.

Such a move would be a major break from international partners that would isolate the United States in global efforts to curb global warming.

EU Commissioner on Climate Action and Energy Miguel Arias Cañete also told CNN in a statement that the EU and China “are joining forces to forge ahead on the implementation of the Paris Agreement and accelerate the global transition to clean energy.

“No one should be left behind, but the EU and China have decided to move forward. Our successful cooperation on issues like emissions trading and clean technologies are bearing fruit. Now is the time to further strengthen these ties to keep the wheels turning for ambitious global climate action.”
The European Union and China spell out their continued commitment to the deal in a draft joint statement, obtained by CNN, which is slated to be published Friday regardless of what Trump announces.

Trump bailing on climate deal would be a middle finger to the future

"The EU and China consider climate action and the clean energy transition an imperative more important than ever," the draft statement says, and "commit to significantly intensify their political, technical, economic and scientific cooperation on climate change and clean energy."

The powers also "underline that tackling climate change and reforming our energy systems are significant drivers of job creation, investment opportunities and economic growth," according to the draft statement, which also emphasizes the importance of international collaboration in combating climate change.

Speaking alongside German Chancellor Angela Merkel in Berlin on Thursday, Chinese Premier Li Keqiang said China had "stayed true to its commitment" in fighting climate change over the past few years, including "promoting the signing of the Paris agreement."

In response to a question referencing Trump, Li responded: "Fighting climate change is a global consensus, not invented by China."

Tusk tweets appeal to Trump

European Council President Donald Tusk made a direct appeal to Trump early Thursday not to pull out of the Paris accord, tweeting "@realDonaldTrump please don't change the (political) climate for the worse."

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker also warned Trump against exiting the Paris climate change deal -- a treaty ratified by the United States last year -- in a speech Wednesday, declaring: "The law is the law, and everyone must adhere to it."

According to the European Commission's Berlin office, Juncker told an audience in the German capital: "I am a trans-Atlanticist. But if the American President was to say in the coming hours that he wants to exit the Paris Accord, then it is our duty to say: 'You can't do that.'"

"We are not only talking about the future of European people, we are first and foremost talking about the future of people elsewhere. Eighty-three countries are in danger of disappearing from the face of the Earth if we do not begin combating climate change in a resolute way."

G7 leaders dismayed

Trump tweeted late Wednesday that he would announce his decision at 3 p.m. ET in the White House Rose Garden, ending his message "MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!"

White House press secretary Sean Spicer told reporters earlier that he wasn’t sure whether Trump had made a final decision yet.

"I obviously don’t know whether he’s made it," Spicer said during a Wednesday afternoon briefing. "When the President has a decision he will make that announcement and he will make it clear what the basis of that is."

I will be announcing my decision on Paris Accord, Thursday at 3:00 P.M. The White House Rose Garden. MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!

The White House was initially slated to make a final decision on the climate accord last month, but then said it would wait until after last week’s G7 meeting in Sicily.

Former EPA head: Climate deal makes economic sense09:19

At the summit, leaders expressed dismay at Trump’s climate stance. After the meetings concluded, the US refused to sign onto a statement of support for the Paris accord that all other G7 participants approved.

The Paris climate agreement was established during a 2015 conference in the French capital. Every nation signed on minus two: war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, which insists the deal isn’t tough enough.

In signing onto the accord, countries pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but were given wide leeway in how much they planned to reduce them by.

China 'trying extremely hard' on climate
China will honour its commitments on climate change, its premier has said, as the US appears poised to pull out of a key deal.

Speaking on a visit to Germany, Premier Li Keqiang said fighting climate change was in China’s own interest.

China was counting on other countries to follow its example, Mr Li said.

US President Donald Trump is due to announce his decision on the 2015 Paris agreement later. Some reports in the US suggest he will withdraw.

"China will continue to implement the promises made in the Paris accord. But of course we also hope to do this with the co-operation of others," Mr Li said.

As a big developing country, China had an ‘international responsibility’ to try to prevent climate change, he added.

Russia also said it would stick to its climate commitments, but said the Paris agreement would be affected by a US pullout.

"It goes without saying that the effectiveness of this convention is likely to be reduced without its key participants," a Kremlin spokesman said.

Meanwhile British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson said he was “anxious” at the prospect of a US withdrawal but said he believed Mr Trump was “genuinely thinking about the issue”.

Some of the biggest gains in tackling carbon emissions in the US had been made at state level rather than federal level, he added.

“Anything that delays the fight against climate change is an economic negative.”

“Anything that we do that works to curtail global warming is an economic plus.”

“Global climate change is a threat to the economy,” says Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s

University of California, Berkeley’s Sol Hsiang and Ted Miguel found the climate change could lying cities and farmland. A 2015 report by Stanford University’s Marshall Burke and the

Economists also warn that climate change could inflict a devastating impact on the global

Economists say that leaving the Paris deal and easing efforts to control emissions would hardly

A White House official said Wednesday that Trump was planning to pull out of the Paris deal, although a final decision had not been made. And Trump has reversed himself before on major policy pledges, including on whether to abandon the North American Free Trade Agreement, a step the president no longer favors.

Economists say that leaving the Paris deal and easing efforts to control emissions would hardly deliver a big payoff in jobs. A 2001 study by Eli Berman and Linda Bui, both then at Boston University, found "no evidence that local air quality regulation substantially reduced employment" when Los Angeles imposed stricter environmental restrictions.

"There’s no doubt that regulations have costs, but they are not the primary driver of employment,” says Michael Greenstone, an economist at the University of Chicago.

Polluting industries such as oil and coal are highly automated and are unlikely to embark on a major hiring spree even if the United States dropped out of the Paris agreement, experts say.

"The potential number of jobs you can create in fossil fuels is limited, while the potential number of jobs in green technologies - in principle the sky is the limit,” says Bart van Ark, chief economist at the Conference Board, a business research group.
Already, the United States employs more people in solar energy (nearly 374,000) than in coal (a little over 160,000), according to the U.S. Department of Energy.

"The perception that we have to decide between creating jobs or tackling climate change is a false choice," said Dan Garfinkel, president of the tech trade group ITI. "Our clean energy industry is growing and employing millions of Americans in good-paying jobs in both red and blue states as it powers more of our businesses and communities. It is not too late to for the president to stay the course and work with the tech industry to ensure that more clean energy jobs continue to go to Americans and that U.S. leadership in innovation is second to none."

Many big companies say they must make long-term investment decisions based on the assumption that most countries will stiffen environmental standards. Accordingly, they are increasingly investing more in green technology.

"The business sector is moving ahead anyway," van Ark says. "Businesses that are into this are into it for the long haul. Not just for four years, the term of a president."

General Electric, for instance, plans to invest $25 billion in clean technology research and development by 2020.

"We believe climate change is real and the science is well accepted," GE's chief executive, Jeffrey Immelt, wrote in a blog post in March. "Our customers, partners and countries are demanding technology that generates power while reducing emissions, improving energy efficiency and reducing cost."

Economists also warn that climate change could inflict a devastating impact on the global economy. Drought and water shortages could sap growth. Rising sea levels could swamp low-lying cities and farmland. A 2015 report by Stanford University's Marshall Burke and the University of California, Berkeley's Sol Hsiang and Ted Miguel found the climate change would cause the global annual output by 2100 - more than five times previous estimates.

"Global climate change is a threat to the economy," says Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. "Anything that we do that works to curtail global warming is an economic plus. Anything that delays the fight against climate change is "an economic negative."

---

AP Business Writer David Koenig in Dallas contributed to this story.

Do the Math: How Much Trump Could Raise U.S. Carbon Emissions

A detailed analysis shows how much more CO\textsubscript{2} each of Trump’s climate policy changes would send into the atmosphere

By Annie Sneed on May 31, 2017

Credit: sharply, done Getty Images

Pres. Donald Trump has said he will announce his decision in the coming days on whether to pull the U.S. out of the Paris climate accord. But even if Trump sticks with the agreement, his policies may profoundly undermine the nation’s ability to reach the climate goals the U.S. promised under the accord.

According to a new report (pdf) released by analysts at the recent Bonn climate talks, the president’s rollback of current climate regulations, if successful, could cause the U.S. to release 0.4 gigatonne more carbon dioxide in annual emissions in the year 2030 than if those policies remained. That gap gets much larger when the report authors accounted for Trump’s decision to dump the Climate Action Plan, which was created by the Obama administration but has not yet been fully implemented. That would create 1.8 gigatonnes more CO\textsubscript{2} in 2030 than the past administration had envisioned—about 31 percent of 2005 U.S. emissions. "This amounts to a very significant reversal of the downward trajectory that U.S. emissions have been on," explains Bill Hare, one of the report authors and CEO of Climate Analytics, a nonprofit climate science and policy institute. "Under Trump’s policies the U.S. will fall far short of its Paris climate goals."

Under the accord the U.S. has agreed to reduce its emissions 26 percent to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. One of the major policies Trump has targeted is the Clean Power Plan (CPP), a centerpiece of Obama’s action plan. It requires the power sector to significantly reduce emissions. The plan is currently tied up in court, but if it never becomes reality, its demise would release 202 more million metric tons of CO\textsubscript{2} in annual emissions in 2025— which would cut 11 to 12 percent from the U.S.’s planned efforts to achieve the Paris 2025 target.
Although U.S. greenhouse gas emissions have fluctuated in recent years, they have decreased overall since 2005. If the Trump administration were to carry out all of Pres. Barack Obama’s climate policies, emissions would decline much further—enough to achieve the nation’s Paris accord goal. But the White House has begun rolling back climate regulations, which could reverse the downward trend of U.S. emissions.

The power sector is still predicted to reduce its emissions significantly without the CPP due to the retirement of coal plants and the growth of renewable energy and natural gas. Thanks to those market forces, “we’re already reducing emissions in the power sector pretty significantly,” explains Kevin Kennedy, deputy director of the World Resources Institute’s U.S. Climate Initiative. But without the CPP, or an alternative plan, “U.S. emissions are expected to level off,” according to the report, rather than decrease.
The report highlights other actions by Trump that could hurt U.S. climate efforts. One of those is the possible rollback of vehicle efficiency standards. If the administration weakens those regulations, the report says, passenger cars and small pickup trucks will add 22 more million metric tons of CO\textsubscript{2} in 2025 than they would have otherwise—taking away a little over 1 percent of the U.S.’s efforts for hitting the Paris 2025 goal. That number may sound small, but that’s because not many of the vehicles affected by those efficiency standards will be on the road in 2025. “Those [standards] are a much bigger deal as you look out to 2030 and beyond,” Kennedy says. “The nature of turnover in the auto industry is slow, so that significant reductions take more time. Part of solving the puzzle overall is how you’re setting yourself up for the longer-term reductions.”

The Trump administration is also reviewing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s regulations for methane emissions from the oil and gas industry. The EPA’s rule would have dropped CO\textsubscript{2} emissions by an additional 9.2 million metric tons of CO\textsubscript{2} in 2025—a little under 1 percent of the U.S.’s efforts to reduce emissions for the Paris target. Again, that number may seem trivial but, Kennedy explains, “you need to be working on methane from industry, on vehicles—across the economy—to be able to meet the [Paris 2025] target.” The U.S. also has yet to ratify the Kigali Amendment—an international plan to reduce hydrofluorocarbons, powerful greenhouse gases used in systems like air-conditioning and refrigeration. The Trump administration appears likely to ratify the amendment, however. If all the current U.S. climate policies—including the CPP—stayed in place, they would bring U.S. emissions 10 percent under 2005 levels by 2025. Even that reduction does not come close to the U.S.’s pledged 26 to 28 percent reduction. If Trump weakens these policies, the Paris target will be even further out of reach.

Obama’s Climate Action Plan was designed to go the rest of the way. The CPP and vehicle standards were central pieces but the plan contained additional policies that had not yet been implemented, such as strategies to double energy productivity by 2030. Weakening U.S. climate policies instead—both planned and current—could shift the nation’s emissions trajectory from a decline to a relative flat line over the next 10 years, Hare says.

The report also notes the U.S.’s 2025 Paris goal itself will not keep the global temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius, which is the central purpose of the climate agreement. Action by other big national emitters is essential. And under the accord, nations are supposed to ratchet up their emissions cuts over time.

The ultimate Paris goal is still not beyond reach for the U.S., according to some experts. “[The report presents] one of the more pessimistic views in terms of what could happen,” says Nolde Selin, associate director of Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Technology and Policy Program. For one, the president’s regulatory rollback may not even happen; rescinding or altering regulations takes time and environmental groups will almost certainly fight any changes in court. Also, economic forces are strongly influencing the nation’s emissions, notably the growth of natural gas and renewable energy paired with the decline of coal. State and local governments affect emissions as well; California, defying the White House, is pursuing its own rigorous climate regulations. “The report is a useful statement of what might happen if the Trump administration got its way,” says David Keith, professor of applied physics and public policy at Harvard University. “At present it looks like the administration’s ability to enact policy is pretty weak.” Nevertheless, Keith says, “uncertainty cuts both ways. It could end up worse than the report says.”

Keith and Selin stress any policy reversals by the administration could undermine global goals beyond the U.S.’s own emissions. “Emissions reductions depend on cooperation,” Keith explains. Right now, China and India—two of the top greenhouse gas emitters—appear set to overachieve their Paris goals, according to the new report, largely because they seem likely to decrease their coal use sooner than predicted. But if it becomes clear the U.S. is not pushing for more ambitious climate actions, Selin notes, that could lead to other nations not meeting their targets. “That’s the real impact,” she says.

China and EU strengthen commitment to Paris deal with US poised to step away

Beijing and Brussels to set up new alliance to reduce global carbon emissions

‘Now is the time to further strengthen these ties’ – EU climate commissioner

China and the EU will forge an alliance to take a leading role in tackling climate change in response to Donald Trump’s expected decision to pull the US out of the historic Paris agreement.

Amid growing fears that the US will soon join Nicaragua and Syria on the small list of countries refusing to back the climate accord, signed in 2015, Beijing and Brussels have been preparing to announce their intention to accelerate joint efforts to reduce global carbon emissions.

The joint EU-China statement will offer a high level of detail on how they intend to make real the promises they made when they agreed to limit global warming to well below 2C (3.6F).

The EU, which has pioneered an emissions trading system, has agreed to provide China with €10m ($11.2m) to support its plan to roll out its own programme this year. The joint EU-China statement is expected to say.
On Wednesday, reports emerged from Washington that Trump had, after months of prevarication, decided to remove the US from the agreement — despite pressure from world leaders at last weekend’s G7 summit. The speculation in the US was followed by a tweet from the president in which he said he would announce his decision “on the Paris accord over the next few days. MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!”

The expected decision from Trump — who once described climate change as a Chinese hoax — has appalled leaders in the EU and China, but there is a resolve to maintain the momentum behind the Paris agreement. EU sources said there was no evidence that any other countries would follow Washington’s lead.

Finnish prime minister Juha Sipila reacted to the reports that Trump intended to withdraw from the Paris agreement by saying that climate change won’t be reversed “by closing your eyes” — and calling the expected withdrawal “a big setback.”

In Denmark, the country’s climate minister, Lars Christian Lilleholt, said that “if true, this is a really, really bad signal from the United States.”

China eyes an opportunity to take ownership of climate change fight

Li Shuo

On Thursday night in Brussels, the Chinese prime minister, Li Keqiang, will join the president of the European council, Donald Tusk, and European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker for an informal dinner before the main events the following day.

A series of communiques and memorandums of understanding are expected to be released. The issues range from a need to increase free trade and ensure respect for global rules and norms, to dealing with non-competitive practices.

The EU will also raise its continued concerns about human rights abuses in China, in particular in relation to new legislation on non-governmental organisations and the media.

However it will be the joint climate change statement that will be the centrepiece of the summit. An EU official said: “The climate change discussions will be about how to promote the implementation of the deal in Paris. How to promote the use of clean energies.

This is a survival question for many Chinese cities and regions. And also for India. Europe has unprecedented knowhow in this field – technological knowhow, and also legal and regulatory knowhow to promote the use of such technologies. This is therefore a key area of cooperation between us.”

Wendel Trio, the Director of Climate Action Network Europe said: “The summit shows that climate protection is and will remain top priority in the international cooperation, no matter what the US administration does.

“The strengthened climate alliance between the EU and China should trigger more climate action. This will smooth the way for the two powers to ramp up their Paris climate pledges by 2020, when they are due to be resubmitted. Both are set to overshoot their targets and can afford to make an even bigger contribution.”

Li Shuo, the climate policy advisor of Greenpeace East Asia, said it was crucial for the largest emitters of carbon to fill the vacuum left by the US’s likely decision.

He said: “The rapid backsliding of US climate action requires enhanced leadership from all other countries. At the upcoming EU-China summit, Beijing and Brussels need to demonstrate they are putting new and collective leadership into concrete terms. If US-China climate cooperation gave birth to the Paris agreement, now it is up to EU and China to defend and enhance it.”

Trump expected to withdraw from Paris climate agreement

By Kevin Liptak and Dan Merica, CNN

Updated 1923 GMT (0323 HKT) May 31, 2017
Source: CNN

Trump expected to withdraw from Paris Accord 01:37

Story highlights

A formal announcement is expected at some point this week

Washington (CNN) President Donald Trump is expected to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, two senior US officials familiar with his plans told CNN Wednesday, a major break from international partners that would isolate the United States in global efforts to curb global warming.

The decision, which will be announced this week, would put the US at odds with nearly every other nation on earth. It would reflect a major reversal of the Obama administration’s efforts on climate change. And it could trigger further efforts to erode the landmark climate accord.

Trump told reporters Wednesday that he would announce his intentions “very soon.”

“I’m hearing from a lot of people both ways,” he said as he met with Vietnam’s prime minister in the Oval Office.

The precise mechanism for withdrawal hasn’t yet been determined, and White House officials cautioned the plans could change until Trump makes his decision public.

Language for the withdrawal was still being prepared Wednesday, and will likely include specific legal conditions crafted by Trump’s administration.

In conversations over the past week, Trump has made clear he plans to fulfill his campaign promises to withdraw from the carbon reduction agreement, citing negative effects on jobs in the areas he won a large percentage of the vote, including states in the Rust Belt and the western plains.

But Trump has changed his mind in the past on major issues, and was still speaking to opponents of withdrawal even as his team prepared an announcement. He is set to meet Wednesday afternoon with Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, who supports remaining in the agreement. On Tuesday, Trump met with a key voice advocating for withdrawal, Environmental Protection Agency administrator Scott Pruitt.
Trump signals he's ready to exit Paris climate accord, but decision not final

Speaking Wednesday, press secretary Sean Spicer said he wasn’t sure whether Trump had made a final decision on withdrawing from the Paris agreement.

"I obviously don’t know whether he’s made it," Spicer said during an afternoon briefing. "When the President has a decision he will make that announcement and he will make it clear what the basis of that is."

Donald J. Trump
@realDonaldTrump

I will be announcing my decision on the Paris Accord over the next few days. MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!

The Paris climate agreement was established during a 2015 conference in the French capital. Every nation signed on minus two: war-torn Syria and Nicaragua, who insists the deal isn’t tough enough. In signing onto the accord, countries pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but were given wide leeway in how much they planned to reduce them by.

The President's decision comes after months of internal debate and speculation about what Trump, who campaigned on leaving the deal, would do once he took office. Trump faced intense pressure on both sides, including from his senior advisers and family.

The White House was initially slated to make a final decision on the climate accord earlier this month, but delayed the decision until the G7 meeting in Sicily. At the summit, leaders expressed dismay at Trump’s climate stance. After the meetings concluded, the US refused to sign onto a statement of support for the Paris accord that all other G7 participants approved.

Aides to Trump said he was listening with an open mind to the other leaders' arguments about Paris, but didn’t feel obligated to heed their calls to remain within the pact. After he returned to Washington, Trump lashed out at Merkel over other matters, including NATO funding and Germany’s trade deficit.

Fierce divisions

Meetings inside the West Wing about Paris have been contentious, sources told CNN, as aides expressed their deep grievances over the climate agreement that President Barack Obama helped broker with nearly every country.

Steve Bannon, Trump’s chief strategist and the former head of Breitbart, had pressed Trump to stick with his campaign promise and leave the deal.

But Ivanka Trump, the President’s top aide and daughter, pressed aides to look at the full picture when considering what withdrawal could mean. She worked to ensure her father heard pro-Paris viewpoints, including from former Vice President Al Gore.

Trump’s son-in-law and top aide, Jared Kushner, was said to be neutral on the deal, and concerned about the legal ramifications of reducing US carbon reduction commitments below what Obama pledged.

Tillerson and Energy Secretary Rick Perry had both advised against leaving the deal, sources said, joining a bombardment of voices from outside the White House. Elon Musk, the tech billionaire and founder of Tesla, tweeted earlier this month that he spoke with Trump about sticking with the deal. The president of Exxon Mobil wrote Trump personally stressing the importance of maintaining a seat at the global negotiating table.

Gore, who met with Trump during his presidential transition, has also been an outspoken critic of leaving the Paris accord.

UN leader: US leaving Paris accord will harm its global influence

But those voices were tempered by conservatives who argue the agreement harms American jobs and punishes US taxpayers. Trump himself said he would “cancel” the deal
on the campaign trail and his campaign’s energy plan included a pledge to “cancel the Paris climate agreement and stop all payments of US tax dollars to UN global warming programs.”

A group of Republican US senators, including Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, wrote Trump earlier this month encouraging him to make a clean break from the climate accord. And leaders from coal-producing states have pressed Trump to uphold his vows to cancel US commitments to Paris.

Obama and a host of other countries signed the climate change agreement in 2015 and the former president touted it as the “best chance we have” to save the planet.

“The Paris agreement establishes the enduring framework the world needs to solve the climate crisis,” Obama said, speaking from the White House. “It creates the mechanism, the architecture, for us to continually tackle this problem in an effective way.”

The US committed to reducing carbon emissions by 26-28% in a decade in signing onto the agreement. The main driver of the reduction was Obama’s Clean Power Plan, which would have closed coal-fired power plants. Trump has already said he’s reviewing that order, along with other aspects of his predecessor’s climate agenda.

Planet Earth has been taking advantage of America for too long

By Alexandra Petri
May 31 at 2:13 PM

(NASA via Reuters)

Nationalists in the Trump administration are right. We should withdraw from the Paris climate accord.

This would be a real victory. America, after all, is on its own planet.

Before Earth asks us to step up and help protect it, it should take stock of its own contributions. There is, frankly, a lot of waste there. It has flourished too long without cuts, and now it is time to pay the piper.
If there is one thing I have learned from "Planet Earth" it is that Earth has a lot of areas where it could tighten its belt before asking me to lower my emissions.

Look at the wanton extravagance of the planet. Pandas. Mosquitoes. Butterflies. Elephant seals. Birds, some garishly colored, waking me up in the morning by shouting come-ons at one another. Armored beetles. Arctic foxes. I ask you. Who needs all this?

Gibbons. Naked mole rats. Those monkeys with bulbous noses who look like J. Pierpont Morgan and those other monkeys with buttocks in obscene laces. Those things in the ocean that look like they’re wearing headlamps. When was the last time we used any of this? Do we really need it? Does it spark joy?

Absurd big birds in black and white tuxedos. Demanding bears in white fur coats who insist they need floating ice to survive. Maybe they should ditch those luxury garments and try to live like the rest of us. And don’t get me started on coral reefs, fragile palaces of underwater porcelain that certain fish insist are the only possible place they can live. Toughen up, fish.

We have horses. Why do we need zebras? We should go through the ape house and ask ourselves if some of these monkeys are not too small to be useful. For instance, marmosets. Everything about electric eels is excessive.

What are armadillos good for but bothering drivers? What are dolphins good for but interfering with tuna fishing? Spotted owls are just protesters in disguise who move their habitats from place to place preventing necessary infrastructure projects.

Do we need mushrooms AND baobabs AND cougars AND rhinos? The Trump boys have been doing their best to eliminate waste in at least one of these areas, but we could do with even more.

Earth is full of freeloaders and parasites and bloodsuckers: the stinking corpse flower. Epiphytes. Flukes. Ticks. The vampire bat. The leech. It should take a good look at itself before it asks us for support.

Maybe it doesn’t need all this land. Has it considered that? Maybe it could have a little more ocean. Maybe that would make it thriftier and more efficient.

Right now, it’s embarrassing to look at. Deserts. Whole giant expanses of nothing but hot sand. Ice floes, really? Does Earth think it is an expensive cocktail?

Forests? What are they but fire hazards?

Marshes are just breeding grounds for alligators, who would devour everything we hold dear and end the American way of life if they got their way:

Tundra. Taiga. Permafrost. Is all this necessary, or is some of it just there for aesthetic purposes? Vast expanses of grassland. Lava fields. Bogs. Marsas. Big rocks. Little rocks. I would guess that we could cut back in some of these areas. Maybe starting with the ice, which takes a lot of effort to maintain.

Think of all the destruction that these features have been responsible for. Glaciers are always devouring hikers. Mount Everest kills climbers every single year. And don’t forget that time an iceberg took down a whole liner full of passengers. It is time we put an end to these dangerous eco-terrorists. It is time the Earth cut back.

Some people whine, “Think about the children.” Look at the budget that was just submitted to Congress. Does it look like we care about children?

Why should we do anything nice for the children? Or worse, the grandchildren? Why would you ever allow yourself to be even slightly inconvenienced on behalf of people you may never meet who will definitely have cooler cellphones than you? Sounds like a fool’s bargain. Well, we have been too lenient on grandchildren before. No more are they getting nice things at our expense. That deficit ends now.

Time to put America first. America is its own thing; one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Our polar bears are safe in zoos. If we run out of them we can make more using CGI.

Extreme heat? Maybe elsewhere, but not here, in America, where Jim Inhofe was able to bring a “snowball” to the floor of Congress. America is impervious to volcanoes and floods and hurricanes. We will shield ourselves with prayer and new improved data sets that
show that these things do not exist.

Just in case, we can build a bigger wall. We are not part of a fragile blue marble hurtling through space. That is other people. The world exists only when my eyes are open. When I close them, I alone am the world.

Planet Earth has been taking advantage of America for too long.

Paris climate deal: EU and China rebuff Trump

Chinese and EU leaders are to agree a joint statement on the Paris climate agreement saying it is "an imperative more important than ever".

A draft of the document, seen by the BBC, stresses the "highest political commitment" to implement the deal. It will be widely seen as a rebuff to the US, as President Trump deliberates on withdrawal from the accord.

The joint statement will be published on Friday after a summit in Brussels. For more than a year, Chinese and EU officials have been working behind the scenes to agree a joint statement on climate change and clean energy. The document highlights the dangers posed by rising temperatures, "as a national security issue and multiplying factor of social and political fragility," while pointing out that the transition to clean energy creates jobs and economic growth.

"The EU and China consider the Paris agreement as an historic achievement further accelerating the irreversible global low greenhouse gas emission and climate resilient development," the draft document says.

"The Paris Agreement is proof that with shared political will and mutual trust, multilateralism can succeed in building fair and effective solutions to the most critical global problems of our time. The EU and China underline their highest political commitment to the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement in all its aspects."

Both sides say they will step up action to and "forge ahead with further policies and measures" to implement their national plans on cutting carbon. Significantly, both the EU and China agree that they will outline their long term low carbon strategies by 2020.

The document outlines other areas of co-operation including on the development and linking of carbon markets. There will also be bilateral work on energy labelling, energy performance standards and the performance standards of buildings.

"The EU and China are joining forces to forge ahead on the implementation of the Paris agreement and accelerate the global transition to clean energy," said EU climate commissioner Miguel Arias Cañete.

"No one should be left behind, but the EU and China have decided to move forward."

What does Trump want to leave climate deal?

Climate change, or global warming, refers to the damaging effect of gases, or emissions, released from industry and agriculture on the atmosphere.

The Paris accord is meant to limit the global rise in temperature attributed to emissions.

Countries agreed to:

- Keep global temperatures "well below" the level of 2C (3.6F) above pre-industrial times and "endeavour to limit" them even more, to 1.5C
- Limit the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by human activity to the same levels that trees, soil and oceans can absorb naturally, beginning at some point between 2050 and 2100
- Review each country’s contribution to cutting emissions every five years so they scale up to the challenge
- Enable rich countries to help poorer nations by providing “climate finance” to adapt to climate change and switch to renewable energy

To date, 147 out of the 197 countries have ratified the accord, including the US, where the accord entered into force last November.

Antarctic ice crack takes major turn

The increased co-operation between the EU and China comes as reports indicate a further cooling in the US towards the Paris accord. Several sources, quoted by US media, suggest that President Trump is set to pull out. The President himself tweeted enigmatically that he would announce his decision over the next few days.

This comes after the President failed to find common ground with other global leaders at the G7 summit in Taormina, Sicily. In the wake of that meeting, German Chancellor Angela Merkel vented her frustration with the US position.

"The entire discussion about climate was very difficult, if not to say very disappointing," she told reporters.

"There are no indications whether the United States will stay in the Paris Agreement or not."
Media caption
California to ‘work with China’ on climate
This new move by the EU and China was warmly welcomed by environmental campaigners, rattled by the prospect of the world’s second largest emitter of carbon pulling out of the globally supported agreement.

"If US-China climate cooperation gave birth to the Paris Agreement, now it is up to EU and China to defend and enhance it," said Li Shuo, from Greenpeace.

"The pair has the potential to become the new driver for international climate diplomacy."

Trump 'poised to quit Paris climate deal'

Image copyright STR
Image caption
The Paris accord is meant to limit the global rise in temperature attributed to emissions.

US President Donald Trump is poised to pull the country out of the Paris climate accord, US media report, quoting senior officials.

The accord was signed by 195 countries out of 197 in a UN group on climate change, with Syria and Nicaragua abstaining.

In a tweet on Wednesday, Mr Trump said he would announce his decision within the "next few days".

What is climate change?

Climate change, or global warming, refers to the damaging effect of gases, or emissions, released from industry and agriculture on the atmosphere.

What was agreed in Paris?

Countries agreed to:

- Keep global temperatures "well below" the level of 2°C (3.6°F) above pre-industrial times and "endeavour to limit" them even more, to 1.5°C
- Limit the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by human activity to the same levels that trees, soil and oceans can absorb naturally, beginning at some point between 2050 and 2100
- Review each country’s contribution to cutting emissions every five years so they scale up to the challenge
- Enable rich countries to help poorer nations by providing "climate finance" to adapt to climate change and switch to renewable energy

To date, 147 out of the 197 countries have ratified the accord, including the US, where the accord entered into force last November.

Why does Trump object?

Mr Trump has previously called climate change "a hoax" devised by the Chinese government.

He vowed to "cancel" the Paris deal during his election campaign last year, saying it was "bad for US business" because it allowed "foreign bureaucrats control over how much energy we use".
Paris celebrated when the climate accord came into force in November. His supporters argue the accord restricts America’s ability to do what it wants with its energy resources – an important sector of the economy.

However, under the accord, countries set emission limits themselves - not an outside panel.

A slap in the face - Analysis by BBC News environment correspondent Matt McGrath

If he does decide to pull out of the accord, the key question is how will he do it?

The agreement stipulates a three-year waiting period before a country can give notice of leaving, which adds another 12 months and brings us to June 2021.

It could be that President Trump will be out of office before the US would be out of the deal. Alternatively he could declare that the agreement is a treaty which in US law needs approval by the Senate. It’s likely that the Republican majority in the chamber would mean the end of the road for Paris.

A more extreme option would be to pull out of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change upon which the Paris deal is built. It dates back to 1992 and was agreed by President George Bush, and left in place by his son, George W, who was no great fan of climate action. Leaving this longstanding convention would only take 12 months, but would be seen as perhaps a bigger slap in the face for the international community, as it places strong emphasis on the environmental rights of developing nations.

Can America leave just like that?

It remains unclear when or how the administration might plan to pull out of the climate agreement, the BBC’s Paul Rincon writes.

A four-year period is required to quit the Paris deal but by pulling out of the UN’s climate body - the UNFCCC - the US could extricate itself in one year.

However, this would represent a significant move: the US signed up to the convention in 1992, under then President George Bush Snr.

A small team including Environmental Protection Agency chief Scott Pruitt is working on the details of how the withdrawal will be executed, the Axios news site reports, quoting unnamed sources.

Does it matter if the US pulls out?

America is the world’s second-biggest carbon dioxide emitter after China so its withdrawal would have a real impact. Under the Paris accord, it is committed to reducing greenhouse emissions by 26-28% below its 2005 level by 2025.
Movement conservatives, including US Environmental Protection Agency head Scott Pruitt, are keen to strike a blow to the environmentalist coalition, which they view as creeping socialism cloaked in an earth-friendly guise. Meanwhile, Mr Trump’s working-class supporters - particularly those in the economically distressed coal-producing regions of West Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania that delivered victory to the president - are more concerned about jobs and their way of life, rather than the distant, amorphous threat of rising sea levels or shifting climate patterns.

A top EU official said Europe was ready to assume leadership on combating climate change. “There is a much stronger expectation from our partners across the world from Africa, Asia and China that Europe should assume leadership in this effort and we are ready to do that,” European Commission Vice-President Maros Sefcovic was quoted as saying by Reuters news agency.

German government spokeswoman Ulrike Demmer said: “I can only reiterate the well-known position that the German government unequivocally supports the Paris climate agreement and is campaigning for it to be quickly implemented and hopes the USA remains committed to this agreement.”

Trump nearing a decision on whether to pull U.S. from Paris climate deal, breaking ranks with more than 190 countries

By Chris Mowsey and Brady Dennis May 31 at 4:00 PM

Play Video 1:18

What you need to know about the Paris Agreement on climate change

The Paris Agreement is an international agreement to lower worldwide greenhouse gas emissions in order to mitigate climate change. Here’s what you need to know. (Daron Taylor/The Washington Post)

This story has been updated.

President Trump is nearing a final decision on whether to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, with one White House official saying Wednesday that the president is leaning toward an exit but three others cautioning that he has not reached a verdict.

The matter has deeply divided the administration for months. Ivanka Trump and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson have urged the president to remain in the deal, and White House strategist Stephen K. Bannon and Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt have been pushing for a withdrawal.

Whatever Trump decides on Paris, he has already taken the U.S. out of the climate game

A withdrawal would put the United States in the same camp as Nicaragua and Syria: a tiny group of countries refusing to participate in the almost universally supported Paris climate change agreement.

Trump added to the intense speculation about the future of the agreement Wednesday morning, tweeting that his decision will be announced “over the next few days.”

I will be announcing my decision on the Paris Accord over the next few days. MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!

Later in the day, he again stoked the uncertainty during a brief appearance a Vietnamese Prime Minister Nguyen Xuan Phuc at the White House. He told members of the White House press pool that he would have a decision about the Paris agreement "very soon."

"I'm hearing from a lot of people, both ways," he said.

More than 190 nations agreed to the accord in December 2015 in Paris, and 147 have since formally ratified or otherwise joined it, including the United States — representing more than 80 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions.

A U.S. withdrawal would remove the world's second-largest emitter and nearly 18 percent of the globe's present-day emissions from the agreement, presenting a severe challenge to its structure and raising questions about whether it would weaken the commitments of other nations.

These experts say it may actually be best if the U.S. left the Paris climate agreement

Trump has already, through executive orders, moved to roll back key Obama administration policies, notably the EPA's Clean Power
Plan, that comprised a key part of the U.S.’s Paris promise to reduce its emissions 26 percent to 28 percent below their 2005 levels by 2025.

As of 2015, emissions were 12 percent lower, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

The Paris decision has deeply divided the administration, with internationalists, such as Tillerson, arguing that it would be beneficial to the United States to remain part of negotiations and international meetings surrounding the agreement, as a matter of leverage and influence.

All but two countries are in the Paris climate agreement. The United States could be the third.

Conservatives, such as Pruitt, have argued that the agreement is not fair to the United States and that staying in it would be used as a legal tool by environmental groups seeking to fight Trump environmental policies.

Trump has long been lobbied by people on both sides of the issue, inside and outside the White House. A broad range of advocates, from former vice president Al Gore to Pope Francis to scores of companies — including Exxon, Chevron and BP — have urged Trump to allow the United States to remain part of the global accord.

But other forces have leaned on him to exit the agreement.

Experts at the influential Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank, have argued that the Paris agreement should be viewed as a treaty and submitted to the Senate for approval. Trump also has cited the organization’s research concluding that remaining in the Paris accord would inflict economic harm on the United States in return for little environmental benefit — a conclusion environmental groups insist is flawed.

[Just don’t call it ‘climate change’: How the government is rebranding in the age of Trump]

In addition, a group of 22 Republican senators — a group that included Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell — wrote to Trump, urging him to exit the Paris accord.

"Because of existing provisions within the Clean Air Act and others embedded in the Paris Agreement, remaining in it would subject the United States to significant litigation risk that could upend your Administration’s ability to fulfill its goal of rescinding the Clean Power Plan," the group wrote. "Accordingly, we strongly encourage you to make a clean break from the Paris Agreement."

Reactions to the prospect of Trump withdrawing from international accord came quickly on Wednesday, even as the president himself declined to official announce his decision.

Elon Musk, the CEO of Tesla, tweeted that if Trump does leave the accord, he would have "no choice but to depart councils" on which he has advised the president in the past. (Musk has been part of Trump’s White House manufacturing jobs initiative.)

"Withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement would be a grave mistake," Harold P. Wimmer, president of the American Lung
Association, said in a statement. “Everyone deserves to breathe air that will not make them sick or cause them to die prematurely. We need to cooperate globally to address climate change if we want to continue to reduce air pollution and protect public health.”

Even on Capitol Hill, some Democrats began to condemn the move, before it had formally happened. Sen. Michael Bennet (D-Colo.), said leaving the Paris agreement would amount to an “abdication” of American values.

“This would be yet another example of President Trump’s ‘Putting America Last’ agenda—last in innovation, last in science, and last in international leadership,” Bennet said in a statement. “The Paris agreement has wide support—from global oil and gas companies to coal generators in our Western states. We should not be moving backwards as the rest of the world races forward to compete in the clean energy industry.”

Financial firms lead shareholder rebellion against ExxonMobil climate change policies

Others cheered the notion that Trump might soon kill the climate agreement that had been such a key initiative of President Obama.

“For far too long the Obama Administration allowed foreign governments and alarmist environmentalists to dictate, not only climate change policy, but worse our nation’s economic policy,” David McIntosh, president of the Club for Growth, a conservative political action group, said in a statement. "President Trump’s decision sends a strong message to the environmentalist movement: no longer will the United States be strong armed by their scare tactics intended to harm our economy and inhibit economic growth.”

Trump’s environmental policies, aimed largely at rolling back regulations on the fossil fuel industry, have made it highly unlikely that the country could honor the Obama administration’s Paris pledge to sharply cut carbon dioxide emissions.

That leaves Trump with two clear choices: withdraw from Paris or revise the U.S. pledge downward to something more realistic in light of domestic policies, but nonetheless stay in the accord.

A downward revision would certainly prompt criticism from the international community, but not nearly so much as an abandonment. The Paris agreement is, after all, the first global accord on climate change action that has managed to unify both developed and developing nations behind a single framework to cut emissions.

Moreover, the accord is flexible in the sense that it does not mandate that any nation achieve any particular level of emissions cuts. Rather, every nation under the agreement pledges to do the best it can, and to participate in a process in which nations will regularly increase their ambitions over time.

The ultimate goal of the Paris agreement is to hold the warming of the planet to “well below” two degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) of warming above the temperatures found in the pre-industrial times of the late 1800s. The Earth is already about one degree Celsius (1.8 degrees Fahrenheit) warmer than it was at that time, scientists have determined, and current and near future emissions seem quite likely to take the planet past 1.5 degrees C (2.7 degrees F) in the coming decades.

Recent research has highlighted that above 2 degrees, major threats could ensue for Earth systems ranging from coral reefs to the planet’s vast ice sheets.

According to the agreement, a party that has fully joined the accord, as the United States has, cannot formally withdraw for three years after the agreement has entered into force — and that is then capped by an extra year-long waiting period. Under those rules, Trump could not completely force a U.S. exit from the agreement until the waning days of his term.

Trump also could opt to withdraw from the more foundational U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which laid the groundwork for the Paris deal and was signed by President George H.W. Bush and ratified by the Senate in the early 1990s.

But that is a more radical move, which would further withdraw the United States from all international climate change negotiations.

Energy and Environment newsletter
The science and policy of environmental issues.

The back-and-forth in the Trump administration over whether to stay part of the Paris agreement has triggered an outpouring of opinion and lobbying, perhaps most of all from corporate America, which has strongly supported the accord. Companies ranging
from Apple to ExxonMobil have endorsed advertisements or statements supporting the accord, saying it won’t harm the competitiveness of U.S. business.

In light of this, it will be difficult for the president to argue that the Paris agreement hurts the U.S. economy. The agreement’s flexibility also means that it does not impose any specific requirement to cut emissions by a particular amount.

Because the United States is the second-largest emitter, removing the country from Paris could also remove 21 percent of the emissions reductions that would have been achieved by 2030, according to an analysis by the think tank Climate Interactive. Other countries would have to make up the difference, with the likeliest candidates being China — the world’s top emitter — or India, a nation expected to experience some of the fastest emissions growth in coming decades.

*Philip Rucker and Juliet Eilperin contributed to this report.*

**Financial firms lead shareholder rebellion against ExxonMobil climate change policies**

*By Steven Mufson May 31 at 12:45 PM*

ExxonMobil management was defeated Wednesday by a shareholder rebellion over climate change, as investors with 62.3 percent of shares voted to instruct the oil giant to report on the impact of global measures designed to keep climate change to 2 degrees centigrade.

The shareholder rebellion at the ExxonMobil annual meeting in Dallas was led by major financial advisory firms and fund managers who traditionally have played passive roles. Although the identity of voters wasn’t disclosed, a source familiar with the vote said that major financial advisory firm BlackRock had cast its shares in opposition to Exxon management and that Vanguard and State Street had likely done the same. All three financial giants have been openly considering casting their votes against management on this key proxy resolution.

The shareholder vote on climate change came on a day when President Trump appeared to be nearing a decision on whether to exit the Paris climate agreement, underlining the deep political and economic divisions over how to deal with the global challenge. Even as the Trump administration’s commitment to the climate accord wavered, the Exxon vote showed that climate concerns were gaining ground in the business world.

**What you need to know about the Paris Agreement on climate change**

BlackRock and Vanguard are the biggest shareholders in ExxonMobil, owning 13 percent, or $43.6 billion worth, of the company’s stock. State Street Global Advisers, another big financial advisory firm that has called for greater climate disclosures, is close behind with 5.1 percent of the stock. The vote by them against management marked an important step for groups that have been trying to force corporations to adopt greater disclosure and transparency about the financial fallout of climate change.

BlackRock, which said that climate disclosure is one of its top priorities, had warned on its website that “our patience is not infinite.”

“This is an unprecedented victory for investors in the fight to ensure a smooth transition to a low carbon economy,” said New York State Comptroller Thomas P. DiNapoli, a trustee of the New York Common Retirement Fund which co-sponsored the proxy resolution. “Climate change is one of the greatest long-term risks we face in our portfolio and has direct impact on the core business of ExxonMobil,” he said in a statement.

*Besieged by climate controversy, ExxonMobil puts a climate scientist on its board*

The resolution, which was co-sponsored by the New York City pension fund, says that the company “should analyze the impacts on ExxonMobil’s oil and gas reserves and resources under a scenario in which reduction in demand results from carbon restrictions and related rules or commitments adopted by governments consistent with the globally agreed upon 2 degree [Celsius] target.”
The resolution adds that "this reporting should assess the resilience of the company's full portfolio of reserves and resources through 2040 and beyond, and address the financial risks associated with such a scenario."

It notes that other major oil companies including BP, Total, ConocoPhillips and Royal Dutch Shell have endorsed the two degree analysis.

BlackRock's website injected a sense of urgency about the issue.

"As a long-term investor, we are willing to be patient with companies when our engagement affirms they are working to address our concerns," it said.

However, it added, "when we do not see progress despite ongoing engagement, or companies are insufficiently responsive to our efforts to protect the long-term economic interests of our clients, we will not hesitate to exercise our right to vote against management recommendations."

Fidelity Investments said it was adopting the U.N.'s Principles for Responsible Investment, though a spokesman said that was just a "formulation of what we've done for a long time."

The prospect of major financial management firms joining pension funds such as California's and New York's that have backed social and environmental resolutions in the past is already putting some companies on the defensive.

This month similar resolutions demanding that management explain how climate change could affect their businesses were adopted at Occidental Petroleum and PPL, a large utility holding company. Occidental's shareholders backed the resolution with a 58 percent majority; that majority included BlackRock in its first vote ever against a company's management over the climate issue.

Major shareholders have also leveled criticism at ExxonMobil's board of directors. Worried about the outcome of the Wednesday votes, the oil giant on Tuesday issued an addendum to its proxy statement, providing additional arguments and information to bolster its recommendation that shareholders reject resolutions about the responsiveness of the company's board of directors.

While the management prevailed, the votes showed widespread discontent among Exxon shareholders. One resolution, requiring that a director running unopposed garner a majority of votes cast, was supported by 45.7 percent of the shares despite the opposition of management. A resolution backing an independent chairman separate from the chief executive garnered 38.2 percent. And a resolution that would enable 15 percent of shareholders the call a special meeting won 40 percent of the votes cast.

The ExxonMobil annual meeting was the first for Darren W. Woods as chief executive. He took over from Rex Tillerson, now secretary of state.

Although the company has written two open letters urging President Trump to stay in the Paris climate accord, ExxonMobil has remained the subject of criticism and litigation over whether it has adequately disclosed climate consequences of burning fossil fuels.

Some corporate governance groups have urged ExxonMobil to disclose more than the modest statement it currently files with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

But other experts say that the uncertainties about the size and consequences of climate change make disclosure useless.

At a recent Chamber of Commerce panel about whether the SEC should require greater disclosure, historian and oil industry expert and consultant Daniel Yergin said that events that take place in 30 years might not be material for Big Oil and gas companies and that it went "beyond the scope of what investors need to make decisions." He said that there was a difference between scenarios and forecasts that provide foundations for financial planning. And financial regulation should not turn into climate regulation, he added.

"Climate regulation is best left to governments with expertise and not to financial regulators," he said.

But Gretchen Goldman, research director at the center for science and democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists, said that investors "are right that climate change can pose material risks to companies and that this is another indication that investors are demanding this information and are not satisfied with the way companies are acting."

She said that climate change would persuade governments to restrict the use of fossil fuels and that much of the reserves held by oil,
gas and coal companies could be “stranded” and never used.

In its proxy materials, ExxonMobil rejected that argument. It cited the International Energy Agency’s estimate that $11 trillion to $22 trillion would be needed through 2040 for energy investment in exploration and production.

If ExxonMobil were a country, its economy would be bigger than Ireland’s

The company also said that it had done adequate disclosure in its annual “Outlook for Energy” document, which most recently said that global demand for energy would increase 25 percent through 2040 and that “oil will remain the world’s primary fuel.”

“We believe the risks of climate change are serious and warrant action, thoughtful action,” Woods said, repeating the proxy points. He said that the company uses a carbon cost to measure repeated potential impacts. But he defended the company’s mission, saying that “there’s a moral imperative to bring energy to people who live in energy poverty.”

Exxon’s feud over access to directors has added to friction with major shareholders. Edward Kamonjoh, of the 50/50 Climate Project, said that ExxonMobil barred shareholders from “engaging in a direct and unfiltered way” with directors. He called the board “ossified” thanks to the way it chooses new directors and the financial incentives for directors to serve until the age of 72.

Unhappy about those issues, BlackRock voted against two of ExxonMobil’s directors last year.

This year 50/50 Climate Project is urging shareholders to oppose director Kenneth Frazier, who chairs ExxonMobil’s Board Affairs Committee that has direct oversight responsibility for the investor engagement policy, board succession planning and director compensation.

Kamonjoh said that Exxon’s addendum to the proxy statement “feels a little desperate to me and is, in many respects, unprecedented but Exxon has been known to employ its well-oiled machinery to defeat proposals that are headed for majority investor support in the past.”

Trump Advisers Wage Tug of War Before Decision on Climate Deal

WASHINGTON — A divided White House staff, anxious corporate executives, lawmakers and foreign leaders are fiercely competing for President Trump’s ear this week as he nears a decision on whether to pull the United States out of the Paris climate accord, the landmark agreement that commits nearly every country to combat global warming.
Mr. Trump said on Twitter over the weekend that he would announce his decision this week, and White House officials said the president spoke again Tuesday with Mr. Pruitt, who is responsible for unwinding the pollution-reduction efforts the prior administration had put in place during the negotiations in Paris.

“Mr. Trump said on Twitter over the weekend that he would announce his decision this week, and White House officials said the president spoke again Tuesday with Mr. Pruitt, who is responsible for unwinding the pollution-reduction efforts the prior administration had put in place during the negotiations in Paris.”

He wants a fair deal for the American people,” Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, said of Mr. Trump. “He will have an announcement on that shortly.”

Mr. Trump has given few public indications of his thinking. Inside the West Wing, advisers have believed for weeks that the president was inclined to do what he promised during the campaign: In rallies, he repeatedly vowed to “cancel” what he called the job-killing agreement.

Mr. Trump’s daughter, however, has spent the past several weeks making sure that her father has heard from both sides, according to an administration official familiar with her efforts.

Ms. Trump’s husband, Jared Kushner, a senior adviser in the White House, also favors staying as long as doing so does not legally limit the steps Mr. Trump is taking to move away from the restrictive environmental standards President Barack Obama put in place.

On the other side, Mr. Bannon has been one of the most aggressive advisers lobbying the president to pull out of the agreement. Since the administration is already moving quickly to reverse the policies implemented to comply with the accord, staying in would be pointless, he argues, but would risk costing the president support from his core supporters.

Meanwhile, advice is pouring in from outside the White House — much of it unsolicited.

On Capitol Hill, 22 Republican senators signed a letter urging the president to abandon the agreement. Staying in “would subject the United States to significant litigation risk that could upend its administration’s ability to fulfill its goal of rescinding the Clean Power Plan,” they wrote.

Senator Lindsey Graham, Republican of South Carolina, chided his colleagues from his party, saying on CNN that pulling out of the Paris accord would amount to “a statement that climate change is not a problem, is not real.”

Democratic senators took to Twitter — Mr. Trump’s favorite communication medium — over the weekend to make their case.

But the corporate voices for remaining in the agreement may be the most influential. “By expanding markets for innovative clean technologies, the agreement generates jobs and economic growth. U.S. companies are well positioned to lead in these markets,” a host of corporate giants wrote in full-page advertisements that ran recently in The New York Times, The New York Post and The Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Woods, the Exxon Mobil chief executive, wrote to Mr. Trump this month after the two men spoke by phone about investments that the company was planning in the Gulf of Mexico, according to a company spokesman, Alan Jeffers. As disagreement over whether to withdraw appeared to intensify, Mr. Woods wanted to communicate his stance directly.

“By remaining a party to the Paris Agreement, the United States will maintain a seat at the negotiating table to ensure a level playing field so that all energy sources and technologies are treated equitably in an open, transparent and competitive global market so as to achieve economic growth and poverty reduction at the lowest cost to society,” Mr. Woods wrote.

He included an earlier letter that the company had sent expressing support for the agreement to George David Banks, the special assistant to the president for international energy and environment, who had asked the company to share its views.

Environmentally oriented groups like Ceres, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy and the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions have brought together big companies like Apple, Ingersoll Rand, Mars, National Grid and Schneider Electric to appeal to the president to stay in. Many of them operate globally and worry that if the United States abandons the deal, it would be harder to operate in existing markets and break into new ones.
Scott Pruitt, the Environmental Protection Agency administrator, has urged a withdrawal from the climate pact.

“It’s the right thing — we finally had a workable framework,” said Stephen Harper, global director of environment, energy and sustainability policy for Intel, who has attended several of the global climate meetings. “More than half of our market is outside the United States — our biggest market right now is China.”

Tom Werner, the chief executive of SunPower, a solar panel maker, sent letters to Mr. Trump and other administration officials arguing that companies have already made plans based on the Paris standards.

“It was important to speak up,” he said.

The global reaction has been fierce and almost exclusively in favor of keeping the United States in the 2015 agreement. In Europe last week, world leaders privately implored Mr. Trump not to bolt.

President Emmanuel Macron of France told reporters that he urged Mr. Trump not to make a “hasty decision.” Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany called her discussions with the president “very difficult, if not to say very dissatisfying.”

The global pressure campaign continued on Tuesday with the speech by Mr. Guterres at New York University. While not specifically mentioning Mr. Trump in his speech, the secretary general of the United Nations referred to “those who might hold divergent perspectives” as he called for all countries to fulfill the promises they made. After the speech, in answer to a question from the audience, Mr. Guterres said he hoped that the United States would stick to the deal, or that American businesses would if the government did not.

“It is absolutely essential that the world implements the Paris Agreement — and that we fulfill that duty with increased ambition,” Mr. Guterres said. “The real danger is not the threat to one’s economy that comes from acting. It is, instead, the risk to one’s economy by failing to act.”

In the end, Mr. Trump’s decision may be influenced by voices closer to home. Critics of the pact said they hoped Mr. Trump would think less about world leaders and more about his voters.

“This is a huge deal to speak to the people who brung you to the dance,” Mr. Norquist said. If Mr. Trump pulls out of the Paris Agreement, he said, the message is this: “I kept my word.”

UN chief Guterres says climate deal is essential
Responding to questions, he said: “We believe that it would be important for the US not to leave the Paris agreement. “But even if the government decides to leave the Paris agreement, it’s very important for US society as a whole - the cities, the states, the companies, the businesses - to remain engaged.”

New York and California have already pledged to combat climate change without the Trump administration’s support.

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres said climate change was “undeniable”.

The US is one of more than 140 countries and organisations that have ratified the agreement, but Mr Trump railed against it on the campaign trail saying it was bad for the US economy. He has repeatedly promised to strengthen the coal industry.

The Paris deal is the world’s first comprehensive climate agreement, with the aim of keeping the global average rise in temperatures below 2C.

In order to do that, countries pledge to reduce their carbon emissions.

Last weekend President Trump left the G7 summit in Italy without reaffirming his commitment to the accord, unlike the other six world leaders in attendance.

Donald Trump will make ‘final decision’ on Paris climate deal next week

President resists pressure from other G7 countries to support treaty

Merkel says discussions on climate deal ‘difficult and unsatisfactory’

Donald Trump poses with African leaders in Taormina, Italy, on Saturday. Photograph: Andrew Medichini/AP

Donald Trump's Europe tour leaves leaders strangely shaken

Read more

She added: “Here we have a situation of six against one, meaning there is still no sign of whether the US will remain in the Paris accord or not.”

Instead, six of the seven nations used a communiqué at the end of the meetings to assert their commitment to implement the Paris plan, leaving Trump to tweet that he will decide next week whether the US will join them in their pledge.

The deadlock at the end of the G7 summit in Italy left other world leaders frustrated. The German chancellor Angela Merkel said the discussions “had been very difficult and not to say very unsatisfactory.

Instead, six of the seven nations used a communiqué at the end of the meetings to assert their commitment to implement the Paris plan, leaving Trump to tweet that he will decide next week whether the US will join them in their pledge.

The US president announced his forthcoming decision on Saturday morning, on the final day of his first international trip as US president.

The deadline at the end of the G7 summit in Italy left other world leaders frustrated. The German chancellor Angela Merkel said the discussions “had been very difficult and not to say very unsatisfactory.

During the two-day conclave in Taormina, other leaders repeatedly urged Trump to recognise that as world’s second biggest carbon emitter, the US had to show leadership on climate issues.

Emmanuel Macron, the French president, said he had seen progress on climate change at G7, but revealed he had told Trump he would be making an error and standing ground to China if he did not stick with the Paris accord.

Macron said: “It is essential for international equilibrium and the reputation of America that it remains engaged with the Paris treaty. The G7 has shown issues such as climate change are not side issues that can be left to others.”

He refused to speculate on the US decision, but he said: “Trump was a good listener, a pragmatic guy and open to debate.”

The Canadian prime minister, Justin Trudeau, said he was not going to lecture any country, but he added: “You cannot build a strong economic future unless you are protective and mindful of the climate.”
In order to do that, countries pledged to reduce their carbon emissions. The Paris deal is the world’s first comprehensive climate agreement, set out in 2015, with the aim of keeping the global average rise in temperatures below 2°C.

What is the Paris accord?

The uncertainty over his position on the Paris agreement puts him at odds with other members of the G7. Mr Trump, who has called climate change “a hoax” on occasion, has reportedly indicated this is still his position to key members of his inner circle. He previously threatened to pull out.

Mr Trump left the G7 summit in Sicily on Saturday without reaffirming his commitment to the accord, unlike the other six world leaders in attendance. The US president tweeted he would make his “final decision” on the Paris accord after his return to Washington.

Climate change: World awaits Trump decision on Paris deal

The investigations swirling around Donald Trump – a short guide

Europe

The US president tweeted he would make his “final decision” on the Paris accord after his return to Washington.

Mr Trump left the G7 summit in Sicily on Saturday without reaffirming his commitment to the accord, unlike the other six world leaders in attendance. The US president tweeted he would make his “final decision” on the Paris accord after his return to Washington.

What is climate change?

Mr Trump, who has called climate change “a hoax” on occasion, has reportedly indicated this is still his position to key members of his inner circle. The uncertainty over his position on the Paris accord puts him at odds with other members of the G7.

What is the Paris accord?

The Paris deal is the world’s first comprehensive climate agreement, set out in 2015, with the aim of keeping the global average rise in temperatures below 2°C. In order to do that, countries pledged to reduce their carbon emissions.
Barack Obama signed the US up in September 2016, and members of the G7 are keen for the US to continue to back it, not least because the country is the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases after China.

What was agreed in Paris?

Barack Obama, pictured with Chinese President Xi Jinping during the Paris summit, signed the agreement in 2016

Why doesn't Donald Trump like the agreement?

Mr Trump told voters on the campaign trail he wanted to scrap agreements "contrary to the national interest", while repeatedly promising to strengthen the coal industry.

Coal power is a major contributor to carbon emissions. However, Mr Trump wants to boost coal production to create more jobs.

He has also expressed doubt about the causes of climate change, saying it is a "hoax" made up by China.

Can 'first daughter' save climate accord?

Paris deal is 'lifeline' for world's poor

Will the US withdraw?

The Axios news site suggests Mr Trump is leaning that way currently, citing three sources who say his mind is made up, and that the wheels are quietly being put in motion behind the scenes.

This is despite US defence secretary James Mattis saying in an interview to air on Sunday that the president is now "wide open" on the issue.

Withdrawal would risk making Mr Trump unpopular not only with his allies abroad, but also with activists at home.

It was noted his attitude to climate change was one of the major hurdles during the summit in Sicily - the first time he has met his fellow G7 leaders as a group.

His stance left him isolated, with Mr Trump's reluctance to reaffirm his commitment clearly annoying German chancellor Angela Merkel, who told reporters: "The entire discussion about climate was very difficult, if not to say very dissatisfying."

World vs Trump on climate deal?

What would be the effect?

There are fears the US pulling out may lead to other, smaller countries following suit.

Even if they do not, as the US has such a large carbon footprint, it will mean the impact of the agreement will likely be lessened significantly.

Whatever the US chooses, the EU, India and China say they will stick to their pledges made in Paris.

And what's more, some of Mr Trump's own country is likely to ignore his scepticism.

New York and California have already pledged to combat climate change without the Trump administration's support.

G7 talks: Trump isolated over Paris climate change deal
This is Mr Trump’s first G7 summit - during his first foreign trip.

G7 leaders from the US, Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy and Japan have agreed a statement on fighting terrorism.

‘America first’ and cultural mishaps

Why is there no deal on climate change?

The final communique issued at the G7 summit in Italy said the US “is in the process of reviewing its policies on climate change and on the Paris Agreement and thus is not in a position to join the consensus on these topics”.

However, the other G7 leaders pledged to “reaffirm their strong commitment to swiftly implement the Paris Agreement”.

Mr Trump tweeted: “I will make my final decision on the Paris Accord next week!”

His economic adviser, Gary Cohn, said Mr Trump “came here to learn. He came here to get smart. His views are evolving... exactly as they should be.”

Analysis by James Reynolds, BBC News, Taormina

There is a new fault line within the G7. An informal G6 (Canada, Japan, the UK, France, Germany, Italy) faces an informal G1 - the US.

The drafters of the summit’s final communique had no way of hiding the division which exists on climate change.

The statement noted simply that six countries remained committed to the Paris agreement while the US was in the process of evaluating its participation.

In his closing news conference, Italy’s Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni was unable to hide his disappointment with the lack of agreement. On this subject, the G1 acts alone.

What about trade?

The G7 has been a champion of free trade since its inception.

The leaders’ last summit in Japan last year stressed the need to avoid protectionism. But this was before the election of Donald Trump and his campaign slogan of “America First”.

German weekly Der Spiegel quoted Mr Trump as saying in a meeting with European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker on Thursday that Germans were “very bad” regarding car exports to the US.

However, all G7 leaders agreed to back the final communique which pledged to “fight protectionism”, while acknowledging that “trade has not always worked to the benefit of everyone”.

How about migration?

Leaders from Tunisia, Kenya, Ethiopia, Niger and Nigeria took part in the discussions in Sicilian town Taormina earlier on Saturday.

Italy is keen to encourage the world’s wealthiest nations to support African countries in developing their economies, so fewer young people will feel forced to make the dangerous journey to Europe.

However, a diplomat told Reuters that other Italian proposals - which looked to highlight the benefits of migration and promote a major initiative on food security - were dismissed ahead of the summit.

According to the source, Mr Trump’s administration was unwilling to highlight benefits of human mobility, Reuters reported.

A statement originally intended to be separate and run into several pages has now been condensed to two paragraphs.

So far this year, more than 1,500 migrants are thought to have drowned in the Mediterranean.

How has Mr Trump’s trip gone?

Mr Trump described his first foreign trip as “a truly historic week for our country” and said he was “more hopeful than ever that nations of many faiths... can join together in common cause” in fighting terrorism.

He is now returning to the US, where his approval ratings are low.
Mr Trump, pictured with wife Melania, is no doubt hoping for positive reviews of his first overseas trip. US media have already been casting judgement:

Conservative daily The Washington Times said Mr Trump “nears the end of his first foreign trip Thursday by largely fulfilling a transformative agenda that was more ambitious than anything Mr Obama tried overseas during his first year in office”. It went on to note “the president has made no major gaffes on the trip.”

But James P. Rubin, a former assistant secretary of state for Bill Clinton, was far less forgiving. Writing in Politico Magazine, he described Mr Trump as doing little more than “muddling” through the engagements. Mr Rubin went on to say that “despite the highly staged events designed to pump up Trump’s image, the new administration has done nothing on this trip to restore respect and admiration for US international leadership.”

Broadcaster ABC News, meanwhile, chose to focus on the President’s “awkward body language moments” - including pushing the Montenegrin prime minister out the way.

Headlines in the US continue to be dominated by alleged Russian meddling in November’s election, and there are whispers of discontent within his own party over policy decisions.

Trump’s views on climate are ‘evolving,’ aide says, amid pressure from Europeans

From left, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, President Trump and Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni arrive May 26 for the group photo at the G7 summit in Taormina, Italy. (Sean Gallup/Getty Images)

By Philip Rucker May 26 at 5:15 PM

TAORMINA, Italy — President Trump’s views on climate policy are “evolving” after European allies personally pressured him to reverse his vow to abandon an international agreement to limit greenhouse-gas emissions, a senior White House adviser said at the Group of Seven summit here Friday.

Trump is considering remaining in the 2015 Paris environmental accord, a decision that would be a striking turnabout for a president who during his campaign pledged to scrap the agreement and has routinely labeled climate change a “hoax.”

“His views are evolving,” said National Economic Council Director Gary Cohn, who accompanied Trump at the G-7 summit. “He came here to learn. He came here to get smarter.”

Cohn said Trump feels "much more knowledgeable" on the topic and "learned how important it is for the United States to show leadership." For instance, Cohn said, the European leaders impressed upon Trump that a global agreement, even if more than 100 nations sign on, has little power if it is not endorsed by the United States.

“The president, he digested that,” Cohn said. “That was a meaningful moment for him.”

President Trump and Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau leave the ancient Greek theater of Taormina on May 26 in Italy after a G7 family photo. (Evan Vucci/AP)

The statement from Cohn, who has been privately counseling Trump to stay in the Paris accord, followed days of lobbying by foreign leaders during Trump’s first trip abroad urging him not to abandon it.

The president of France tried to persuade him, as did the prime minister of Belgium and the heads of the European Union. Then there was Pope Francis, who presented Trump with a copy of his encyclical on preserving the environment and the “care of our common home.”

Trump has been waiting to make a final decision about whether to withdraw from the accord until after he returns to Washington this weekend. Cohn said he will decide based on “what’s best for the United States,” and is also weighing domestic manufacturing and other economic concerns.

So far at this two-day gathering of the G-7 — a grouping of Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States — Trump and his counterparts have discussed a broad range of issues, including terrorism and trade, as well as foreign policy hot spots such as Libya, Syria and North Korea.
The leaders agreed to a joint statement on combating global terrorism, Cohn said.

Trump has made virtually no public remarks about the G-7 other than a tweet Friday: "Getting ready to engage G-7 leaders on many issues including economic growth, terrorism, and security."¹

Although most of his counterparts held news conferences here Friday, Trump did not, and he has yet to hold one during his marathon foreign trip — a break with tradition for presidential travel overseas.

Play Video 1:06

Tillerson: No decision yet on Paris climate deal

President Trump has not yet made a final decision on whether the United States will remain a party to the Paris climate accords, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said on May 24. (Reuters)

Some of Trump's counterparts are prioritizing climate here, well aware that pulling the United States out of the Paris agreement has been the subject of considerable debate within Trump's administration, dividing the nationalists and globalists who battle to have the president's ear. Cohn, for instance, has been among those urging Trump to stay in the agreement.

Cohn said that Trump did not want his G-7 partners to think he did not care about the environment, so the president told them, "The environment is very, very important to me, Donald Trump."²

Trump also told his counterparts that he has won environmental awards in the past, Cohn said. The Washington Post's Fact Checker has found no evidence of any such awards — aside from one issued by a golf association for his New Jersey golf course — and environmentalists have strongly criticized many of his real estate projects over the years.

It is unclear what Trump might decide about the Paris agreement, and White House officials have signaled that he might strike a compromise that involves lowering the U.S. emissions targets that some industries see as constraining growth while staying in the accord.

Under the agreement, which was reached by nearly 200 countries, the Obama administration pledged to cut U.S. greenhouse-gas emissions 26 percent to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025, though that is not legally binding. Only two nations — Syria and Nicaragua — are not parties to the accord.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson talked to reporters earlier this week about "the difficulty of balancing addressing climate change, responses to climate change, and ensuring that you still have a thriving economy and you can still offer people jobs so they can feed their families and have a prosperous economy. And that's a difficult balancing act."

The G-7 leaders — German Chancellor Angela Merkel is the dean in length of tenure — convened at an ancient Greek theater overlooking the sparkling waters of the Ionian Sea as Italian fighter jets soared through the clear sky, leaving a trail of red, white and green smoke to kick off the summit.

The group, which includes the seven national leaders plus European Council President Donald Tusk and European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, adjourned to the San Domenico Palace, a historic monastery-turned-luxury-hotel, for private sessions.

Cohn described the G-7 session as "a family dinner," with leaders free to "cut in when you want."² During discussions on climate and trade, two issues on which Trump's views diverge somewhat from those of U.S. allies, Trump chose to allow most of the other leaders to speak first before sharing his views, Cohn said.

"He listened very acutely to the other leaders in the room," Cohn said. He said it was undecided whether the nine leaders would sign off on a joint communique stating a consensus on climate policy, or what it might say.

British Prime Minister Theresa May told reporters that there was agreement among the leaders that the climate was a priority. "The United States is considering its position in relation to these matters and what its policy is going to be, but there was no doubt around the table about how important this issue on climate change is," May said. "We were all very clear about that and about the role of the Paris agreement."
Tensions were running high after Trump chastised NATO partners Thursday for allegedly not carrying their weight in defense spending. Trump also criticized Germany in a meeting Thursday with Tusk and Juncker, according to Cohn: "He said they're very bad on trade, but he doesn't have a problem with Germany. He said his dad is from Germany."

Tusk said at a news conference: "There is no doubt that this will be the most challenging G-7 summit in years. It is no secret that the leaders meeting sometimes have different positions on topics such as climate change and trade."

Before the formal sessions began, Trump met Friday morning with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe to discuss the growing threat posed by North Korea, which has alarmed neighbors with its recent missile tests.

"It's a big problem," Trump said. "It's a world problem, and it will be solved at some point. It will be solved, you can bet on that."

Abe warmly praised Trump, saying his visit to the Middle East and address Thursday at NATO headquarters were "successful."

"There is one unfortunate thing I have to confess," Abe said. "This time around we will not be able to play golf together." In February, Trump hosted Abe at his Mar-a-Lago resort in Palm Beach, Fla., where they hit the links, as well as at the White House.

On the sidelines of the Taormina summit, Trump also met individually with May and Merkel. Canadian officials have told reporters that Trump will meet with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau on Saturday.

The summit has transformed the sun-splashed tourist island of Sicily into a fortress state, with restaurants, pubs and shops battening down the hatches. Wooden planks and metal sheets now fortify most of their fronts, parasols are disappearing from the beach and police units constantly patrol the streets as the ancient Greek colony braces for possible protests by thousands of people.

"It feels like we're bracing for a hurricane," said Maurizio Donato, 39, owner of Schizzo, a seaside ice cream parlor.

Luigi Sturniolo, 56, a librarian and veteran social activist from the Sicilian city of Messina, is organizing the main protest rally. Last Sunday, along with 15 other activists, he came to nearby Giardini Naxos to distribute leaflets that read, in part: "the meeting of the so called 'great seven' is the political expression of a scary global inequality ... because [they're preparing for] a war on migrants."

"We'll be there to oppose Trump's racism, xenophobia and sexism during his debut on the global stage," the leaflet also read.

Stefano Pitrelli in Giardini Naxos contributed to this report.

Arctic summit: Trump to make 'right decision for the US' on climate
Some climate scientists here in Alaska say they are pleasantly surprised by the relatively tough language on climate change adopted by all eight Arctic Council nations including the United States. The acceptance of the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gases (such as methane and carbon dioxide) and pollutants (like black carbon and aerosols) appears significant.

But a couple of things are missing. Although the logic of the statement insists that human activity is causing climate change, the word "human" is not actually present. Nor is there a commitment to implement the landmark Paris accord, an omission which is causing alarm among environmentalists.

The acceptance of the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gases (such as methane and carbon dioxide) and pollutants (like black carbon and aerosols) appears significant. The thrust of the text, argues Prof John Walsh, chief scientist at the University of Alaska’s International Arctic Research Center, actually echoes the approach of the Obama administration.
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Other members of the administration, including Energy Secretary Rick Perry, have advocated a “renegotiation” of the US commitments to the agreement, but legal questions have been raised about the feasibility of lowering US carbon reduction goals.

Ivanka Trump was originally due to meet with Pruitt privately Tuesday ahead of the larger meeting on top aides. But, like that larger meeting, the session between Ivanka Trump and Pruitt was postponed.

Macron tells Trump he wants to protect climate 12:21
In a conversation Monday, Trump told French President-elect Emmanuel Macron he is “pondering” whether to remain in the Paris Climate Agreement, French Ambassador to the US Gerard Araud told CNN’s Christiane Amanpour in Paris on Tuesday.

Macron and Trump spoke over the phone on Monday.

“President Macron raised the issue of climate change, because as far as you know the Americans are thinking about staying or leaving the Paris agreement,” Araud told Amanpour.

“President Macron emphasized the importance of the Paris Agreement. There was a very good discussion. President Trump said that he was pondering on this issue, and the two men agreed to meet again in two weeks in Brussels,” Araud said.

Obama: Food shortages will create conflicts 01:39
Meanwhile, at a summit in Milan, Italy, focused on climate change and food availability, President Barack Obama defended the Paris agreement earlier Tuesday, saying the US must show leadership and not “sit on the sidelines.”

“During the course of my presidency, I made climate change a top priority because I believe that all the challenges that we face, this is the one that will define the contours of this century, more dramatically perhaps than any other,” Obama said at the Seeds & Chips summit.

“We have been able to bring our emissions down even as we grow our economy. The same is true in many parts of Europe,” he said.

“We certainly could not have imagined this political picture when we signed the agreement in Paris,” said Teixeira. “It is a concern because we saw a similar situation when George W Bush came to power and backed away from the Kyoto protocol”.

“We have been able to bring our emissions down even as we grow our economy. The same is true in many parts of Europe,” he said.

“I do think America will take a lead in this process. We have seen in the last four years we can do something about climate change,” Obama said.

The administration is now mulling whether the US should stay in the Paris climate agreement, a landmark deal struck by nearly 200 nations to lower greenhouse gas emissions that was ratified last year. Trump has previously promised to “cancel” the deal, but his advisers are reportedly split over whether quitting the compact would be worth the resulting diplomatic fallout.

Keystone XL and Dakota Access, two major and controversial oil pipelines, have been approved. Last week, the president ordered reviews of protected areas on land and water regulations, and curbs on toxic discharge from power plants.

The US president has started peeling away many of the pollution rules imposed by Barack Obama’s administration, such as the signature Clean Power Plan, new vehicle emissions standards, clean water regulations, and rules on toxic discharge from power plants.

The administration is now mulling whether the US should stay in the Paris climate agreement, a landmark deal struck by nearly 200 nations to lower greenhouse gas emissions that was ratified last year. Trump has previously promised to “cancel” the deal, but his advisers are reportedly split over whether quitting the compact would be worth the resulting diplomatic fallout.

Last week a senior UN official warned the US would suffer economically if it chooses to pull out of Paris, citing the clean energy jobs that will be created as countries decarbonize their electricity sources. “There is no doubt where the future is and that is what all the private sector companies have understood,” Erik Solheim, UN environment chief, told Reuters. “The future is green. Obviously if you are not a party to the Paris agreement you will lose out. And the main losers of course will be the people of the United States itself because all the interesting, fascinating new green jobs would go to China and to the other parts of the world that are investing heavily in this.”

Pacific island nations particularly vulnerable to the rising seas, heatwaves and droughts wrought by increasing global temperatures are particularly alarmed at the sharp reversal in climate policy by the US, the world’s second largest emitter of greenhouse gases.

Frank Bainimarama, the prime minister of Fiji, has written to Trump to urge him to stay within the Paris agreement. Bainimarama will officially head the UN climate change talks taking place in Bonn, Germany in November. “Climate change is not a hoax. It is frighteningly real,” Bainimarama told a conference in Melbourne. “Billions of people are losing the ability to feed themselves. Don’t let the whole side down by leaving, just when we have a game plan.”
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Donald Trump's aides have abruptly postponed a meeting to determine whether the US should remain in the Paris climate agreement, with an unlikely coalition of fossil fuel firms, environmental groups and Republicans calling on the president to stick with the deal.

Trump's top advisers were set to meet on Tuesday to provide the president with a recommendation ahead of a G7 meeting in May. However, a White House official said the meeting had been postponed due to conflicting schedules. It is unclear when it will now take place.

Trump has already signed executive orders to start the demolition of the clean power plan, phase open federal land to coal mining, and halt new vehicle emissions standards but has so far not acted on his campaign pledge to "cancel" the Paris agreement.

Jane Martinson in New York
Trump begins tearing up Obama’s years of progress on tackling climate change

President Donald Trump is preparing to rip up Barack Obama’s legacy on climate change, a US official has said, with his aides split on whether the US should stay in the voluntary agreement, which was fully ratified last year.

Barack Obama pledged that the US would cut greenhouse gas emissions by 26-28% by 2025, based on 2005 levels, as part of a landmark global effort that for the first time required emissions reduction goals from all nations, including the large developing emitters China and India.

Trump’s aide Steve Bannon and the Environmental Protection Agency head, Scott Pruitt, are both in favour of ditching the Paris agreement. Last week, Pruitt called the agreement a “bad deal” for the US that imposes a burden that other countries do not have to bear.

However, the weight of opinion may be in favour of those who support the agreement. Trump’s daughter, Ivanka, and son-in-law, Jared Kushner, both advisers to the president, have positioned themselves as defenders of the agreement, while Rex Tillerson, the secretary of state, has supported the idea of “keeping a seat at the table”. Other advisers at the meeting were expected to include Rick Perry, the energy secretary; Gary Cohen, an economic adviser; and HR McMaster, the national security adviser.

Support for the Paris deal has come from seemingly unlikely quarters – the oil giant ExxonMobil wrote to the White House to advocate it as an “effective framework for addressing the risks of climate change”. BP and Shell have also previously endorsed the Paris deal, along with dozens of other businesses including Gap, General Mills and the Kellogg Company.

A group of Republicans in Congress also warned against withdrawing from the agreement. The Florida congressman Carlos Curbelo, in his role as co-chair of the Climate Solutions Caucus, said it was “imperative that we maintain our seat at the table”.

“The world’s leading nations must work together to not only reduce the impact carbon emissions have on climate change, but also mitigate and prepare for the effects, which communities like ours are dealing with every day,” Curbelo said in a joint statement with Ted Deutch, a Democrat who is his fellow co-chair.

“If it’s our hope the administration will take a responsible approach on this issue.”

Proponents of remaining in the deal cite the severe diplomatic fallout of leaving, which could damage the US position on other issues, as well as the imperative to cut emissions to avoid dangerous climate change.

“Withdrawal from the Paris agreement would send a clear message that America is an unreliable partner that fails to live up to its commitments,” said Susan Case-Lefkowitz, chief program officer at the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group.

Withdrawal would send a clear message that America is an unreliable partner that fails to live up to commitments

Susan Case-Lefkowitz

“It will also handicap the competitiveness of American businesses in clean energy – a $1.3tn yearly global market. It is essential that the US not withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.”

Conservative and free market groups have rallied to urge Trump to follow through with his pledge to exit the agreement. Among those organizations is the Competitive Enterprise Institute, a libertarian thinktank that includes Myron Ebell, who was part of Trump’s EPA transition team. The group has launched an online ad that tells Trump: “Don’t listen to the swamp. Keep your promise. Withdraw from the Paris climate treaty.”

If Trump decides to exit the deal, it will require a three-year notice period before the process begins. In order to speed up the process, he could remove the US from the overall UN climate change framework or submit the deal to the Senate to be ratified as a treaty, where it will probably fail.

A third, and perhaps most likely, option is to remain in the agreement in name only, retaining a modicum of US prestige abroad while dismantling Obama-era rules designed to reduce emissions. The US will face no penalty for not meeting its emissions targets, although some other countries have raised the possibility of imposing a “carbon tariff” on American goods.

Regardless of whether the US stays within the Paris deal, its chances of making deep cuts in its emissions have receded since Trump took office. Without the clean power plan, more stringent emissions standards on vehicles and gas and oil drilling operations or any sort of tax on greenhouse gases – a plan recently floated by some Republicans – the US will pull back from the effort to help avoid more severe heatwaves, droughts, the disappearance of coral reefs and coastal inundation.

“Regardless of what Trump does on Paris, he has abrogated our position,” said Tom Steyer, a leading hedge fund manager and climate campaigner. “This is an administration trying as hard as possible to bring back coal mining; they have given up American leadership on energy and climate. They have already walked away.”

Scott Pruitt calls for an ‘exit’ from the Paris accord, sharpening the Trump White House’s climate rift
President Trump’s top environment official called for an “exit” from the historic Paris agreement Thursday, the first time such a high-ranking administration official has so explicitly disavowed the agreement endorsed by nearly 200 countries to fight climate change.

Speaking with “Fox & Friends,” Pruitt commented, “Paris is something that we need to really look at closely. It’s something we need to exit in my opinion.”

“It’s a bad deal for America,” Pruitt continued. “It was an America second, third, or fourth kind of approach. China and India had no obligations under the agreement until 2030. We front-loaded all of our costs.”

Pruitt’s claim about China and India having “no obligations” until 2030 is incorrect — while these countries do indeed have 2030 targets, they are already acting now to reduce their emissions by investing in renewable energy and other initiatives.

Pruitt had called the Paris accord a “bad deal” in the past but does not appear to have previously gone so far as to call for the United States to withdraw.

The Trump administration has previously said it is currently reviewing its position on climate change and energy policy and remains noncommittal, for now, on whether it will follow through on the president’s campaign pledge to “cancel” the 2015 Paris climate agreement. Trump’s recent executive order on energy policy, which set in motion the rollback of Obama’s domestic Clean Power Plan, was silent on the matter of Paris.

What’s next for the Paris Agreement?

The Paris Agreement entered into force on Friday, Nov. 4, 2016. The Post’s Chris Mooney explains where we go from here. (Daron Taylor/The Washington Post)

“You might’ve read in the media that there was much discussion about U.S. energy policy and the fact that we’re undergoing a review of many of those policies,” Energy Secretary Rick Perry said in Texas on Thursday, according to prepared remarks. “It’s true, we are and it’s the right thing to do.”

White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer has said that the administration will resolve its view on the Paris accord “by the time of the G7 Summit, late May-ish, if not sooner.”

Amid this uncertainty, the statement aligns Pruitt with a more hard-line approach held by some in the Trump administration, such as chief strategist Stephen Bannon, rather than the more moderate take of Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, who had said in his
confirmation that the U.S. should have a “seat at the table” in the Paris negotiations, and Ivanka Trump and her husband and Trump confidant Jared Kushner.

Tillerson’s former company, the oil giant ExxonMobil, has also supported the Paris accord, and in late March wrote a letter to the White House reiterating its view that “the United States is well positioned to compete within the framework of the Paris agreement, with abundant low-carbon resources such as natural gas, and innovative private industries, including the oil, gas, and petrochemical sectors.”

If the Trump administration wants to take a more moderate approach to the Paris deal, it could consider modifying the United States’ current pledge to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, rather than seeking to exit altogether.

That’s a tack advanced in a letter to Trump, previously reported on by E&E News, by North Dakota Republican Rep. Kevin Cramer, who argued that “the U.S. should present a new pledge that does no harm to our economy,” one that would highlight “the importance of baseload power generation, including highly efficient and low emission coal-fired and nuclear power plants.”

The Obama administration had promised the world that the United States would reduce its emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 levels by the year 2025. The Trump administration could simply revise that pledge and make it less ambitious, and easier to attain.

President Trump signed an executive order on March 28, to obliterate former president Barack Obama’s environmental record. The order will instruct federal regulators to rewrite Clean Power Plan rules that curb U.S. carbon emissions, as well as halt other environmental regulations. (Jenny Starrs/The Washington Post)

In the energy sector, U.S. carbon dioxide emissions have already declined by 14 percent from 2005 to 2016, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. The reason is more burning of natural gas rather than coal and a growing profusion of renewables.

“It is looking like we may see them announce that they’re going to stay in Paris and also announce simultaneously that they’re going to revise the U.S. target under Paris to 2025,” Andrew Light, a senior fellow in the global climate program at the World Resources Institute, noted in an interview earlier this week. But as he added, “look, these guys are unpredictable, and I don’t think we can know.”

It is far from clear how the Trump administration could actually “exit” the Paris agreement, assuming that the Pruitt line wins and the administration determines that it wants to. Now that the agreement has entered into force, it takes three years under its terms for a party to withdraw, followed by a one-year waiting period — a length roughly equal to Trump’s first term in office.

One of the most fervent voices pushing the Trump administration to withdraw from the Paris agreement, however, has been the conservative Heritage Foundation.

Last summer, the group called the Paris deal “the latest in a series of costly policy choices the U.S. government has made because of its participation in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change,” and it urged the United States government to withdraw from the UNFCCC altogether.

“Such a dramatic transformation will drive energy costs higher for developed nations and block access to dependable energy sources for developing ones,” authors from Heritage wrote about the Paris accord in one report. “America’s participation in international climate change programs has wasted taxpayer money and led to questionable and harmful interventions in energy markets through government-backed financial programs, mandates, and heavy-handed regulation.”

In a recent op-ed in Investor’s Business Daily, Heritage employees Stephen Moore and Timothy Doesscher wrote that following through with the climate change promises made under the Obama administration “would effectively decapitate our coal industry, which now supplies about one-third of our electric power. If Trump allows this deal to go forward, he will unwittingly fulfill Hillary Clinton’s arrogant and dastardly promise to put every coal miner in America out of a job.”

They added, “We can’t help wondering if the thousands of university professors, environmental activists, climatologists and
government bureaucrats would be so enthusiastic if it were their jobs that were going to be eliminated."

While the Trump administration has backed away from the global leadership on climate change that President Obama pursued, other countries have embraced that role.

"The Paris Agreement is a hard-won achievement which is in keeping with the underlying trend of global development," Chinese President Xi Jinping said at the World Economic Forum earlier this year. "All signatories should stick to it instead of walking away from it as this is a responsibility we must assume for future generations."

The country also has announced plans to spend more than $360 billion dollars over the next several years investing in renewable energy sources such as wind and solar. In January, China’s National Energy Administration outlined a plan to make massive investments in clean energy through 2020, even as President Trump has focused almost exclusively on supporting the fossil fuel industry. The country said it expects such funding to create roughly 13 million jobs, reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses responsible for global warming and lessen the smog that has long plagued Beijing and other Chinese cities.

As for India — which is on course to greatly increase its energy demand in coming years as electrification reaches more and more of the country’s vast population — it, too, is moving to address climate change. It has, for instance, a plan to install 100 gigawatts of solar energy capacity by the year 2020 — more than double the amount that the U.S. currently has, notes Anjali Jaiswal, director of the India initiative at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

“It’s completely false that India is not doing anything under the Paris agreement,” said Jaiswal, noting that the country is seeking to expand solar and other forms of renewable energy both to lessen grave air pollution problems and also because the country has a vast natural solar resource.

“India is not backing away from its Paris commitments and goals for renewable energy because the country has a need and desire to be more efficient as its economy grows,” added Priyavrat Bhati, an energy analyst with Center for Science and Environment in New Delhi.

— Annie Gowen contributed to this report.

Trump signs order undoing Obama climate change policies

President Donald Trump has signed an executive order rolling back Obama-era rules aimed at curbing climate change. The president said this would put an end to the “war on coal” and “job-killing regulations”.

The Energy Independence Executive Order suspends more than half a dozen measures enacted by his predecessor, and boosts fossil fuels. Business groups have praised the Trump administration’s move but environmental campaigners have condemned it.

How much has Trump achieved so far?

Flanked by coal miners as he signed the order, the president said: "My administration is putting an end to the war on coal. The regulation has been unpopular in Republican-run states, where it has been subject to legal challenges - especially from businesses that rely on burning oil, coal and gas.

Last year the Supreme Court temporarily halted the plan, while the challenges are heard.

The Trump administration says that scrapping the plan will put people to work and reduce America's reliance on imported fuel.

"With today’s executive action I am taking historic steps to lift the restrictions on American energy, to reverse government intrusion and to cancel job-killing regulations."

During the campaign, he vowed to pull the US out of the Paris climate deal agreed in December 2015.
It says the president will be "moving forward on energy production in the US.
"The previous administration devalued workers with their policies. We can protect the environment while providing people with work."

During the president's maiden visit to the Environmental Protection Agency, he signed the Energy Independence Executive Order, which cuts EPA regulations in order to support Mr Trump's plan of cutting the agency's budget by a third.

He recently appointed climate change sceptic Scott Pruitt as its new head.

Trump's 'control-alt-delete' on climate change policy

Trump: The best thing ever for climate change?

What will the impact be?

Matt McGrath, BBC environment correspondent

This order signed by President Trump is both a practical and a philosophical attempt to change the US narrative on climate change.

His supporters say it will create thousands of jobs in the liberated oil and gas industries. His opponents agree the new order will be a job creator - but they'll be jobs for lawyers, not in the coal fields.

Front and centre is practical action on the Clean Power Plan (CPP), the Obama project to cut fossil fuels from energy production. Although it has long been tied up in the courts, the new administration will leave it to fester there while they cook up a much weaker replacement.

There will also be new, less restrictive rules on methane emissions from the oil and industry and more freedom to sell coal leases from federal lands.

President Trump is signalling a significant change in the widely held philosophy that CO2 is the enemy, the main driver of climate change.

US environmentalists are astounded but also enraged. They will be queuing up to go to court. But in many ways that's playing into the hands of President Trump and the fossil fuel lobby.

"Delay is what they want," one green source told me, "delay is winning."

Read Matt's piece in full

Will the US honour its commitments under the Paris climate deal?

While campaigning for the presidency, Mr Trump argued that the agreement was unfair to the US.

The landmark agreement commits governments to moving their economies away from fossil fuels and reducing carbon emissions to try to contain global temperature rise.

Mr Trump has in the past said climate change had been "created by and for the Chinese."

But at the end of last year, he acknowledged that there was "some connectivity" between human activity and climate change.

It is now unclear where exactly the US stands in relation to the deal.

Whatever the US chooses, the EU, India and China say they will stick to their pledges made in Paris.

What has been the reaction?

The president's order will be resisted by environmentalists, who have promised to challenge it in the courts.

"These actions are an assault on American values and they endanger the health, safety and prosperity of every American," billionaire environmental activist Tom Steyer was quoted by Reuters as saying.

"I think it is a climate destruction plan in place of a climate action plan," the Natural Resources Defense Council's David Doniger told the BBC, adding that they will fight the president in court.

Another green group, Earthjustice, said it would challenge the measure in and out of court.

"This order ignores the law and scientific reality," its President Trip Van Noppen said.

Read more about the Paris climate deal

Trump team moving away from supporters on climate science
Does Trump believe in climate change?
Tara McKelvey, BBC White House reporter

Yes - at least according to a senior aide.

When asked whether the president believes in man-made climate change, the aide said "sure", adopting a matter-of-fact tone.

This marks a shift. In 2015 the president said that climate change was a "hoax".

By November 2016, the president had softened his position on the matter, saying he saw "some connectivity" between man and climate change.

Now the president has gone further - at least, according to his aide.

The president, a one-time climate-change denier, now believes, that climate change is real - and that humans are behind it.

Trump moves decisively to wipe out Obama’s climate-change record

By Juliet Eilperin and Brady Dennis
March 27 at 11:01 PM

President Trump will take the most significant step yet in obliterating his predecessor’s environmental record Tuesday, instructing federal regulators to rewrite key rules curbing U.S. carbon emissions.

The sweeping executive order also seeks to lift a moratorium on federal coal leasing and remove the requirement that federal officials consider the impact of climate change when making decisions.

The order sends an unmistakable signal that just as President Barack Obama sought to weave climate considerations into every aspect of the federal government, Trump is hoping to rip that approach out by its roots.

"This policy is in keeping with President Trump's desire to make the United States energy independent," said a senior administration official who briefed reporters on the directive Monday evening and asked for anonymity to speak in advance of the announcement.

"When it comes to climate change, we want to take our course and do it in our own form and fashion."

Some of the measures could take years to implement and are unlikely to alter broader economic trends that are shifting the nation's
electricity mix from coal-fired generation to natural gas and renewables. The order is silent on whether the United States should withdraw from the 2015 Paris climate agreement, under which it has pledged to cut its greenhouse gas emissions between 26 and 28 percent by 2025 compared to 2005 levels, because the administration remains divided on that question.

The order comes after several moves by Trump to roll back Obama-era restrictions on mining, drilling and coal- and gas-burning operations. In his first two months as president, Trump has nullified a regulation barring surface-mining companies from polluting waterways and set aside a new accounting system that would have compelled coal companies and other energy firms to pay more in federal royalties.

The administration also has announced it will reconsider stricter fuel-efficiency standards for cars and light trucks and has approved two major oil pipelines, Dakota Access and Keystone XL, that Obama had halted.

Accelerating fossil-fuel production on federal lands and sidelining climate considerations could lead to higher emissions of the greenhouse gases driving climate change and complicate a global effort to curb the world’s carbon output. But Trump has repeatedly questioned whether climate change is underway and emphasized that he is determined to deliver for the voters in coal country who helped him win the Oval Office.

“He’s made a pledge to the coal industry and he’s going to do whatever he can to help those workers,” the senior administration official said.

U.S. coal jobs, which number about 75,000, have been declining for decades. The official did not predict how many jobs might be spurred by this shift in policy.

Legal fight possible

The centerpiece of the new presidential directive, telling the Environmental Protection Agency to begin rewriting the 2015 regulation that limits greenhouse-gas emissions from existing power plants, will trigger a laborious rulemaking process and a possible legal fight.

The agency must first get permission from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, where the rule is tied up in litigation, to revisit the matter. Then, agency officials will have to justify reaching the opposite conclusion of the Obama EPA, which argued it was technically feasible and legally warranted to reduce carbon pollution by about one-third by 2030, compared with 2005 levels.

“So, for the president, even if he would like to revoke the Clean Power Plan, he doesn’t have legal authority to do that,” said Jeffrey Holmstead, a partner at the Bracewell law firm who opposes the Obama-era rule. Holmstead, who headed the EPA’s air and radiation office under President George W. Bush, said he thinks the agency can justify reversing the regulation. But “they have to justify why they have changed,” he added.
While environmental groups derided Trump’s move, mining officials welcomed it as an important course correction in federal energy policy.

“This rule was an unlawful attempt to radically transform the nation’s power grid, destroying valuable energy assets and leaving our economy more vulnerable to rising power prices — all for an insignificant environmental benefit,” said Hal Quinn, president and chief executive of the National Mining Association.

Environmentalists vowed to fight the executive order in court and press ahead with their goals on the state level.

David Doniger, director of the Natural Resources Defense Council’s climate and clean-air program, said unwinding the Clean Power Plan will not happen quickly, no matter what the president wants. “Tearing the rules down require going through the same process it took to build them up,” Doniger said. “We will make them face the music at every step.”

Christopher Field, a professor at Stanford University’s Wood Institute for the Environment, said in an email that the directive carries long-term risks, rather than immediate ones. “Some are risks from eroding the position of U.S. companies in the clean energy sector,” Field said. “Others are from the loss of irreplaceable natural heritage that is put in jeopardy by ill-conceived policies.”

The president will also instruct the Interior Department to rewrite a 2015 rule, currently stayed in court, that imposes restrictions on hydraulic fracturing on federal and tribal lands. The directive will also make it easier to flare methane in oil and gas operations on federal land, by triggering the review of a rule the Interior Department finalized in November.

More immediate actions...
Other aspects of the executive order can take effect immediately, though it is unclear how quickly they will translate into greater coal extraction. One section overturns a 2016 White House directive to consider climate change when agencies conduct reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act, a sweeping law that informed any federal decisions that have a significant environmental impact. Another provision instructs Interior’s Bureau of Land Management to lift a freeze on federal coal leasing. That moratorium has been in effect since December 2015.

Tom Sanzillo, director of finance for the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis, said in an interview that the move "becomes a largely politically symbolic measure for right now" because other, lower-carbon sources of energy are out-competing coal. He noted that U.S. coal consumption has declined 27 percent since 2005, from 1.02 billion tons to 739 million tons in 2016, its lowest level in nearly four decades.

"They're not going to reverse the fundamental economic law here," Sanzillo said. "There's no market signal that's telling them they should be mining more coal." Still, regulatory relief could make some coal firms, nearly 50 of which have filed for bankruptcy since 2012, somewhat more economically viable. Some of the sector's biggest companies — including Arch Coal, Peabody Energy and Alpha Natural Resources — are just now emerging from bankruptcy protection.

Ethan Zindler, head of U.S. research at Bloomberg New Energy Finance, said in an email that solar and wind are competitive with coal in some parts of the country and that natural gas ranks as the lowest-cost source of electricity generation overall. The sector that could suffer the greatest hit from the elimination of the Clean Power Plan is nuclear energy, which provides about a fifth of U.S. businesses' and households' power.

"Many of the 100 or so U.S. plants are aging, and approximately a third are economically uncompetitive today," Zindler said. Without stricter federal emissions limits, he added, "there may be little to stop the retirement of these plants in coming years and their replacement with a combination of gas, wind and solar."

Separately, Trump has instructed federal officials to abandon the practice of factoring in the impact of climate change — what is dubbed "the social cost of carbon" — in their policymaking decisions. That calculus, which is currently set at $36 per ton of carbon dioxide, aims to capture the negative consequences of allowing greenhouse-gas emissions to continue to rise. But some conservatives have criticized it as too sweeping.

Federal officials will return to the traditional cost-benefit analysis the George W. Bush administration adopted nearly 15 years ago, which has a much lower cost associated with carbon emissions.

As Trump seeks to scale back federal limits on greenhouse gas emissions, states and cities are likely to take on a larger role in charting the course forward.

An analysis by the Rhodium Group, an economic consulting firm, found that Trump's forthcoming executive order would slow the country's shift away from carbon-emitting sources of energy. It found after Trump's action, the United States would be 14 percent below its 2005 emissions levels by 2025, compared to 21 percent below that mark had current Obama-era policies remained in place.

Tim Profeta, who directs Duke University's Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, said regulators from more than half-a-dozen states in the Southeast are now talking about how to chart their own path forward. Having met for nearly three years, the group stopped discussing how to comply with the Clean Power Plan after November's election, but it is still talking.

"We are now talking about the evolution of the power sector in an environment of uncertainty," Profeta said in an interview. "We're seeing the beginning of states taking control of their destiny."

This climate lawsuit could change everything. No wonder the Trump administration doesn't want it going to
A groundbreaking climate lawsuit, brought against the federal government by 21 children, has been hailed by environmentalists as a bold new strategy to press for climate action in the United States. But the Trump administration, which has pledged to undo Barack Obama's climate regulations, is doing its best to make sure the case doesn't get far.

The Trump administration this week filed a motion to overturn a ruling by a federal judge back in November that cleared the lawsuit for trial — and filed a separate motion to delay trial preparation until that appeal is considered.

The lawsuit — the first of its kind — argues the federal government has violated the constitutional right of the 21 plaintiffs to a healthy climate system.

Environmental groups say the case — if it's successful — could force even a reluctant government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and take other measures to counter warming.

"It would be huge," said Pat Gallagher, legal director at the Sierra Club, who is not involved in the case. "It would upend climate litigation, climate law, as we know it."

The landmark lawsuit was originally filed during the Obama administration. The 21 plaintiffs, now between the ages of 9 and 20, claim the federal government has consistently engaged in activity that promotes fossil fuel production and greenhouse gas emissions, thereby worsening climate change. They argue this violates their constitutional right to life, liberty and property, as well the public trust doctrine, while holds that the government is responsible for the preservation of certain vital resources — in this case, a healthy climate system — for public use.

While legal experts are uncertain as to the lawsuit's likelihood of success, few have disputed its pioneering nature. Similar cases have been brought on the state level, but this is the first against the federal government in the United States. And in November, the case cleared a major early hurdle when U.S. District Judge Ann Aiken denied motions filed by the Obama administration, as well as the fossil fuel industry, to have the lawsuit dismissed, ordering that it should proceed to trial.

The move allowed the case to join the ranks of climate lawsuits filed in other nations, which could upend the way environmental advocacy is conducted around the world. Just last year, a court in the Netherlands ordered the Dutch government to cut carbon emissions by a quarter within five years. Similar climate-related suits have been brought and won in Austria, Pakistan and South Africa.

Shortly after President Trump's inauguration, the plaintiffs submitted a request that the Department of Justice preserve all documents that could be relevant to the lawsuit, including information on climate change, energy and emissions, and cease any destruction of such documents that may otherwise occur during the presidential transition. The request came just days after reports began to surface of climate information disappearing from White House and certain federal agency websites.

"We are concerned with the new administration's immediate maneuver to remove important climate change information from the public domain and, based on recent media reports, we are concerned about how deep the scrubbing effort will go," Julia Olson, chief legal counsel for the plaintiffs and executive director of the advocacy group Our Children's Trust, said in a statement at the time. "Destroying evidence is illegal and we just put those new U.S. Defendants and the Industry Defendants on notice that they are barred from doing so."

The Trump administration is combating this request in its motion to stay litigation, along with its motion to appeal. The administration charges that the United States could be "irreparably harmed" if the case's proceedings are not halted pending consideration of its appeal, claiming that "the extraordinary scope of this litigation and the concomitant scope of discovery that Plaintiffs appear to be seeking set this case apart."

"One of the things that the government argues is that the preservation of documents itself represents a burden on the government," said Michael Burger, executive director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia Law School. "What they're arguing
is that they’ll be irreparably injured by having to go through discovery here.”

This, he added, “sends kind of the wrong signal, or at least a very dangerous signal, in terms of what the government’s priorities are or what it’s thinking of doing. It shouldn’t be any kind of burden for the government to preserve documents that are already in existence.”

But given the broad implications of the case for U.S. climate action, especially if the plaintiffs prevail, “it’s not surprising that the Trump administration would want to quash it,” said Gallagher, the Sierra Club legal director.

If the case were successful, the federal government would be obligated to take meaningful action against climate change, probably through a planned reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. This type of order would run counter to the current administration’s priorities. On Thursday, Scott Pruitt, the EPA chief, rejected the underlying science of climate change, and the administration has indicated its intent to cancel a number of Obama-era climate and environmental regulations, including the Clean Power Plan, and withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

Whether either of the federal government’s most recent motions will hold up remains to be decided. According to Burger, this largely depends on Aiken, the federal judge who ordered that the case proceed to trial, who essentially must sign off in order for the appeal to take place.

“In order to do that, the judge needs to basically agree that there are issues of law that could be determinative that the case would be better served if the Ninth Circuit [Court of Appeals] heard it now,” Burger said. Appeals most typically occur after a final opinion on a case has been reached through trial, he noted, pointing out that although it’s “common enough for parties to seek interlocutory appeal, it’s the exception rather than the rule that it be granted.”

A stay of the proceedings, pending appeal, is also subject to Aiken’s decision. This means there are multiple combinations of outcomes that could occur for the case’s proceedings.

“It’s conceivable that Judge Aiken could certify her order on the motion to dismiss for interlocutory appeal and not grant a stay on the proceedings,” Burger noted. In this situation, the case would be heard in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which would essentially decide whether it should proceed on the basis of the claims the plaintiffs have already set forth, while at the same time continuing through discovery at the district court level, he said.

Regardless of the final outcome, legal experts have highlighted the lawsuit’s importance as a novel approach to the climate issue in the United States. “It could spawn a whole new universe of litigation at both the state and the federal levels,” Gallagher said.