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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgas/Netzwerke</th>
<th>PI: persönliches Interview; TI: Telefoninterview (Nacherhebung); X: Nacherhebung nicht umsetzbar</th>
<th>Mitgliedschaft in einem der drei im Umfeld der COP15 aktiven Netzwerke</th>
<th>Themenfeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transnationale NGO-Netzwerke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT International – Action by Churches Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BirdLife international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Network (CAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDSE – Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Justice Now! (CJN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Alliance - Klimabündnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban Group of Climate Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Young European Greens (FYEG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth International (FOEI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender CC - Women for Climate Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Footprint Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Forest Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions for Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TckTckTck – Time for Climate Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third World Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationales Bewegungsnetzwerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Kategorien</td>
<td>Jahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350.org</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kohlenstoffmanagement 350.org 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Justice Action (CJA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJA</td>
<td>GJEP 2009; Focus 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Camp International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Peace Initiative of Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Entwicklung</td>
<td>GROOTS 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating together in Sisterhood (GROOTS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples of Africa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Indigenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinating Committee (IPACC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Youth Climate Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jugend</td>
<td>FYCM 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Alliance of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Tropical Forests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Via Campesina (LVC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Trust A COP (NTAC)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Autonome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples’ Movement on Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJN</td>
<td>PMCC 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (PMCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisationen mit eigenem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internalem Netzwerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesellschaft für bedrohte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ökologie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace International</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>GP 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Working Group for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entwicklung</td>
<td>Oxfam 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Natura International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naturschutz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s International League for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Freedom (WILPF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAN; Naturschutz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational agierende Netzwerk-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisationen oder Initiaten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAAZ.org</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webaktivismus</td>
<td>FYCM 2009 (Personalunion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Corporate Front Group</td>
<td>Copenhagen 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2 Interviewleitfäden

A.2.1 Deutsch-sprachige Version des Interviewleitfadens

Einstieg¹

Herzlichen Dank, dass Sie sich Zeit für das Interview nehmen. Bevor wir jetzt mit dem Interview beginnen, möchte ich Ihnen noch einmal kurz erzählen, worum es geht: Ich arbeite an einer Studie zum Thema „klimapolitische Diskurse im Feld transnationaler Sozialer Bewegungen und NGOs“. Sind Sie dazu schon Ihrer Meinung nach ausreichend informiert oder haben Sie noch Fragen?

→ wenn der/die Interviewte mehr Informationen wünscht:

Ich möchte herausfinden, was ihre klimapolitischen Ziele und Forderungen sind, wie Sie im Rahmen Ihrer Organisation/ Sozialen Bewegung aktiv sind. Die Befragung findet im Rahmen eines Promotionsvorhabens im Fach Politikwissenschaft statt, das an der Freien Universität Berlin angesiedelt ist.

Ist das soweit okay?

Gut, im Verlauf unseres Gesprächs werde ich Ihnen nun verschiedene offene Fragen stellen, bei denen ich Sie grundsätzlich bitte, einfach all das zu erzählen, was für Sie relevant und wichtig ist. Ich werde Sie dabei nicht unterbrechen. Es gibt da auch kein „richtig“ und kein „falsch“. Ich werte nicht. Ich werde Ihnen auch genügend Zeit lassen, fühlen Sie sich also nicht unter Druck gesetzt, wir haben sozusagen „alle Zeit der Welt“, die Sie sich nehmen möchten.
Ich schätze, das Interview wird in etwa 45-60 Minuten in Anspruch nehmen, wie ich Ihnen ja schon beim ersten Kontakt gesagt habe.

Noch zu den formellen Angelegenheiten:


Ist das soweit in Ordnung für Sie?
Gut, ja, dann zur ersten Frage …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Erzählauflorderung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO/ Soz. Bewegung</td>
<td>[Welcher Organisation/ Sozialen Bewegung gehören Sie an?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie kam es dazu, dass Sie sich dieser Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung angeschlossen haben?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziele/ Forderungen</td>
<td>Kommen wir nun zur Klimapolitik: Wer bzw. was ist für Sie das eigentliche Problem der globalen Erwärmung?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klimaverhandlungen</td>
<td>Jetzt würde ich gerne erfahren, wie Sie die 'internationalen Klimaverhandlungen' einschätzen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handlungsform</td>
<td>Was macht Ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung denn so zum Klimathema?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akteurskonstellation</td>
<td>Mit wem arbeiten Sie zusammen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ + Faktenfragen
### Einstieg

#### #Aufnahme Start

#### Einstiegsinformationen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>• klimapolitische Diskurse im Feld transnationaler Sozialer Bewegungen und NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

→ Sind sie dazu schon ausreichend informiert oder haben Sie noch Fragen?

| Projekterklärung | • Blick auf klimapolitische Ziele und Forderungen  
|                 | • Aktivitäten der Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung  
|                 | • Befragung im Rahmen eines Promotionsvorhabens (Politikwissenschaft) an der Freien Universität Berlin |

→ Ist das soweit okay?

| Kommunikationsmuster | • offene Fragen  
|                     | • grundsätzlich all das erzählen, was relevant und wichtig ist  
|                     | • keine Unterbrechung  
|                     | • kein „richtig“ und kein „falsch“  
|                     | • keine Wertung  
|                     | • genügend Zeit, kein Druck  
|                     | • Schätzung 30-40 Minuten |

#### Formelles

| Datenschutz | • Aufnahme für spätere Auswertung → Verschriftlichung  
|            | • Verwendung des Interviewmaterials streng vertraulich und anonym;  
|            | • anonymisierte Auswertung ausschließlich nach Einverständniserklärung |

→ Ist das soweit in Ordnung für Sie? Haben Sie noch allgemeine Fragen?  
→ Gut, dann zur ersten Frage …
1. NGO/ Soziale Bewegung

[Welcher Organisation/ Sozialen Bewegung gehören sie an?]

Wie kam es dazu, dass Sie sich dieser Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung angeschlossen haben?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolle, Rollenwahrnehmung</td>
<td>• In welcher Rolle sehen Sie die Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung?</td>
<td>- Wen vertreten Sie mit Ihrer Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Und was glauben Sie, in welcher Rolle andere Sie sehen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentrale Ereignisse</td>
<td>• Erzählen Sie mir etwas über Höhepunkte der Auseinandersetzungen um die politische Agenda ihrer Organisation.</td>
<td>- Wann bräuchte es Ihre Orga./ Soz. Bewegung nicht mehr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themenfelder der Organisation</td>
<td>• Welche Arbeitsschwerpunkte hat Ihre Organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte [thematische Zuwendung zum Klimathema]</td>
<td>• Wie lange arbeitet Ihre Organisation/ Soziale Bewegung schon zur Klimapolitik?</td>
<td>- Wie lange arbeiten Sie persönlich schon zur Klimapolitik?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Ziele/ Forderungen

**Kommen wir nun zur Klimapolitik: Wer bzw. was ist für Sie das eigentliche Problem der globalen Erwärmung?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problemsicht, Ziele, Forderungen</td>
<td>• Was sind „richtige“ Lösungen hinsichtlich des Klimawandels?</td>
<td>- Gibt es sonst noch was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was sind „falsche“ Lösungen hinsichtlich des Klimawandels?</td>
<td>- Und sonst?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„Klimagerechtigkeit“:</td>
<td>• Was verstehen Sie unter „Klimagerechtigkeit“? Können Sie mir bitte erzählen was Sie unter „Klimagerechtigkeit“ auffassen?</td>
<td>- Und weiter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begriffsverständnis</td>
<td>• Wie stehen Sie zu dem Begriff?</td>
<td>- Können Sie mir noch mehr erzählen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewertung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Klimaverhandlungen

Jetzt würde ich gerne erfahren, wie Sie die 'internationalen Klimaverhandlungen' einschätzen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teilhabe</td>
<td>• Wie beurteilen Sie Ihre Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten auf diesem Gipfel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teilnahmemotivation</td>
<td>• Was möchten Sie in Kopenhagen erreichen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repräsentanz, Integration, Exklusion</td>
<td>• Stellen Sie sich vor Sie werden von einem Freund gefragt: „Wer nimmt denn so an einer Klimakonferenz teil?“ Was würden Sie antworten?</td>
<td>- Wer dürfte nicht hier sein?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wer ist nicht hier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akzeptanz Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung</td>
<td>• Wie wird hier in Kopenhagen denn so über Ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung geredet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimität</td>
<td>• Stellen Sie sich vor, die Klimakonferenz ist ein Fußballspiel: Wie würden Sie das kommentieren?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Handlungsform

**Was macht Ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung denn so zum Klimathema?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen/ Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Konkrete Projekte</td>
<td>• Gibt es weitere konkrete Projekte die ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung zum Klimathema durchführt?</td>
<td>- Fällt Ihnen sonst noch etwas ein?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handlung Vor-Ort</td>
<td>• Welche Aktionen unterstützt Ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung hier in Kopenhagen?</td>
<td>- Und sonst?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimität von Aktionsformen</td>
<td>• Was meinen Sie sind für die hier anwesenden zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen die Gründe für eine Konferenzakkreditierung?</td>
<td>- Hilft Ihnen der Protest auf der Straße?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkreditierung</td>
<td>• Wie stehen Sie zu/ Was halten Sie von den Protesten außerhalb der Konferenz/ auf der Straße?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest Außen</td>
<td>• Wie stehen Sie zu/ Was halten Sie von der Mobilisierung autonemer Gruppen hin zu den Klimaverhandlungen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Akteurskonstellation

### Mit wem arbeiten Sie zusammen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Netzwerke, Bündnispartner** | • In welchen nationalen oder globalen Netzwerken arbeitet Sie / ihre Organisation?  
• Wie haben Sie sich für Kopenhagen vorbereitet?  
• Würden sie bestimmten Standpunkten anderer NGOs [fundamental] widersprechen? – Welche wären das? | - Fällt Ihnen sonst noch etwas ein?  
- Und sonst?  
- Und weiter?  
| **Gegner** | [optional ausschließlich an Orga./ Soz.Bewegung außerhalb der Konferenz] |  |
| **Rolle** | • *Ich habe nun noch eine provozierende Frage:*  
Wie würde der Verfassungsschutz Ihre Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung erwähnen? |  |
### 6. Faktenfragen

*Ich hätte da jetzt am Ende einfach noch ein paar konkrete Fragen.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Fragen</th>
<th>Konkretisierung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lektüre</td>
<td>• Was lesen Sie so zum Thema Klimawandel und Klimapolitik? Und was auf keine Fall?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulierung von Forderungen</td>
<td>• Gibt es zentrale Orte an denen Ihre Organisation ihre Programmatik, ihr klimapolitischen Forderungen formuliert?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genese „Klimagerechtigkeit“</td>
<td>• Erinnern Sie sich, wann Sie den Begriff „Klimagerechtigkeit“ zuerst kennengelernt haben?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finanzierung Organisation/ Soz. Bewegung</td>
<td>• Wie finanziert sich ihre Organisation/ die soziale Bewegung? Woher kommt das Geld?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offene Nachfrage zum Abschluss

Ja, von meiner Seite aus wäre es das dann. Gibt es noch von Ihnen aus etwas, was Sie gerne noch erzählen möchten, was Ihnen wichtig ist, und was bisher im Interview noch nicht zur Sprache gekommen ist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ausleitungsfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nachfrage bzgl. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nachfrage bzgl. Teilnahmemotivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Aufnahme Ende

- Dank für das Gespräch
- Einverständniserklärung unterzeichnen lassen
- Des Weiteren mitteilen, falls erwünscht, dass Forschungsergebnisse zugänglich gemacht werden können, falls die Probanden daran Interesse haben. Dann Adresse notieren.

→ Postskript erstellen!
Wichtigste Besonderheiten der Interviewdurchführung (Atmosphäre, Befindlichkeiten, Rapport, Interaktionen, Auffälligkeiten, Störungen, Gesprächsverlauf/ Interviewdynamik, wichtigste Thematiken im Interview, etc.)
Einstieg

Thank you for giving me the opportunity for this interview. Before we start I’d like to sketch out what it’s all about. I’m working on a study of “The discourse of climate politics in the field of transnational social movements and NGOs”. Does this mean anything to you or would you like me to be more precise?

[→ wenn der/die Interviewte mehr Informationen wünscht:]

I want to find out what – regarding climate politics - your aims and demands are and in what manner you are active within the framework of your organization / social movement. The interview is the basis for a PhD thesis in Political Science at Free University Berlin.

Is that o.k. with you so far?

Well, in the course of our interview I’m going to ask various open questions- so would you please simply tell me whatever is relevant and important to you. I won´t interrupt you, and of course there is no “right” or “wrong”. I won´t judge any of your answers. And there is enough time, so don’t feel yourself put under pressure – we have all the time in the world.

As I’ve told you already I think the interview will take up about 30 to 40 minutes.

Now for some formalities:

As you know, I want to tape-record and transcribe the interview for later analysis. This will allow me to follow our talk better as I won’t have to take notes. Of course the interview material will be used strictly confidentially and in an anonymous form. This means all personal data that might allow to identify you will be deleted or be given an anonymous form. Moreover, all data will be used only if you give your consent after the interview.

Is that all right with you?

Well, here we are, this is my first question ...

## Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Invitation to tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO/ social Movement</td>
<td>[What is your organization / your social movement? ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How was it that you joined this organization /social movement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims/ demands</td>
<td>Now for climate politics: In your view, who or what is the real problem of global warming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate negotiations</td>
<td>Now I´d like to know how you assess the „international climate negotiations“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of action</td>
<td>When climate is the issue, what are your organization´s activities, generally speaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation of actors</td>
<td>Who do you cooperate with?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ + Faktenfragen
### Einstieg

#### #Aufnahme Start

**Einstiegsinformationen:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>• The discourse of climate politics in the field of transnational social movements and NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

→ Are there any questions regarding the project?

| Projekterklärung | • aims and demands of organizations/ social movements regarding climate politics  
|                 | • in what manner they are active  
|                 | • interview is the basis for a PhD thesis in Political Science at Free University Berlin |

→ Is that o.k. with you so far?

| Kommunikationsmuster | • various open questions  
|                     | • simply tell me whatever is relevant and important to you  
|                     | • no interruption  
|                     | • no “right” or “wrong”  
|                     | • no judgement of answers  
|                     | • enough time, no pressure  
|                     | • about 30 to 40 minutes |

| Formelles | • tape-recording and transcription of the interview for later analysis |
| Datenschutz | • interview material will be used strictly confidentially and in an anonymous form;  
|            | • data will be used only if you give your consent after the interview |

→ Is that all right with you?  
→ Well, here we are, this is my first question …
1. NGO/ Soziale Bewegung

[What is your organization / your social movement?]

How was it that you joined this organization / soc. movement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| role, role perception | • What is your view of the role of this organization/ movement?  
                      | • And how do you think do others perceive you?^[A] | - Whose interests is your organization/ movement looking after? Whose cause do you promote? |
| central occurences | • Could you tell me something about the most critical stage when you were discussing the political agenda of your organization?^[A] | |
| understanding of success/ utopia | • What would be the greatest success for your org. / movem.?  
                                | • What is the main area where your org./ movem. works? | - Under which circumstances would your org./ movem. no longer be needed / lose its raison d´etre? |
| topics of organization/ movement | • How long has climate politics been part of your organization´s work? | - What importance does your org. attach to climate change? |
| history  
[attention to topic of climate change] | | - And how long has it been part of your personal work? |

^[A] Da bei dieser Frage oftmals Verständnisschwierigkeiten auftraten, wurde sie ausschließlich bei den ersten Interviews gestellt.
Now for climate politics itself: In your view, who or what is the real problem of global warming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| perspectives on the problem, goals, demands | • What are the „right“ solutions regarding the climate change?  
• What are „wrong“ solutions regarding the climate change?  
• What do you understand by „climate justice“? Please tell me: What is your idea of that term?  
• And what is your personal view? Would you make use of the concept? | - Is there anything else?  
- And what else?  
- And what exactly would that mean?  
- Is there anything you might want to add? |
### 3. Klimaverhandlungen

*Now I’d like to know how you assess the “international climate negotiations”.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>• How do you assess your chances to influence things on the present summit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation for participation</td>
<td>• What do you want to achieve in Copenhagen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation, integration, exclusion</td>
<td>• Imagine a friend asking you: “Who attends a climate conference?“ What would you answer?</td>
<td>- Who should not be here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do people say about your org. here in Copenhagen?</td>
<td>- Who is not here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance of organization/ movement</td>
<td>• Imagine the climate conference as a football match: What would your comment be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legitimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B Diese Frage wurde nur dann gestellt, wenn ausreichend Zeit zur Verfügung stand.*
4. Handlungsform

*When climate is the issue, what are your organization´s activities, generally speaking?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen/ Konkrete Nachfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>concrete projects</td>
<td>• Are there other specific projects regarding the climate that are carried out by your org. / movem.?</td>
<td>- Anything else that comes to your mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local activity</td>
<td>• Which activities here in Copenhagen are supported by your org.?</td>
<td>- And otherwise? At other occasions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legitimacy of types of activity</td>
<td>• What do you think are reasons why the organizations of civil society present are accredited to the conference?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accreditation</td>
<td>• What do you think of the protest activities outside the conference / in the streets?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protest outside</td>
<td>• What do you think of the mobilization of autonomous groups for the climate negotiations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Akteurskonstellation

**Who do you cooperate with?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Anschlussfragen</th>
<th>Aufrechterhaltungsfragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| networks, allies    | • In which national or global networks does your org. work?  
                      • How did you prepare for Copenhagen?  
                      • Would you strictly contradict / oppose certain positions of other NGOs? – Which ones?  
                      • Now I have a provocative question: How might the secret service refer to your org./movement in their annual report? | - Any other ideas?  
                      - Anything else?  
                      - Are there other things you want to mention? |
| opponents           |                 |                          |
| role                |                 |                          |

[optional ausschließlich an Orga./Soz.Bewegung außerhalb der Konferenz]
### Some concrete questions to finish the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhaltliche Aspekte</th>
<th>Fragen</th>
<th>Konkretisierung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| reading                             | • What do you read when you want to know about climate change and climate politics?  
                                        And what do you never read?  
                                        • Are there particular places where your org./movem. has stated its programme, its demands regarding climate politics?  
                                        • Do you remember when you first met with the term "climate justice"?  
                                        • How is your org./movem. financed? Where does the money come from? |                  |
| formulation of demands              |                                                                        |                  |
| genesis of „Climate Justice“        |                                                                        |                  |
| funding organization/ movement      |                                                                        |                  |
Offene Nachfrage zum Abschluss

That’s it, as far as I’m concerned.

Is there anything you on your part want to add, anything that is important to you and has not come up in the interview so far?

Ausleitungsfragen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nachfrage bzgl. Interview</th>
<th>How did you feel being interviewed? What was it like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nachfrage bzgl. Teilnahmemotivation</td>
<td>What were your reasons for giving the interview?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Aufnahme Ende

➢ thanks for the conversation
➢ signing of declaration of consent
➢ if interested, possibility to send results of the study ➔ Adresse notieren

➔ Postskript erstellen!
Wichtigste Besonderheiten der Interviewdurchführung (Atmosphäre, Befindlichkeiten, Rapport, Interaktionen, Auffälligkeiten, Störungen, Gesprächsverlauf/ Interviewdynamik, wichtigste Thematiken im Interview, etc.)
A.3 Transkripte der Interviews (teilweise anonymisiert)

A.3.1 Vorbemerkungen zur Transkription

Bei der Transkription der Interviews wurden die in Tabelle 2 zusammengefassten Notationen verwendet. Die Einstiegsinformationen (vgl. Seite 6 bzw. 16 im Interviewleitfaden Anhang A.2) wurden in den Transkripten nicht erfasst.

In Interviews mit Personen, die um eine Anonymisierung des Geäußerten baten, wurden Textstellen, die Rückschlüsse auf die Person ermöglichen, unkenntlich gemacht. Entsprechende Textstellen unterliegen einer Markierung (»[gesperrt]«).

Tabelle 2: Der Transkription zugrundegelegte Notationen (in Anlehnung an Kruse 2009: 134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I:</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>Proband_in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Verschleifungen, schnelle Anschlüsse, Stottern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wort- oder Satzabbruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(((lacht))) ((( hustet)))</td>
<td>Außersprachliche Handlungen/Ereignisse/Störungen, sprachbegleitende Handlungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{gleichzeitig}...}</td>
<td>Gleichzeitige Rede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;lachend&gt;...&gt;</td>
<td>Vermuteter Wortlaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?,meint?) (?!)</td>
<td>Unverständlicher Redebeitrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mhm, ahja]</td>
<td>Redebeitrag des anderen Kommunikanten an der jeweiligen Stelle des Redebeitrags der Kommunikationspartner_in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhm, hmm</td>
<td>Bejahung, Verneinung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># ... #</td>
<td>Unterbrechung des Interviews, ggf. Nennung des Grundes und der Zeitspanne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I: so my first question is (...) how was it that you get to 350, that you are active there?

P: 

the campaign was called step it up and it was distributed events all over the country, the united states. and the idea was to put direct pressure on the u s congress, to cut carbon 80% by 2050. that was a bold demand, that was in 2007, and none of the politicians has signed onto that long-term goal yet. 

we had 1400 events on one day on april 14th was step it up in every state, and it was these beautiful things like on top of the rocky mountains and up the coast of the florida keys and the coral reefs, in manhattan (...) all of which was very exciting and powerful and felt like a real movement which hadn’t happened much in the us. there was a lot of good local stuff going on but not a lot of national social movement pressure. and, in addition to that, two weeks later, both barack obama and hillary clinton signed on to “80% by 2050”. so, we felt pretty good about the work that we had done and felt that we had moved the debate some in the us. so, at that
point, we decided that seeing this big copenhagen process coming up, we wanted to engage internationally and went to the bali un conference and saw a similar role that we could fill with the kind of organizing that we did. At the same time, the james hansen was coming out with the first concrete science around 350 as a bottom line for CO2 for a safe, stable climate. so we seized on that number made it our next goal and started gathering an international team and came up with the big october 24th, day of organizing this year, and now we’re in copenhagen.

I: what do you think would be the greatest success for 350.org?

P: this day, october 24th, was about six weeks ago. we did events all over the world, similar to what we did in the us but much much bigger, much cooler. and all the events highlighted the need to get back to 350 ppm and amazing organizing. and it was a cnn called it the most widespread day of political action in history. it was 5200 events in 181 countries. it was incredible. and we are a bit more professional than we were before but not much. it was still very much of a grassroots effort.

I: what do you think, when wouldn’t 350.org be needed anymore?

P: perhaps after copenhagen. we don’t have any organizing plans after this.

I: under which circumstances do you think it wouldn’t be needed anymore?

P: one of our goals was to shift the debate in here. so, everyone was talking about 2 degrees and 450 parts per million. now, there are i believe over 100 countries which are directly advocating for 350 ppm and sort of in correlation with 1.5 degrees. a lot of the island states, the aosis delegations, the least developed countries, the africa group are all pushing for these harder targets now. so, part of that job is done. and then one of the other goals was to make the science of 350 well known in all circles where people are concerned about climate change. so, anyone who cares about climate change should know that 350 is this new science and is this bottom line. i think we have almost accomplished that.

I: what do you think is the real problem of climate change?

P: the real problem? [mhm] i think, from my perspective the main problem of climate change is that we put to much carbon in the atmosphere and we’re doing it in progress.

I: what do you think would be real solutions?

P: there’s a lot of solutions. the ones that i think have the most power at this point are strong smart government action. and so (.) in the us before (.) as we were
starting to organize at my university and then later with
this "step it up" campaign, there was a lot of emphasis on
behavioral change, to people changing their light bulbs,
buying (?), turning down their thermostat, unplugging
their computers all of which are incredibly important
things and will help but will never get us to 350 because
no matter how many good-natured people there are in the
world and how many people you can convince that those are
good things to do, it won't have the amount of reduction
we need. And so i think the alternative is government
action that sets limits and sets standards by which an
entire society can change much more rapidly because it’s
an agreed upon treaty or action.

I: is there anything else? a real solution?

P: for solutions?

I: “real solution”.

P: real solutions?

I: anything else? anything more?

P: i mean (.) you need that government action. and so, what
that means is that governments have to initiate an entire
system change, remove all subsidies from fossil fuels,
invest in the technologies that will be reducing carbon
and some of the things (.) that are coming to my mind
because we were at the meeting here in copenhagen earlier
this year it also means that it has got to be smart
government action. and so, it can't be things like massive
tree plantations in brasil after they cut down the rain
forest and you lose all that biodiversity and kicking
indigenous people off the land. it has to be properly done
so that the peoples’ rights are protected, so that
biodiversity is protected, so that we are healing the
planet at the same time that we’re reducing carbon, not
one and not the other.

I: what do you understand by climate justice?

P: maybe (.) maybe two pieces to it. i haven’t often
formulated a definition of climate justice, so take this
with a grain of salt. i think climate justice would be
both pro-active and reactive. so, the pro-active part you
wouldn’t need to insure as fair as possible a system to
address concerns of oppressed peoples around the world in
anticipation of climate impacts. so, from the 350 work,
that means drastic mitigation efforts to reduce co2, so
that further impacts aren’t imposed on especially poor
people. it also means financing, adaptation fundings so
that for instance island states that are in danger of
going under water are able to protect their lands and
their livelihoods. and that would be financed by countries
like the u s that have caused most of the problem. so,
that’s the pro-active piece of it. But i also think that
many people think of climate justice as reactive, and so
basically making reparations for damage already done. so,
recognizing the idea of climate debt, that the u s has
been burning fossil fuels for 200 years and that that has
contributed the vast amount of carbon into the atmosphere
that is causing climate impacts right now. and so, making
reparations for that debt is part of climate justice
recognizing that people are dying, that people have had
their livelihoods taken away from them by this historic
carbon emissions from richer countries and (.) using that
to institute programs that address it either through
emissions reductions or financing or technology transfer.

I: would you make use of the term ‘climate justice’?
P: yeah, absolutely. it’s a little bit (.) at some points i
feel that because my understanding of it is not as deep as
some other groups, that i run a danger in using it, of
other groups feeling that i’m not committed enough to the
principles of it because i haven’t gone as in depths as
other groups. but it’s certainly something that I believe
in, that 350.org believes in and that we try to (.) that
we try to get into our work. But it isn’t as much a (.)
message that we campaign on, mostly because of the fact
that we’re so focused on climate science. and so, when we
talk about the fair, bold, ambitious ways of getting back
to 350, in my mind that includes climate justice. but
obviously, there are different definitions of what is
fair, what is bold, what is ambitious.

I: how do you assess the climate negotiations?
P: right now?
I: in general.
P: how would you assess the climate negotiations in general.
this u n process?
I: this u n process, u n f c c c, kyoto
P: (.) i think it’s the best venue we have to try to solve
this problem in a comprehensive way. in terms of global
institutions, i think the u n is one of the most
representative, it has incredible flaws i was just talking
to two u k delegates who we accredited through 350 who
have come here to work with some of the members of aosis
(.) the alliance of small island states (.) basically to
(.) do their media work, to run statistics for them, to go
out and print things at the copier, anything like that
simply because these island states don’t have enough
delegates to be filling all the roles they need to fill at
these negotiations, whereas the u s has i don’t know a
delegation of 40 people that are running these
negotiations. So, in that sense, they are incredibly
unfair. however, every country has a seat at the table
which is much better than some of the other global
institutions we have. and global warming is a global
problem, there is no way to solve it without the
cooporation of all countries. and so, i think this is the
best forum we have in terms of assessing negotiations. i
would very much like to see this process succeed.

I: how do you assess chances to influence these negotiations?
P: i think it’s hard, but (..) with civil society organizing,
we’re trying to influence a global process of a hundred
and eighty-something, a hundred and ninety-something
countries. and so, it’s bound to be incredibly difficult
if 180, 190 countries are trying to come to consensus on
something. that’s already incredibly difficult and then
we’re an added component. but i still think that we have
access and we have ways to change the debate

I: how if a friend was asking you ‘who is participating in
these negotiations’ what would you answer?
P: ‘who is participating’? governments (.). in the actual
debate of the treaty text, what’s going on, the
governments are the ones that make all the decisions.

I: and at a summit?
P: who is participating at a summit?

I: yes.
P: governments, (.). ngos, businesses, research institutions.

I: do you think there is someone missing or there is someone
who shouldn’t be here?
P: i think there are very underrepresented voices. indigenous
people are here, but they are very underrepresented. young
people are here, but they are somewhat underrepresented.
they just received constituency status which gives young
people a little bit more access but it also
institutionalizes them a little bit more. so, there may be
less room to speak up. i think, in general there is a fear
of confrontational tactics anywhere inside this space and
so, doing anything that is action-oriented or very lively
is very frowned upon, is discouraged. so, that is silenced
a little bit here.

I: imagine the whole summit would be a football match. what
would your comment be?
P: {{if the whole summit were a football match}} i don’t
watch football. so i am (??) to make a football
commentary. i don’t know who the two sides would be. maybe
at this point i would call one side the (.). in my mind
it’s the countries that are supporting what we actually
need to do in order to stop this problem and do it in a
fair way and those countries that are not which because of
the 350 campaign i have categorized into groups that are
supporting 350 and the policies that go along with it
versus those that are not. so, if we’re talking about a
football match with two teams, i would pick those two
teams to be playing right now.

I: could you tell me a little bit more about the activities
of your organization, generally speaking, what 350.org is
doing for projects in general but also at copenhagen?
P: sure. the first thing to say probably is that 350.org is
not exactly an organization, so we don’t do any long-term
planning. The one project that we ran from the poland
negotiations through now it was this day of action on
october 24th. and so, all of our efforts were focused on
making that day come off well. but in order to do that we
did a lot of different things. so, this past year we did a
bit of capacity-building work, doing week-long conferences
in south africa for young people in africa that were
organizing on climate change and in turkey. we have been
working with people in a lot of the u n conferences,
trying to build up the representation of youth and
especially the diversity of youth. but that was all
towards the goal of making this october 24th day as strong
as it can be and using october 24th as a tool for movement
building and growing the social movement around climate
change. so, that was our big projects and in copenhagen,
we sort of see it as a continuation of that day and what
we are trying to do is bring the voices of all the people
that we organized with october 24th into the negotiations
so, represent the in some way and then also report out
what is going on here back to the global movement that we
have connected with for october 24th. and then, the last
thing that we want to do in copenhagen is continue to
build the movement and make it stronger and more powerful

I: what do you think about the protests outside the summit?
P: it depends which ones? i mean, i haven’t we are still
waiting for the big ones, right? there are few people
outside now doing small protests which i think gives a
certain atmosphere to the conference which i think is good

I: what kind of protests are there?
P: right now? there are people outside, at the entrance ways
to the conference, groups of 10 or 20, specific
organizations usually with a specific message that they
want to get across. and so, i think that lends an air of
heightened tension to these negotiations which i think is
good. because i think the delegates who negotiate this
treaty need to feel that the entire world is watching them
and they are under pressure to do it well. and then later
this week and next week, i think we will see much larger
protests. some of them i am very excited about, some of
them i am a little concerned about. the ones i am excited
about are the ones i think will continue to draw the
world’s eyes to copenhagen and recognize (.) how important this decision could be if done well or if done incredibly poorly. the mediocre in between will get lost somewhere. and protests that will continue to make both heads of state or environmental ministers or the delegates basically anyone who has decision-making authority in this process feel civil society pressure and feel (?heat/need?) to get the job done and get a good job done. the ones that i am a little concerned about are the ones i think may turn violent and i think that may bring the wrong kind of attention to copenhagen. (.) i think that they will draw the world’s media certainly but if we’re making radical demands, we want to bring in my mind we want to bring as much of society with us as possible in making those radical demands. and i think in violent protests what you get is that much of society is on the fence that could come with you. with all this i am saying that i don’t want to be a part of that and then they draw away and you lost them and you’re on your own.

I: now, this is it’s another topic (.). who do you cooperate with? are there any organizations or networks 350.org is cooperating with?

P: yeah. for october 24th i think we had something like 400 partners around the world. and generally, we defined a partner as anybody that is willing to help organize or help spread the word about october 24th events, pushing the 350-target and the climate science behind it and getting there in a fair and just way. so that was anybody from groups like the climate action network which is the big ngo umbrella group that organizes around the conferences to groups like the belize botanical gardens that was organizing a 350-event in belize and wanted to be on the website, wanted a link to their organization, they were willing to spread the word, so we said ‘sure’. [ok] so, we’re incredibly flexible, i think, as long as people are supporting 350 and pushing this idea of october 24th day, we are willing to partner with them. because of that i think we found a lot of allies.

I: if you look at the ngos and social movements, are there certain positions you would contradict totally?

P: (.) personally or as an organization?

I: as an organization but you are not an organization.

P: as 350, i think one of the positions that we’re coming out more and more strongly against is the position of ‘2 degrees’. when we started 350, we were concerned that ‘2 degrees’ was a hard metric to use in negotiations because it’s not very easy to implement. so, for instance, 450 parts per million would have about a fifty-fifty chance of getting us below 2 degrees. and so, if you’re coming up
with policies for governments, it’s very hard to make a
decision on how to implement something if it’s based on a
probability factor. so, if you said ‘okay, well, if we cut
carbon 40% by 2020 in industrialized nations, then we may
get to 450 which gives us a 50%-chance of 2 degrees. do
you go for 40% if it’s a 50%-chance? i would argue ‘no’
because you would want a 100%-chance if you’re going to
make the decision. but because no one knows exactly how
much carbon you could put in the atmosphere to get to 2
degrees, i think it’s a bad way to make the decision. i
think parts-per-million targets are much more measurable
and much easier to implement. and in addition to it being
a hard metric, now there is a lot of physical evidence
that’s coming out that says 2 degrees is actually way too
much. we have raised the temperature of the earth a little
less than one degree celsius at this point and the arctic
is melting. according to kofi annan’s organization, there
are 300’000 people dying each year as a direct or indirect
result of climate change and i can’t understand anybody
that would say ‘i want another degree of warming and i
want to possibly more than double those figures of deaths
and melting and sea level rise and glacier melt’ if these
effects are already happening at one degree celsius, why
in the world would you want more than one degree celsius?
so, we are very much pushing against the common
understanding that 2 degrees is what we want to stabilize
at in using 350 because we’re already above it and that
makes a lot of sense when you see bad things happening
around the world as a result of climate change. safety is
behind us and we need to get back there.

I: is there some more you would contradict besides 2 degrees
as a demand?

P: i think in sticking with the science, that’s the strongest
position in terms of contradiction. i think, if you’re
driving at things like if you are interested in me talking
about things like the carbon markets or carbon trading how
we reduce carbon in the atmosphere through this treaty
process i don’t think i would fully contradict those
ideas. again, i think i am more of an organizer than a
policy (??), but my understanding is that it can be done
well and my general philosophy is optimism and faith in
humanity and so if it can be done well, i think it should
be done well and we should work towards that rather than
reject an approach outright. but that’s it, i think, the
way the governments have implemented carbon trading or the
cdm projects, the idea of off-setting has been done
incredibly poorly so far. and so, there are a lot of
flaws. but i think those should be fixed

I: i got some concrete questions at the end. what do you read
about climate, if you want to know about climate politics
and climate change and what do you never read?
P: what do i read and what do i not read? [yeah]. mostly i
read listservers. being a full-time organizer for the past
year and a half, i have found my ability to read long non-
fiction books very diminished. i don’t feel like i have
time to read. a lot of the books coming out about climate
science or solutions, what we should and shouldn’t do so i
have my basic understanding from a while ago and now
mostly i keep up on new developments through news articles
and through reports that are coming out from organizations
or listservers that i am on in the climate movement.

I: are there some special places of 350.org where i can find
some information about the positions of 350.org, of
demands and aims?

P: on the 350-site? yeah, there’s a i don’t know what’s on
there now because we shifted things around after october
24th. there is a 350 science section which explains where
we think the science is and how it has gotten there and
what it means. (. .) i don’t know if there are many places
on the website where we go very in-depths in terms of
policy. i think the place on the website where we address
most of those questions is on the ‘frequently asked
questions’-page. so, if you check that out, that has some
of the answers

I: besides the website, are there any documents?

P: yeah, there are some documents at the booth that i could
give you. there is a 350-science pamphlet, there is a 350-
solution pamphlet and then there is one more which i
forgot

I: could you remember when you heard the term climate justice
the first time?

P: in the u s, there were a few groups that organized
actually that may not be true climate justice, i first
heard or first really saw in bali, indonesia, the u n
conference there. and there were Indonesian groups there,
they were organizing actions inside the congress centre
there on climate justice. before that, in the u s, i heard
a lot about environmental justice which is a similar idea.
but encompassing things like (. .) in some ways, the terms
are interchangeable but the idea behind environmental
justice in the u s was around things like mountain top
removal, coal mining which devastates (??) communities and
new coal plants being built on indigenous land in the
southwest. increased rates of asthma as a result of air
pollution, (??) in the water that poor people have to
drink around areas of heavy industry. so that was around
in the u s when i was a university student and that’s when
i was introduced to those ideas. and then climate justice,
i think i mainly started understanding when i got involved
in international climate campaigns.
I: in the end, could you tell me a bit of the fundings of 350.org?

P: almost all of our funding comes from us based foundations, so philanthropic charity groups and then smaller amounts come from individual donations. and we i don’t think have ever done member-based fund raising, asking people to give us money.

I: that was it as far as i am concerned. Perhaps you think about something which is really important to mention which i forgot to ask you?

P: i think the most powerful thing to come out of 350 for me and i haven’t really sat back and thought about it a lot because we had this big day of action and then we ran straight into copenhagen but it was the breadth and diversity of the global movement on climate change and how widespread it is and how powerful it is. i think one of the things that we did well was keep the message simple and focused enough, that a lot of groups could engage, while at the same time we had a very pointed political demand which is ‘350’. and so, because we focused on the science, and because we are open to partnering with a lot of different groups, i think we’re able to get a fairly widespread of organizations and activists and social movements that organize on climate change to participate together. and i think creating that sense of unity and sense of shared purpose is incredibly powerful and incredibly important as we go for it in this way.

I: thank you.

P: yeah.

I: how did you feel about being interviewed?

P: okay. it’s (?ignition?). i haven’t thought about the campaign and what we did and how it was done we actually going to (?fore…??). this is the first time, in copenhagen, that our full global staff has ever met and so we’re having a meeting tonight, we will start to talk about the past year and what we did and what worked and what didn’t, that will be very interesting <<lacht>>

I: it’s a good preparing.

P: yeah, it’s nice to do interviews like this, going back over what’s happened because it gets me to thinking more about what we have done.

I: what was you motivation for the interview?

P: you asked.

I: you could say no.

P: yeah, but you’re part of the climate movement, you’re doing good research and things you learn will be useful
both to you and hopefully a lot of other people.

I: thank you.
I: the first question i get is a more personal question. in general i want to know your connection to climate action network and the view from climate action network. and this first question is more a personal question. how was it that you joined the climate action network?

P:

I: ok (. ) what is your view of the role of climate action network?

P: well (. ) i think (. ) ever since its beginnings it was established with the recognition that civil society could be most effective with coordination and with a unified voice. and so (. ) with the immense amount of money and resources that are invested by businesses that are looking to maintain the status quo, not to pertain to climate policy. civil society is really ( ?at the bandage in another way?). and so (. ) coordination and maximizing our collective effort is really important. i see CAN as key
part of making that happen. It's the largest network of
organizations focused on climate change in the world. The
secretariat is one of the only secretariats are only
bodies [mhm] such as (.) will we focus or ensuring that
NGOs are working together on these issues. So I see our
role - it's really kind of finally to cooperate more
effectively amongst the members [mhm] and to identify
places where such cooperation can be most effective and
most impactful and so that sort of the role that we play
is trying to create tools that can help make that
happen, identify opportunities, and really encourage that
cooporation.

I: ok (.) what would you say would be the greatest success
for climate action network?
P: I mean it's hard to say exactly one specific success. But
I think just the (near?) fact that so many - we have five
hundred member organizations at the moment. So many
organizations and people are still devoted and understand
the importance of cooperating in the way that CAN
cooperates. That, I think that (is success?) (?)
(self?). That people really, you know, taking the time to
invest in climate action network activities whether it's
working on specific policy (.) positions at the network or
(?) participating in various activities or otherwise. I
think that that's really important thing to recognize.
Maybe - I always point to one specific example just in
terms of my time with CAN that I always like to think
about is (.) at the bali negotiations in 2007 [mhm] which
was the negotiations that kicked off the bali action plan
which led to Copenhagen being identified as a key point in
the climate negotiation [mhm] I feel that CAN played a
capital role. A (?) very difficult role in actually
achieving a successful outcome in bali. We identified a
strategy as a network together of isolating the US' and
bush administration's policies and positions and
identified countries that might be inclined to agree with
the bush administration's positions and can turn away to
encourage and force them to actually change their
positions and have a more productive and more acceptable
position and in the end the bush administration was
isolated in bali. Our efforts to sort of (what a shame?)
or pressure countries like Japan and Canada was successful
and getting them to not stand behind the US position, not
to stand the US position. And that isolation that the US
saw was (.) important in allowing a number of developing
countries especially to stand up to the US position, stand
up to the bush administration and (say that it wasn't?)
(succeedful?) and in the end the US was forced (?) and
allowed for the bali action plan to move forward. [mhm]
and I think that our role in that as CAN was incredibly
vital and only happened because we were cooperating
because we've working together. we had identified specific things we needed and we had very clear strategies, really pushed this, this countries and (their imperfect?) position.

I: in your view, could you tell me who or what is the real problem of global warming?

P: what is the real problem of global warming? and if knew that answer we had have solved- no- i think (.) there is a few different problems that create challenges for global warming, for addressing global warming. one is simply that the fossil fuel industry, especially oil companies, but also coal companies and others, have (been?) incredibly lucrative and successful in their business. and so you have companies like exxon mobil that are making record profit beyond which i can even imagine. and therefore- and they are making those profits on business models that all are causing climate change in a lot of ways. and you know oil- burning fossil fuels causes emissions - it's one of the bigger causes to climate change. companies are making the money often (of the fossil fuel?). [mhm] they are addressing immense amounts of resources to try to avoid a change in those consumption patterns and a change in the government's policies that allow them to continue. and meanwhile you have still societies that are basically depending on donations and other resources that are (know when the other things scale?). that's the reason that i think that cooperation is a important (some the?) NGO perspective. because we have such limited resources compared to the opposition essentially. in addition i think that the effects of climate change are very dispersed and they are not quite as evident in some of the countries that are the biggest- have the biggest responsibility. so you have countries in africa that are already seeing desertification and other effects (yet?). african countries are causing climate change and (yet) reduce their emissions to zero wouldn't actually have as much an impact as the US or europe who are the developed countries to reduce their emission drastically. so not seeing the effects first hand allows countries to sort of push it aside and not focus on it as much.

I: what would you think are the right solutions regarding climate change? (.) you mentioned some- some things now, but could you tell me more about it?

P: we've for many years been an environmental group that talks about personal action to address climate change or to address environmental issues and that's really important. but it's pretty clear, but it's very clear that government action is actually a much important thing at the moment. we have such (.) problematic patterns of consumption, patterns of government policies that are
driving emissions to continue to rise and we need to see those government policies incentivize greener technologies, internalize healthier lifestyles and help to shift the patterns into a more positive fashion and that's what I think is most important (so that's what we are we? is?) fighting for a government policy, international policies that are all policies- international policies to affect that obviously the things that we wanna see are more efficient buildings and production of energy and those sorts of things. so efficiency is one of the most important things that we can see, because the cheapest way or the cheapest- you know, kill a lot of power is the power that you don't have to produce. we wanna make sure that we don't have to use so much power and then of course shifting to renewable electricity and renewable power resources such as wind and solar that are currently are not on an even plain field in a lot of countries, where fossil fuels subsidies and other government policies are internalizing dirty technology. so we need to see those green technologies internalized so that they can get up to the same level of economic feasibility and also attractiveness to investors in otherwise. see those technologies really be the way for the future and they can create jobs, they can make cleaner air, they can do all sorts of things in addition to helping to address global warming emission.

I: is there anything you would call wrong solutions to climate change?

P: yeah. there are some solutions that people talk about that (where's a wide?) opinions on. two of the biggest ones that I can think of are so-called green coal, which doesn't really exist, but that's what they call it or carbon sequestration as well as nuclear power. those are two (. ) sources or potential sources of power that cause a lot of- a big controversy around. in the case of nuclear for instance, those variety of different influence that people hold, even (know/though?) of course it is (?) theoretically a lower zero emission power source there's so many different concerns around the safety, both in terms of its operation and also the waste. security issues around nuclear proliferation and the security around that nuclear- the radioactive waste and nuclear sources as well as the costs, which is actually for me, at least personally, one of the biggest things. we have such limited resources especially in a downturned economy, etc., that we need to be investing in solutions that aren't as costly as nuclear power is. we could be investing in new cleaner technologies that we don't have to worry about the waste for- waste the money that could be spend- that would be spend on nuclear power and furthermore time it takes long, long time to actually
bring nuclear power stations up onto the grid. that time
could be taken and (new to pursue?) a greener technology.
[mhm] on the coal issue, there's a lot of debate about
whether carbon capture and sequestration is actually going
to be a viable technology. and again a lot of it (i
read?) to my perspective and there's some variety of views
on this, my perspective is that that time resources spent
to researching it, the time spent investing in this search
for new technologies to be better spent on even cleaner
technology, [mhm] because (??) you have emissions i think
you might be able to capture with the technology, you have
to remember, than you're still dealing with the dirty
extraction of coal or other fossil fuels that comes before
this (intermission?). so using capture they're even
emitted. there are some people, who say that countries
such as china or india are bound to a lot of coal, almost
without any question, just simply because of the
development pathway that they (are already were backed?)
into in another respect. there could be an argument to be
made to pursue some of the capture and sequestration
technologies for those countries. but certainly in
developed countries shifting away from coal power at all,
regardless whether it's captured and sequestered, is
something that, i think that we need to see.

I: could you tell me what do you understand by climate
justice? what is your idea of that term?

P: the word justice i think has taken on a lot of different
meanings for a lot of different people in the climate
movement. and it's become almost a politicized term in a
lot of ways. my view on climate justice is recognizing
that those that are most affected by climate change are
the ones that have the least to do with the problem.
they're actually the least responsible for it. recognizing
that most of us in the developed world, who have (.)
developed on very dirty technologies, polluted the
atmosphere, basically become prosperous on technologies
that now are causing climate change, be to recognize that
we all owe dept of some variety to those countries and
those people that haven't been able to benefit of those
the technologies that we have (.) in especially in the
context of moving away from those technologies quite
quickly. so you have countries that need to continue to
develop in order to remove their- to lift their citizens
out of poverty, an extreme poverty in many cases, but may
not have the ability or may not be able to use the
technologies that (we view?) such as no coal plants an
otherwise, because of the global warming crisis and
therefore we (??all?) have a responsibility to help them
develop in ways that are cleaner and develop in ways that
allow them to lift their citizens out of poverty quickly
[mhm] and will also helping to ensure that they have a
stable planet to (?live in as well?).

I: does the climate action network make use of the concept of climate justice?

P: absolutely. there's a number of our members that have climate justice as the key focal point of their campaigns and certainly climate action network as a whole as a network takes principles of equity and justice and fairness into account and into all of our positions (.) (?unless/ i miss?) the discussion that we have basically on any position that they were coming to is- this is this, you know, is it not only ambitious and gonna solve the problem, but is it also fair and equitable? [mhm] the key part of the justice frame is the equity issue.

I: now i would like to know how you assess the international climate negotiations?

P: aha?

I: in general

P: just general?

I: just generally

P: ya. (.) i mean they're obviously very challenging. we had a lot of high- (. ) a lot of lofty goals for copenhagen that we didn't achieve or we didn't see the government achieve. i think there is ( ?a big wave/ ways of call?) in terms of why that happened. [mhm] i think that we're realizing that the negotiations despite our understanding of them being incredibly complicated and incredibly challenging are even more still than we ever expected. you have had the states that are engaged on the issue and (. ) you know, one (?see?) ( ??) sorts of high-level political heads of state involved (?it starts?) seeing all the other issues that have very limited relevance to climate and start getting (?draft?) into these negotiations. so you have geopolitical issues that (?all the sudden?) are incorporated into the discussions. they're at least a background for the discussions on how to redress climate change. it's a whole new negotiation. [mhm] we're looking at the negotiations as being very complicated but still were being (. ) optimistic and ambitious ( ?our/are?) being able to address it and have prompt and quick and ambitious action. but recognizing that, you know, there's a lot of different pieces that need to fall into place to make that happen.

I: imagine a friend is asking you, who attends a climate conference. what would you answer to this question?

P: if a friend asks me who attends? (. ) well (. ) let's see. so there's obviously the governments and there's a variety of different types of government actors that attend, everything from scientists and sort of high-level
bureaucrats to political appointees and ministers. and of
course in copenhagen had to (say no they are?) (??). the
NGOs that attend range as well from very, very expert and
experienced NGO-actors that have been (?far?) in the
negotiations. as long as they've been around and have, you
know, maybe even been a part of government delegation in
the past, to experts that have no association with
governments but certainly are qualified and very
innovative and putting forward very creative solutions to
very activist oriented organizations that are focussed on
simply making the public awareness about the issue. [mhm]
I say 'simply' just in terms of (.) where it looks like-
it's an incredibly important part of the movement, but
it's a different sort of role. we see all this at the
negotiations. and then there's also of course the
independent scientists and others that are there, that are
just trying to put out very different proposals and models
and other possible ways of looking at the issue. tons of
medias (.) are at least (??) tons of media with the object
in public interest in the issue. then there's businesses
that are there, that are trying to either be a part of the
solution and sort of take advantage of the new way for a
new (.) area for investment and innovation. and there are
other businesses as we were talking about before and
there's a try to maintain the status quo and maintain
their dominance in the market and their ability to make
money of the dirty energy. [mhm] there's also indigenous
people, there's a variety of different people and i think
even in the past two years those number and variety of
people that are paying attention to the issue and coming
to a negotiation has grown tremendously.

I: do you think there are people, groups, institutions there,
who shouldn't be at such conferences?

P: i mean, i think, there's a lot of unreasonable
expectations on how effective you can be at the conference
itself and changing a government policy or changing having
a huge effect on the trajectory of the negotiation.
there's a lot of details that are hammered out and that
are finalized at the negotiations, but there are limits to
how far government can really move at the negotiations
themselves as opposed to beforehand as they're developing
their position into their- you know, could be a (?case
dream made?) that some of the campaigning groups, there're
some of the (.) variety of groups that really need to see
drastic changes in government positions could have more
success working on that back home. in the capitals of the
countries from which they're coming from in order to get
position change beforehand, before the negotiations, but
also to see if they can affect political discussions in
the capital during the negotiations that might allow for
new instructions to be send to the negotiations, to the
negotiators or otherwise. I think that it's really (?) to
go straight to the negotiations, because it's a sort of
consolidated or compressed place where everyone seems to
be. But in fact some of the negotiators are really— they
are hands tight in a lot of ways. And they are basically
just following instructions with some wiggle room here and
there, but perhaps not as much as we might expect. [mhm]
And I also think you know, various NGOs or businesses or
otherwise, that are there simply to disrupt or to stop the
negotiations and that's not something that I'm looking
for. I think that the UN framework convention on climate
change is the most appropriate place to see these
negotiations take place. I think that it's the most (.)
transparent and open process and allows for the most (.)
the widest variety of voices to be heard. I also of course
think that it's clear what the UNFCCC's goals are and
that's already've been agreed by over a hundred and eighty
countries. [mhm] And so if you're there to block any
action and (minus?) those goals, I think that that seems
a lot of strange, because it's clear what all those
countries are there to do.

I: Yea. Do you think there's anyone missing at these
conferences?

P: (.) A lot of people would say that the voices of
indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most
affected by climate change aren't heard well enough at the
negotiations. And I think that's actually the case,
because if they would have been heard well enough we would
see stronger action being agreed. [mhm] I again— I think
we need to think carefully about where those voices need
to be heard and how they need to be heard and whether it's
bringing them specifically to the negotiations themselves
or finding other ways for their voices to be lifted in the
dialogue is a good question, but finding ways for more
developing country activists or experts especially to be
able to have direct communication with government
delegations and otherwise I think is a good thing and
could be increased.

I: When climate is the issue what are CAN's activities
generally speaking? Could you tell me a little bit more
about that issue?

P: You mean at the negotiations or just generally?

I: Generally. What are the activities of CAN regarding
climate politics, regarding climate change?

P: Aha. I mean we're solely (diverted?) to climate policy
and politics and climate change. All of our activities are
relevant to what you're asking. So I just sort of (?) see
if I miss anything. Between this negotiations we do a lot
of work to develop positions that will be able to lobby
on. we develop and work on policy positions on a whole variety of issues basically every issue that's addressed in the climate negotiations [mhm] and try to come up with positions that our network of 500 organizations can stand behind as a coalition. that takes a lot of work, because there's a wide variety of views. we work hard to try to come up with the key positions that we can all agree on. we also do work on specific campaigns or specific lobby efforts around various events. whether it's UN climate negotiations or the G20 or other regional events. we try to work together to come up with all (?these wide issues?) and potentially campaign strategies to try to affect those events. [mhm] we do media work as well. we coordinate on thinking about how to talk about various events and how to talk about various pieces of the climate negotiations puzzle, but also trying to reach out to the media and to (?mark then?) the online world and the public and really to communicate our messages in a way that they can help to shape the stories that have been written about climate change. to help to put our messages out there so that policy makers and otherwise can actually see them and be affected by that. at the negotiations themselves we do a lot of work around just coordinating, information sharing, coordinating in a lot of lobby activities, trying to work together, (?a lot of?) meeting with various governments otherwise we have a variety of different events to focus on media attention, to focus delegations attention on our feelings about the issues. we publish a newsletter every day. we do sort of a media event every evening that focus on (?shaming some other world?) countries in the negotiations. we do press briefings. we do a large amount of activity at the negotiations itself. [mhm] and then in addition we have a program that we've started basically last year, which is a southern capacity building program. it's focussed on trying to ensure that- or trying to work on building the capacity of the developing country members of CAN and partners of CAN so that they're in a better position to advocate for climate solutions and for vested policies about climate change so within their countries but also at the international negotiations. and (?) there is?) mentioning (. ) we think that those sorts of voices are important to the discussion. there's always a lack of resources and challenges there. so we are trying to help to build those capacities, doing workshops and also supporting participation in the negotiations itself.

I: could you tell me what you think about the protest activities outside the conference area, outside the summit at copenhagen?

P: ( . ) well, as i said i think that the UNFCCC is the best- i mean it's not perfect, but the best venue for these negotiations to take place. and so all the efforts the
efforts that I'm putting forward are aimed at facilitating progress and encouraging progress in this negotiations. So, you know protests that are saying that the UN isn't the right place for these negotiations to take place, I wouldn't necessarily agree with. [mhm] But some of the protests or activities around raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue, raising awareness of the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries. And I think those are important, because it raises the level of awareness of the public and can help to encourage governments or forcing them to take stronger action. And so, you know, in Copenhagen there were variety of different voices that were being heard. The hundred thousand persons march at the middle Saturday was incredible. And I think raised a lot of awareness, but also injected a whole lot of energy into the negotiations and that has been a large part, because the vast majority of those marchers and activists were pushing for strong action on climate change, pushing for action in the negotiations, pushing for a real deal in Copenhagen and not saying that the whole process [what a shame?]. So I think that that was really useful.

I: (...) could you tell me, who does CAN cooperate with? Are there special national or global networks, which CAN international is cooperating with?

P: (...) Well, I just said we are a network of basically 500 organizations and so we- that's a lot of cooperation already. [yeah] And those organizations include everything from the smallest you know organizations in Uganda or something that are very community-based organizations to some of the largest environmental and development organizations in the world, which is Greenpeace International, Oxfam, WWF, those sorts of organizations as well. So to a large extent those are the ones that we cooperate most costly with, especially this international network have variety of (?) around the world that can help to insure that various perspectives are being heard in the negotiations- in our discussion. But we are still cooperate with groups like the global campaign on climate action, GCCA, with their group that was established not to (?) at this point and works with them very closely. Both in ensuring that their campaigner were at least (?) under lined with our sort of more specific policy positions, but also sort of helping to share intelligence and ways in which their campaign could be effective and can targeting specific potential (?) changes in government positions. We have worked with other groups. You know, you mentioned climate justice. We tried to cooperate with the climate justice networks as much as possible in terms of identifying joint position or identifying places where we
share positions and finding ways that we can cooperate on
those. [mhm] and (. ) i mean, i think that that's the main.
I: (. ) could you tell me the global campaign for climate
action is it the same as the tcktcktck campaign
P: yeah
I: ok. because i didn't get it. in the internet it's really
not very transparent.
P: yeah. it's- the tcktcktck will go a brand. it's something
that they call open-source, which basically means that
they don't sort of regulate the use of that logo, but GCCA
it's certainly one of the main actors behind it. if not
the main actor behind it.
I: ok. i get some more concrete questions to finish the
interview and the one is about the term climate justice
again. do you remember, when you first met with this term?
P: (. ) that's a good question. i definitely- you know,
certainly in bali, if not before. bali was the place,
where i think the climate justice sort of community or
movement really (?they take?) a lot of steam and certainly
was an (??). it certainly was very active beforehand, but
bali was the place where i think that they (?rid?) their
profile to some extent. but, you know, environmental
justice has been around for very long time and i think- i
can't necessarily tipp on when i heard the term climate
justice necessarily but (. ) i can imagine it was before
bali as well.
I: could you tell me about the fundings of climate action
network. how is financed?
P: we have a pretty small secretariat. we have about four
staff at the moment (. ) and so our funding is- we get (?a
wide?) funding. we get funding- we get very limited
contributions from (?some?) of the largest members of CAN.
so the largest international networks or organizations
provide basically voluntary donations that support the
secretariat in addition we have some private foundation
support from variety of small foundations [mhm] and then
the southern capacity building program has received
support from some european governments. focussed fully on
the capacity building and not on the policy position
making and other things, but fully on the capacity
building effort to help developing countries participation
and capacity building. so we've got a support from the UK,
danish, svedish, and (. ) excuse me, german governments.
I: (. ) ok. (. ) ok. that's it as far as i'm concerned. but
perhaps you think there's something you want add. anything
that's important and i didn't mention it yet. i don't
know.
P: (. ) not so i can think of. (. ) (?i feel?) to contribute
and certainly afford to being were this takes you and
updates that you have i love to hear.

I: ok. thank you very much. i'm very happy that i get this
interview with you.
I: let me start with the first question (.) how was it that you joined the organization?

P: 

I: what do you think is the role of i don’t know how to pronounce it - cidse? [yeah, that’s right, perfect] what’s the role of cidse?

P: generally speaking, an open network. well, the role of the network is, it brings together like-minded organizations from across europe so they’re all public development agencies, they all some kind of link, whether a very strong formal link or an informal link with a national bishop’s conference, so, the church development agencies, they have a similar perspective, a similar way of working, they all work in partnership with developing countries, they don’t- they’re not just donorating, say they don’t do service delivery, they support local organizations to do the work in the country. so, the fact that this kind of commonality and vision and perspective brings the cidse member organizations together and the aim of coming together at a network level is to have a greater voice, to have a greater voice to influence in changing international policies that are impacting on the communities that they work with in the south. so, a large part of our work, the biggest part of our work is advocacy work, lobbying, campaigning. but there is also an element of programme cooperation (.) so, (.) enhancing our aid-effectiveness, of ensuring what is coordinated and burning for one another’s, there’s a big emphasis on burning, for one another’s wealth-sharing and things like that.

I: could you tell me something about the most critical stage when you were discussing the political agenda of cidse?

P: we actually just went through strategic planning process. so, the last strategic plan was from 2005-2008 and our next one that has just been agreed and it is from 2010 to 2015. so, we just went through the process of reflecting what are the political priorities. and our priorities for the next five years will be climate change, resources for
development which takes in (.) any ways of financing like
taxation and different things like that, and transparency,
accountability and also the private sector. so, corporate
social responsibility in the private sector and things
like that. we work on food agriculture and sustainable
trade. that’s another priority. (.) and then we have a
cross-cutting priority also on global governance. global
governance as an over-arching issue that is relevant for
each of these areas. so, in each of the problematic areas
CIDSE looks at, we take a global governance perspective.
so, the subsidiary (?with perspective?) (??) so we look at
the influence of global governance, of global structures.
but subsidiary as in the decisions being taken, as close
to the people and as most relevant level as possible.
that’s one of our principles as well. so, (??)

I: could you tell me, how long has it been that cidse is
working on the climate issue?

P: not that long (.) basically, there was a decision, about
three years ago that climate change is there, it’s a
problem, it’s on the agenda. i think that most of our
member organizations have been working on climate change
in the programme area, so, a lot of work they had been
doing has to do with climate change, especially in
disaster resolution. there is an increasing recognition
that (.) we need to do more, we can’t just be tackling the
effects, we need to be tackling the symptoms, we need to
tackle the (?real?) causes. so, climate change also
started to be in the advocacy, the political discussions
in the advocacy and strategizing. and so then, with the
fact that this process that was on-going, there was also
potential for political change, for having an impact. and
so, the combination of that, we recognize this priority,
we recognize this process, this potential for political
change and so, for those reasons we decided to make
climate change a priority and to not only start developing
a policy on it and doing research but to also launch an
international campaign on this process.

I: regarding climate change, what do you think is the real
problem of global warming?

P: what do you mean?

I: what do you think is the problem, which is causing global
warming?

P: i don’t really know what you’re asking me. do you want to
know if i think it’s man-made or do i what do you mean?

I: (.) why do you think is global warming occurring?

P: why is it a problem for development agencies you mean?

I: no. why is global warming occurring?

P: so, are you asking me a scientific question?
I: no, you can answer that

P: well, there like climate change, broadly speaking, has
been happening forever, but that is the recognition, a
very broad recognition of scientific evidence that the
climate change that we’re experiencing now and will
experience in the coming years has been (?) really man-
made. yeah. fossil fuels, burning the fossil fuels, too
many greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (.)

I: what do you think would be right solutions to the climate
change?

P: oh (. ) it’s very complex and it’s very simple. it’s very
complex and that involves so many actors at so many
levels, and it involves such a fundamental shift in the
way we think about, you know, development, growth, gain,
happiness, everything, well-being, you know, and (?) from
monetary growth like physical gain, all these kinds of
things so it’s very very complex and not only technical
but also kind of metaphorical (?) complex. and then
you could say it’s extremely simple we need to drastically
cut greenhouse gas emissions, so we need to change our
lifestyles, in that we cut our source of those type of
energy and we need to make our (?) financing to help
countries adapt that need to adapt. it’s as simple as
that.

I: could there be also false solutions to climate change?

P: ah, yeah. from our perspective as development agencies and
solutions that aren’t well (??), that aren’t (??), that
come from a (??) or pursue the negation policies that have
a negative impact on poor communities as well. so, for
example, CDM seen as one of the solutions. I’m not against
all the markets. there’s potential in these things, but
there is also potential for negative impacts, let’s say
(??) cases (??) where they can’t proof their environmental
benefits. very few poor countries and poor communities
(?are punished then?) and things like that. then you got
the this little question of- when i said more adaptation –
so we’re looking at adaptation processes whether it’s a
community or regional or national level or whatever. it’s
potentially adaptation in one place that impacts negative
on another area’s ability to adapt. so, there is a real
need for economy, for planning but also for broad
understanding and regional cooperation about how to do
these things (. ) cause climate change doesn’t stop at
national borders. there really needs to be and to go on a
geographic and by a climatic basis, as supposed to on
national boundaries

I: what do you understand by the term ‘climate justice’?

P: well, for us, climate justice means everything what we
just talked about. it means reducing greenhouse gas
emissions, preventing warming from emitting through the warming beyond the threshold (??), how to stop climate change and fighting the (??) effects (??) that will be affected with the resources. they need to be able to adapt to the effects they’re already feeling as the effects that they will— that they are bound to experience in the future because of the future warming (?we?) are already committed to. so, it essentially means stopping the further damage to been done to communities that have not contributed to the climate problem and also ensuring that they have the potential to further pursue their own development. so, it means them being able to develop and not to have their development potential eroded because of what climate change is doing. so, it’s kind of two things that are stopping what’s happening but it’s also (?they?) are not ensuring that they have the potential now to go forward do you know what i mean?

I: would you make use of the term?
P: of justice? oh, very much. so, we’re faith-based network and there’s usually (?this approaches?) as fundamentals to our (.) reflections, to our analyses, to our messages, everything.

I: how would you assess the climate negotiations?
P: (.) it’s terrible. it’s depressing to see, after all this time, after- like two years that we’re looking at this process things went so slowly and the positions that come out here are odd. (??) things just aren’t shifting. yes people (?come out and what they said?) (??) (??clarified?) (??) and what they need and what they are willing to do. we are so far from where we need to get. i think we are getting pretty closer to getting a deal than we did six month ago. what kind of a deal? You know, the figures are on the table and one year was enough to do what we just discussed to stop what’s happening and to ensure that people are able to continue to develop, the mitigation commitments are necessary are not there and the financing that is necessary is not there. one thing i like to say is really a expected admire (.) the work have been done by developing countries in the last week to come together and to (?introduce) (??) so, i think- it’s really (??). and also civil society, i think they want to have some activity and (?spontaneous?) (??) and responsiveness and (??) i think that’s really important, that the governments realize how much, you know, how people care and that we are here. i think the justice message is really (?needed?) (??) and it’s not just little based-groups that are calling for climate justice it’s very very broad and i thing that message is growing

I: how do you assess the chances to influence the process of negotiation?
P: well, i think, it’s like (??) said yesterday afternoon he
said, you know, people may think we don’t have power, in
berlin, people marched when there was oppression people
marched the berlin wall down, in south africa there was
oppression under the apartheid, the people marched and
apartheid ended. i think we current underestimate the
(power?) civil society action can have. we might not
always get what we want when we want it, but we have power
and i think the more people are together the more you can
achieve.

I: how do you assess the protests outside the negotiations?

P: you mean just out here now or the demonstrations on
saturday?

I: outside the building.

P: yeah, i mean, it’s all part of the same thing. it’s really
important for people to come and to show they care and to
let the negotiators to know that they are not going to be
able to (taking?) away with doing just anything.

I: what do you think of the mobilization of the autonomous
groups to copenhagen, this black block and

P: (??)

I: can you tell me what you want to achieve in copenhagen,
what cidse wants to achieve?

P: we want a fair, effective, binding outcome. so, one that
agrees- that ensures emission reductions (??) and that (.)
will ensure sufficient secure financing for developing
countries to help them to adapt and to develop
sustainably, that’s crucial. and that it also will be
binding.

I: imagining a friend is asking you ‘who is participating at
these negotiations. what would you answer?

P: i would say the states from the (??) are negotiating on
the text, civil society is standing around them watching
and shouting.

I: is there anyone missing?

P: do you mean certain constituencies that should be here
represented or–?

I: yeah. who’s not here?

P: (??) question.

I: well, the other way round (. ) who should not be here?

P: i wouldn’t say there’s anybody here who shouldn’t be here.

I: it’s only a question.

P: i think everyone has the right to see and to watch and
comment.
I: if climate is the issue, what are the activities of CIDSE?

P: I can give you some examples of the work we've done this year. In June, we launched a report on adaptation technologies. So, it was something that we saw in the negotiations that wasn't getting enough attention, so there was a lot of discussion around technology, it was there by mitigation technologies, it was there by technologies of (??) more advanced developing countries. But for the organizations that we work with, the part of the work they do is more small-field technologies the communities (?agreement?). And so, we wanted to ensure that the importance of these kinds of technologies will also be recognized in the negotiations and that it will be taken and be part of technology negotiations and the adaptation negotiations. So, we did a piece of research using the case studies from the work (?) from our partners and we launched that at the UNFCCC negotiations in June in Bonn with a panel discussion and with one of the partners was there to also present some of his work, it seems that everything had a life (?) at the same time we had a meeting in Bali with partners from Latin America, from Asia and from Africa who had gathered together, sharing experiences of the impacts and also on Africa, (??) strategizing that they were doing (?). And then they created a (?) between the meeting in Malawi and the UNFCCC meeting in Bonn. So it was a light (?) they presented a statement to a side-event in Bonn and then we had questions (?). And then, the (?) year in September, there was the summit on climate change, you remember, at the end of September. [Mhm] Mr. Ban Ki moon organized a big delegation (?) he had a couple of arch bishops and bishops and a cardinal and a range of our partners again (?) conference and there is some leadership from our member organizations. We all went together to New York and had a whole range of activities, but the main point we have been there was to lobby governments (?) with environmental ministers, some heads of state, things like that. To basically, come to join to (?) message, see the church voices, the Southern voices of our partners. And there are directors (?) organizations. That was really really effective and we also have lots of these massive side events and fast briefings and different things like that. So, that was (?). And I think what we try to do is to make use of our specificity, and the specificity is the fact that we work with partner organizations, so it's that expertise (?) and the fact that we're a faith-based network (?) church (?) try to maximize on our specificity to have a specific message (?).

I: who do you cooperate with?

P: Civil-society-wise?
I: in general, (?civil society?)
P: well, the major part of our (?) on climate change is (?) anything else. we are very similar in many ways (?) members but they are a global network and we work together with (?). then, we also work together a lot with ecumenical partners, so (?) a lot this year (?) back in brussels we worked a lot with them. those are our main partners on climate change. but then, on other issues we work with a whole variety of different civil society partners, expert organizations, think tanks, other networks

I: what are these networks, for example?
P: (?) network on tax issues and (?) on agriculture trade policy, on trade issues, (?) is a partner of ours as well because (?) issues.

I: are there certain positions of NGOs, other NGOs or social movements, where you think you strictly, fundamentally contradict them?
P: i’m sure there are. yeah, there are definitely. we have different positions from both interregionally so, like different types of organizations might have slightly different slots on things. so, often more like within regions, i would say than within in europe we could have fairly similar positions in terms of figures with other european organizations but we might have very different nuances, very different messages, very different emphasis, we would accept or we would emphasize different things. so, for some people, they would be emphasizing the environmental (?) take the papers. and you might be emphasizing the (?very much?) (?) (?people?). but then, the (?) in the united states or in israel or wherever you might have different sorts of contexts where they might say for them, certain things work and certain things don’t certain demands, certain messages or whatever work and certain things don’t. so, there’s (?) distinctions.

I: in the end, i got some more concrete questions (.). what are you reading if you want to know about climate change and climate politics?
P: lots of stuff. i read the papers, for a start. but then, policy papers, people’s position papers. well, then also some negotiations-

I: is there anything you do never read? any publications you would never read?
P: i don’t think i would refuse to read anything. i just like to (??).

I: do you remember when you first met with the term ‘climate justice’?
P: probably when i started the job, so, (??)
I: (??) could you tell me how cidse is financed?
P: through our member organizations. so, our member
organizations pay a contributory fee.
I: and the last question (.) are there particular places
where i could have a look for the aims and demands of
cidse?
P: yeah, of course. we have a policy paper at the stand you
can take with you. (??) said more things (??). if you go
to our website, everything is available. you can take
what’s available here but in terms of the most recent
statements we have made and the press releases, letters,
things like that, they would be on the website and there
would be most probably up to date things.
I: (.) i think that was it as far as i am concerned. but
perhaps you think there is something missing, one
important point i would have to mention?
P: i am interested in hearing what your hypothesis is (??)
I: (.) (??) to finish this tape-recording how did you feel
being interviewed?
P: fine.
I: thank you.
A.3.5 Transkript »Focus/ CJN! – Focus on the Global South/ Climate Justice Now!«

I: how did you join CJN, climate justice now? how was it that you joined it?

P: in fact what happened was the- (.) during the COP there was a very nice outside alternative space that was organized by the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, which was the solidarity village for a cool planet. [mhm] so lot of us, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalization campaigns across asia have been part of helping to organize that space. and then- but then we also started to do some things on the inside. some actions and putting out some commentary on the negotiations and so on. it was a really good experience of working together. it was a kind of- (.) at that time it was a sort of a little bit anti-CAN, alter-CAN space. it was for people, who either didn't wanna join CAN or were having such difficulties in their discussions with CAN that they wanna to like have at least a separate caucus. a group of people that they could talk together. so at the end of the bali COP we actually had this really good experience of working together. we put out a- done some actions together, put out, i think, one or two press statements together. [mhm] so we decided to form CJN! climate justice now. the initial document, which was for the formation of the CJN! [mhm] was basically press released, which announced the formation of CJN!. it announced the basic principals of the climate justice now. and in the first list there was like fif- no, maybe thirty organizations, something like that. but i can send you that documents. you've probably seen it already, but if not, i can send you that document, which lists all of the organizations. so focus was there.

I: could you tell me, what do you think is the role of CJN!?

P: i think it has a lot of different roles and i think the role (.) will take changing as well. as i just said, i think initially it was partly as a kind of alternative to CAN. so to create a little bit of a different space. a climate justice space inside the negotiations, which would be pushing much more a justice framework and supporting more the position of the south governments trying to have a more systemic critique, a more system-critical approach to the climate negotiations, more critical of the market solutions and so on. one of the functions of CJN! is to be an alternative space inside the UNFCCC frame. but i think, what we've seen happen is the outside space has become really very important. it's not very structured. but i think the idea of climate justice is something that really
resonates a lot with, particularly movements and organizations from the south, who've been involved in a lot of resource-based struggles or struggles against large-scale development and sort of neoliberal economic policies. [mhm] so that sort of cluster of movements, that have been very active(??) on the trade campaigns and the world bank campaigns, the privatization campaigns. for them this idea of climate justice is very intuitive. it's very- it's like a space that they immediately understand. they can (??) see, there's no possibility to actually address the climate issues and that's we talk about resources, we talk about equity, we talk about the development model, we talk about rights. you know, so it's very automatic that people end into this kind of idea of climate justice. so i think the outside, what climate justice now or even the idea of climate justice in the abstract does is (?it?) opens up the politics of climate change for people, who've been involved in other campaigns, in other struggles. and so it's- and what we've tried to do, i think is through climate justice now, is to create a lot of (?inter?)points and those bridges between the real campaigns and the real struggles of people that already exist, and how they relate to what's happening in the climate negotiations and the larger impacts and responses to climate change. so for example on the question of agriculture. it's very obvious that movements like via campesina have a critical role or a critical interest in climate justice now, because it's how we make that bridge between their campaign for agrarian reform, for food sovereignty and use the climate debate as a way to challenge the dominant agricultural system to talk about alternative agriculture and so on. so i think climate justice now as a network can help articulate a lot of the linkages between the real struggles and the sort of more official (?element?) of climate debate. [ok] [laute Hintergrundmusik] do you wanna move?

I: do you think there is a place, where it's a little bit quieter? what do you think would be the biggest success for climate justice now? when won't we need climate justice now anymore?

P: when won't we need climate justice now? i think that's a long time in the future. but i also think it's- it might not be called climate justice now. i think we always need movements, right? for social transformation. i think for me the strength of climate justice now is that climate is really on the political agenda. so we're able to use that opportunity to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time. it's not as if these- [mhm] in my view there's nothing, we're not saying anything new in climate justice. but what we're doing is using that political space that's created by the interesting climate
change to actually reassert to build new alliances, to expand this movement for transformation. I think what's really interesting is, that there is a very conscious (.) linkage with particularly indigenous people's movements. A reframing (of our?) discourse in this kind of (buen vivir?), the rights of mother earth, this sort of- it's a little bit of a reframing of the alternatives. In a very large way I think, which I haven't really heard before. It's always being there. (.) Ok, we've always talked about alternatives, but we've never talked about alternatives in the framework of the ecosystem or mother earth or redefining what it means to live well. You know, so I think that what's very- potentially very powerful in this sort of climate justice- climate space [mhm] is that it's forcing us to be very conscious of the ecological questions, which are not always that evident, right? For the classic left. You know, for the (?) left, it's not always (.) so much in an ecological framework. Of course the social justice issues are clear, but the social justice frame within a larger ecological envelope is not how a lot of- the traditional left thinks about things. I think that that- the climate debate is forcing some of the traditional left, who've believed in modernity and progress and development, you know in these sort of thing. Forced even that part of the left to reconsider, what are the consequences of that kind of development. So it's not only the social questions but also the ecological questions have to be considered together [mhm] and the idea that you can have social justice with that ecological justice and you can have ecological justice with that social justice. The decisions about the allocation, the use of resources, natural resources, that ecosystems, biodiversity, water, soil, air, and everything, that how we make the decisions about the allocation, the use of those resources is absolutely intrinsically tied to both questions of sustainability and also social justice. Ok? That's what I think is the sort of transformative potential of a sort of climate justice framing. And I think climate justice now as a very kind of loose and very new network has been, has just to get back to your question, I think it's been successful to the extent that we've- we're beginning to shift a little bit the discourse about climate. [mhm] so that's it not only about part per million. It's not only about numbers, [mhm] but also what are the invocations of those numbers for real people and for real ecosystems. [ok] And so that these rather technical debates are not abstracted of the social reality and the social impacts of those things. So I think climate justice now tries to talk about, I guess the politics of climate change, rather than the science of climate change.

I: are there some main areas of work of climate justice now?
P: well it's a very loose network with no very clear structures and no very clear common work plan. i mean we arrived in copenhagen without a position, right? we didn't have a CJN! position for the COP. what we have is the clear principles of climate justice now, which is a rejection of the false solutions of nuclear, of geo-engineering, of carbon markets, of off-sets, of market-based solutions. and that we will work together to build responses to climate change based on energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, (?papers?) participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights, a just transition for workers. i mean we have very broad (.). a common platform. i think different groups are working on those in different ways. both inside the negotiations and outside the negotiations. and so it's not- i mean it's a very broad and- (.). i can say, it's a network in progress.

I: what would you think is the real cause of climate change or global warming? is there a- what is the real cause of global warming?

P: (?well?) consuming (.). resources in general, but consuming fossil fuels in particular (.) at a rate, which far exceeds the earth's capacity to absorb and regenerate and replenish itself. i mean it's the rate of consumption completely exceeds the rate of reproduction (.). in my view, right? [yeah] it's not very scientific, but it's like everything is way to fast for the planet to actually regenerate itself and to absorb and renew it. and to absorb the pollutants and to renew the ecosystems. because not only climate change, i mean it's biodiversity depletion, the soils are in a completely (?parulis?) state. (?all?) the systems are being polluted. you know, fish stocks- it's a planetary- eco- there's a total crisis of the planetary ecosystems. and the climate change i think is the most visible and potentially irreversible (.). part of that. and i think we have to see that all of these things are very much related. i mean the depletion of the soils and the depletion of biodiversity is a consequences of climate change and also a response to that will also be part of our response to climate change. so that's why things like geo-engineering are completely (?loon?) (?), because they don't help actually to rebuild and replenish ecosystems in a sustainable way.

I: what do you think are real solutions to climate change, then?

P: i think we definitely need to reduce consumption on every level. consumption of energy, consumption of material goods, consumption of meat. whatever you like. [mhm] consumption in general needs to be reduced. i think the way we organize our energy systems is completely wrong. i mean it's this sort of huge scale rather inefficient
massive infrastructure which is heavily dependent up until
now on coal and other non-renewable resources. so, of
course we have to switch to renewable energy sources. but
i also think we need to scale down and localize energy
production. one, so that it's more democratic, but also so
that it's more efficient. so that you actually producing
energy locally, for actual needs, rather than in this sort
of huge scale, which has a lot of waste and a lot of- it's
a very sort of energy inten- i mean, you need to use a lot
of energy to build the infrastructure to produce the
energy. so it's a very inefficient system. i think the
agricultural system really should be- we have to transform
it from a basically industrial model of agriculture, which
is of course water-intensive, mono-growing, export-
oriented, depends a lot on transportation, a lot of
processing involved, which of course has terrible impacts
on local markets and small-scale farmers, but also has
very devastating environmental impacts. so i think even a
transformation of the agricultural system to (.) reduce
transport, reduce the inputs to have much more diverse
agricultural production, which actually helps to protect
and regenerate biodiversity and soils. i think that, you
know, with smart solutions, which are not high-tech
solutions, but (?.well sorts of smart?) solutions, we can
address a lot of different issues simultaneously. [mhm]
the social questions, the questions of food and access to
food, biodiversity, reducing our dependence on fossil
fuel, reducing CO2 emissions. i think a lot of- public
transport is an other thing, right? i mean we need to
reorganize our cities. so that we are not dependent on
cars. so that we can actually have accessible low-cost
public transport, which makes it possible for people to
live without cars or to reduce their dependency on cars a
lot, which also should have a very good social impact as
well, because it means that in fact public transport
becomes a good system, which is accessible to everyone. so
i think it's really important that we think about the
social and the ecological at the same time. and i think
they're totally compatible, that we can actually deal with
these questions of consumption and over-production of
greenhouse gas emissions at the same time as transforming
production systems and improving social conditions and
redistributing the benefits of the economic production to
a much larger group of people. but it means, i think it
means, that live will change. but i also think that it
means that live will be better for the majority of people.
unfortunately, the elite, that make the decisions at the
moment are in a very comfortable position and they're not
actually willing to change their lifestyle, because they
feel that they will- their lives will be worse. but in
fact i am sure, what we would see is that the lives of the
majority world, would be greatly improved with smart
solutions, socially just solutions, people-based solutions to climate change.

I: (.) regarding the climate politics, how would you assess the climate negotiations?

P: oh. a complete disaster. total disaster. i mean it's- i think the negotiations are- the negotiations between the economically important countries, who were looking at how- to see how they can defend their interests. a lot of people used the expression business as usual. and i think that's a good expression. all of the major economies want to protect their interests, since they have (?like an?) find an agreement amongst themselves, which should allow them to (.). yea (.). not change, in fact. not affect their own way of life. their potential for growth. and i think this is especially a (.). duplicity some are part of the northern countries, [mhm] who have actually forced the developing countries into a position of accepting the terms of the deal as they've been put on the table by the rich countries. ok, i think it's- (??) in the end, i think it's the most vulnerable countries, who all-. who've been leave out in the cold. [mhm] who get-. who will really get nothing out of these negotiations. and i would say that even in the short term, (?while?) might protect the economic interests of some of the, particularly the northern countries, but also some of the big southern developing countries, that might protect their economic interests in the short term, it's definitely a short term response, which is in the longer term completely (.). out of (.). touch, with the reality of the science. it's condemning us, right? to ecological kind of chaos, which is gonna affect everyone and everything. [mhm] i think it's a really short term economic interests, which were saying dominate in these climate talks.

I: and how would you assess the in- the chances to influence these processes of negotiations?

P: i think we have very- frankly i think that we don't have much chance to influence the negotiations. i think it's kind of damage control. [mhm] i think at the moment it's good that it's not a legally binding agreement, because if it was legally binding, what we would have is, you know, is something set in concrete, that we would stuck with for the next five years, which would mean- or ten years or whatever, which would kind of leave us in a state of paralysis, because i think the vast majority of people would think that, ok the deal is done. the problem is going solved. they come up with a legally binding agreement in copenhagen. ok we don't need to worry about climate change anymore. but i think the fact that they were unable to come up with anything legally binding, but what they have and what they will announce this afternoon,
right, is so completely out of touch with what's required. means that we have incredible potential to continue to build a climate justice movement and i personally think that the real work has to be done at the national level. i think that we need to build movements and campaigns and coalitions and political forces at the national level, which push governments [mhm] to put in place policies, even unilateral at the national level, which [show a] sufficient response to the climate crisis. [mhm] because i don't think we can wait for a UN agreement. if we wait for a UN agreement, it will never happen. i think we have to start building up this sort of bottom-up process, [mhm] which forces national governments to put in place at the national level very clear national policies, which are (.). an adequate response to (..) mitigation, to adaptation and (?let's?) (??)- ok just look the (?) [im Hintergrund findet die Verleihung des "Fossil of the Year" Awards durch AVAAZ u.a. statt] so canada is the fossil of the year. (..) ok. so for me i don't have much faith in the UN process at all. and i think that it's gonna get worse. but i think that there's a lot of possibility to do stuff at the national level.

I: imagine a friend is asking you, who is participating at these negotiations

P: say again

I: imagine a friend is asking you, who is participating at these negotiations, [yeah] what would you answer?

P: who is actually participating? the most powerful countries. the G8, of course. they're participating very actively. they have big delegations and they are able to really dominate a lot of the discussions here in the negotiations. the (. ) corporations are very active, an active force in the negotiations, but in a kind of contradictory way, because not all corporations, not all companies have the same interests. i mean there's some corporations, who could potentially benefit enormously [mhm] from some kind of shift to a green capitalism. and there're others, who are really defending their existing interests. so i think there's actually a real contradiction between different sectors of capitalism in what would be a good result for them in the climate negotiations. i think the social forces, who are talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach, are completely absent from the negotiations. [mhm] say one or two governments in particular. we can highlight bolivia. i think it's the probably the one government that is absolutely clear in articulating a very transformative agenda and a complete- i would say they are clear in a anti-capitalist agenda. [yeah] they say there's no way that we can actually deal
with the ecological crisis of the planet in a capitalist framework. and they're very clear about who's responsible, what are the problems and what we need to do. bolivia is a minority of one, i think, in the climate negotiations, but outside the negotiations bolivia has a lot of supporters, you know so, but i think a lot of voices, there are being excluded from these negotiations.

I: could you tell me. what do people say about climate justice now at copenhagen?

P: (.) yeah. i don't really know what people say. i think probably people who've been stuck inside the bella center for the past two weeks probably don't have much to say about climate justice now, because we haven't had a very high visibility inside the bella center. on the outside, i would say that people- you know, even though people may not identify the network as such, i think the climate justice sort of framing is very dominant in the klimaforum. certainly in the reclaim power action that was a very strong part of the sort of framing of the reclaim power action. to talk about the people's voices and alternatives and justice-based responses to climate change. so i don't think the network as such has got a very strong branding. but i think the sort of ideas and the spaces that climate justice now has created have been extremely important spaces both inside but more importantly outside the negotiations. so i'm not sure about the- where the people identify CJN! as the sort of the network, but it's more the ideas and so on.

I: what projects or activities are supported by CJN! at copenhagen?

P: well, in the official process, there's (.) well, as a network we meet together. as a network we have interventions in some of the plenaries in the negotiations. as a network we have press conferences. as a network- more or less as a network, not everyone joined (?) , but as a network we really mobilized for the reclaim power action. particularly the inside part, the walk-out part of the action. we did that together as climate justice now. on the outside we organized a full day of activities at the klimaforum at sunday the 13th, which was sort of a half day of seminars and workshops. and then another half day, which was a (?deed ?) assembly of many speeches and music and films. more or less to show people the diversity of what's in the climate justice now network. on saturday during the demonstration, climate justice now participated as a block in the system change not climate change block. [mhm] so that was an activity that we did together to be part of the system change not climate change block. a lot of us, a lot of the different movements and networks in CJN! joined the outside part of
the reclaim power. participated in the people's assembly. so i think as a space, we've done a lot of things together. and i think actually one thing i think CJN! has done really well has been to organize this evening briefing at the klimaforum, [mhm] which is- it's only one hour, but i think it's the only kind of open forum, where a lot of people, who have just participated in the klimaforum as well as CJN! organizations can come together, to talk about what's happening inside, to talk about, what's happening on the outside and to share information about what's happening the next day. to have a little bit of a political analysis. so i think that's something that really distinguishes CJN! from CAN for example. i mean CAN really doesn't do anything much at all on the outside. they're very inside-focussed. and i think CJN! has done a really good job at trying to bring the information onto the outside and also to bring the outside agenda to the inside.

I: could you- you spoke a lot, but i will ask you the question again. what do you think about the protests outside the negotiations?

P: what do i think about them?

I: how do you assess them?

P: i think they are fantastic. i mean, i think they were absolutely what we needed, right?, to actually- well- (. ) let me say two things. the demonstrations on the 12th, that i thought was really great, because it was huge, it was really diverse and i think was a very strong expression of a kind of global demand for something to be done about the crisis that we're facing. so i think that was really important, the saturday demo. the reclaim power action i think was important on many different levels. i think it was- the process of building it or of developing it, for me it is, i was involved really from the beginning, was a really interesting political process of bringing together different kinds of ways of working, different kind of political perspectives and to see how we can build some common activity. and i think the fact that (. ) that alliance, if you like, or that merging of different sorts of political forces was able to hold together until the (??) end of blue block arrived back in the city at the end of the day on the 16th. it was incredibly powerful, right? because, you know that i can (?beg?) unity really held very, very strongly. i think the (. ) fact that people were willing to like (?climb?) the things and really push as far as they could before they've really pushed back pretty- in a pretty brutal way by the police, showed that it's a radical movement. a radical movement with purpose and commitment and courage of convictions. a movement that knows how to mobilize, how to
take political action. It's a movement that is able to bring together lot's of different voices, different movements from the south. I mean I know a lot of friends of mine, who were coming from Indonesia and Thailand and Philippines and India. For them the highlight of the week was participating in the reclaim power action and the people's assembly, [yeah] because for them it really gave them— it gave us all I think an incredible sense of unity that people, when they work together and stay together can achieve things. A sense of purpose, a sense of having a voice, a sense that we had actually challenged the power, [mhm] because the reactions from the UN and the reaction from the Danish authorities I think is a very clear indication that we have, you know, they hear us. That they feel us. That they know that we were there. If we're invisible and silent, there's no point to even have a single police man on the street. But because we are visible and noisy and the force of the reaction is an indication of a kind of nervousness if you like on their part.

I: what do you think about the mobilization of these autonomous groups, groups of direct action to Copenhagen?

P: the direct action groups in the CJA? Or

I: it's a little bit hard to translate, but the groups like black block who was mobilizing to Copenhagen, [yea] what do you think about it and how do you assess it?

P: well, I don't know. I mean there was a lot of talk. But frankly I felt the black block was invisible in this two weeks really. I thought that it was almost invisible. [mhm] that there was no— yea, I mean frankly I felt that they were really invisible in the past two weeks. And— I don't know what that means. Does that mean that the police tactic was very effective at intimidating people and (?the?) (?!) arrests and all of the arrests was, we could say that for example that was, that the police was very successful, right?, in keeping the demonstrations [mhm] very (?cool?) and so on. [mhm] Or can we say that in the end the black block— the other thing that we can say is that the CJA— we can say that the (. . .) dominant— you know, there were lot of people, particularly in the CJA, who I think worked very, very hard to sort of get a strong— to get people to commit to the action consensus, which was a non-violent direct action consensus. I think that the CJA, who (?in that/their milieu?) I think a lot of them probably have more links with (. . .) some parts of the black block, who have different forms of political action. We can also interpret that as saying that CJA was really very successful in kind of— in consolidating a commitment to the action consensus. I mean I don't know how you interpret this, but for me the black block was like not
I: could you tell me a little bit about the cooperation of CJN! ? who do you cooperate with?
P: CJN!
I: CJN!
P: in what sense?
I: about networks and organizations, who you work with?
P: well, anyone, who wants to join, can join. you know, so it's like, if you wanna cooperate you may as well join. i mean some big networks and organizations and movements are already part of CJN! they sort of identify with CJN! we try and cooperate with some governments, particularly supporting bolivia and ecuador and a few governments that are trying to push some alternatives. but just to say, for example, you know via campesina, jubilee south, friends of the earth, a lot of the attac networks- who else? a lot of the (...) groups involved in the WTO campaigning and so on [mhm] they're already part of CJN! [ok] they- and we've- i think we've collaborated and cooperated a lot with people in the CJA as well. and i think there's some overlap in the CJA CJN! world. i mean, i've participated in the CJA processes up till now as focus. so focus on the global south is in the CJN! and active and probably quite visible, right?, in terms of one of the organizations it's helping to build the network. but we've also been active in the CJA processes. and i think quite deliberately as a kind of trying to be a link, right?, between the two different processes and different networks. because at least in focus we really believe that, ok it's good to do the policy stuff, but you also have to be able to build movements and take action and build broad alliances and i think find different ways of working together.
I: do you think there are certain positions of NGOs and movements- or movements, which you would say, you would strictly oppose them? you would fundamentally contradict them?
P: i definitely oppose to any NGOs that are promoting global carbon markets or more CDMs or- i mean there're a lot of- there are NGOs, who are part of the climate negotiations, who are actively promoting these kinds of market-based solutions or geo-engineering or privatization of the forests or- you know these sorts of what we can call false solutions, right?, for climate change. i'm very clearly in opposition to those kinds of positions.
I: at the end, before i get some very short or concrete questions, i get a provocative question. what do you think might the- how might the secret service refer to climate justice now?
P: (. ) mhm (. ) on their watch list, not maybe rather on their
hit list. like some dangerous tendencies there, i would
say. yeah, i think they would see CJN! as (. ) potentially
dangerous and (. ) definitely to be watched. yeah

I: at the end i get some short- or not short but concrete
questions. could you tell me about what you are reading,
if you want to know about climate change and climate
politics?
P: good question.
I: and what do you never read?
P: oh. i never read technical stuff, because i think for me
it's- where we are now is in a political debate not in a
scientific debate. so i'm actually much more interested in
sort of the political debates around the climate issues.
and- so what do i read? (. ) it's kind of eclectic, i
suppose. (. ) you know, i really read the stuff that comes
out of the wuppertal institute, because i think they have
some quite interesting analysis of the sort of the
governance questions and those sorts of things. (. ) i
don't know. well, i can tell you what we've published,
which we- which i found very useful and very interesting
is this contours of climate justice. the dag hammerskjöld
reader. i think that's in that- there's a collection of
essays, which are really good at sort of reframing the-
looking at how the climate issue has been constructed in
the past and what are the weaknesses of that and the
limitations of that and how we might rethink about or
reconstruct the climate debate in a way that actually is
more transformative. it doesn't end up in this sort of
dead end of (. ) maintaining a sort of, if you like,
scientific approach to climate and how we can actually
bring it- make it a more political (. ) yeah. i think i
just read thousands and thousands of emails. that's what i
read.

I: do you know, when you first met with the term climate
justice?
P: (. ) probably in bali, i think, because i hadn't- i'd
followed a little bit climate issues. i mean, i remember
in fact going back a long way- (. ) like- no- sort of mid-
like nineteen eighties in australia, there was already a
beginning of discussion about global warming and about
ozone depletion, because in the sort of like eighties,
there was sort of a discussion about both of these issues.
[mhm] and it was pretty high profile then. and then it
really disappeared, i think of the- after rio it was like
sort of slowly got in- it became more and more
bureaucratized. and so i kind of lost interest and it
became a very complex UN (. ) process with lots of (. )
acronyms [mhm] that were pretty incomprehensible. and then
(.i think it was in bali that i heard the term climate
justice, because i hadn't actually been reading that much.
i mean, for example i didn't read much of the stuff that
was coming out of the durban group. of course we rejected
the carbon markets and of course we felt that the kyoto
protocol was a complete sell out. i mean we had a kind of
position on things. [mhm] but at least as focus we hadn't
sort of incorporated this framing into our work. yeah. so
the climate justice was- i'm a newcomer. just two years
(?i think?).

I: could you tell me about the fundings of climate justice
now. how is it financed?

P: ah, we have no money. [ok] i think that we- the first
grant that we got was for this COP. and it was basically a
little bit of money to do some media work. a little bit of
money to (.i do some printing. i mean it's really
extremely small amount of money. and up until now the
network has depended, i would say (?large on the?)
voluntary contributions of the people in the network. so
for example focus lets me use a lot of my time to
participate in the network and to help all, you know, like
facilitate and organize the network a little bit.
similarly, you know, yeah, i think all of the
organizations, who contribute in a voluntary way, which is
a little bit problematic, right?, because it means that
groups that don't have like capacity to give some staff
time or some resources can be a little bit excluded from
the network. so i think we need to be more serious about
the resource question, so that we can make use money so
that more people can participate in building the network.

I: my last question would be, if there are any specific
places, where climate justice now has stated its program,
its aims and demands.

P: i think in every intervention that we have in the UN, in
the plenaries, it's two minutes, but we use that as a
platform to restate some clear positions. in the- of
course in press conferences and so on. in the wsf in
belem, there was a call for climate justice, which came
out of the world social forum in belem [mhm] and i think
that was also an articulation of a sort of a climate
justice principles and climate justice approach. in
publications (.i mean there are various statements
(?here?) around. ok, i mean CJN! prepared a statement at
the end of the posznan COP in 2008. we'll prepare one at
the end of this COP, which should be our response to
copenhagen. which will be, i guess, a further iteration of
the positions of the collectivity of climate justice now.
[mhm] we have a website, which is like a- pretty bad at
the moment, but it's a work in progress and i think that
soon we can tell people to go there and to look for what
we have. [yeah] i'm not sure, if that really answers that question, but it's different spots, where we say what we believe in and what we disagree with and what we're pushing for.

I: so as far as i'm concerned i think that's it from my side.

P: ok.

I: so perhaps, if you think, oh, he missed that very important point.

P: no, i think i can keep- you've got my brain on your recorder. it's ok. enough.

I: how did you feel being interviewed?

P: it's interesting, isn't it. being interviewed, when you don't get a sort of feedback, don't you think?

I: yeah, that's what i said before.

P: yeah. that's a little bit weird. anyhow? no, it's fine.

I: thank you very much.

P: [pleasure/sure?].
A.3.6 Transkript »GenderCC – Women for Climate Justice«

I: (Könntest/Möchtest?) du mir zum Einstieg erzählen wie es eigentlich dazu gekommen ist dass du bei GenderCC bist?

P:
I: Was meinst du waren wesentliche Höhepunkte der Arbeit von GenderCC in den letzten Jahren?

P: Oh wir jagen irgendwie von einem Höhepunkt zum anderen das ist relativ einfach wenn man bei Null anfängt also das ist ja immer so wenn man wenn nichts da ist und man erreicht dass man Sidevents hat die wahrgenommen haben oder dass Gender im Text auftaucht oder dass man überhaupt zum ersten Mal eine Pressekonferenz hat da ist jedes erst Mal ein Höhepunkt und da das noch nicht so lange geht würde ich mal sagen das es ist- also im Moment ist wirklich noch Höhepunkt dass es im Text bleibt vielleicht das ist ja im Moment noch Hoffnung (.) aber Höhe- ja aber dass es überhaupt also so viele Referenzen mal gab dazu dass es wahrgenommen wird inzwischen dass ja relativ wenige offen sagen finden wir irgendwie völlig bescheuert (.) also das irgendwie ja also insofern es gibt noch nicht so diesen einen Höhepunkt wo wir wirklich was erreicht haben wo man sich dann hinsetzen könnte und sich auf die Schultern klopfen könnte aber es gibt immer wieder kleine Höhepunkte in Form von ja wie gesagt Erwähnungen Referenzen in den Texten (.) ja und irgendwie- ja ein Höhe- ja ne doch also ein Höhepunkt war wahrscheinlich dass wir es geschafft haben als Constituency anerkannt zu werden im Prozess das haben wir (.) du musst mich unterbrechen wenn ich zu viel rede (.) ((lacht)) das haben wir haben wir lange diskutiert- also lange- zwei Jahre lang auf den Konferenzen- wollen wir das? Weil es war klar dass ist viel Verpflichtung auch und es ist viel sich anpassen müssen an den Prozess möglicherweise (??) jetzt auch und (.) auf der anderen Seite hat man eben auch mehr Chancen also mehr Chancen irgendwie Statements abzugeben in den Verhandlungen wahrgenommen zu werden eingeladen zu werden und (??) auch so die Vorteile wie dieses kleine Büro da zu haben das ist manchmal schon sehr hilfreich oder (.) ja oder eben die täglichen- den täglichen Raum für ein Treffen zu kriegen also das sind die Vorteile die Nachteile sind halt und das spüren wir jetzt auch schon dass wir da nur hinterher hecheln (.) also es kommen ständig diese Anfragen (.) #Unterbrechung des Interviews – längere Pause durch und Kommunikation mit anderer Person# es kommen dann irgendwie es kommen dann irgendwie weiß ich nicht morgens um zehn eine Mail vom Sekretariat bis zwölf brauchen wir den Namen für diejenige die Intervention gibt im Plenary XY und bis drei muss der Text da sein so (.) machen wir das jetzt oder- also diese Diskussionen dann und das ist halt auch- also die ist ja ganz neu noch die Constituency offiziell seit Anfang November also in Barcelona waren wir zum ersten Mal als Constituency (.) also von daher ist es noch- und in dieser Größenordnung
jetzt von dieser Konferenz mit vielen anderen Beteiligten
auch ist es ganz neu und keiner weiß- also wir haben noch
nicht so richtig viel Positionen so wie CAN wo man dann
sagen kann oh wir schöpfen hier aus dem Vorrat an
Positionen können wir halt Statements machen (.) also wir
haben wenig gemeinsame Positionen und auch jede der
Organisationen die in der Constituency sind das sind ja
noch nicht so wahnsinnig viele die sind halt alle neu in
dem Prozess und müssen sich erst zurechtfinden und für die
ist es dann wenn die dann sagen- also die Aufforderung ist
dann- SBI opening plenary statement zu welchem Thema (.)
dann heißt es immer welche Themen bearbeitet das
<<lachend> SBI plenary> oder das SBI jetzt nochmal (.) und
so also es dauert immer ein bisschen länger und ist schon
(.) es ist eine Herausforderung das zu machen es ist
wirklich die Frage raubt einem das auch Energien (.) die
man eigentlich bräuchte um Positionen zu entwickeln

I: Was denkst du denn wäre der größte Erfolg für GenderCC?
Wann bräuchte es GenderCC nicht mehr?

P: Oh. Also ich glaube erstmal braucht es uns noch (.) Also
ich denk der größte Erfolg jetzt im- kurzfristig den wir
erreichen können ist wirklich diesen eigenen Paragraphen
bei den Prinzipien drin zu haben man weiß ja im Moment
noch nicht wie es aussieht ob es bei der shared (??) oder
ob es bei den irgendwie principles (??) für welche Sachen
auch immer also für die künftigen Aktionen ist- also da
als ein Prinzip die Gender equality zu verankern das ist
so das worauf wir hinarbeiten und das wäre irgendwie das
was wir im Moment als größten Erfolg bezeichnen würden (.)
man braucht es dann nicht mehr wenn es selbstverständlich
überall die Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden (.) also wenn
das alle oder fast alle machen würden dann bräuchte es uns
tatsächlich nicht mehr (.) auf dieser Ebene (.) Das geht
ja dann irgendwie- also uns als Netzwerk- also wir als
Netzwerk arbeiten ja nicht nur auf der internationalen
Ebene da liegt zwar im Moment ein Schwerpunkt aber (.)
unsere ??points in Afrika und Asien und Lateinamerika
Pazifik die arbeiten ja auch auf der nationalen und auf
der lokalen Ebene also das heißt die führen Projekte da
durch die arbeiten gleichzeitig auf der politischen Ebene
( .) national und so weiter- also das sind ja mehr Ebenen
und von daher ( .) wird das glaube ich noch ein bisschen
was dauern ( .) bis wir uns überflüssig gemacht haben

I: Was sind denn so die wesentlichen Arbeitsschwerpunkte von
GenderCC?

P: Die sind im Moment noch- also ich könnte es im Moment noch
gar nicht so richtig beantworten weil wir hecheln ja
gerecht so hinterher immer- so eine Position zu financing
eine Position zu technology transfer ( .) also die
Schwerpunkte sind eigentlich in die verschiedenen Themen
die hier diskutiert werden die Genderaspekte rein zu kriegen die müssen aber erst einmal erarbeitet werden (.)
also zu financing denke ich gibt es inzwischen schon ein bisschen was da haben wir in Bali schon mit angefangen
technology transfer gibt es ein paar Sachen auf die man zurückgreifen kann (.) vor allen Dingen im Bereich (?mitigation?) ist es schwierig da gibt es ganz ganz wenig nur (.) da gibt es auch- naja (.) große Animositäten sag ich mal (.) zwischen also ja zwischen den Vertreterinnen aus den Entwicklungsländern und denen aus den (.) entwickelten Industrieländern (.) was damit zu tun hat dass die sagen jetzt macht mal ihr erstmal und dann könnt ihr mit uns darüber reden was wir irgendwie- (.) wie wir runter gehen können oder welche Projekte wir durchführen können und (.) ich finde auch da liegen wir halbwegs richtig damit (.) aber die ja die Genderaspekte bei den Reduzierungen in Industrieländer- auch in Entwicklungsländern aber da ist es so ein bisschen einfacher- in den Industrieländern ist es halt ungeheuer schwer da bewegt man sich immer ganz schnell auf dieser Ebene (.) wer verbraucht wofür mehr Energie und (.) ist das nicht irgendwie eher- also ich meine gut man bewegt sich da nicht mehr eigentlich nicht mehr auf dieser Ebene Frauen Männer sondern auf dieser Ebene der Geschlechterverhältnisse und der Machtverhältnisse und der Rationalitäten die dahinter liegen also dem was Gender ja eigentlich sein sollte also was- (.) wer bestimmt eigentlich welche Lösungsvorschläge oder welche Maßnahmen sich durchsetzen bei den Verhandlungen oder auch dann bei der Umsetzung auf- (??) ((lacht)) da fliegen gerade irgendwie Tempotaschentücher von oben runter (??) ich bin irgendwie aus dem Konzept raus- (.) ach so auf der Ebene der Rationalitäten und der dahinter stehenden Werte und was wird als wichtig und richtig anerkannt und was als nicht als weniger wichtig und da ist man dann ganz schnell wieder bei den Geschlechterverhältnissen also die Ökonomie (.) steht irgendwie über allem aber das ist halt irgendwie die traditionelle Ökonomie dieser ganze Bereich der Versorgungskonzepte taucht darin nicht auf (.) Planungen und ökonomische Entwicklungen werden so unterstützt dass sie eher kontraproduktiv sind und weiterhin zu größeren Emissionen statt zu- also eher zu höheren Emissionen statt zur Reduktion beizutragen und so weiter also das ist der Punkt der dahinter steht nur (.) den hier- also daran zu arbeiten das machen wir gerade in Deutschland auch mit der AGV in dem Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung dazu haben wir ja auch (.) ein bisschen was erarbeitet schon aber (.) das ist so komplex (.) das versteht hier leider niemand also dieses wenn man über Frauen und Gender spricht dann haben die Verhandler hier (.) da ist für die sofort klar Frauen Opfer Frauen Klimawandel Frauen Opfer des Klimawandels das ist was sie eindeutig verstehen was auch überhaupt kein
Problem ist (.) schon wenn man dann sagt ja sie sind ja nicht nur Opfer vielleicht tragen sie auch bei zum Klimawandel und (.) und vor allem wissen sie auch einiges über Lösungen und haben dann möglicherweise andere Präferenzen das ist dann schon was nicht mehr so richtig wahrgenommen wird (.) aber wenn man versucht zu erklären versucht dass (.) die Situation die wir haben also die Klimakrise so zu sagen was zu tun hat mit Geschlechterverhältnissen da (.) hört es dann ziemlich auf

I: Was ist denn das eigentliche Problem vom Klimawandel oder globaler Erwärmung?

P: Also das ist jetzt aber meine persönliche Meinung wir haben da auch keine gemeinsamen Positionen dazu im Netzwerk bisher (.) Also ich denke schon dass das Problem (.) eine also um mit Meike Spitzner zu reden androzentrische Planung und Denkweise ist also irgendwas was die Männlichkeitsrollen oder -rezeptionen in den Mittelpunkt stellt und immer weiter fortführt letztendlich also eine Planung die orientiert ist an einigen wenigen- das sind ja auch nicht alle Männer- sondern einigen wenigen und bestimmten Männlichkeitskonzepten das ist es ja eher also größer schneller weiter (.) und wachstumsorientierten Konzepten die irgendwie nichts anderes mehr zulassen also wo alles andere- ich meine das ist ja auch bei uns so wenn wir- weiß ich nicht beim Ministerium beim Treffen mit dem neuen Minister reden darüber dass man ja vielleicht runter kommen muss von dem Wachstum und von dem immer währenden weiteren Wachstum (.) da kommen wir ja ohne Gender schon nicht durch (.) weil das einfach nicht wahrgenommen werden will weil auch- ich glaube auch weil sich niemand vorstellen kann dass man in einer Gesellschaft leben kann und zwar (.) auch Auskommen hat und sich wohl fühlen und eine Lebensqualität hat in der kein Wachstum da ist ich glaube (.) da ist so eine Denkbarriere da in vielen vielen Feldern auch (.) also wenn ich lese über Green Growth oder Green New Deal oder so was dann merke ich das zieht sich wirklich ja auch durch alle durch (.) da taucht ja dann wieder der Wachstumsbegriff auf das ist dann zwar ein anderer aber ich glaube dass auch ein grünes Wachstum begrenzt ist (.) ja

I: Was wären denn dann real solutions to Climate Change?

P: Ich habe keine real solutions und jeder der die auf den Tisch legt hier den würde ich für einen (.) Schwätzer halten weil ich glaube was wir brauchen ist (.) ein Prozess (.) ist ein Prozess wo wir uns wirklich auseinandersetzen damit wie wir leben wollen in Zukunft auf diesem Planeten (.) und der dauert und der ist nicht einfach irgendwelche (.) Pläne zu entwickeln am Schreibtisch oder am Runden oder sonst irgendwie am Tisch
(.) führt meiner Ansicht nach nicht weiter ich glaube wirklich wir brauchen einen Prozess wir müssen irgendwie möglichst viele einbeziehen da in diesen Prozess und es ist wirklich die Frage wie wollen wir leben (.) das ist ja nicht mehr nur- es geht ja nicht nur in Anführungsstrichen um Klimawandel was viele dann sehen als ein Umweltproblem- sondern das ist wirklich dieses wie wollen wir in Zukunft leben mit ganz wenigen Ressourcen mit einer Gerechtigkeit- jetzt wird mir langsam warm ich friere den ganzen Tag- mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit und was bedeutet eine weltweite Gerechtigkeit (.) also diese Diskussion auch zu führen schaffen wir ja noch kaum in kleineren Kreisen dieses was ist gerecht (.) alle Diskussionen die ich darüber kenne die (.) hören irgendwie relativ schnell wieder auf (.) ich merke auch bei mir selbst dass ich da Entwicklungsbedarf habe also und Diskussionsbedarf einfach noch habe (.) und dazu ist immer keine Zeit da das ist das was (.) also da sagen uns die Klimaschützer dafür- das machen wir dann wenn wir mal Zeit haben genauso wie uns um Gerechtigkeit kümmern- das sagen aber auch wir immer wieder weil wir hecheln ja auch von einer Konferenz und einer Position zur anderen anderen uns mal die Zeit zu nehmen- also wie Auszeiten letztendlich zu nehmen und zu sagen OK wir machen jetzt mal eine Woche lang statt Klimakonferenz ein retreat wo wir über Gerechtigkeit reden was bedeutet für uns Gerechtigkeit auch unter uns die wir aus den ganzen verschiedenen Regionen kommen

I: Jetzt frag ich die Frage nochmal anders herum was wären dann für dich false solutions?

P: Also das sind für mich- ah ja ich merke schon ich habe die Frage nicht richtig beantwortet - <<lachend> nein ist gut> (.) also das sind für mich die ganzen Lösungen von denen man glaubt sie würden schnell irgendwas machen ohne dass wir eben diese Diskussion führen und ohne dass wir unser Leben wirklich verändern also (.) die ganzen Technologien- also ich sage nicht dass wir keine Technologien brauchen ich bin ja selbst Ingenieurin und auch nicht technologiefreundlich aber diese Hoffnung darauf dass es schnelle technologische Lösungen gebe wie CCS oder dann auch wieder Atomenergie- ich meine das sieht man ja in Deutschland gerade sehr deutlich- welche auch immer es da gibt das halte ich für falsche Lösungen ich halte genau so diese ganzen- also aus unserer Sicht zumindest sind diese ganzen marktbasierten Lösungen also ein Markt der diese Situation geschaffen hat der jetzt wieder wirtschaften soll indem er die Lösungen vorgibt oder sie wieder alle nur am Markt oder an der Ökonomie orientiert sind (.) und immer weiter in diesen Zirkel führen aber nicht da raus aus diesem Zirkel von daher ist- es hilft nichts. ich glaube wirklich man muss was anderes machen. und wenn ich mich hier so umgucke. und das ist auf dieser konferenz,

I: Was verstehst du denn unter Klimagerechtigkeit?

das denke ich ist ein- also das ist was, was bei uns auch
nur ganz wenig diskutiert ist. insofern kann ich auch
nicht sagen, was ist jetzt wirklich gerecht. aber gerecht,
gerade (.) also ich finde es ausgesprochen schwierig
jetzt wirklich zu sagen, was ist gerecht. aber es ist auf
denfall etwas, was erstmal denjenigen, die in Armut
leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung gibt. und dafür
müssen wir alles tun. also das wäre für mich gerecht. also
wirklich auch zu sagen, ok, ich verzichte auf das und das
und das, damit die Menschen da aus der Armut raus kommen.
und da trägt halt der klimawandel- also dazu gehört zum
einen die Möglichkeit Emissionen zu emittieren, sozusagen.
aber auf der anderen Seite eben auch die Verhinderung der
Auswirkungen des Klimawandels. also es hat schon diese
beiden Seiten, dann die dann ganz stark berücksichtigt
werden müssen. und es gehört natürlich dazu, dass alle
gleich auch an den Lösungen mitarbeiten und deren stimmen
gleichwertig berücksichtigt werden oder gleichen Wert
haben und das ist ja mitnichten der fall. es ist zwar hier
im UN-System ein Land, eine Stimme, aber das ist ja-
gleich ist eben doch nicht gleich.

I: würdest du den Begriff verwenden?
P: ne. also ich- ich meine wir verwenden ja im Englischen
auch Gender und Climate Justice. aber im Deutschen würde
ich ihn eher nicht verwenden.

I: und den englischen Begriff?
P: der- den- ja deshalb. das- ich weiß irgendwie- das hängt
damit zusammen glaube ich, dass der eingeführter ist als
die deutsche Klimagerechtigkeit. also in- es ist im
englischen für mich auch leichter kombinierbar mit anderen
Gerechtigkeitsaspekten. also für mich ist
Klimagerechtigkeit- ist mir eigentlich zu eingeschränkt.
also ich will nicht nur Klimagerechtigkeit. ich will eine
geschlechtergerechte Klimagerechtigkeit und eine weiß-der-
teufel-was-gerechte Klimagerechtigkeit.

I: und was verstehst du dann unter Climate Justice?
P: ja, das sag ich ja. das ist irgendwie sich in die eigene
Tasche lügen, wenn man sagt englisch- aber weil im
englischen, im englischen verbinden ich es halt schneller
mit Gender and Climate Justice, zum Beispiel. während wenn
ich im deutschen Geschlechtergerechtigkeit und
Klimagerechtigkeit sage oder Geschlechter- und
Klimagerechtigkeit, das ist auch ein Stück weit ein
Sprachproblem, wahrscheinlich.

I: (. ) wenn dich ein Freund fragt, wer nimmt so an einer
Klimaverhandlung teil, was würdest du darauf antworten?
(. oder eine Freundin.

P: ja ist wurscht. würde ich gleich antworten, würde ich mal
vermuten. ja, also natürlich als erstes die
Ländervertreter. ganz viel aus Industrieländern. viel
weniger aus den Südländern, weil die gar nicht die
Ressourcen haben. also auch in den Ministerien nicht so
die Leute, die an den vielen Konferenzen teilnehmen
können. dann gibt es die ganz vielen verschiedenen
Observer- nein, dann gibt es natürlich die UN-
Institutionen, die teilnehmen und die ganz vielen
unterschiedlichen Observer-Gruppen, die eben reichen von
Business bis hin zu (. ja irgendeine
Umweltorganisationen, inzwischen ja auch Frauen- Gender-
Frauen- Trade-Unions, Jugend und so weiter- und die- das
Verhältnis zwischen diesen beiden bereichen, also sag ich
jetzt mal. Regierungen und Observer-Gruppen, das ändert
sich glaub ich gerade heftig in Richtung hohe Dominanz
derjenigen, die nichts zu sagen haben hier. also
zahlenmäßige Dominanz, nicht (. nicht inhaltliche.

I: gibt es denn (. irgendeine, die hier eigentlich nicht
sein dürfen? (. dürfen?

P: also es gibt immer die, die ich hier lieber sehe und die,
die ich weniger gern habe.

I: ok.

P: lieb habe ist ja quatsch, aber, die ich weniger gern hier
sehen. aber ich finde eine Berechtigung hat hier jeder, zu
sein. also eine Berechtigung hier zu sein, hat natürlich
jeder. natürlich stinkt es uns, wenn dann diejenigen, die
viel Geld haben auch eine höher Präsenz haben. einfach
zahlenmäßiger eine andere Präsenz haben aber auch in ihrer
Selbstdarstellung und natürlich, bekanntermaßen in ihrer
Einflussnahme eine andere Präsenz haben.

I: wie wird denn hier in Kopenhagen über GenderCC geredet?

P: ja da musst du die anderen fragen. das kann ich dir nicht
sagen. das kann ich nicht beantworten, die Frage. das weiß
ich einfach nicht.

I: wenn du die Klimaverhandlungen mit einem Fußballspiel
vergleichst. was wäre da dein Kommentar?

P: kann ich- bin- ich weiß noch nicht einmal, wie ich ein
Fußballspiel kommentieren sollte. weil- also Fußball ist
nun überhaupt nicht das was ich- wo ich mich auskenne. (. du
meinst jetzt irgendwie, wer so- wer die Mannschaften
sind, die gegeneinander spielen, oder, oder (. ja da
müsst ich- kann ich irgendwie gar nicht sagen, weil ich
überlege gerade eben so- also entweder, entweder es sind
two gleiche- zwei ganz ungleiche Mannschaften. also die
zwei haben die ganzen kräftigen und die anderen nur die
ganzen kleinen. das wäre dann, na ja, so Nord-Süd oder
Entwicklungsländer-Industrieländer. oder aber mein Eindruck wäre eher, dass- oder ist es vielleicht bis vor kurzem gewesen, die einen- also alle spielen auf ein Tor, sozusagen. also die einen haben gar kein Tor, wo sie reintreffen können, um auf das gleiche- um zu einem gleichen- oder die Chance zu haben, irgendwie zu gewinnen in dem spiel. man muss da irgendwie- beim Fußballspiel brauchst du ja ein Tor, wo du reinschießt und ich habe so den Eindruck auf der einen Seite fehlt das Tor.

I: welche Seite wäre das?

P: na ja, die Seite, wo die betroffenen vom Klimawandel ihre Tore reinschießen würden. während die Seite wo die Verursacher ihre Tore reinschießen, die hat ein großes Tor, so.

I: kannst du mir denn erzählen, was GenderCC jetzt konkret hier an Aktivitäten in Kopenhagen macht?

P: wir, wir haben wie immer unsere Füße überall. also sowohl im- hier auf der Konferenz. wo wir also ein Side-Event gestern Abend schon hatten. im EU-Pavillion zu Gender-Cities on Climate Change, das mit der Habitat zusammen. also was wir sonst nicht machen, mit UN-Organisationen. das beruhte aber auf einer Studie, die von uns jemand gemacht hat. und dann haben wir noch am Montag eins mit Entwicklungsorganisationen um so ein bisschen so darüber zu reden, was kann man eigentlich aus der- den langjährigen Erfahrungen der Entwicklungsorganisationen bei der Integration von Gender lernen für den internationalen prozess. und dann ist GenderCC halt der focal-point von der constituency oder eine Person von GenderCC und als solche Organi- also sind wir immer dabei diese Statements zu organisieren zu schreiben, also jetzt nicht für die gesamte Constituency. aber die einzelnen Mitglieder von uns, also diejenigen die eine Intervention hält, schreibt halt auch den draft davon, das abzustimmen und so weiter. wir haben den täglichen women's caucus. also da wo wir uns mit den Frauen und Gender- also es sind nicht nur Frauen, es sind auch mal ein paar Männer zumindest dabei- an interessierten oder Experten abstimmen, was wir also austauschen, Einschätzungen der Verhandlungen, wo legen wir jetzt unseren Schwerpunkt drauf, was wollen wir erreichen, also auf dieses (.) und so weiter. also das ist so- haben unseren Informationsstand hier, was wir irgendwie schon vor drei, vier Jahren oder fünf Jahren als eigentlich die ideale Möglichkeit um mit den Delegationen und den participants jeglicher couleur hier ins Gespräch zu kommen gesehen haben. weil da sind sie immer am ehesten mal kurz für ein Gespräch anzu- also für ein Argument ansprechbar. man kann halt immer am besten auch die Sachen verteilen. also das ist hier innerhalb des Prozesses. außerhalb sind- haben
wir im Klimaforum noch- also im NGO-Forum noch
Veranstaltungen, [mhm] die dann auch so ein bisschen
anspruchsvoller sind im sinne von, ja eben zu diskutieren,
also unsere eine, die wir nächste Woche haben, da geht es
halt, wir sagen immer- also Gender-Mainstreaming reicht
uns nicht. wir möchten beyond Gender-Mainstreaming,
nämlich wirklich eine Transformation erreichen, der
Gesellschaft und nicht nur teil des Mainstreams sein. und
was heißt das eben (?!)? also wir haben es genannt
einen philosophischen Salon. also wirklich mal drüber zu
philosophieren oder nachzudenken, ohne eben gleich wieder
einen bestimmten text vorschlagen zu müssen dafür, was das
bedeutet darüber hinaus zu gehen. und es gibt dann darüber
hinaus noch eine Zusammenar- lockere Zusammenarbeit mit
den Frauen-Aktivitäten, die in dem, wie heißt das, green-
greenlanding- greenland- no- iceland not. i think
greenland- house stattfinden. also da gibt es so einen
Space für women's Aktivitäten, wo auch einiges an
Diskussionen läuft und tägliche briefings sind. also auch
so ein report back. oh gott, dabei fällt mir etwas. ich
habe etwas total vergessen. (.) also es gibt irgendwie
zwischen der Konferenz hier, und das ist das, was ich
vergessen habe, zwischen den constituencies hier und den
NGOs außerhalb, da im Klimaforum, da gibt es halt auch so
eine Vereinbarung, das sich immer jeden tag jemand hingeht
und mit denen ein briefing macht, was läuft hier. [ok] ich
meine es ist erst nächste Woche, aber (.) eijeijei. gut.
also so- es gibt da schon- es gibt Versuche Verbindungen
herzustellen und ich denke- ich weiß nicht, wie gut das
läuft aber es sind zumindest gute Ansätze dazu da.

I: ich muss einmal nachfragen. es sind jetzt 33 Minuten. ist
das für dich gerade ok, wenn wir jetzt noch ein bisschen
weitermachen, oder?

P: ja, wenn es noch ein bisschen ist.

I: ok. wie stehst du denn- oder was hältst du von den
Protesten außerhalb der Konferenz?

P: also

ich
denke Protest außerhalb ist immens wichtig. ich gehe
morgen auch zur Demo. hoffe ich jedenfalls. falls sich
wieder die deutsche Delegation- hat jetzt ihren Termin
verschoben, so dass das langsam in die nähe kommt, da.
aber ich finde der Druck von außen ist immens wichtig und
der wird ja hier auch gemacht. hoffe ich jedenfalls. was
mich tief erschreckt hat ist das Video, was irgendwie vor
kurzem verbreitet wurde von dem Climate Justice Action
Network. also dem sehr linken, sehr radikalen, wir müssen
die Verhandlungen stoppen, Netzwerk, was so in Richtung
gehnt, ok wir müssen halt Kopenhagen abfackeln. so- im-
sinngemäß. und das finde ich, ist einfach keine Lösung. 
also ich weiß wie schwierig es hier ist zu Vereinbarungen 
zu kommen, ich bin ja auch nicht erst seit gestern dabei, 
aber ich denke, man kann es nicht erzwingen. und wenn man 
hier zu keiner Lösung kommt, dann ist es immer noch kein 
Grund irgendwie- ja- die- also ich glaube einfach nicht, 
das die Lösung ist zu sagen, wir versuchen jetzt alles um 
diese Verhandlungen zu verhindern oder ein Ergebnis zu 
verhindern, weil das ist eh scheiße, was dabei 
herauskommt. also nicht das was wirklich gebraucht wird. 
es ist zwar richtig für eine Analyse, aber was mir da 
total fehlt ist, ja aber was denn. also, wo soll das dann-
ich hab ja auch gesagt ich finde den prozess nicht richtig 
hier. aber ich finde ihn nicht richtig organisiert. also 
ich denke einfach, man muss mehr, mehr- ja woanders die, 
die- auch die wert- die, na sag mal, jetzt fehlt mir das 
Wort. (.) also eine andere Wertigkeit hier rein bringen. 
oder auch zum Beispiel, ich denke manchmal es wäre gut die 
Anzahl der Teilnehmer zu reduzieren. [mhm] auch wenn mich 
das jetzt betreffen würde. und zwar nicht indem man sagt, 
man limitiert irgendwie die Anzahl der Organisationen, die 
hier beteiligt sein dürfen, sondern vielleicht die Anzahl 
der members von den Delegationen. weil das ist inzwischen 
ja, also absurd. wenn ich mir diese participants-liste 
angucke. es ist wirklich finde ich absur. und ich weiß 
irgendwie, wir hatten mal vor ein paar Jahren die 
Diskussion, dass das, also hier bei uns jetzt hier in dem 
Netzwerk, das es so sein sollte, vielleicht, dass wir das- 
au auch jedes land hat irgendwie. weil das macht ja auch die 
Ungerechtigkeit. also wenn Deutschland ist so mit einer 
Delegation von 250 hier. Samoa, weiß ich jetzt nicht. ich 
kenn- ich weiß nicht wie groß die Samoa-Delegation ist. 
aber ärmere Länder sind halt mit einer Delegation von fünf 
hier. wie- also es geht einfach nicht zusammen. da ist 
doch völlig klar, wer kann irgendwie was bestimmen. und 
die Idee war halt zu sagen, ok, jede Delegation, ich sag 
jetzt einmal eine fiktive zahl, darf zehn Leute herbringen 
und alles, was darüber ist, dafür muss immer jemand aus 
dem Süden dann finanziert werden. also wenn ich irgendwie 
die elfte Person haben will, dann muss ich aber auch eine 
für Samoa, jetzt bei dem Beispiel bleiben, finanzieren. 
also so. und genauso könnte man das ja für die NGOs 
machen. [mhm ja] und- also ich glaube, das würde dann 
noch ein bisschen limitier. vielleicht, den- die Größe. 
weil, also ich finde es eigentlich nur noch schrecklich. 
ich fand die Konferenzen gut, solange es so um die 5000 
waren. ich fand schon Bali mit 10.000 grenzwertig. da habe 
ich noch gedacht, das liegt an Bali. und das hier mit, ich 
weiß nicht, 25.000 also die registriert sind oder 27.000 
oden was auch immer. ich finde es einfach nur noch 
beschweuert. also es bringt überhaupt nicht weiter. kein 
stück.
I: kannst du mir erzählen, mit wem GenderCC kooperiert?

P: also wir kooperieren auf der einen Seite ja mit unseren Organisationen mit denen wir zusammenarbeiten aus dem Süden. also indigenen Netzwerken oder Organisationen in Afrika. greenhouse project, und so weiter. also die Frauen vertreten ja alle Projekte auch. also die sind ja keine Einzelfrauen. das ist das eine. zum anderen kooperieren wir hier im prozess natürlich mit den Constituencies, die traditionell näher dran sind an den Gender-Aspekten, an den Gerechtigkeits-Aspekten. das ist Jugend, das sind die trade-unions, also so als, deshalb sag ich traditionell, ne, als traditioneller Verfechter oder Verfechterin auch von den Gerechtigkeits-Aspekten. und das sind die indigenen. schwierig ist es mit Umwelt. also Umweltverbände finde ich eine der härtesten Nüsse hier. weil das- die sind- also Länder sind leichter. Regierungen sind leichter zu (. ) überzeugen, davon, dass es wichtig ist Gender-Aspekte zu integrieren. Umwelt-Verbände haben da in der Regel relativ wenig Offenheit. Business lass ich jetzt einmal außen vor. die haben sowieso keine Offenheit. das sieht man- da muss man nur- das sind immer die Delegationen mit dem geringsten Frauen-Anteil. also allein daran sieht man das schon. Städte mäßig. so, also wir gucken schon, dass wir da- und da sind wir im Moment gerade auch dabei, Positionen abzustimmen mit denen. also wenn es einen Vorschlag von den trade-unions unterstützt von anderen war, dass man in dem text was drinnen hat zu den stakeholdern und dann werden sie halt genannt, Frauen und indigene und Jugend und mhm mhm mhm und das möchte man hier hält nicht so gern im text haben. weil das so lange ist, dann. weil muss ja auch gekürzt werden und da sind wir gerade in einem Abstimmungsprozess, was wir akzeptieren könnten als eine Lösung. das wir nicht immer jede- also, dass wir nicht gegen einander arbeiten, sondern, dass wir irgendwie mit einem gemeinsamen Vorschlag kommen. also das sind Kooperationspartner. dann gibt es immer- Kooperationspartner sind Entwicklungsorganisationen, natürlich. also natürlich im sinne von traditionell auch offener für Gender-Arbeit, zumindest auf dem Papier. und, und ja diejenigen, die vor allem ja mit den folgen des Klimawandels und diesem bereich der akzeptierter ist aus der- also wo die Gender-Perspektive auch akzeptiert wird. ( . ) ja, und sagen wir mal so, mit allen, mit denen wir kooperieren können. also die auch die Angebote machen. das können mal UN-Organisationen sein. also es gibt ja noch ein anderes Netzwerk, mit denen du vielleicht auch schon geredet hast oder noch machst. die global Gender and Climate Alliance. das ist ja entstanden aus einem Netzwerk zu Anfang ausschließlich von UN-Organisationen. von einem- in einer NGO organisiert, aber eben nur die Gender-Abteilung der UN-Organisationen. und das ist genau das, was wir nicht
wollen. und da- aber das auch vor diesem Hintergrund, dass
das eben die Offenheit der Positionen limitiert. weil das-
also ich finde es gut, dass es die gibt. es braucht
diverschiedene Ansatzpunkte und die erreichen, was so hier
den text angeht wahrscheinlich mehr oder mit Sicherheit
mehr als wir. wir sind aber, und das finde ich auch ganz
interessant da, das es die gibt, sind wir immer mehr in
einer so radikale Richtung gegangen. also die- weil wir
gesagt haben, ok, wenn die jetzt irgendwie vertreten, dass
da Gender in den text kommt und hier ein bisschen Women
und da ein bisschen Ecology rein, dann müssen wir uns
darum nicht mehr in erster Linie kümmern. dann kümmern wir
uns lieber darum, zu sagen, wir wollen Change, wir wollen
irgendeine eine Transformation der Gesellschaften und so
weiter. also irgendwie radikaler zu werden in den
Positionen, was sie einfach nicht können. also die können
zum beispiel- also die haben eine sehr positive
Einstellung. also ein Beispiel jetzt einmal zu REDD. weil
UNDP fördert halt Waldprojekte und UNEP auch und so
weiter. also die können- und die gehen dann in diese
Richtung, aber Frauen sollen profitieren können- oder auch
CDM-projekte. Frauen sollen davon profitieren, während von
vielen unserer Frauen das radikal abgelehnt wird. (?ihr
sagt?) wir wollen die überhaupt nicht haben die Projekte.
also es sind viele Projekte, in denen ihr unsere
livelihoods zerstört und selbst davon profitiert, so.

I: und (. ) gibt, jetzt mal ganz umfassend, hier bestimmte
Positionen hier bei NGOs und Bewegungen, wo du sagen
würdest, ja da bin ich fundamental anderer Meinung?
P: (. ) also die gibt es. die gibt es mit Sicherheit. weil es
gibt ja so viele Positionen, hier, und Bewegungen.
insofern (. ) könnte ich das jetzt so irgendwie gar nicht
sagen. ich könnte es- also ich hätte Schwierigkeiten es
generell zu sagen, weil viele der Positionen haben halt
irgendwie so einen teil der richtig ist aber dann wieder
auch einen teil, der falsch ist. und die bewegen sich ja
auch ganz schnell. also die Positionen verändern sich ja.
das sind ja keine starren, feststehenden- das ist ja auch
gut in diesem- also ich habe das ja auch mitverfolgt.
zumindest seit Den Haag. wie irgendwie diese Veränderung
gerade bei den Umweltorganisationen eine Einstellung zu
den Marktinstrumenten und ob vom also vom Emissionshandel
bis CDM und sonst was war und deren immer stärkere
Anpassungen als an das, was praktisch festgeschrieben war
und gut heißen und bis hin zu- also ich erinnere mich
irgendwie WWF, die dann bei dem als der erste deutsche
allokations-plan gemacht wurde, dann sagte Emissionshandel
sei das einzige instrument- einzig wirksame Instrument zum
Klimaschutz. wo ich gedacht habe, ach guck an wir
(??ändern/enden nur?) noch so gut, wie ihr produziert habt
in Den Haag gegen den Emissionshandel, also so verändert
sich das und ich habe den Eindruck, im Moment geht das
gerade wieder so ein bisschen in die andere Richtung. (.)
also verändern sich die Positionen und ich- also es
gibt jetzt nichts, wo ich sagen würde ich- da müssen wir
jetzt gegen kämpfen. aber es gibt viel, was wir einfach
auch nicht gut heißen und nicht unterstützen müssen, so.

I: ich habe dann eigentlich so eher ganz konkrete Fragen am
Schluss. weißt du, wann du das erste mal mit dem begriff
Klimagerechtigkeit in Verbindung getreten bist?

P: also jedenfalls lange bevor es hier im prozess war. also
hier im prozess fing das an vor Bali, würde ich sagen. so
von meinem Gefühl her, jetzt. aber-

I: so Climate Justice auch. mir geht es nicht nur um den
deutschen begriff.

P: ja ja, ich weiß schon. aber also vorher halt mehr in
Richtung Environmental Justice. da gab es- also da gibt es
ja auch relativ viel aus dem englisch-sprachigen Raum und
(??) aus den USA dazu. also Klimagerechtigkeit- also der
deutsche oder auch Climate Justice, ist für mich eher ein
begriff, der so im Vorfeld von der Bali-Konferenz mit dem
Climate Justice Now Aktionen und den Grassroots
Organisationen die rein gebracht wurden in den prozess
aufgekommen ist. wobei die Diskussionen darüber, was sind
gerechte Verteilungen von Emissionen oder was ist gerecht,
ohne diesen begriff Klimagerechtigkeit zu haben ja schon
wesentlich älter sind.

I: und wie ist denn GenderCC eigentlich finanziert?

P: schlecht.

I: schlecht. <<lacht>>

P: also wir sind im moment- wir sind immer so von so
stückchenweise ein bisschen so Finanzierungen. also im
Moment, dieses Jahr noch sind wir finanziert über DEZA
also die schweizerische Entwicklungsgesellschaft. ein bisschen
Oxfam, (. ) NOVIB, also Oxfam Netherlands. und haben
irgendwie jetzt die Frauen finanziert über- also das ist
so ein bisschen so das mühsamste. eine Brot für die Welt.
zwei irgendwie Stiftung umverteilen. eine von den Linken
oder zwei und so. was es extrem mühsam macht. also nicht
nur in der Aquise, sondern auch in der Abrechnung und in
der Berichterstattung, die dann ja folgt. und nächstes
Jahr haben wir ein Projekt, was wir zusammen mit unserer
Partnerin oder dem vocal point in Südafrika machen. was
irgendwie ein zwei-jahres-Projekt ist, wo es wirklich um
Kommunikation in dem bereich- also wie kriegt man das
Thema kommuniziert- capacity building und so geht. in
Südafrika aber eben auch das dann hier auf die
internationale ebene tragen. das ist über das BMZ
finanziert und wir sind halt- haben diverse Anträge so im
Entwicklungsbereich zu laufen. (. ) gestern, ne vorgestern
also kam beim Stand bei mir jemand vorbei, fragte- stellte
genau- also interessierte sich eigentlich mäßig für unsere
arbeit, fand es aber gut und fragte dann auch, wie wir
finanziert sind und ich sag, na ja, mehr schlecht als
recht und so. meint er so ich hab da übrigens (?was?) (.).
also er wusste irgendwie eine Stiftung, die uns hundert
prozentig finanzieren würde. (.). also Schlaumeier gibt es
immer. aber es ist natürlich- also es sind ja deshalb auch
so viele Organisationen jetzt hier und aufgesprungen auf
den prozess, weil es eben Geld dafür gibt. [mhm] und das
ist natürlich- es ist dadurch ja nicht wirklich mehr
beworden, weil jetzt ist der Kampf plötzlich um- geht um-
also jetzt gibt es was und jetzt geht natürlich der Kampf
um die Gelder los, aber müssen wir mal gucken.

I: allerletzte frage, die ich dir heute stelle, wäre, was
liest du zu Klimawandel und was liest du nicht. also
beziehungsweise, wenn du dich zu Klimawandel und
Klimapolitik fortbilden willst, was liest du dann?

P: ich finde das eine schwierige frage. es gibt viel, was ich
gerne lesen würde. es gibt ganz wenig, was ich real lese,
weil ich ja irgendwie auch noch einen job habe für den ich
bezahlt werden. also das ist ja irgendwie, der ist- der
hat nicht direkt mit Klima und Gender zu tun, sondern ich
mach das ja mehr oder minder in meiner Freizeit und denke
ich halte mich irgendwie immer mehr so nebenbei mit Mails
lesen, also auch in den diversen Mailinglisten auf dem
lauftenden. fühle mich aber manchmal auch nicht gut
informiert. wenn ich etwas lese, lese ich eher so etwas
wie- ja weiß ich nicht. sagen wir mal so halb-
wissenschaftliche Bücher über Klima und kriege oder
Klimaflüchtlinge oder so was. die ich dann aber abends im
bett lese und manchmal aber auch schnell wieder beiseite
lege, weil's mir dann irgendwann auch zu viel wird. also
(.) schwierig, schwierig. also es ist schon viel, so- also
ich würde mich auch nicht für besonders gut informiert
halten, so. also ich kenn mich natürlich, weiß sicherlich
mehr als das gros der Bevölkerung darüber. aber so über
die Details der Verhandlungen hier zum Beispiel kommen wir
auch kaum zu (?gehör/ ehrlich?). aber ich weiß dann, wen
ich fragen kann. das ist ja auch schon was.

I: also von meiner Seite wäre das das. [ok] wenn du aber
jetzt- vielleicht hast du ja irgendwie noch so punkte, wo
du dir denkst, die sind noch total wichtig, die würde ich
gerne noch sagen.

P: ne. ich glaube ich habe jetzt alles wichtige gesagt. wenn
dann fällt mir das wahrscheinlich später ein. dann frage
ich dich einfach nochmal, ob du dein gerät nochmal
einschalten kannst oder was aufschreibst.

I: wie war das für dich interviewt zu werden?
war ok. war gut. also ich mache das ja nicht zum ersten mal. ich glaube ich habe noch drei andere Studenten und Studentinnen und- aber eher Studentinnen, glaub ich, vor mir, die auch was machen wollen, in dem bereich. also es ist halt auch so ein also was, wo man aufpassen muss das man es nicht zu oft macht. [ok] du bist der erste hier.
P: ... to try to create an agreement that world leaders need in
order to move forward together. you know, i have seen
pictures of the large gatherings that these summits
generate and they reminded me of photographs of big
nations meetings. it’s a world full of people, there must
be hundreds of people, you know the (??)

And it seems to me that’s a very difficult situation to
try to imagine any kind of agreement coming out of that. i
mean, i labor, when i’m in a meeting of twelve people
trying to get a common agreement (??). imagine the
difficulty trying to get a common agreement in a committee
of hundreds <<lacht>>. very hard! [yeah] but i celebrate
the fact that you did give a credit to it. that’s
wonderful and it must have been quite an experience to be
in the middle of such (?fermate?). if you understand my
use of that term. i mean, we’re in this period when, you
know, all of us i guess, across the planet having to come
to grips with challenges that are so daunting it’s hard to
really grasp, to really understand the implications of the
changes that seem to be on the horizon. and yet, there are
rare events such as copenhagen where collective minds can
come together and at least have a chance to see the size
of the (??) we are involved in. that must have been
rewarding in some way.

I: ok. Shall i tell you a little bit about the structure of
the interview i want to do with you?

P: my first question to you would be, how was it that you
joined the ‘global footprint network’?

I:
I: ok, thank you. could you tell me, what do you think is the role of ‘global footprint network’?

P: well, ‘global footprint network’s’ mission is to draw attention to problems of what we call ‘overshoot’ or ‘demanding too much from the natural world’. as you know, bio-capacity production is the first focus of ‘global footprint network’, we look at the ability of the natural world to generate natural capital or bio-capacity and then we look at the demand of nations and other institutions on that bio-capacity. we then look at the balance between the production and the consumption of bio-capacity,
determinations of the extend to which the earth can actually support the demand that is being made. and it turns out that, you know, there is more demand than there is annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity. and that’s a problem. and that is reflected in the word we use overshoot which describes a demand for bio-capacity in excess of the annual production.

I: ok. what would you say would be the greatest success for the ‘global footprint network’? when aren’t we in need of the ‘global footprint network’ anymore

P: yeah, i think that question has a very clear answer, you know. we have had great success working with a variety of nations across the world, helping them understand the applications of overshoot. and answering their questions associated of how we might work with these nations to end overshoot or at least reverse the trends so that they can manage their natural resources in a more efficient way are goals to help them drag down the embodied energy of trade in which case, you know, energy efficiency improvements would be (?) and our goal is to help them understand the environmental impacts of our capacity demand and the implications of that if environmental impacts are managed i am sorry (?be continued that would be the problem to be managed?). so, the ecological footprint has been created to examine a variety of different land types in the production of bio-capacity or natural capital within those land types and then, the impact of human activities on that production mostly represented by the demand, but at the same time represented by the construction of infrastructure and the environmental effects of that (?work essence?). so, that’s a long answer to your question. but again, back to the shorter answer: we have engaged perhaps as many as two dozen nations across the world in the last five years, we have engaged corporations, both individually and then in collectives. for example, the ‘world business council for sustainable development’ had a long-going project with ‘global footprint network’ now for (?) year. and our effort continues to grow in that respect. we are reaching out to a variety of other corporations, mostly all of which had international operations with the idea of trying to help them understand the relationship between the supply chain and then, of course, the opportunity to serve (?) customer base. so, you know, the effort is quite large and diverse. and our goal for 2010 and beyond is to carry the message of (.) to pursue the mission, i guess, in such a way that we engage more nations and more of these other institutions including the multi-national corporations.

I: mhm. now, for climate politics itself. in your view, who or what is the real problem of global warming?
P: we think it’s two-fold. there is an issue associated with the use, the continuing demand of humans for fossil fuels or demand for energy and the ability (.) or the dependency that we have had the past years on fossil fuels as a way of satisfying that demand. fossil fuels are by nature a problem in that they represent a source of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere that jeopardizes the balance between oxygen and co2 on the planet. the growth of demand for fossil fuels has been so great in the past 50 years, let’s say, that we now have exceeded the capacity of the atmosphere to assimilate that additional co2 and the result has been (all the many?) (?) that (??) are associated with global warming and climate change. that’s a result of the greenhouse gas effect. so, on the one side of the coin, the missions associated with the continuing dependency on fossil fuels create a significant problem for us. on the other side of the coin (?, of the fence?) there is the on-going demand for energy associated with the continued consumption of goods and services certainly in the west (.). there is an enormous demand on the fossil fuels in order to satisfy the consumption patterns that western humans have become used to. and then, with regards to the developing economies and i think of those in india and china, but elsewhere, too you know, they likely so ask, you know, ‘why can’t we also have many of the things the westerners have enjoyed for the past (?50?) years or so and to what extent now can we develop our economies so that we can satisfy the quality of life or demands that our population represents?’. so, you got the supply side, basically, and the demand side. and those two issues, i think, characterize (.). or maybe focus our attention best on how to address climate change and perhaps effectuate reasonable solutions.

I: could you tell me more about the right solutions to climate change? what would you think would be ‘right’ solutions regarding climate change?

P: well, we obviously need to work on the supply side to either shift the demand away from fossil fuels or to in some way reduce the carbon content of the emissions that we are responsible for. that’s a difficult problem, of course, because there is basic chemistry involved in trying to remove carbon dioxide from carbon-based fuels. You can only get so much without spending more energy to control carbon dioxide than the energy that the fuel’s worth in the first place. so, with continued improvements in pollution control or pollution prevention devices we think it’s possible to effectuate some change there. at the same time, there needs to be a clear movement away from fossil fuels and to other sources of energy we think of renewables as an important alternative, especially with aspect to what is called (?pink?) power. but you know,
there may also have to be more attention given to the
nuclear option because, as it turns out, continued
dependency on fossil fuels to supply the energy needs just
can’t happen without there being disastrous consequences.
i think everybody is clear about that now. so, that’s the
supply side. on the demand side, we’re discovering that
there is a need to begin to change people’s behaviors and
to begin to affect the way of people think about the
demand for products and for services, of course but
products for the most part; products that might not be
necessary to support quality of life or products that are
just not made very efficiently in the first place. and it
turns out that there seems to be a groundswell of interest
in people trying to optimize their consumption. now, it’s
a slow process because we are talking about, of course,
trying to change the behaviorial habits of hundreds of
millions if not billions of people. that takes time. but I
believe that governments and many corporations and
certainly many non-profit groups are all beginning to
speak the same voice, to share the same messages, to
encourage people to begin to think in different ways about
the ways in which they use energy and (?reckon?) the
demands they make on the eco-system, basically, in
demanding certain products, products that are not aligned
with quality of life, seem to be unnecessary and therefore
maybe represent the best opportunity to shift demand for
greenhouse gases or demand for co2 and to represent at the
same time a change of behavior that will get us for long-
term shift that we’re looking for.

I: if you think about ‘wrong’ solutions what would you say
would be ‘wrong’ solutions to climate change?

P: i think, continuing to debate the issue is a wrong
solution. It seems to me that the science is very clear,
that climate change is not only occurring now to
relatively mild degrees but bound to occur in a much more
dramatic way if we are not able to act effectively between
now and let’s say 2030. i’m sure you’re familiar with the
stern commission (??) [yes] i believe that work, that
effort has set the stage for (??) clear terms by telling
us that, you know that, if we don’t invest appropriately
in alternatives to energy and in terms of shifting
consumer behavior or consumer demand, then you know, we
will in effect experience the worst effects of climate
change. and nicholas stern went on to write ‘if we don’t
act appropriately before 2020 or 2030 at the outside then,
you know,(.) the problem will not have been effectively
addressed and we will have lost the issue’. You know, that
creates a very difficult situation for everybody, of
course, because climate change is a global phenomenon and
all people will feel the effects of it. so, i think the
short answer to your question is that inaction is the way
not to address this issue.

I: could you tell me what you understand by ‘climate
justice’? what is your idea of this term?

P: well, we’re certainly attentive to the subject of
environmental justice which is a localized impact, an
inequality, an unequally shared burden related back to
emissions or pollution of some kind. and when i say
‘unequally shared’ i mean that it tends to impact the poor
communities more, the less educated and less well-off
communities. and i believe that in terms of climate
change, we can begin to talk about social injustice in the
same way. (as we mentioned, that’d be?) shifting patterns
of rainfall and temperature, you know, dramatic changes
across the planet in terms of the ability of the land base
to provide of food and other basic needs for people and it
seems to me that the poor communities, the developing
economies, the ones that are currently stressed or
unstable are the economies that will likely feel the
effects of climate change first and perhaps worst. it may
be that this happens more (?rapidly?) than anybody is
expecting and therefore we can expect there will be (??)
in these developing nations, these core nations, before
the wealthy nations, you know, are hit hard. everybody
will feel these effects. now, the ‘global footprint
network’ is particularly active in places like africa now,
making an effort to educate leaders in the various nations
there as to the problems of the imbalance associated with
bio-capacity production and consumption. in many nations
in africa, for example, it’s true right now that they have
a surplus of bio-capacity, that in the nation, the demand
for bio-capacity is less than the ability of the land base
to produce natural resources or natural capital. what
we’re discovering is that other nations are looking at
that (??) bio-capacity and beginning to appropriate it for
their own needs. and so for example, china is acting in
africa and making a large effort to try to secure
contracts that would satisfy the needs of the chinese
people. and so, we see trade relationships taking shape
between the nations in africa and nations like china that
represent long-term problems because the flow of bio-
capacity from one continent to another is not the answer,
and so for example, china is acting in
africa and making a large effort to try to secure
contracts that would satisfy the needs of the chinese
people. and so, we see trade relationships taking shape
between the nations in africa and nations like china that
represent long-term problems because the flow of bio-
capacity from one continent to another is not the answer,
in latin america, we’re trying to work with the nations there. many nations now understand this imbalance that i’ve just mentioned and they are beginning to ask questions about how they can manage their bio-capacity so they don’t find themselves in, you know, a (mate?), dead-end situation. ecuador is maybe the best example of a nation that has just recently understood the importance of (.) maintaining a surplus bio-capacity production. they have recently moved into a situation where they are (.) demanding more in terms of a long bio-capacity needs than the nation has been able to produce. In other words, they’ve slipped below the curve and this is troubling them. in fact, they have now adopted the ecological footprint and built it into their political structure there so that every agency is required to report the status of bio-capacity that the agency is responsible for managing. and we think this is a terrific first step and we are beginning to work with other nations in latin america to do likewise – for example, the central andean nations. we are working with brazil, we are working with mexico and are quite excited about the opportunity to begin changing people’s thinking about the net effects of the production and consumption of natural capital.

I: ok, yeah. now i would like to know how you assess the international climate negotiations.

P: well, i think everybody – and again, i’ gonna mix a little of my own perspective here with the ‘global footprint network’s’ perspective. gfn the global footprint network was prepared to observe an upright failure at copenhagen but i think there may have been some positive outcomes at that meeting. you know, president obama was there and very anxious to try and facilitate some kind of agreement between the nations although the voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the (?)trend/trim? ?associated to?) those emissions that agreement, you know, the sort of (?)title written enforceable agreement?) that we might have wanted, it is nonetheless an agreement on the part of all nations, including china to at least make these trends known, and the visibility associated with that be the simple fact that they’re paying attention now and reporting at all. and this trend is, in my mind, a positive sign. the second outcome which i was very interested to see had to do with the interest of a global community now and somehow rewarding nations for preserving their forest land base. you may be familiar with the reductions and de-forestations and destruction of forestry, the REDD agreement? i think that’s a very (??) new development. and so we see now for the first time nations with a strong forest canopy or with the opportunity to manage their forest land base in a variety of ways, suddenly now facing the opportunity to receive
monetary payment for not only preserving forest but
perhaps even for building back the forest canopy that was
once there. so, restoration of natural capital becomes an
opportunity for nations that’s very much in line this
ecological asset management idea that I spoke about
earlier. It’s very encouraging to see that.

I: imagine a friend is asking you ‘who attends the climate
conference?’ - what would you answer to that question?
P: I’m sorry, I don’t understand your question - say again.
I: if someone is asking you ‘who attends at the climate
conference?’ what would you answer to that question?
P: I would say (.) you know, if not having attended I don’t
know for certain, but I would imagine that it is a
complete cross-section of humanity. That you have world
leaders and I know for a fact that not only do the heads
of nations attend but, you know, their very highly placed
representatives may attend in their stead if for some
reasons they decide not to go. There are agency
representatives, people from various government agencies
across the world who come together and deliberate on
topics that (??) interested in, and I know that non-
government organizations attend in great (force?). You
know, I think that not only do they often have opinions to
share about what’s going on there and the news that comes
up (.) day to day. If not hour to hour. But they also have
an interest base that they are trying to build and a
mission they are trying to pursue. So they bring, you
know, a quite wide-ranging set of materials with them to
begin to present potential solutions to the climate change
issue. I think that’s very healthy, you know, it’s good to
have all these opportunities and ideas and the (??) people
scrutinize. Out of that complex mix of ideas no doubt, one
or two percent of them are going to survive and (??) with
us, you know, a real viable solution to (??). So, I think
the opportunity to talk about all these many good ideas
will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we’re
looking for.

I: do you think there is anyone there at these conferences
who shouldn’t be there?
P: no, I don’t think so. If anybody can come, then that’s a
good thing because, again, such a meeting deserves to hear
as many different points of view as possible and it’s a
great education for individuals who can show up. Now,
should the all attend the large meetings, the large
sessions? No, because I think that confuses the issue even
more. We’ve already talked about meeting that involves in
many cases hundreds of people (??) sessions for example -
and it’s difficult enough to try to work with a group that
size, representing the various nations, you know, to
imagine additional people participating in the meeting in a formal way, it would just become chaotic.

I: the other way round is there anyone missing in this conference?

P: i don’t know if i can answer that. what i can say is that there (. ) if indigenous peoples are not represented at these meetings in some way, then that’s probably not appropriate. it would seem to me that there is a great deal of wisdom to be (?heired) from the experience of indigenous peoples but in a similar way, they may have some quite extraordinary ideas that, you know, more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration. so, i think, no (. ) if these underprivileged nations or communities, if these developing economies, the indigenous peoples are not represented, then that’s not appropriate

I: what do you think about the protest activities outside the climate conference at copenhagen? in the streets, the protest activities.

P: i think it’s important that people have the opportunity to voice their frustrations with the process. i think it’s appropriate that the people have an opportunity to try to make the urgency of the situation known to decision-makers and leaders. i don’t think it’s appropriate to come to such meetings and try to make statements that aren’t relevant to the discussions going on. i mean, it’s a meeting about climate change and so i believe that even protest activities should be developed, need to be focused on the issue at hand. if there are sideline issues or derivative issues, you know, those are probably expressed more effectively in different forms. but again, i think it’s healthy to have (. ) that people have a voice in situations like this

I: have there been special activities of ‘global footprint network’ at copenhagen?

P: yes. mathis wackernagel, the founder and president of ‘global footprint network’ was present, we had authorized or proved, as you know, and had alongside events going on and press conferences and (. ) social events. there was to my understanding a table set up, maybe a couple of tables that allowed ‘global footprint network’ to present some of the materials that we had developed in the past related to bio-capacity production and consumption and the relationship of natural capital to the issues at hand. as we already talked (. ) energy efficiency and the embodied energy is the link between the climate change debate and the work the global footprint network does. you know, to that extent, our (?) was to try to educate the people that what we refer to is the need for ‘carbon-plus’-thinking which means we’re looking at embodied energy
associated with (?trade?) specifically. but we're not
limiting ourselves to the carbon component but rather
beginning to understand that carbon is connected to all of
the other natural capital and bio-capacity production
issues or that it’s related to all the other different
land types in the same way that, you know, grazing and
agriculture are related, in the same way that fishing and
agriculture are related. they’re just expressions of the
same activity on the (?) seeking, you know, satisfying
the various needs that people have for quality of life.
but at the same time doing so in ways that deserve greater
attention, (??) prove the energy efficiency of those
activities and of course the environmental effects of bio-
capacity demand.

I: i got a very open question. but perhaps (.) there is some
information you can give me. are there certain positions
of other ngos which you would strictly contradict? and
which ones would that be?
P: oh, i don’t know if i can answer that question. i really
have not studied the formal positions of these other ngos.
it wouldn't surprise me if there was a group that was
offering a solution that we felt, you know, was not into
the practical realities of nature. but i don’t know
anything of specific terms that i could point to.

I: ok. so, at the end of the interview, i got some more
concrete questions, like this one what do you read when
you want to know about climate change ordinate politics?
P: well, i go to the sources as much as i can, i am very
interested to see, you know, on nearly a daily basis the
discussions related to ongoing conversations within the
united nations and across the european community
especially, because there is so much more activity on this
conflict there as anywhere else. so, yeah, i look at the
united nations environmental programme news, i of course
look at the ongoing efforts of the academicians or
scientists, we always are interested in learning about new
data and new (?hypocrisies?/hypotheses?) that are coming
along, so we are linked into a variety of different
organizations that report to us periodically - or report
the world at large periodically about new data that would
inform the debate and the argument better. the inter-
governmental panel on climate change and all the various
committees associated with that, the individuals who make
up those committees are all part of the network that we
try to stay in touch with.

I: are there particular places besides the website of 'global
footprint network' where the 'global footprint network'
has (.)

[Leitung unterbrochen]
stated its programmes, its demands regarding climate politics? are there some particular places besides the website where I can find information about this? (.) It’s about the programme or the demands of ‘global footprint network’, if there is any text or (.) something where I can find these (.)

P: are you asking if we have submitted materials [yes] better not on the website that might reflect some of the perspective that we offer? right?

I: yes, that’s right.

P: you know, I don’t think so. I think pretty much everything that we have written is reflected in some way on the website. I know, for example, that our communications team tries to keep people informed very regularly about new efforts that we make to, you know, to communicate our perspectives about all the subjects that we discussed. I know, you know, there is information about how we improve the ecological footprint, the efforts that we make to (.) build stronger relationships with our many application partners, I know that Mathis has a letter to the editor or something to that effect that we send out (?during?) the press release. All of that is reported pretty (?routinely?) on the website. [ok] in fact, if you haven’t had a chance to really look in that, let me recommend to do so because there is a lot of stuff there that is hidden <<lacht>> and it really takes a dedicated effort to locate it. In fact, I think it shows the need for us to take the website to a whole new level which is something that we’re giving serious attention to in 2010. So, (.) we should be able to make a lot of the information that is hidden there more visible and therefore more accessible to people. But I think if you explore, you’ll find that there’s a lot of current content and again, to my knowledge, (?everything?) we go public with is in some place located there on the website.

I: the last question would be if you could tell me a little bit about the funding of ‘global footprint network’, how is it financed?

P: (.) We’re funded basically from three different sources. From foundations and therefore the grants that foundations offer, from direct service contracts, typically with governments but not only governments some of the large corporations that I’ve mentioned –, and then donations. Donations that may come from, you know, large individuals, wealthy individuals or lots of little donations that are coming in from around the world. Those three sources make up the lion’s share of the money that we have to work with.

I: thank you. So, that’s it as far as I’m concerned. But perhaps you think there is anything from your part which
you want to add, anything that is important to you and
that hasn’t come up in the interview yet i don’t know (.)
P: i don’t think so, philip. you know, i appreciate having
the chance to answer your questions and i wish you well
with this course study. i of course would be very
interested to see how this is all used. i am particularly
interested in the information that you may have gotten
from some of the other interviews you’ve done. i’d like to
see some of that at some point.
I: yeah. if i get some results i can send them to you but i’m
still in the process of doing these interviews. and then i
will try to analyze them. i think i still need some time.
but i got your email-address and is it ok to get in
contact with you by this email-address?
P: you bet. you bet, any time. i’d be delighted to stay in
touch, ok?
I: ok.
P: great.
I: then i say thank you very very much for this interview.
P: you’re welcome.
I: and i wish you a nice time.
P: bye bye.
I: take care. bye.
A.3.8 Transkript »GJEP/ CJN! – Global Justice Ecology Project/ Climate Justice Now!«

I: let me start with the question how was it that you joined the climate justice now organization or network?

P: well it's it (.) as i said it's really important there's an alternative to can. and this was the first year here in copenhagen that climate justice now has been given equal access to the n g o resources that can used to monopolize. so used to be that climate justice now will have to beg for a room or beg for time (?at/ in?) a press conference because climate action network was given that exclusive right. but now the secretary had said you and climate justice (.) and climate action network will have to share. so we now have official space within [mhm] the climate justice network will have to share. so we now have official space within [mhm] the climate process to have a room at press conferences and all that. so that's a interesting development. so it's really the climate justice manifestation within the u n climate convention (.) since the climate action network does not have that. so it's a very important role.
I: what would you think would be the greatest success for climate justice now? when we are not in we aren't in need [ok] of climate justice now anymore?
P: what's that?
I: when you think we are
P: well when will we not be needed anymore? well i guess <<lachend> when> when we have a whole new social structure in place in this=on this world. a whole new system that's not depended on capitalist economics i think then there will not be a role for climate justice now anymore. [ok]
until then i have the feeling that climate problems are going to continue to intensify.
I: could you describe me on what main areas climate justice now is working on?
P: well it's a lot of human rights work. working in solidarity with the indigenous peoples' organizations [mhm] working on the adaptation issues, the financing issue, i mean really that the technical details of the discussion on the texts that are coming out of the u n climate convention they focus on those (. ) explicitly and go at them (. ) from the climate justice perspective to try to build more just text into the agreements. [mhm] well also (. ) trying to bring the voices of people who are outside of the talks, you know the social movements, the peasants, the farmers, the fisher folk, [mhm] the women, and so on who are not permitted to come in (. ) to provide a to try to take their voices and their messages and bring them inside [mhm] so that those voices are also heard inside the talks.
I: let me ask you (. ) what is your personal connection to the climate issue. how long have you been (. ) involved in the climate change topic
P: ah foo probably since the mid nineties or so=i mean we've known that this is gonna be==or this is becoming a major problem for a very long time and it's one of these issues that's very daunting as far as how do you (?cluck?) into it, how do you get involved. [mhm] and it=like i said it wasn't until one of our issues was directly plugged into the u n climate convention that we got involved at the international level. and now that we're involved at the international level it seems that like the alliance building work that we're doing and the work to (. ) build the climate justice movement not just internationally but now in the united states as well has really given us a better frame for our work on climate change.
I: regarding climate change, what do you think are=is the real problem of climate change?
P: the real problem of climate change is the- [or global
warming] yea as i mentioned is the underlying drivers it's 
really what we're trying to get (?out=is?) the underlying 
drivers of climate change=so [mhm] and that comes down to 
i think ultimately this system of infinite growth on a 
finite planet you know that's really the root cause of 
climate change is the idea that we can continue exploiting 
more and more resources every year on the planet so you 
know to concentrate the wealth in fewer and fewer hands 
and think that there will not be an ecological consequence 
to that. i mean humans are another species on the planet 
along with the billions of other [mhm] species on this 
planet. and we are absolutely bound to the same natural 
laws as all the other species. so we have (. ) we have 
over- what's the word (. ) used too much of the ecosystem. 
we've overused it [mhm] and were abusing it and now the 
ecosystem is starting to collapse. and as happens with all 
other species that do the same thing (. ) you know 
eventually the human population is=it's going to end up 
coming down as well (. ) it's just, you know, it's just 
because we are part of this planet and part of an 
ecosystem as well.

I: (. ) could you tell me, what do you think would be real 
solutions to the climate crisis?

P: well it's gonna be the transformation away from that 
system and we're going to have to as humans on this planet 
figure out, how we wanna live [mhm] in a way that's not 
ecologically destructive and i think as we (. ) approach 
that goal, we will simultaneously start to see how we can 
live in more socially just way. one of the reasons that we 
work in solidarity with so many indigenous groups is 
because they come with a lot of knowledge about how we can 
actually live on this planet in a way that's not 
destructive. [mhm] they still, you know they've been=a lot 
of these groups have (. ) many millennia of experience in 
how to do that. so we need to draw from that experience as 
we figure out how to build the new (. ) system that's not-= 
new society that's not going to destroy the very land that 
sustains us. [mhm]

I: if you're talking about climate justice (. ) what do you 
understand by climate justice?

P: well climate justice is (. ) is kind of an emerging 
philosophy, an emerging (. ) way of doing work within the 
climate (?round?) that (?sort of/ sorted?) about ten years 
ago, in the late nineties [mhm] and since then has=it's 
gone to a number of sort of settlements to come where it 
is now. and i think now that the climate justice issue is, 
it's tying the social issues together with the climate 
issues. so it's understanding that (. ) we are exploiting 
the earth or simultaneously exploiting violating human 
rights violating the rights of indigenous peoples. and
these things all go together that you know engender injustice (. ) all of these things are part of the same problem(??=so (?with?) climate justice i think is exploring that how all of these problems have the same root causes and the climate issue i think is the perfect umbrella of showing how all of these issues interconnect. so it's really try to look at the big picture of climate and figure out if we're gonna make a difference on climate (.) how we gonna make a difference on all these other issues as well. [mhm] (. ) i hope that makes sense.

I: ((lacht)) yes. regarding the climate negotiations, how do you assess them?

P: well they've been pretty a bit small ((lacht)). and they've been getting worse i mean were bad in 2004, the first one we went to and (. ) maybe it's gotten worse and worse and worse. and this one's the worst yea, you know this copenhagen one where they're supposed to coming up with the next round of commitments under kyoto and what they're coming up with is- or first of all let's get rid of any binding emission targets [mhm] you know let's make them all voluntary. let's make them all offset. even so offsets are not proven to do a damn thing for actually addressing climate change and let's make the targets for emissions reductions so unbelievably low that even if we did stick to them it wouldn't make a damn rather difference anyway. so that ((lacht)) it's it's mind-blowing it actually how bad the direction is moving [mhm] beyond (. ) i mean james hansen even, the climate scientist, said that if there's an agreement that comes out of this copenhagen deal it will be a disaster. [mhm] and that will be worse than nothing. because it will be an agreement that everybody has come to. it will look like there's some forward motion on climate when in fact it's actually moving backwards.

I: how do you assess the chances to influence this process of negotiation?

P: au i think the only way we're gonna influence this process is to access posit for the fraud that it is. so that the world understands that we need to get rid of it and try something else. because as long as the un f c c c is in place and doing this kind of (. ) bullshit negotiating we are in (?effort to ?? this crew?). so [mhm] working on to try to expose it and a abolish it.

I: (. ) what do you want to achieve in copenhagen?

P: exactly that ((lacht))

I: ok

P: <<lachend>>to, you know and i think this is a, copenhagen> has a real opportunity to expose this process. because there are so many social movements that are mobilizing
both on the inside [mhm] of the talks and on the outside of the talks. and i think what we're going to see over the next week and a half as this talks continue is an extreme amount of repression against the movements. and at what i'm hoping is that, when people around the world see that level of repression that suddenly they understand that this is not a just process, this is not a fair process, and this u n climate convention is not about solving climate change. it's about empowering corporations to continue business as usual under the guise of dealing with climate change. so i'm hoping that all of this becomes clear and that of this that the u n climate convention is exposed and eliminated and something else created that actually can do the job.

I: imagine a friend is asking you, you is participating at the climate negotiations. what would you answer?

P: who's participating?

I: yea.

P: well there's levels of participation that people who are actually making the deals behind closed doors are the country delegations and particularly the developed country delegations as this leaked danish text that [mhm] came out a couple of days ago proves. you know the big powers of the world are still collaborating and conspiring to figure out how to control everything and use the developing countries for their own means in the way that they always have. it's just in a continuation of the imperialist, colonialist model, that's been going on for a long time. so really they're the one making the decisions. then the developing countries get to participate the extent that, you know, they can have some input into the text with this or that. then you have the in- you know the non-governmental organizations and the indigenous peoples' organizations who get to talk to the country delegations and try to get something in there, you know maybe they get statements for a minute or two [mhm] minutes throughout the two weeks. but they're- that participation is extremely limited. there's no formal(ly?) participation allowed. ((räuspert sich)) and there is everybody else that's on the outside, who doesn't have any participation at all. [ok] so except through the groups that are trying to ensure their voices are heard. but it's really, it's extremely hierarchically. it's extremely patriarchically and it's extremely problematic.

I: (.) could you tell me what do people say about climate justice now in copenhagen?

P: well it depends i guess who you talk to. ((lacht))

I: <<lachend> yea. tell me>

P: i think you know there's some really good points to
climate justice now that we've- that people have pointed
out about trying to share peoples' voices from the outside
and have a i- solid coalition of groups that's an
alternative to can. [mhm] but then there's also very
necessary critique of climate justice now. saying that
they're too involved in the internal process. they're to
involved in the arguing of the text [mhm] and trying to
tget countries to do this and that and that maybe they
should be putting a little more pressure on. being a
little bit more vocal and militant in what they're
demanding rather than just kind of this sort of not very
radical position that many of the groups in c j n have.
[mhm]

I: (...) are you keen on football? (lacht)

P: on what?

I: on football? because imagine the negotiations as a
football [mhm] match. what would be your comment?

P: yea. well it seems like the the industrialized countries
have rigged the game. you know they've already bought of
the referees and so, you know, they've made sure that
they're gonna win. no matter what happens in the actual
arena. [yea] so i think that it's pretty unfair.

I: (...) could you tell me something about the activities of
climate justice now, generally speaking?

P: well the climate justice now comes together every morning
and in the evenings to try to talk about what's going on
in the inside of the negotiations [mhm] how they can
influence what's going on. where the opportunities are,
what the newest developments are, what countries are
saying what, so that they- you know to try create some
kind of a strategy for having some kind of (...) influence
into the process. in addition to that they have press
conferences where they talk about the issues and try to
get a venue for peoples' voices that aren't being heard
[mhm] and they're also trying to take what's going on
inside the negotiations and broadcast out to the rest of
the world. so the rest of the world has an understanding
of what's happening [mhm] inside the negotiations. so they
try to do all these things that there's a lot of, you know
lot of very valuable stuff that c j n does.

I: (...) what do you think about the protests outside the
negotiations?

P: they're critical. and i think they're critically
important. and that's one thing that's been very lacking.
in fact we wrote an article in 2001 that quoted an article
from the guardian saying, that the one big thing that was
missing at these climate talks was big angry protest
outside. that was the only way that governments were
potentially even gonna think about listening. and so i
think it's been a long time coming that they're will gonna have very militant angry protests outside of the convention centre and i think it's a (. ) really critical part of trying to put things forward.

I: what do you think about the mobilization of autonomous groups, i mean direct action?

P: you mean like the folks who were coming in for the 12th?

I: but there are many people coming for <<lachend>> the 12th.>

P: no, no those thought <<lachend>> i got this> people who are got at the- the people who are called never trust a cop {{gleichzeitig}} is who i'm talking about.

I: {{gleichzeitig}} yea that's for example- yea

P: is that who you're talking about?

I: yea.

P: ok. well you know (. ) all i can say is that when you have this kind of process that's so thoroughly corrupt from top to bottom, it's not surprising to me, that people are really pissed of and wanna come and take out some of their anger. that's just say it's not a surprise. [mhm]

I: (. ) could you tell me who is climate justice now cooperating with?

P: who they're cooperating with?

I: yes.

P: well i know that c j n is working with climate justice action, which is the groups mobilizing on the outside to have coordinated activities inside and outside. they are, i mean they are- i don't- i think there's a hundred and sixty one groups now, that are members of climate justice now. [mhm] so they have- you know they work broadly with everybody from via campesina, which is the peasants movement [yea] to, you know, friends of the earth, which is a much larger n g o to fisher folk and indigenous peoples. i think they're trying to work with as many of the different sectors that are out there as possible.

I: (. ) could you imagine certain positions of n g os or movements which you would fundamentally oppose?

P: i'm sorry say it again.

I: some certain positions of n g os or movements that you- which you would fundamentally contradict.

P: yea there are definitely some positions that some of the n g os take that i don't particularly agree with. some of the positions on redd for example. the reducing emissions from deforestation scheme [mhm] and some of the other positions of the n g os where they really feel like they
have to support the positions of the developing countries.
so for example [mhm] tuvalu is calling for 45 per cent
emission reductions by 2050 and i believe that the n g os
would be much more successful if they didn't support that
goal but actually asked for more. [mhm] you know if the n
ng os were saying no need 80 per cent reductions by 2020
[mhm] i think that would strengthen the position of
countries like tuvalu or right now being considered the
extreme position because they're asking for the most of
anybody. [mhm] i think that their position would be
strengthened if there is an even more extreme position
because then their position starts to look more
reasonable. moderate. [mhm] so i think when the n g os beg
the countries they're actually doing them a disservice. i
believe that they should be much more aggressive and
radical in their demands.

I: could you think about more (. ) other (. ) positions which
you think you don't like them?
P: that's the main one. that's really the one that is burring
in my mind.
I: <<lachend>ok>
P: i'm sure there're others but i am not thinking about
[<<lachend>ok>] it at this moment.
I: i got a provocative question. what do you think- how would
the secret service refer to climate justice now?
P: (. ) i don't know. probably a (?category?) of troublemakers
and [yea] but not, you know, but not to dangerous just
yet.
I: ok. at the end i got some more concrete questions. so-
what do you read if you want to know about climate
politics or climate change?
P: the list serve ((lacht))
I: <<lachend>ok>
P: <<lachend>climate justice list serve>, the durban group
for climate justice has a list serve and it's always, i
mean there's no shortage of really good information [mhm]
that goes across the lists. i don't need to go anywhere
else really.
I: ( . ) and what's the you don't read?
P: what's the?
I: what you don't read?
P: what do i not read?
I: yea
P: (. ) well i guess i don't read a lot of what the climate
deniers are <<lachend>putting out there. you know the
people who i disagree with> let's say i don't read their stuff all that often [yea] cause there's too much interesting information out there for me to read, so

I: (.) do you know when you met with the term climate justice the first time?

P: with the durban group for climate justice we co-founded the durban group for climate justice in 2004 [mhm] in october. so that was the first time i came into close contact with that term and understood it and began to work with it.

I: (.) and how could you tell me a little bit more about the fundings of climate justice now. how is it financed?

P: it's not really. it doesn't- climate justice now itself doesn't really get much in the way of money. there's i think some=a few foundations are putting a few thousand dollars toward the website and media work but aside from that it's basically all the different n g os just putting in their own peoples' time and resources.

I: (.) i think that's it as far as i'm con-=concerned but perhaps you think there's something missing which is really important to mention?

P: (.) no. i think you did a great job. [yea] very thorough.

I: and how did you like being interviewed?

P: that's fine. it's very easy- it was easy to be er honest.

I: that's nice. and what was your motivation for being interviewed? (.) i have asked you

P: pretty much yes exactly. you asked and why not. seem like you're doing some good work, so.

I: you're doing many interviews at copenhagen.

P: yea, that's why i have no voice left.
I: Als Einstiegsfrage dachte ich mir (.) mal wissen zu wollen wie kam das dazu dass du zu Greenpeace gestoßen bist?

P: 

I: Was denkst du denn ist die Rolle von Greenpeace?

P: Die Rolle von Greenpeace ist als political pressure group für (.) den Einsatz von Umweltschutztechnologien und für Umweltschutz und Klimaschutz zu kämpfen

I: Gab es da (.) also in der vergangenen Zeit bestimmte Höhepunkte in Bezug auf die politische Agenda von Greenpeace (.) besonders ins Auge-

P: Es gab immer wieder spannende Themen immer wieder Höhenpunkte (.). ein Höhepunkt in der Zeit war sicherlich die Auseinandersetzung um die Brent Spar (.). aber (.). man muss auch sagen dass ich die Arbeit gar nicht an den Höhenpunkten festmachen (.). sollte denn Brent Spar das was in den Medien als Höhepunkt war wurde erst eigentlich drei Jahre später zum Erfolg geführt als es ein Plattformversenkungsverbot für über 450 Ölplattformen in der Nordsee gab was dann eigentlich so als medialen Höhepunkt überhaupt keine Rolle mehr gespielt hat das war dann dort wo wir unser Protest unsere Protestaktionen zum Erfolg geführt haben haben in ein politisch legales Abkommen im Rahmen der OSPAR(.). und so sieht das oft bei uns aus die Kohleproteste haben wir jetzt auch vielfach gemacht- hauptsächlich Protestaktionen sind für Greenpeace immer auch Höhepunkte wobei sie ja auch immer sehr symbolhaft sind und der Erfolg dann über Gesetzesmaßnahmen über (.). gesellschaftliche Rahmenbedingungen dann auch oftmals viel später eingefahren wird

I: Was wäre denn der größte Erfolg für Greenpeace? Wann bräuchte es Greenpeace nicht mehr?

P: Wenn wir die Umwelt gerettet haben (.). das heißt hier jetzt bezogen auf die Klimaverhandlungen ist es sicherlich so dass wir einen Erfolg hätten wenn wir bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts (.). eine Gesellschaft haben, die kein CO2 mehr aus stößt und damit klimaverträglich ist also das heißt Treibhausgasreduktion bis zum Jahr 2050 auf nahe
Null

I: Ok (.) wie lange arbeitet denn Greenpeace so zum Klimabereich?

P: (. ) Oh exakt ist immer schwierig aber wir haben ( . ) wir haben schon relativ früh davon angefangen ( . ) und zwar ( . ) haben wir 1990 1992 ein Buch herausgegeben die Wärmekatastrophe und das war eigentlich der Hauptanfang wo wir zu Klima gearbeitet hatten Daten müsste ich nach gucken jetzt genau

I: Du persönlich?

P: 

I: Im Bezug auf Klimawandel was ist da eigentlich- das eigentliche Problem? Also gibt es da- beziehungsweise wer wen oder was würdest du da als das eigentliche Problem bezeichnen?

P: Das ( . ) Problem im Bezug des Klimawandels ( . ) ist der hohe Ausstoß von Treibhausgasen die die Erdatmosphäre ( . ) belasten mit Gasen die zum Treibhauseffekt führen und damit die Erdtemperatur erhöhen und zu ( . ) enormen Klimaauswirkungen führen sowie zu sozialen Verwerfungen von Gesellschaftssystemen bis hin zu Klimakriegen und Millionen von Klimaflüchtlingen die wir in Zukunft haben und damit ist das dann natürlich auch ein Gerechtigkeitsproblem

I: Was wären denn dann richtige oder real solutions?

P: Also eine solution ( . ) und eine real solution ist sicherlich die erneuerbaren Energien das hängt ganz eng mit zusammen- die Nutzung von Windenergie die Nutzung von Sonnenenergie möglichst dezentral und- ( . ) klar ist natürlich auch dass wir insgesamt mit der Ressourcenverschwendung auch herunter müssen also die Ressourcenverschwendung ist (?dort?) auch ein Grundproblem

I: Würdest du da noch weitere Sachen anfügen oder?

P: Naja wenn es um Klimaverhandlungen geht erstmal nicht

I: Weil ich jetzt nach real solutions gefragt hab (??) auch nach false solutions was würdest du als false solution bezeichnen?

P: Also false solutions sind immer die Lösungen die ( . ) nicht an der Wurzel anpacken und ( . ) das ist natürlich ganz klar CCS Technologie also das ( . ) Abscheiden und Speichern von
CO2 im Untergrund klar ist auch dass man ein Risiko mit
dem anderen Risiko nicht aufwiegen kann das heißt
Nukleartechnologie ist eine falsche (.) Lösung und all die
Geotechnologien die versuchen unser Wetter über
Geingeneering zu beeinflussen sind natürlich falsche
Lösungen

I: Was würdest du denn- oder was verstehst du unter
Klimagerechtigkeit? Dieser Begriff- (.)
P: (.) Klimagerechtigkeit ist (.) in Bezug auf die
Verhandlungen hier jetzt ein Punkt wo eigentlich jeder und
zwar jeder Mensch das gleiche Recht zu dem Zugang zu
Ressourcen die gleichen Pflichten zur Begrenzung der
Emissionen haben muss also das heißt auf lange Sicht so
wie beim Wahlrecht dass jedem Menschen nur noch eine
begrenzte CO2 Menge zur Verfügung steht ungefähr eine
Tonne pro Person und (.) beim Ausstoß und dass jedem
Menschen aber auch der Zugang zu Energieversorgung zu den
Dienstleistungen über erneuerbare Energien zu Verfügung
steht

I: Würdest du den Begriff verwenden?
P: Ja auf jeden Fall

I: Jetzt in Bezug auf die Klimaverhandlungen hier wie schätzt
du die ein die internationalen Klimaverhandlungen?
P: Hier in Kopenhagen habe ich die große Befürchtung dass das
ganze ein Greenwashing ist dass man um den heißen Brei
herum redet dass man sich nicht dem Ziel verschreibt die
Treibhausgase bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts wirklich auf
Null zu bringen was technisch möglich ist was die
Klimawissenschaftler sagen was fachlich notwendig ist und
wo (.) eigentlich der politische Wille fehlt und hier
sehen wir ganz klar auch auf den Klimaverhandlungen dass
bisher die Industriestaaten nicht bereit sind drastische
Treibhausgasreduktionen anzubieten und deshalb (.) ist
hier dieser ganze Prozess auch ins Stocken geraten man
versucht sich eher auf den kleinsten gemeinsamen Nenner zu
einigen und statt das in Erfolg daran zu messen was die
Klimawissenschaftler uns hier vorschreiben was wir machen
müsten

I: Wie beurteilst du denn die Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten hier?
P: (.) Die sind durchaus da also das heißt zum jetzigen
Zeitpunkt und wir sind ja mitten in den Verhandlungen gibt
es Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten (.) wenn der politische Wille
fehlt dann ist es erstmal auch wichtig dass die Heads of
States hier auch ankommen die Staatschefs auch mit in die
Verhandlungen einbezogen werden und wir haben es ja jetzt
so dass zum Ende der Verhandlungen auch sehr viel
Staatschefs zumindest die der großen Nationen auch alle
hier vor Ort sind und (.) dann muss es auch zum Schwur
kommen sie können das machen und dieser Erfolg ist möglich
I: Was möchte denn Greenpeace hier konkret erreichen?
P: Wir wollen hier erreichen dass sich die Staatschefs auf ein ambitioniertes faire, da spielt Klimagerechtigkeit natürlich auch eine Rolle, und rechtlich verbindliches Klimaabkommen- ein Kopenhagenprotokoll- dass sich die Staatschefs hierauf einigen

I: Stell dir vor ein Freund fragt dich, wer nimmt eigentlich so an den Klimaverhandlungen teil was würdest du denn darauf antworten?
P: (.) Die Länder aller Welt Delegationen der Länder aller Welt die Staatschefs und die Nichtregierungsorganisationen unter dem Dach der UN

I: Gibt es irgendwelche die du vermisst?
P: Es ist sicherlich so dass bei solchen internationalen Verhandlungen die (.) Stimmen der armen Menschen der Menschen die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel hier wenig (.) und auch klar zu wenig Gehör finden

I: Beziehungsweise andersherum gefragt dürfte jemand hier nicht sein der hier ist?
P: Wir sehen hier in den Verhandlungen auch dass die Industrie dass die Industrielobby (.) gerade in den letzten Jahren hier massiv auch ihre Präsenz zugelegt haben und (.) die haben ganz andere Interessen die sie verfolgen und da ist wirklich die Frage (.) inwieweit sie hier berechtigt sind an solchen Konferenzen auch solch einen Raum zur Verfügung zu bekommen wobei erstmal das Grundprinzip da ist dass hier auch alle miteinander reden das ist das Grundprinzip der UN und das finde ich ein ganz ganz wichtiges Grundprinzip

I: Wie wird denn in Kopenhagen so über Greenpeace geredet?
P: Das überlasse ich anderen

I: Ok (.) Stell dir vor die Klimakonferenz ist ein Fußballspiel was wäre da dein Kommentar?
P: Oh ich bin jetzt überhaupt nicht im Fußballfan- (.) ehrlich ich sehe die Parallelen nicht (.)

I: So im Hinblick auf die Frage von Legitimität der ganzen Veranstaltung

P: Also (.) die Frage wäre wo wenn nicht unter dem Dach der UN sollten Verhandlungen stattfinden hier hat jeder Staat sein Rederecht hier können die Ärmsten der Armen ihre Stimme erheben sie machen es auch aber natürlich ist es so dass hier bestimmte Staaten wie die U S A auch ihre Vorherrschaft sehr stark ausspielen und man sieht dass die großen Emittenten auch eine ganz ganz wesentliche Rolle hier spielen eine dominierende Rolle und es dort auch schwer ist das unter dem Dach der UN dann diese
Grundprinzipien einer fairen Verhandlung auch durch zu ziehen.

I: Was macht denn Greenpeace zum Klimathema?

P: Die Frage habe ich nicht verstanden.

I: Was macht Greenpeace denn so {{gleichzeitig} (??) Aktivitäten zum Klimathema}?

P: {{gleichzeitig} Was wir machen?} (.) also das heißt hier sind wir mit einer internationalen Gruppe von Experten aus der ganzen Welt vertreten und (.) wir machen neben der Lobbyarbeit hier konkret in der Konferenz auch außerhalb ein paar Aktivitäten und (.) wir dürfen aber auch hier das nicht verkennen dass letztendlich der gesamte Kohlewiderstand den wir weltweit im Vorfeld der Konferenz auch organisiert haben ganz genau so mit dazu gehört denn Klimaverhandlungen brauchen natürlich einmal den Raum der Verhandlungen selbst auf der anderen Seite auch den Protest bei den Hauptemittenten bei den Kohlekraftwerken zum Beispiel und wir haben gerade in den letzten drei Jahren eigentlich überall auf der Welt an Kohlekraftwerken protestiert also in den Philippinen in ganz Europa an den Kohlekraftwerken (.) auch in China wobei da der Protest nochmal ein bisschen anders aussieht aber letztendlich gibt es weltweit von uns Proteste gegen den Bau Neubau von Kohlekraftwerken und gegen diese Kohlendioxidschleudern vor Ort und dieser Protest gehört ganz genau so zu der Klimabewegung wie hier die Teilnahme in den Verhandlungen

I: Wie stehst du zu den Protesten jetzt außerhalb des Konferenzgeländes in Kopenhagen?

P: Also ich halte es für unbedingt notwendig dass es einen gesellschaftlichen Protest gegen die Bedingungen gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen gibt ich finde es sehr gut dass viele Demonstrationen stattfinden Greenpeace ist natürlich klar an den Protesten auf gewaltfreie Aktionen fokussiert

I: (?Das heißt?) anschließend wäre dann noch die Frage, wie stehst- was hältst du von diesen Mobilisierungen von autonomen Gruppen die ja jetzt hier auch (?nach?) Kopenhagen stattgefunden hat?

P: (.) Dazu kann ich nichts sagen.

I: Mit wem arbeitet Greenpeace eigentlich zusammen? Du hastest ein bisschen was schon gesagt.

I: Wie hat ihr euch konkret auf Kopenhagen vorbereitet?

P: (.) Das sind zwei Ebenen einerseits durch den Besuch der Vorkonferenzen haben wir die Vorkonferenzen im Wesentlichen mit einer Delegation mit vierzig Leuten aus der ganzen Welt begleitet also von 123 Barcelona Bangkok nicht ganz so stark jetzt Kopenhagen wir waren vorher ja schon präsent auch auf den Konferenzen aber diese vierzig Leute das Kernteam waren jetzt eigentlich auf diesen Vorbereitungskonferenzen und dann haben (wir uns?) inhaltlich darauf so darauf vorbereitet und das koordiniert wir haben auch uns (. in internationalen Aktionen und Teams so abgestimmt dass wir eben bestimmte Aktionen machen können und auch schnell reagieren können hier auf bestimmte Aussagen von Politikern

I: Gibt es denn bestimmte Positionen von NGOs und oder sozialen Bewegungen denen du denen Greenpeace fundamental widersprechen würde?

P: Das weiß ich nicht da müsstest du konkreter sagen welche ich will das mal anders sagen es hat sich ja jetzt entwickelt innerhalb des Climate Action Networks dass rausgegangen ist es hat sich entwickelt in den letzten zwei Jahren- es ist- Climate Justice Network gibt und Climate Justice Action und das ist eine Entwicklung, ich glaube der letzten zwei Jahre, wo das Thema der Klimagerechtigkeit ja im Vordergrund steht Climate Justice Now auch wie der Name sagt und (.) das ist sicherlich ein Thema was zurecht hoch gehalten wird was ich auch begrüße dass es hoch gehalten wird wo wir uns eventuell bei all den technischen Fragen zur Treibhausgasreduktion, also Greenpeace hat ja viele Studien gemacht zu Energy Revolution, Revolution des Energiesystems von Fossilen hin zu Erneuerbaren, sind ja alles wesentliche technische Konzepte und (.) da hat die Gerechtigkeitsfrage eher im Hintergrund gestanden und dieses Thema ist (.) denke ich auch vernachlässigt worden wir haben kürzlich na kürzlich also vor zwei Jahren eine Studie zu Klimaflüchtlingen auch veröffentlicht und glauben dass wir wesentlich stärker auf diese Fragen auch eingehen müssen (? dass das dort?) auch passiert und (. hier erhebt die Climate Justice Now Bewegung schon berechtigten Anspruch der auch (. hier oftmals in den Verhandlungen untergeht

I: Fallen dir da andere Punkte ein wo du sagen würdest (. irgendwie Greenpeace steht da eigentlich gegen?

P: {{gleichzeitig} (?irgendselche?} Inhalte}

283 P: {{gleichzeitig} Ne da müsstest du jetzt konkreter fragen wo denn eigentlich} (.) eine ganz zentrale Frage ist sicherlich eine Frage des Wirtschaftswachstums aber da muss man auch ganz klar sagen dass (. es einerseits hier in den Verhandlungen um ein ganz zentrales Thema des
Klimaschutzes und der CO2 Reduktion geht das ist auch eine
Stärke der Verhandlung [mhm] dass auf der anderen Seite
aber auch klar ist dass ich einen Ressourcen
verschwenderischen Lebensstil mit einem Wachstum wie es
von vielen Industriegesellschaften gefordert ist absolut
unvereinbar ist mit dem Reduktionspfad von CO2 das passt
nicht zusammen und das steht also praktisch als zweite
Kategorie sehr wohl dahinter auch wenn es hier so nicht
thematisiert wird

I: Ich habe zum Schluss ein paar konkretere Fragen
beispielsweise das (?je?) danach was du so zum Klimathema
oder Klimawandel liest und was nicht

P: Oh (.) ich lese eigentlich sehr sehr viel also viele
Fachbücher dazu (.) habe gerade in der letzten Zeit viel
über Klimaflüchtlinge gelesen (.) über den Konfliktfall
der Cap Anamur von Elias Bierdel (.) über (.)
interessanten- interessantes Buch auch über Kyoto plus ich
kenn jetzt die ganzen Namen nicht aber das ist ein weites
Feld was ich dort lese

I: Und was was wo du sagst das lese ich lieber [hustet]
nicht?

P: Nein das- da gibt es gar nichts was ich sage das lese ich
lieber nicht

I: Gibt es bestimmte Orte wo Greenpeace seine Forderungen und
Inhalte darlegt?

P: Ja also das heißt im Moment spielt natürlich hier die
Musik in Kopenhagen auf den Verhandlungen deshalb sind wir
auch hier ansonsten ist immer ein wichtiger Ort der Ort
der Quelle des Verursachers und Greenpeace ist ja bekannt
für die direkten Aktionen deshalb steht für uns das
Kohlekraftwerk die Kohlendioxidschleudern auch als
Protestort und Verkündungsort von unseren Forderungen auch
im Vordergrund

I: Auf der Textebene also-

P: Auf der Textebene? Was meinst du denn?

I: Ja schriftliche Formen, Internet, Bücher, die zentralen
Dokumente

P: Naja die wesentlichen Veröffentlichungsformen sind
Presseerklärungen (. ) wo wir uns mit Presseerklärungen in
Form von Aktionen oder aber auch bei Veröffentlichungen
von Studien die dann andere Institute für uns gemacht
haben zu Wort melden und dann über Kommentare zu aktuellen
Aussagen aus Politik und Wirtschaft

I: Weißt du wann du zum ersten Mal mit dem Begriff
Klimagerechtigkeit zusammengestoßen bist?

P: Ne weiß ich nicht
I: Zum Schluss habe ich noch eine Frage (auf die Frage?) wie ist denn Greenpeace finanziert?

P: Wir- das ist eine ganz wichtige Frage- wir nehmen überhaupt kein Geld von Industrie oder Politik wir sind einzig und allein unseren Förderern verantwortlich und wir haben in Deutschland zum Beispiel 500 000 Förderer die uns in der Regel die Summe von 100 Euro so im Jahr geben die auch eine feste Mitgliedschaft haben und haben dann in Deutschland so einen Jahresetat von 40 42 Millionen das wird auch immer im Bericht veröffentlicht aber ganz wichtig ein Kernprinzip von Greenpeace ist um uns Unabhängigkeit zu bewahren dass wir kein Geld von der Politik kein Geld von der Industrie nehmen damit unterscheiden wir uns auch von vielen anderen NGOs

I: Von meiner Seite wäre es das erstmal ich weiß nicht ob du jetzt sagst hier gibt es noch bestimmte Punkte die eigentlich wichtig sind wo ich gerne noch was dazu sagen würde (.) die wir ausgespart haben

P: Ne ich glaub das war es erstmal

I: OK Wie fandest du das das Interview? Oder wie {{gleichzeitig} fühltest du dich}

P: {{gleichzeitig} OK}

I: befragt zu werden

P: Ja (als nächstes/zunächst?) Ok es waren sehr viel offene Fragen da (.) die (.) wir haben das noch an oder dann brauch ich es noch nicht (??) also es gibt ja einen Streit im Moment ob man hier in den Verhandlungen oder außerhalb der Verhandlungen was machen kann und bewegen kann (.) und (.) wenn man jetzt die (.) Autonomens so sieht die sagen für ein ganz anderes Klima wird ja das Wort Klima eigentlich nur benutzt für ein ganz anderes Gesellschaftssystem da geht es vielleicht ja gar nicht sehr als erstes um wirklich die Klimafrage und (.) da glaube ich dass klar ist dass Kopenhagen nicht alle Probleme der Welt lösen kann ich glaube das sollte jedem auch klar sein da muss man dann nochmal sehen dass- (.) nach meiner Auffassung gerade die Stärke von (.) den Klimaverhandlungen hier ist dass sie sich letztendlich beschränken auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen (??) wenn man sich im internationalen Kontext sonst dieses ganze Gefasel anguckt von Verhandlungen Biodiversitätskonvention oder so weiter kommen ja alle nicht voran weil dort immer geredet wird nur (.) die Stärke vom Kyotoprotokoll ist eigentlich dass es sich konzentriert auf die Senkung von Treibhausgasen (.) und dann ist nochmal die Frage wo kann so was verhandelt werden und mit wem? Das ist ganz schwierig aber wer wäre legitimiert außer die UN? Ich finde die G8 sind es nicht die G20 sind es auch nicht hier
ist das Gremium mit 192 Staaten hier ist der Platz auch
genauso das zu diskutieren und (.) da sind für mich zwei
wesentliche Punkte und vielleicht noch ein dritter Punkt
dabei ist eine Debatte muss auch auf (.) sachlich
fundierter Basis stattfinden hier spielt das IPCC eine
ganz ganz wesentliche Rolle (.) der wissenschaftliche
Klimarat finde ich auch zurecht einen Friedensnobelpreis
bekommen hat für seine Arbeit 2007 und ich glaube dass das
das auch ausmachen kann was ein Erfolg von zukünftigen
Klimaverhandlungen- ob wir das hier schaffen? (.) weiß ich
nicht (.) also es ist möglich (.) aber letztendlich ist
das eine Basis wo man einen Erfolg darauf aufbauen kann
diese Ziele auch zu erreichen (.) dass damit nicht alle
Probleme der Welt gelöst sind ist automatisch auch (.)
klar
A.3.10 Transkript »GROOTS – Grassroots Organisations Operating Together in Sisterhood«

I: could you tell me how you- what did you- how was it that you joined the- this groots movement?

P: (.) groots is a network of grassroots women’s organizations and (.) the basically (.) (.) groots was formed (.) after one of the women’s conferences where (.) some of the professionals and grassroots leaders recognized that (.) grassroots women were never being– were never representing themselves and their own interests. they were always being spoken about (.) and so only professionals were speaking about the grassroots and community poor people (.) and so there was always a distortion and how the issues were represented and addressed and so groots=i mean the idea is that you bring grassroots women to the table and to decision-making processes and forums (.)

I like to think of us at the periphery but the grassroots groups at the center. there is funds for grassroots work (.) yeah so i joined (.) because i believe that this is how development should be done. (.)

I: what do you think is the role of groots here at copenhagen?

P: well (. ) here i would say that we (. ) we’ve been working for some years on resilience building as a (. ) (??)=and i would (. ) sort of just to (?do? ) some background. i have a lot of= i have some quiet good materials i can (??) to you=ok? in fact (?we’ll?) be at the gender (. ) global gender climate alliance groups as well (. ) so (. ) the idea is that (. ) we have been working on disaster recovering (is that a long one?) disaster recovery=i’m looking on disaster recovery processes as an opportunity for grassroots women to enter decision making processes and play more public roles. because if you see the whole discourse in disaster=as it is climate change too (. ) is that women are basically victims of climate change and victims of disaster (??) at the moment they put this vulnerable label (.) on anybody. that group is marginalized from decision-making because they do not have the– because then their initiary is that all (?workings?). they can’t do anything. they're traumatized, they're affected, they’re dead, they're sick, they're whatever and
therefore we must do our best for them. they can non-
they're not (?keep vulnerably?) in themselves. and i think
that we are constantly trying to reverse this (.) or to to
counter this whole (?chain?) by saying (. ) the communities
and grassroots women are already doing much before we came
into the picture. are doing huge things every day=they
have every day they have solutions they bring to the
table. they're surviving-the-they've been surviving
poverty in the last of climate change much before us and
much better than us. and (.) and organized grassroots
groups have solutions and practices and if we listen to
those and if lift those up, consolidate them, scale up
those efforts then we can really make programs functioning
at the national level or global level or regional level
work for poor peoples' groups and as poor people and women
who are most affected by climate change and disaster we
really have to bring them into the decision-making
process. so that's- so (.) so that's all about. sort of
broader (?pulse?) but what- i mean right (?at here?) in
this specificity in this forum i would say that there are
specific (.) meetings we wanna have with certain sort of
policy makers and and look at how we can collaborate or
impact the work (?what?) they're doing [mhm] they not
necessarily looking- i mean although we are being to the
global climate whatever gender climate alliance [ok] who
is- they are lobbying very hard for wording around gender
to be inside of the document, but- and i think i'll- i
mean that's a good thing to do, but i think we are more
concerned at you know ultimately when when support and
money and all this (?co?)=mes (.) where you know where are
local people in all of this. and i think there is an
assumption that (.) once the climate change global
agreement (?summing/ agreements are main?) (.) national
governments would automatically start doing work with
local people (.) so i don't- and i think that's a bit of a
dangerous assumption. so so i think we are here to create
some visibility for the kind of solutions or contributions
that local grassroots women who work with large
constituencies, they're not individuals, they're not
consultants, they're not n g os, they're not whatever. so
they work with large poor peoples' constituencies actually
affected by climate change. (??) you know and to show that
the real solutions and if you support the solutions then
your policies and programs are effective. if they're- it's
not effective just because it sounds good or looks good
(?on peoples?). so that's the- and we have somebody at the
(??). she's gonna speak in the high level seg- high level
panel on women's' leadership and climate solutions so and
so she's gonna be next to you know the head of u n d p
gender and i don't know if michelle obama will come but
it's level sort of the high level (??) and she's gonna
speak there for grassroots perspectives. so that's the
formal space that we have in this forum. when you when you
underlies to the climate change negotiations (.) the
negotiations we haven't really- i mean this is- we
haven't- we participated in the world council of
sustainable development. we've participated- we work a lot
with u n habitat. we've been at u n i s d r (.) but we're
quiet new to this (.)

I: but how was this that you are working to the topic of
climate change? how did groots get there?

P: (.) we started of working on disaster recovery not really
(??) [ok] because (.) when all the all the relief and the
high profile stuff is over (.) all the n g os are gone (.)
we(?ve ??) there's (.) you know there's two facing
problems. they're kind of forgotten. so and different
member groups in different regions from latin america and
turkey and the carribean and india are sort of facing
similar problems and suddenly we said (.) ok we (?)are not
the ??) but i think we have to exchange lessons and talk
about how we can work together and learn from one another
and (??) locate on this topic and we also saw that it can
help women enter into decision-making processes. (.) i
think gradually probably after the (.) around the time of
the tsunami i think we've started looking more at what can
you do proactively (.) to- i mean we were always concerned
with this recovery not so much as disaster(??ly?) for
whatever but more as this (?)as/is?) an opportunity to
guide development processes. and this is not just so- we
didn't consider ourselves disaster specialists or anything
but with more that (?)tells?) how women can actually change
something about the development processes. so (.) so then
it was a natural thing and we said so many more groups are
in disaster, risk and vulnerable affected areas,
vulnerable areas (.) and so we (??) gradually started
working on (.) more on what we can do at advance (.) which
is not so different from working on development right and
(??moving/ more?) on sanitation and water supply. so (.)
you ask women do you know what resilience is about? [mhm]
they say no. then you say, you know, what are the kinds of
threats you face and how are you impacted by disaster and
how does your work affect that? (??) you know we're doing
sanitation work (?over there is it better ??) we are
doing, you know (?looothing). we know how to do whatever
( .) a bit more organized with better relationships to the
government. all this improves our ability to handle
disaster. and- so when the climate change- one of the
discussion was heating of. i think we realized that it's
not very different from adaptation or there was someone
who we do (??) about climate change but then ( .) this is
the same as adaptation and frankly, i mean we think that
there has to be (?)the?) constituency-based groups
impacting what happens in terms of policy formulations but
also programmatically. they have to- they have to like, you know there has to be a space for what is gonna happen with people (.). i believe that mitigation is not, i mean i (?don't know them?) but this isn't a group that has a lot of access to energy and this isn't a group that is creating a lot of emissions, right? [yeah] but this is <<lachend> the room that> is gonna be the worst effected by [yeah] climate change. so so i think we feel strongly that this is essentially at the end of the day about development. what route is development gonna do. so the end of the day it's all connected to (.). how are women gonna be involved in shaping development processes and for making development work for themselves and then we've also launched about a year ago community disaster resilience fund, which is a (??) to the special initial branch which will (?quiet hopefully?) based in india and central america [mhm] and now in india it rescaled up in (??) by u n d p (.). so (.). as we learn more about climate change we are finding it's not too different it just that it's looked after by the department of environment and the ministry (??) it's just all those=the false project separation at the grassroots level how people (??) i mean at the end of the day at the grassroots level it what=it's about food security, livelihoods, water [mhm] housing, governance, right? and those five or six things are what people care about whether you look at it from a disaster lens, climate change lens, whatever lens you look at. that's what they (??) care about in the end.

I: (.). i think we have to eat because <<lachend>i could eat and you have to speak>

P: that's ok. don't mind.

I: but, what do you think about this climate negotiations then bec-=how do you assess them?

P: honestly i am not very much on top of them. i went to bangkok but and there i was listening carefully. [mhm] (.). unfortunately they don't seem to be enough about (.). what does effective (.). effective programming on the ground look like [mhm] i think there's i think (.). it's all about foreign policy and (.). posturing and, you know and you know who stands with whom and who stands against whom and- which is OK that's one part of it, of course. but i think like many of the policy forums (.). people who do implementations=see it's like people who do implementation or (??), right. so it's the people who think (??). so it's all about like, you know, let's talk about the big numbers, that macro stuff, the the commitments (?at the?) (.). so it's very (.). it's very general, it's about wording. and, i think you know somebody who's worked on environment for a long time, much longer than me (?will think?) the point is that (.). there are many agreements
where for example gender is liberally used in the agreement in the policy (?round?). (?probably?) the biodiversity convention, many conventions. the point is how are we going to (?) we haven't- hasn't been implemented. the point is we don't know what- it's not about- ok then it shows that there is a political commitment (?about doing?) gender. the point is (.).

incentive structures on the ground have to (?) to actually (.). enable implementation. (.). it's all about- so i think it's (.). it's very much fostering our kind of a top-down- not top-down but (?) i don't even (?) the position to assess the talks but this is our perspective and- (.). so i think it's (.). it's not focused enough on housings, on commitments and what will happen at the grassroots level. that is about winning points but, you know who's more important (?) that movement?. it's not about being a (?) of people. (?) accountability somewhere is. it's like you know give us money to ask questions whatever. i [yea] so i think it's a little- and i think it's- everything is big business. so see the number of organizations who are doing business (?) and this carbon markets and on- it's bullshit frankly. (.). it's actually- i mean you had c d m for so many year. how we- how did poor people benefit from c d m so far?

I: but could you tell me more about what would be real solutions to climate change?

P: honestly (.). from little by little i know (.). solutions (?don't only?) come from adaptation. ok? sure emission reductions (.). (?it will come?) when you see poor people as seriously (.). as serious stakeholders in the process [mhm] it's gonna come from changing the paradigm of development. so (.). yeah i think emission reduction is important. but i think the whole focus on the old is the centerpiece of this climate change agreement. we're checking this problematic is my opinion [mhm] and then (?again?) technology transfer. everything is based on the rich countries selling something to the poor countries. the like reduce emission (.). you know the whole offsetting process everything is like (.). (?serious?) like a ridiculous thing. like and everyone knows it but it's just being seen as some way for something to somebody to make money and to calculate something. but (?whether they are the?) false strange things <<lachend> i don't understand why> (?thinking this one?) why (?we've made) the most important thing. i don't even think mitigation is the most important thing. i think adaptation and how adaptation and development move together is the most important thing. and i think mitigation is important in a sense that development (.). incentive structures in development need to pay attention=need to take into consideration whatever. carbon neutral processes and, you know and reduce
emissions and influence and I think the environment people have been saying it for years. [mhm] this is a silly thing about how suddenly climate change in wording around has become the most important thing. you know and the people who work on environment and environment degradation have been saying the same things for years. [mhm] like whatever they started talking about it in rio or before that [mhm] right the people work on it for 50 years. they're basically saying use environmental resources sustainably [yeah] ok and that means people live in harmony and are not overproducing whatever. I mean even like look at it's not about being vegetarian, it's about being don't do industrial farming you're domesticating and killing much more animals than you actually need to eat. (.) and that's my opinion based on the

I: yeah (. ) could you tell me how you understand the term climate justice?

P: I think when programs and policies work for poor people that's how it was (?handed?).

I: would you make use of the term?

P: (. ) I don't use it. (. ) I think it comes from rights-based language. and the reason I don't use, I (. ) personally don't use rights-based language is that it comes from a perspective in which is somebody is the entitled and somebody is the bestower. somebody is the claimant and somebody is the bestower of rights. and the claimant does not necessarily have contribute to the claiming of the right. it's the job of somebody else to give you. it's the job of the government to do this (?). and your own job is to ask for that. there's- to me that's what the rights language (?). I think (. ) here we are saying that we are gonna do everything we can we are not waiting for you. (. ) (?all?) people's organizations and networks are doing everything they can. (?when the?) government (?will?) support and scale up and mainstream those things, which is a little different, I mean. so that's the reason. yeah

I: Ya (. ) could you tell me something about the activities groot is working (. ) on? is doing {{gleichzeitig} at copenhagen}

P: {{gleichzeitig} we have (. )} oh

I: but perhaps at first in general.

P: just visibly (. ) it's broadly (. ) we are trying to make the (?specificality of those?). (. ) ah we are linked to some coalitions who are present here. [mhm] one is an n g o coalition works on resilience and disaster. one is a gender coalition.

I: what is the n g o coalition called?
P: the global network of civil society organizations in grassroots conduction [mhm] so (. .) we are trying to look at the (?poor?) governments and what they are doing. (. .) we are trying to and i would say we are here really to (?lawn?) poorly actors what are their institutional perspectives and we are- so we have this we have somebody who is featured in=who's a grassroots leader=indigenous person from honduras who is speaking in the high level panel on women [mhm] (. .) and we are here also to see if we can get a (?bind?) on the community fund that (?groots?) set up (. .) from one or two it's not a real a lot of allies. just there are one or two major institutional allies. multilateral (?). so yeah that's not so (. .) governments some were good parties (?and some are really ??) what you know where do we locate ourselves in this whole debate (. .) that's the (?whatever?) (?). do we want to bring people in debate but it's really seen like who are the players? (. .) so yeah i (. .) i was already in another meeting in den hague so i didn't have to pay to come here or whatever=my ticket. similarly, you know, a couple of colleagues are also (??) we have three of us here this weekend and two of us will go home and (??).

I: you have to eat something

P: (??)

I: could you tell me how do you like what do- what do you think about the protests out of the (.) summit at the area of the city?

P: i don't know i haven't heard much. i mean, you know, i see a lot of protest and stuff here. i yeah i think it's good as a, you know, a (??) action getting the attention of common people and (. .) but you know at some times i'm also like, you know i think it's nice that people get together and sort of (. .) take action and they care but i at some time i'm also (??). i saw the swedish negotiator (?go pass?) something yesterday. ok you know (. .) as a tool for civic action i think the protest has very limited limited value it's what i think. it's great that, you know there's so much press here, they're looking for something that's visually stimulating and not just a (?entrance?) so, you know the (?moment you must stand?) here then you act like a tree or act like- you know it's (. .) forget your five minutes of fame. great good for you but [yeah] i wouldn't wanna spend time doing that. i wouldn't love wanna be out in (?fault?) shouting slogan (?forever?)

I: do you think it's helpful?

P: (. .) i think there are those who (. .) we as an organization we either chose to engage with (?a/the?) institutional actor or not. i don't know that we would organize a protest. we wouldn't come to copenhagen and we- but that's
just because, you know we don't live here. this is not a
(whatever?). it's not something that we will do. somebody
else wants to do it for some reasons. i can respect that.
you can I= this is actually my perspective of protests and
stuff like that=cause I think i'm a little cynical on how
(.) how many demonstrations and protests there are every
day and (.). you know sometimes it looks like wow there's a
great public out(=bor?)ing that people really care about
this issue and stuff. you know it looks good it can get--i
think if you're really smart about how you do it, you can
get media attention to something. (.). i don't know if
protest can be a great effectiveness because you are=for
us we are looking to engage and i think that all style of
advversarial politics would be (?) constantly positioning
yourself adverse as an adversarial (?) it's problematic.
because i think we are trying to say that look your
politics aren't our politics. we are different but maybe
we can collaborate over something=and i think we also feel
that with grassroots groups they can't really take on the
government. i think you have to have a certain (?amount?)
of power. we have (?) trying to get the government to
work with grassroots at the country level. ok. they can't
take on a lot of times. ok there is--=but on the other hand
if some group decides we wanna protest with=yea- because
you know best. but we're not going to say that you must
protest [mhm] so we'll=so at the mostly grassroots get
eaten up if they try to take on the government, you know
[ok]. they don't have the strength to handle it. i mean if
you're a lawyer, if you're professional you can do it. if
you're greenpeace you can do it. if you're actually poor
peoples' groups in some village you can’t.

I: what would you what do you think about the autonomous
groups who are mobilizing to copenhagen? do
{{gleichzeitig} you know what i mean with}
P: {{gleichzeitig} i'd like to}

I: autonomous groups?
P: which and what do you (?think?) about?

I: some groups who prepare for action, direct action. there
are feelings of some people here that there might be
violent activity at the weekend and the second week of the
negotiations outside the conference. what do you think
about that?

P: i don't think anything that has any kind of violence is a
good idea at all. i think that will only create a barrier
between the governments and, you know- what they gonna
achieve? they gonna say- you know, they gonna be dew up if
you don't come to an agreement and is that i mean if you
think of yourself and how you would respond if somebody
broke down your door and (??) you know you have to do
This. I am (?) India? I'm from India. That's not how we won anything. So that's historically not a great way to (do work?). Maybe somebody- to me that's (?) only/ not?=it's (?) useful at all [mhm] if anything=anything that has any (?) kind of?) violence (?) what I'm saying is that we are trying to come to an agreement here (.) and it's complicated and it's not fair how some people are behaving. It's not fair who gets money. You know whatever. There are lots of injustices as you can see. Whatever, I don't know. Maybe for all this money having spend on actually doing climate change would be better than having this conference. But that's not (?). None of this is fair. So I don't think that any kind of violence is the solution, I mean. I don't think I doesn't have (?) progress?) . All it does is get more security loads and more security and takes one, you know half an hour or two hours extra to get in somewhere. [Yeah] I just came from Istanbul where the IMF and World Bank had their meeting and all of Istanbul was filled tanks and police it's not a great way to go.

I: Could you tell

P: It just means there's more policing and there'll be less- usually when these kinds of thing of happen, like right now, you know, there's usually the fau-=in countries where there's some kind of, I mean you know. I just think that there's a crackdown in civil society. There's always an adverse response the kind of boomerangs on civil society.

[Yeah]

I: (.) Could you tell me a little bit about the (.) cooperation? Who do you cooperate with? Groots-

{{gleichzeitig} Who does Groots}

P: {{gleichzeitig} How do you mean like we cooperate with lot of people}

I: With what networks and organizations does Groots cooperate with?

P: Yea for example I sit on the steering group of this global civil society network on disaster risk reduction. We've done we've done a small survey some sort of action research with them. How did grassroots women perceive the (?) other?) programings. So it was in parallel with the national governments had to report last (.) this year sorry, to the UNISDR what progress they had made on five years of action, the (?) UN?) framework convention. So (.) the kind of (?) assignment in the civil society (?) thing?). And we talk to grassroots women and women's' organizations saying what do you think is happening. People have to self assess [Yeah]. And that self assess (?) so we're a basically, you know the civil society peoples trying to show that (.) national governments are
saying everything is going well. so they are giving
themselves four out of five on a scale of five, one to
two. grassroots groups are giving themselves four out of five, one to
two. further away from the national government there is
whatever, so (.) there's a- yeah we're involved with the
gender and disaster network (. ) we are looking (. / ??) affected groups that matters
meeting (. / ??) affected groups that matters
with government in india. national disaster management are
in (. / ??) part of the government of india. in
central america we're working with cepredenac which is the
central american regional body for disaster risk
reduction. all the central american governments have their
agencies represented there. so that's open up a lot of
space for the first time. (??) been invited to meeting.
they're recognizing the regional networks. that's opening
up space for grassroots (. / ??) structuring. for the
first time engage the government. it's very difficult (.)
for grassroots organizations to engage governments which
is a big part of our work. we have to try [ok]. so they
actually (.) starting dialogues in
central america for example. guatemala. starting a
dialogue with the (??) environment ministry and disaster
risk reduction agents. that kind of stuff. it's some
examples.
I: (.) do you have to go now?
P: yeah, i would like to. this is it done? or is there more?
I: if perhaps one more question [ya ya] are there-
P: you wanna walk with me i can start (??)
I: we can finish it here [ok] i think it's better, but i can
(??) because are there any certain positions of n g os and
movements which you think you would fundamentally oppose?
regarding climate change?
P: no i don't think (.) i don't think we know enough about
than to oppose them and usually i think i really- (. ) i
think the problem is precisely that, in the sense that (. )
at some level the whole of these conferences about
language. how=what language you represent yourself and
it's very hard sometimes to tell at conferences who
represents who. there's a crisis of who is asking, you
see, i mean whoever you are, if you're a consultant, if
you're a institution (. ) do i representing and who
(??) just i representing and who ask you to come here
<<lachend>on (??) behalf> and speak? so i think it's much
more of an issue of (. ) who are legitimate players and
who's interest do they represent. who for example the
bank, i could come here and say anything and you think i
was very important and you feel i speak good english so
you'd invite me to a panel and=that i (??)
often up with you as?). we leave people in conferences and we find out later that, i mean as you get older you get better at this moaning. you know who are people who do real work? [yeah] who are people who are practitioners? you know and who are people who are good at writing reports [yeah]? i think, you know i think the problem is that that con very silly. (??) of course who work (??) with us. so do i also support poor people. i do research and i whatever but (. ) the fact is you're out to get as many such contracts as you can, right? i mean, so everybody has their own interests. i am here to raise funds for my organization or whatever. so you don't know what (how?) organization that (you haven't seen?) [yea]. i think there's ya- this is the problem when so much time and energy is spend in talking then, you know some (available?) attention is given to who is doing what. (. ) so i think that's where we have to be that's where we are learning and that what i've now (one has now?)=you know been looking in the stream a long enough to- we are quiet good we can make out (?the who are?) actually we have practices to contribute and we do thing(??) on the ground. that's this people who i just (.) asking you for some idea taking it somewhere (?writing?) that's why i said when you work with researchers we like to have some, you know some form of acknowledgement or reclamation thing that we contributed to this=(?what was?) there's a very big problem in the most grassroots groups will tell you that, oh ya this researcher yayaya they came from america they interviewed us, you know we sat with them for one week, we took them everywhere. they're gone. we've never heard of them again. [yea] ya? so i think with- that's that whole thing (??) grassroots and professionals and whatever. so we try hard to listen who's who and what's what and then i think, so so when you meet people and (??(lachend)??) with their forums then you give feeling people and they're waiting different (?adds?) all the day. so we meet them in asia and they say oh i work for (??). and we (?can?) hear this actually i'm gonna tell you (??). so the like, ok. so i have to be (??). [??] so before you oppose them or whatever, you have to know what the hell they're doing.

I: yea you could do- giving you something about my project

P: yea ok
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I: the first question i would be interested in, would be if you could tell me a little bit how you- how it was that you joined the hopenhagen project?

P: and about a year ago with the summer of last year secretary general ban ki moon came to the international advertising association i a a with sort of a unique challenge and he came and he said you know we're having our cop fifteen conference in copenhagen in december of 2009. it's going to be incredibly important because it's the moment when we have to either renew kyoto or come up with new terms of international agreement. (.) so it's incredibly important that the world constituency, the people that our (.) actions and agreements actually affect don't even know that this conference will take place [mhm] (.). so, you know, and ban ki moon talking said, so we're coming to the i a a because you guys are unobviously the (since?)- <<lachend>i'm> paraphrasing here, but you guys are (.) are, you know, demand drivers. at the advertising community drives demand and awareness. so he posed to challenge to (.). the advertising community (.). to help the united nations raise awareness about not only climate change but more over about the u n's role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it. and with that as sort of the big ask, the big call for action, the i a a then said to it's own internal community which includes all of the major advertising companies in the world (.). the i a a said, ok, so let's get started guys. let's create a coalition and a campaign and start pushing it out and (.). you know helping people around the world come to an understanding of what climate change is and how the u n is proposing to solve it at cop fifteen. so with that charge ogilvy earth again ogilvy sustainability marketing practices sort of took up the mantel and said, you know, in the absence of any other leadership in this organization we're gonna be the ones who (.). (delude?) and on a pro bono level actually start to create the strategy and write the creator brief from which the advertising and the campaign will [mhm] (??)merge. so freya williams who is the ogilvy earth world wide planning director (.). give a series of interviews with dot leaders from around the world and these included people from the business community, from the n g o and e n g o communities, from governments, and essentially (.). what freya heard during these interviews was really sort of a fourth-fold message. and the first piece of it was that (.). no change could happen, no agreement could be reached at cop fifteen unless the people of the world demanded it. second that the people of the world would not
demand this change unless they were aware that cop fifteen was happening and self interested in the results. so i e you know unless we made it relevant to them (.) they wouldn't care. the third insight was, that it wouldn't become relevant to people in the world unless (.) it's somehow directly tied to the things that they care most about (.) right in this immediate moment. and amidst international economic crisis that first priority would be economy. so (.) it wouldn= you know, in order to make this relevant we had to make a link between climate change and solutions to climate change [mhm] (.) and the economy and solutions to economic crisis. and then sort of the fourth insight that our worldwide planning director gleaned from this interviews was that (.) people wouldn't be inspired and engaged in this new message unless it inspires their hope. and people were tired. there was sort of this idea of apocalypse the peak. people were tired of hearing all of the doom and gloom messages about climate and seen polar bears stranded on icebergs. [mhm] they wanted to know that climate change was relevant to them and that solutions were available. (.) so and i'm giving you the very long-winded, (?roofed?) version of the story but essentially (.) that was how ogilvy earth got involved with with this hopenha=with the united nations and creating this strategy that then gave rise to the hopenhagen campaign which was a campaign that ogilvy (.) created.

I: (.) could you tell me what would be the greatest success for hopenhagen?

P: what would be the current success, did you say?

I: the greatest success. (.) the criteria? sorry. the (.) the i under-

P: (.) the criteria? sorry. the (.) the i under-

I: {{gleichzeitig} no when do you think}

P: {{gleichzeitig} (??)}

I: when do you think we aren't in need of (.) hopenhagen anymore? when [oh ok] it will be the greatest success for (.) hopenhagen?

P: i see. so i mean (.) ultimately (.) you know the hopenhagen (.) campaign will have done it's job and run it's course when (.) the world's citizens (.) all, you know, not just the e n g o community and their supporters but all of the world citizen (.) recognize that (.) the solutions to climate change which are necessary and urgent
(. ) are also (. ) the solutions to (. ) as our economic
issues. and that the transitions to a green economy will
really, you know, it's the tide that lifts all boats and
that really will, it will create this groundswell of, you
know, hope and enthusiasm and prosperity that is not just
endorsed by, you know, the developed nations and the
existing sort of economic aristocracy but all people and
the developing world and so, you know, hopenhagen will
have done it's job when there's universal demand for an
international shift towards a green economy. and we've
seen that perhaps the united nations will not be the nexus
of that change and perhaps will not lead that change. but,
you know, i think hopenhagen can left when we see green
economies. (. ) sort of becoming pervasive throughout the
world.

I: (. ) ok. what would you say is the real problem of global
warming? (. ) if you (. ) [the] yea

P: the biggest problem?

I: the real problem. what would you say if [ok] i ask you
what would be the real problem?

P: the real problem of global warming i mean, i think we see
that (. ) you know as g h g emissions rise (. ) due to
industrialization and sort of pervasive materialism (. ) in
the developed world (. ) the consequences, climatic
consequences that, you know, have to do with such things
as rising sea levels and you know we have countries like
(. ) the maledives, which are incredibly worried that soon
their land will be entirely submerged. so we have those
sort of, you know, i guess more (. ) how would you call
that? more sort of geographic natural issues. and then on
the other side of the coin (. ) you have the issue of
economic development. and if we (. ) persist with the
status quo, you know, and for instance (. ) in the united
states our energy, oil and gas sector is heavily dependent
on (. ) coal and on national coal reserves and, you know,
aside from the whole issue of energy independence from (. )
from foreign oil , so aside from that oil(?issue?) we
are heavily dependent on our national coal reserves. (. )
those resources will run out. you can not dispute it.
these are finite resources. and so, you know, global
warming is sort of an umbrella concept that to me (. ) also
incorporates this idea that if we don't start to shift
away from (. ) using these non-renewable resources, we're
going to run out before we've effectively prepared to
transition to alternative [mhm] sources of, you know,
material and sort of the foundation of our economic
growth. so, you know, on the one hand you have (. ) global
warming being an incredibly, a potentially incredibly
destructive climatic force. and on the other hand you have
global warming being the outgrowth of our economic
and our inability to foresee the time when these resources will run out.

I: mhm (. ) you now already told me a little bit about the solutions to climate change but [mhm] what do you think are right solutions regarding climate change? could you tell me more about this?

P: (. ) absolutely. so, you know, i think the right solutions to climate change they- i'll start with what they can't be. i don't think that they can come on high from as a mandate from any authoritative (. ) intergovernmental body. so, you know, kind of ruled out the united nations' ability to truly quote unquote solve climate change. solutions to climate change are going to come from (. ) market forces. from free competition to really capitalize on the growth opportunities of (. ) of finding the solutions to global warming (. ) and finding the ways to limit g h gs without hurting productivity and it's going to be companies not countries but companies, that (. ) really drive this and really create the innovation that will allow us to achieve a carbon neutral economy [mhm], you know, and sort of the premise of the hopenhagen campaign was that unlike other e n g os and other climate justice based groups we aren't trying to Alienate the corporate community. we're not trying to condemn business for their role thus far and, you know, steering g h gs and causing man-made climate change. what we're (?truly?) trying to do is bring them into the force and say, you know what, it's companies like i b m (. ) and coca-cola and dupont and siemens and g e, that we really have to rely on and have to somehow encourage to continue, to innovate and to create the solutions that will drive the green economy to implement the smart (?bread?). you know, and to start shifting from non-renewable based industry to renewable based industry. it's gonna be companies that lead this and drive this. so the solutions to climate change will come from business innovation. [mhm]

I: (. ) the other way round. what do you think would be wrong solutions regarding climate change?

P: (. ) i think the wrong solutions to climate change would first and foremost be (. ) mandating and regulating and artificially capping g h g emissions prior to the markets ability to bare them and still continue to function in an optimal level. i think secondarily it would be wrong to think that we would solve climate change through any sort of mass wealth re-distribution scheme where we (. ) you know where we make sort of apologized payments to developing world's governments to help them prepare for the effects of climate change rather than using that same pool of money to invest in the technologies and innovations that are (. ) decisively coming from, you know,
more developed, markets and I include China and India in
that (?territorization?). but we should be investing in
the markets that are (. ) on the forefront of the
technology that will, you know, prepare us to shift to a
low-carbon or carbon-neutral economy, rather than (.)
giving money to at risk [yea] governments.

I: (. ) mhm (. ) you already mentioned the term climate
justice. I hope you understand what I mean (. ) climate
justice what do you (. ) understand (. ) by the term? what
is your idea of climate justice?

P: (. ) so, you know, to me it's an interesting question
though but it caused me to think in the (?inter?) more
about this term and how I feel about it. and I (. ) I kind
of stick with my original viewpoint that the term is non-
sequitur. that justice is about (. ) what's equitable,
right? an what's (. ) what's sort of implicitly righteous
and morally good. it's a really morally charged word. and
sort of non sequitur to stick it with a, you know a very
naturalistic term like climate. you know the climate and
the planet do not have a sense of moral-righteousness,
right [mhm] now people, they do. so I, you know to me the
purpose of that term (. ) is somehow to suggest that right
now, you know, there's this inequitibility in the way that
global warming and awareness occasion that global warming
will have and therefore it's (?incoming?) on the human
population to somehow (. ) to somehow make, you know,
reparations or prepare for that injustice and that
inequitibility by shifting around resources and I think,
you know, I think that's sort of the wrong way to look
[mhm] at our climate change challenge. I think the right
way to look at it is that, you know industrialization
occurred. yes. it occurred at different speeds, in
different countries and afford different Economies, based
on any number of different factors. but it absolutely does
not do any good to at this point stand back and start in
blaming (. ) countries and economies for their prior role
in the amount of g h gs in our atmosphere [mhm]. so, you
know, the only part--the only way to get to solutions is
to look ahead rather than look behind. and (. ) you know,
and so- to look ahead means to say ok, what is at this
point. and all that's left to be determined is what will
be. and so in order to determine that we put, you know,
resources where there is the highest degree of innovative
potential and technological advance. and irrespective of
the so-called inequitibility of what the climate fall-out
will be. [mhm]

I: (. ) (. ) would you make use of the term climate justice or
does hopenhagen make use (. ) of the term?

P: (. ) (. ) yea. now I'm- (. ) <<lachend>(??)> i I probably
shouldn't even have asked this question, but you know in
Our (copy) actually (copy) points I can't.

I remember ever having seen the term climate justice used so
and if it ever was used, I would never say oh yea
(totally), we didn't say climate justice, but I would
have to know the context to comment on it. But I would say
that (.) Copenhagen as a, you know as the campaign (.)
sort of of the people and for the people and by the people
((lacht)) to [mhm] the pinch from our constitution, you
know, the idea of climate justice doesn't really enter
into our, into our paradigm, because we are very much a
forward looking campaign [mhm] and we are very much about
saying, you know, people (.) people can lead and leaders
will follow the leadership of the people [mhm] and (.)
what the people really want (.) is prosperity. Right?
prosperity on as broad a scale as possible. And in order
to achieve that, you know, it's about shifting from a
status quo economic model (.) to a new economic model
based on (.) renewable resources, low-carbon production
and new technologies. [mhm] and that really has nothing to
do with (.) sort of the idea of apologism and saying (.)
because it was the countries that industrialized first,
they contributed so much to (.) this, you know, this
trajectory of climate change. It's really (?incoming on
us?) to somehow, you know, provide them some charity for
the planet. It's not about that. So, you know, solutions
are gonna come, because we're all looking ahead and we're
all sort of=we're all saying (.) we need a green economy,
you know, a low-carbon economy that invests in the
solutions [mhm]. Not, let's apologize for what we've done
and (.) and focus on how to sort of repay for those
damages. [mhm]

I: (.) thank you. Now I would like to know how you assess the
international climate negotiations. (.) How do you assess
them?

P: (.) you know, that's ((lacht)) that's another sort of
complexity (.) (fra/for?) issue. I think, you know, i
wouldn't be alone in saying that there was a lot of
expectation before COP fifteen. And then by virtue of that
(concept?) expectation a whole lot of disappointment and
the (opened?) outcome. You know, there's been some talk
of the amazing (?) or that is?) our deal but you know
miracle worker Obama managed to create a multilateral
agreement, you know, that included China and isn't that
(.) isn't that amazing? But I think when you'll actually
look at (.) what that quote on quote deal consisted of (.)
it was pretty empty of actual of actual substance and
actual sort of prescription. Prescriptive regulation and
(.) carbon-caps that would do (.) what they were. You
know, that they would do what they were supposed to do.
Now I would be contradict myself if I said, I think the
kind of regulatory framework was really the best way to go
about (.) solving climate change. you know, i- so while
there was some disappointments (. ) that cop fifteen didn't
lead to that huge international agreement (?in/and?) that
great replacement for kyoto [mhm] what i do think it did
was sort of highlight the the shortcomings of that
international accord. the whole idea of seeking an
international accord to solve this problem. and i think it
also highlighted the idea that this is going to come down
to (.), you know, and i sound like a broken record here,
but it's going to come down to (.) companies being able to
innovate free it's sort of a framework of freedom [mhm].
give, you know, give companies a mission, go out and solve
climate change because there will be market rewards [mhm]
it's not because you'll be penalized for not doing so.
you'll be rewarded by the market for going out there and
leading innovation. and so i think, you know, and i love
tom freeman (. ) had a great interview with (?cres?) but
since been published on a number of sort of environmental
and business blogs. but he essentially said (.) in the
absence of leadership from the united nations or (??) the
absence of leadership from of the united nations is
actually incredibly healthy for (. ) climate change and for
our ability to solve it. because what it has done is, it
left the market free enough to continue to innovate and to
innovate as quickly as possible to gain leadership. so
what we do (??now?) have is the sort of wonderful sort of
space race happening again except this time between (.) u
s technology firms and chinese technology firms. and this
gonna be a race to the top. to see who can create the best
solutions quickly enough [mhm] or the most quickly. and,
you know, and all that an international agreement about
limiting and capping and penalizing would have done would
have been to jeopardize (. ) business's ability to create
and innovate. (. ) [mhm] so it's a failure so to, you know,
just to sum up here, it's a failure in the sense that
there was no international agreement. that was obviously
what the conference set out to create. and it didn't do
it. but the bright spot, and i think it's a big bright
spot, is that it's left markets free to create the
solutions themselves.

I: (.) ok. (.) are you a football fan? because i get a
question [i am] <<lachend>ok> i got a question imagine the
climate conference as a football match. what would your
comment be?
P: (.) what would my=what would my comment be?
I: yea.
P: (.) <<lachend> it was. i>really like that framing so (?i
( .) get?). (.) i think (. ) what we saw was a draw. we saw
a pretty lack (?laughter?) match between a couple teams
that (. ) they came to the pitch with (. ) a lot to loose
and only a little bit to gain and they played (.) they
played like that was the case and (.) i'm not being very
clear. i think that's only one point. but the actual match
we saw between (.) countries (.) between like china and
the u s or the developing world and the developed world.
there are any number of dichotomies and, you know,
dichotomies you can create. any number of teams playing
against each other at that conference. but, essentially
you saw nobody come out as the clear winner. you also saw
an incredibly rowdy set of fans, terrible crowd control on
the part of the united nations and, you know and just sort
of a real, a real failure to see the moment and turn the
conference into something, into a really hopeful forward
looking dialogue [mhm] so no i'm busy mixing metaphors but
(.) you know i hope that kind of (.) i hope that kind of
answers the point. it was on the international accord-
(?frence?) it was very much a draw. and on the
international (?fan?)-(?frence?) it was very much chaotic.

I: ok. yea thank you. (.) when climate is the issue, what are
hopenhagen's activities (.) in generally speaking?

P: (.) generally speaking, throughout the campaign our
activities included included a couple of events and mostly
focused on and those would be sort of meetings of members
of our community in various settings and further with
various sort of entertainment and purpose and (.) but the
bulk of our real more or less (?tensible?) activities
happened at copenhagen, during the conference. and so we
had our hopenhagen life main stage in city center which
again, you know, it's all=it was also the purpose of
raising awareness more than sort of dictating what
outcomes should be [mhm]. and in that sense i think
hopenhagen succeeded, where some of the more metric
oriented organizations had to say (??) given the outcome
of cop fifteen. you know, hopenhagen did not fail because
there was not an international agreement [mhm]. hopenhagen
(.) hopenhagen succeeded, because there was much, much
greater awareness that the conference was happening and
that solutions are possible. (?so?). [mhm] but to answer
your question (.) our events and the way we sort of
transmitted our campaign, was through you know extensive
advertising, internationally and it was almostly donated
media. and then at the conference itself bringing people
together around that main stage where there were speakers
from (.) the the intergovernmental community, from the e n
go community, from the youth climate activist community
as [mhm] well as sort of (?your-?)=the typical
entertainments. bands and things. but mostly we focused on
raising awareness through international advertising.

I: (.) could you tell me, what do you think about the- of the
protest activities outside the conference areas. the
protest activities in the streets.
I think the protests in the streets really demonstrated to me the incredibly high level of angst that have been fomented around climate change and around the lack of solution thus far. And, you know, I think it's fair to say. And that's understandable, because they feel the most marginalized not only in terms of being the ones who potentially be affected the most by climate change, but also being the one who are marginalized at the table of discussion. In the United Nations, during the United Nations summit, related to this. So, they have their reason to be angry at the system that the United Nations have put in place, the framework that's put in place. As well as the looming climate consequences of global warming. That said, was it productive for them to protest in the way that they did? No. I think all it did was discredit them. And discredit them as people who would be unwilling to come to the table as equal partners in dialogue and as contributors to any solutions. And I think that's unfortunate to you. You know, what the United Nations is incredibly good at, is setting a large enough table that, that everyone can come and sit down and talk. That's what the United Nations does. The United Nations isn't terribly good at solutions. But it does create that open forum for discussion and so for groups to not take advantage of that. I think it's unfortunate. I don't think the United Nations made it very easy for those groups to take advantage of that. I know, you know, hearing from people who were at the conference and saying how absolutely inexcusable it was for the United Nations to be so unprepared for the number of attendees and the types of attendees who were there, you know, that's unfortunate, too. But protesting on that stage really does nothing but discredit one's approach and one's viewpoints.

P: Could you tell me a little bit about the cooperation of Hopenhagen. Who does Hopenhagen cooperate with?

Sure. Hopenhagen has cooperated with a number of other environmental organizations, including 350.org and world wildlife fund. It has, you know, it is obviously encouraged as community of followers to sign on as possible. International following. And it's also cooperated with a number of multinationals and national companies. Our sort of founding sponsors were SAP, Coca-Cola, Siemens, right?
((lacht)) yes! coca-cola, s a p and siemens. and then we have supporting partners. it included the climate group [mhm] (. ) dupont, g a p, method and recyclebank, which is a logo market-oriented recycling. mhm [mhm] so we, you know, we had sort of a wide array partners with a wide array of viewpoints and the reason, that they could all come together and do this campaign, was because our mantel was sort of so open-ended and it was, you know, it was based on the idea that it's time to have an optimistic point of view about how we can solve climate change and it's time to believe that solutions are possible and solutions are incredibly beneficial and solutions come without a price and without compromise and it can be a win-win-win for everyone. [mhm] and given that premise, you know, we alienated few and brought on board many. so. [mhm] I: (. ) (. ) would you strictly contradict certain positions of other n g os or social movements? (. ) and which one's [no] would be that? P: (. ) we didn't (. ) we didn't contradict. we consciously did not contradict other environmental organizations who are active in this space. what we did do was was i think stay neutral on a number of the policy(-frence?). hopenhagen never sought to to make strict demands of the perspective view and accord. or to clearly stipulate. this is exactly what we want to see from (. ) a cop fifteen accord. and we didn't really step too deeply into the science. we said, you know, there's pretty much international agreement that climate change is occurring in fact there's universal agreement that climate change is occurring. we let scientists and other more invested environ- argue and quibble over the details of that. but we take that as the premise. and we move forward just in the expectation that people want solutions of, you know, of every kind. of a really sort of open-ended and open-source kind. and given that that was our (?cueof?) and that was our perspective and our paradigm, you know, we really didn't step on the toes or contradict [mhm] (. ) other environmental groups. and we really wanted to encourage a bunch of environmental organizations who were sort of each having their own conversations and running their own campaigns in this space. we really wanted to be the nexus of (. ) of a group effort. and a coordinated effort. and (. ) you know ironically (. ) it's very hard to get all of these different n g os on the same page. even (?now?) we're all working for the same ultimate goals, there's a lot of real, sort of (. ) competitiveness and (. ) in sense that, you know, well we don't wanna fight up with you, because that undermines our leadership. [mhm] so it, you know, it's been interesting. i think hopenhagen has sort of stood before collaboration on the vastest possible scale.
and we have (?)run?) to other groups too, who haven't
wanted necessarily to (.) to quote on quote play with us
or, you know, join us [mhm]. simply because they're
interested in prepe-=pursuing their own proprietary
message. ((schnell)) which is kind of counterproductive if
you ask me. [ok] (?but?)

I: thank you. i get some concrete questions to finish the
interview.

P: go on.

I: the first one would be. (.) what do you read, when you
want to know about climate change and climate politics?

P: mhm. so i read a number of really great environmentally
oriented blogs. one of which is the wall streets
journal's. i also read new york times' environmental blog.
then there're a couple of other (.) blogs that i really
think do a nice job of connecting environment and economy.
and that includes tree hugger, joel makower's two steps
forward and then there's the, you know, it is obviously
there's a lot of great, you know, offline there're a lot
of great books on the subject [mhm] which, you know, i
always was (??) when always sort of provide that (?god?)
deeper insight, but (. ) in terms of just like day to day i
try and stay up on some of the- on new york times, wall
street journal and (?some other?) blogs that i mentioned.

so.

I: ok. (.) is there anything what you never read?

P: (. ) ((lacht)) [ok] you know, i- no i think part of being,
you know, part of trying to be (.) up on the day to day of
(?the space?) you really have to embrace all sources of
news. then you don't-, you know, you certainly don't need
to agree with them all, but i think in order to really
round out the perspective and have a 360 degree
understanding of what's going on on the space [mhm] you
certainly need to be open to all content. and i would just
add on the former question of what i read. we have a
number of expert relationships in ogilvy earth bill becker
who's the executive director of presidential climate
action committee [mhm] and (.) hunter lovins of natural
capital((orig.: capitalism, P.B.)) solutions they're
constantly sort of feeding in research and articles to us
which really help us stay, you know stay up on the (??)
side of these- of the policy and the science. so [mhm] i
wanna add that as well.

I: ok. (. ) is there besides to the website of hopenhagen, is
there any particular place where hopenhagen has stated
it's program and demands regarding climate politics?

P: (. ) mhm. you know given the hope of being a real sort of
international awareness galvanizer. we had to find a
platform that could live across borders and so the
internet was really the only place we could do that. and still provide a lot of information. so hopenhagen dot org is definitely our primary portal of information and insight. at our blog, we have a branded blog series which lives on huffington post and tree hugger and take part. those were three of our partners as well. and so that was sort of a fought of opinion and perspective. which also lived at hopenhagen dot org, but was pushed out (?with those green elite?) as well. but now we, you know, we pretty much focused our efforts aside from more traditional advertising [mhm] which ran worldwide, but we pretty much focused our efforts on the hopenhagen dot org community and made that the centre of our campaign and of our (. ) philosophy.

I: ok. mhm. could you tell me-. do you remember when you first met with the term climate justice?

P: (. ) i believe (. ) <<flüsternd>climate justice> (. ) you know it may have been in some early conversations with bill mckibben of 350.org. he, you know, give that sort of a pillar campaign. and so i'm, you know, i- if recollection serves it could have been in (. ) in some early conversations with him. you know, back when the u n first came to us. [mhm] so i think.

I: (.) ok. i get a last question and it's about the (. ) funding of hopenhagen. could you tell me a- how is it financed the hopenhagen project?

P: (. ) yes. so it's a it was a pro bono campaign. so we did that, you know we did it four the- on behalf of the united nations and (. ) ogilvy and mather absorbed much of the costs as did some of our partner organizations. we also had the sponsorships of coca-cola, s a p and siemens and through those sponsorships we were able to create co- branded campaigns and campaign assets. [mhm] but, you know, in a word it was (?small?) pro bono.

I: (.) ok. (. ) so you mean, voluntary? or? because i read your- the website- on the website of hopenhagen i read something about voluntary work of people for hopenhagen. or do i just remember it in a false way.

P: (. ) (??) to what? i'm sorry.

I: (. ) voluntary work for the hopenhagen project [oh yea] yea.

P: yes. there was- yes we had a lot of of sort of what we call on our website friends and sort of supporting partner organizations that yes would make voluntary contributions and that wasn't necessarily monetary so much as voluntary(?-near?) services [mhm] to the hopenhagen campaign.

I: (. ) ok. thank you. that's it as far as i'm concerned. so.
[oh (??)] perhaps theirs anything which you on your part would like to add. anything that is important to you (.).
and hasn't come up [no] till now?
P: you had a very comprehensive set of questions and i appreciate it. so i'll leave it to you if you find that there're any holes that you need to fill. please let me know. you have my email address. feel free to get in touch. and i'm happy to provide more information should you need it.
I: (. ) i'm very very happy and i thank you very much for the interview.
P: it was a pleasure. good luck with your thesis.
I: how was it that you joined the global youth movement?

P: 

I: and what do you think is the greatest success of your organization? What would be the greatest success?

P: I mean I think it's a real success of the energy coalition that we drove that first in 2008 during the election we mobilized almost half a million young voters around clean energy and climate change to show that not only were young people really active in the 2008 election but we were active because not just cause we had like this sexy young president that was
running but because there were real issues on the table and so we were able kind of tap into this energy around the country and focus a bit towards clean energy i think that was the real success and then within a hundred days of the administration we brought twelve thousand young people to d c to demand from the new administration real action on climate change like clean energy whether not we've seen what we wanna see from the administration is in some ways like i mean i think in the united states worse starting like we are still in many places in the country many of the young people that i worked with the coalition it's like they with the majority of people still not believe that climate change is real and so their work where they living in states that are heavily dependent on the coal industry or the oil industry and so you know i think that we face like a rather uphill battle but what is really exciting and successful to me is that there really is this movement that like isn't stopping and is growing and getting stronger and stronger and is like with young people working on their campuses trying to get clean energy policies and then within like a year it was like a blossoming growing the like that happening on a thousand campuses and then everybody was like we are wanna just stay on the campuses we wanna go and like force our politicians to change their way and we're shut down their coal plant that's trying to get built in our community and so i just i think for me it's like that we really have successfully been building a real movement of young people in the united states to challenge the kind of like fossil fuel industry as usual and the politicians i think we have a one way to go before we see that change in our congress and our senate however i think that where you real change happen is at the like community level in states at the like state and city level young people are like really creating change i: ok but what do you think is the real problem of global warming p: what do you mean by that i: the main problem if there is something central which you would say the main problem of climate change p: i mean i think the main problem you mean the like the problem of the impacts of climate change like the health or do you mean i: more the causes p: the causes i mean i feel pretty strongly that it is
that the real problem is (.) the just (it is?) definitely in the united states and beyond (.) the kind of the power and influence that the fossil fuel industry has on our government (.) and i mean they have like a strangle (.).

and they give (.) billions of dollars and they spend millions and millions of dollars on lying to the public and lobbying our politicians and paying for their elections and it's just a incredibly corrupt system=so even now it doesn't make sense to continue to- i mean it like really is like (.) (??) the thing with climate change is=it's like one of those things where it's like this huge problem (.) and the solutions are right there (.) and the solutions can like help create a lot of new jobs and can like revitalize neighborhoods and communities and the economy and all these things (.) i mean to me it's just seems very clear that there- (?) is) up the power that the coal and oil and nuclear energy has on our government where there getting billions of dollars and subsidies instead of those subsidies going towards the renewable energy sector it's what holding us back=and it's why our senators and congress people are holding back obama when he's here negotiating and why he's=) i mean like (.) just today there is like (?) that you know obama is giving three mill- three billion dollars to exxon to start a new project where (?is?) like you know there (?is not addict?) to that=i think it's like that collusion between the fossil fuel industry and our government

I: what do you think would be real solutions to climate change

P: i think that real solutions to climate change would be not really almost none of this offset (.) stuff. that it would be- that it would be (.) countries committing to like serious energy efficiency (.) national energy efficiency and like global energy efficiencies and massive investments in clean and renewable energies like solar and wind. and like moving or- and like in-=you know in the u s it's a lot about (??)=i mean for me it seems like (.) weaning ourselves very quickly of the fossil fuels and moving towards clean energy is what we- it's like the=and i feel like (?at?) these climate negotiations everybody has (to talk?) about all these other things that are really=) i mean like at the root of it (.) we know the greenhouse gas emissions comes from (?) burning the fossil fuels. so we need to get of fossil fuels and move towards renewable energy sources instead. and you can like hardly confute people and like make of these like crazy offset schemes and (?.)the end of the day people need to cut emissions and use clean energy instead.

I: ok

P: great
I: are there more real solutions you can mention (.) or is it-

P: i mean- i think that's awe=i mean=i=yeah=i also- i think-
you know (.) real equitable and just mechanisms that keep
trees standing and incr- you know the like (.) the natural
carbon sinks that exists in the world to keep them
standing and do not (.) you know do crazy things with
plantations and all of this but like actually treat our
biodiversity with kind of respecting care and (.) which i
think again goes back to the initiaries that the profit
(?we conveyed on have a toss?) on (.) exploiting those
natural resources and so i think putting the cause on this
pretty natural resources (.) poor those companies is a
really smart thing to do as part of a solution. (.) i mean
i really- i think that number one it's it's the (.)
government stepping up and figuring out national plans
that will seriously reduce their emissions immediately and
(?) (??).

I: if you (.) think about the term climate justice

P: yeah

I: what do you think (.) about it

P: i think that it's

I: what is it?

P: an incredibly important and essential part of these- the
like the growing climate movement. i think-

I: but what do you understand

P: what do i understand about it

I: with the term {{gleichzeitig} climate justice}

P: {{gleichzeitig} i understand} climate justice to mean a
lot of different things to a lot of different people=i
think that with the u n context=ok in- (.) most broadly i
think a very basic piece of climate justice is that (.)
the country and peoples that are most impacted by climate
change are the people that have done the least to
introduce to it. and so at its very nature (.) the way
that climate change is happening is unjust. just based on
that.= it's like people that didn't do anything to create
a problem are suffering the most because of it. number two
is who is at the table and who is able to make the
decisions about what we do about climate (.) change. and
so many of these people that are the most impacted are
excluded from talks=don't have formally places within the
negotiating process=and that's an issue of climate
justice. within- i mean it seems like one of the major
issues of climate justice within (.) the the u n and the
cop is- and there(?'re?) coming around a lot of indigenous
rights issues around their control of their land when
there is all this redd schemes (?for have?) carbon trading
schemes that are (.) at their very nature do not take- i
meaning like (.) the government are respecting the basic
(.) rights of indigenous people in their sovereignty. and
(.) so that's another (?major?) (??)=i think you can go
like-=and in the united states it's also climate justice
also has issues what we saw in hurricane katharina where
(.) it was poor mostly minority black people in the united
states that were displaced from their homes, died, had
such an inadequate response by our government who dealing
with that super storm=and so it's like also issues
about=it's like who (.) within countries are being
impacted and (now?) those are issues of climate justice.
and whose- i mean furthermore like (.) the the point of
the problem of destruction is like where are those- in the
united states it's like they only build coal plants in
poor communities. and that's an issues of justice, that
all the health impacts and you know quality of life
impacts that comes when (.) when coal is being burned in
your- like next door to you=and the asthma rates and the
cancer rates in those community.=that's a (??) of both a
kind of environmental and climate justice (??)

I: yeah(.) and if you look at the climate negotiations how do
you assess them?

P: ((hustet)) how do like what info-=what information do i
use=or how do i feel about them?

I: how do you feel about them?

P: i mean (.). i feel a lot of conflict. i mean i
think that on the one hand again like kind of especially
coming from the u s i think it's pretty remarkable (.) how
much (.) energy and (commitment?)=there really is. that's
like (.) and i was really struck by this afterwards in
poznan for the first time=it's like i mean again like.
coming from a country that's like widely debating whether
not climate change is an issue. to come to this place and
to see like tens of thousands of people here whether not
they're doing the right thing at all times=but like it=it=
=they're actually taking the issues seriously which i
think is something that is important. i think that it is
really inspiring and amazing to see people like the
president of the maldives and the lead of the small
island states and the african union and other kind of more
(.). just enfranchised countries and communities standing
up being really bold and saying what does (??)=i mean
there is leadership within these halls. it's just
unfortunately generally not coming from who really needs
to step up and be leaders. and- you know i think that as a
u s citizen it's (.). it's-= i mean last year (.). it was
humiliating to be part of= i mean not no- humiliating is
like not even a rough enough word it's like you feel like
a murder. like you are part of a country that is
condemning the (..) the survival of peoples. (..) <<lachend>
you know so>

I: yeah

P: i mean it's like it's- and you know things may be a little
bit different we're unfortunately seen the u s are playing
a real rolling back position in the negotiation and doing
the (??)

I: if you look at the conference and you think a friend is
asking you who attends at the climate conference what
would you answer?

P: i would say (..) governments most specifically negotiators,
environment ministers and heads of state (..) non-
governmental organizations so like groups like
greenpeace=and oxfam (??) thousand young people are part
of the international youth climate movement, there is
caucuses of many different people like the indigenous
people's caucus. there's also lot of business info=it's
here for sure (..) see (?it's?) the mostly like you have
governments, you have civil society, you have business and
you have kind of clumps of people that are impacted.

I: is there anyone here who shouldn't have=shouldn't be here?

P: (?who?) i mean i think (..) i don't know if they shouldn't.
i would say that the the corporations and the fossil fuel
industry should not have the influence that they have
here.

I: anyone missing?

P: yeah i mean i think that there's many many many people
that are impacted by climate change and can't afford to
get here that should be here and should be a vital part
of=not only the conversations=but they should be sitting
at the table and (??) making. i mean i know that that's
like a little bit not how the u n is structured but it (.)
it does seem that- you know when you get into somebody's
negotiations (such there's the??) plenaries and stuff (.)
then it would- you wish sometimes that especially like
negotiators from the u s and these (??) often kind of
(?base the?) reality of this (?a little bit more?)

I: (.) are there specific projects regarding climate change
your organization is here (..) working on (.)
{{gleichzeitig} at copenhagen no we're just}

P: we're kind of helping to organize civil society to show a
strong force to (..) governments around the world that
people want a fair ambiguous and (?pollining?) treaty.

I: ok. but do you have special activities here at copenhagen?

P: yeah we do and we were working a lot with the
international youth orgs like today (Name) who i've
working with helped to organize this big youth flash dance
and then we did a die-in outside of the plenary=you know
kind of doing different=taking different actions to
highlight different either problems or solutions within
the cop process.

I: (...) what do you think are the reasons for accreditation of
the organizations here at the conference?

P: why (...) like who did they accredit?

I: the civil society organizations?

P: yeah (...) i don't know. i mean it seems like if you wanna
get accredited and you're a (??any officially/
beneficially?) recognized n g o you can get accreditation.
i mean this year there's like so many more people trying
to do it but (...) i've been with groups that have like in
(??) this year that are non-profit organization and non-
governmental organizations (??) i've somehow related to
the work in climate change in some way and they applied
and get to bring some people (??) (.) but maybe i'm
wrong on that. i've got to (??) my impression.

I: what do you think about the protest activities outside?

P: i think they're great. i think they <<lacht>>were=i mean i
think what's happening in here is really important and i
think that the tens of thousands of people (??who've had
a?) gathering at copenhagen to demonstrate outside is
equally important. we needs a lot- i mean i really- there
needs to be a global and visible power and movement people
like now demanding real action from governments. and i
think what's even more important what's happening here (.)
is what's happening in new delhi and london and washington
d c and all these capital cities around the world are
responding and like making a (??fast air to?)= you know (.)
it's (.) i mean it's cool that one of the things (??avaaz
for a week?) getting like ten million people so far signed
on to saying that they wanna (??) a really binding treaty.
like- i think that kind of thing is really great.

I: but what do you think about the mobilization of autonomous
groups to copenhagen?

P: yeah. like the climate justice action?

I: like never trust a cop

P: i mean never trust a cop

I: {{gleichzeitig} or direct action}

P: {{gleichzeitig} is even except anymore=} i think direct
action is absolutely necessary and important for social
movements for change like throughout history. every major
issue that is needed to change by the civil right or women
suffragette or you know (??permit?) anything has had a
strong civil disobedience and non-violent direct action
movement to it and climate change is not different. and i
know yeah personally will probably be outside and joining
with= i mean i really- i just- i think there is really at
the moment when everybody needs be doing as much as
possible to show the world that people want a real deal.

I: yeah. (.) who do you cooperate with? your organization the
{{gleichzeitig} global youth movement}

P: {{gleichzeitig} like every (?group?)}> (.) i mean
avaaz cooperates well with like tons of=like it seems like
every organization within here most. we also work a lot
with international youth i have been or= i personally like
kind of (??)= i have my (??) a bunch of different
partners. like (?avaaz?) i (?ended?) working a lot with
kind of bigger n g os here, a lot with the international
youth, i've been attending climate justice action meetings
to find out what is going on on the outsides. working with
people like (name) or (name). so kind of- i don't see any
boundary here of where my involvement needs to be.

I: would you strictly oppose certain positions of n g os or
movements {{gleichzeitig} which are here}?

P: {{gleichzeitig} yeah i mean i think} that if there are (.)
whether not it's governments or n g os that are putting
towards false position that do not have equity and science
at there core i disagree with it. i think there're
anything that lowers the political expectation. it's like
any time it becomes politics and said what is actually
necessary (.) yeah i don't agree with it=i think that that
we need- and there's no reason that we can't have policies
that are equitable and in-line with what sciences are (?in
as?) we need right now. i think it tells different to
everybody when n g os and governments are saying (.) oh
let's take 30 per cent and what we know we need is 45 per
cent. like need to- we need to be speaking the truth. we
know what we need to do to respond to the climate crisis.

I: now i have a very provocative question

P: yes

I: how do you think the secret service refer to your
organization?

P: i think avaaz is probably not i mean a good- they're
probably not a concern of the secret service at all.

I: global youth movement?

P: (.) i don't think (?it's good?)= i mean honestly i don't
think were- i think there are some places in the in the u
s and probably in the (??) australia where young people
are taking a lot more easy in direct as a tactical onwards
as shut down coal plants or (?takes her ...?) climate
change or whatever and i think that day might be arising
(??) of the secret service a bit. as a whole we're a
pretty benign movement at this point. I think they will know that we're doing a really like \(<\text{lacht}\>(??) that we are start to actually have some real impact when we starting a little closer watch.

I: now I got some short questions at the end

P: yeah

I: what do you read when you want to know about climate change and climate politics and what do you not read

P: I read the news and blogs and emails and communication from environmental groups and (??). I read a lot (??). I like (??) news which came to (??). And I also have a lot of kind of alternative news and blogs and stuff that I get (??) here.

I: are there particular places where the global movement stated it's program it's demands regarding climate politics?

P: well you know the global youth movement has some of that but there's such a diversity of groups and people and opinions. It's actually broad but on youth climate dot org you see that and also energy (??) runs this blog or it's getting hot in here dot org and I think you see the diversity of opinions and issues and like what people are working on when they think about things pretty well when it's getting hot in here. And many of the like- like in the u s we have- there are the energy action coalition you can like see what the u s youth coalition is on things and same with a lot of the other like national delegations.

I: do you remember when you first met with the term climate justice?

P: (.) a couple of years ago I would say. I don't remember the exact time. I'm s-=I don't-

#Unterbrechung des Interviews – eine weitere Person spricht

Interviewpartnerin an, 1:30 min#

I: one last question

P: yeah

I: how is the global youth movement financed?

P: mostly self-financed. It's like people do fundraisers at parties and (.) raise money from their friends and family to get here,=it's not I mean I think (??) at the youth got some money this year from the dutch government or something to do something but I don't know the de(??) not (?at all?). Also (.) you know I think some number of youth could have get financed through (??) organizations in their countries to come here (.) it depends a lot=but it's not like we're=we don't have like (.) a lot of money.

\(<\text{lachend}\) it's very self organized yes (.) our fancy (??)
markers should be able to tell you
that>[Interviewpartnerin zeichnet parallel zum Interview
mit einem Marker Sprechblasen]
I: ok and that's it {{gleichzeitig} as}
P: {{gleichzeitig} that's it}
I: far as i am concerned to {{gleichzeitig} it perhaps}
P: {{gleichzeitig} ah cool}
I: you think about something you want to mention
P: ok
I: and
P: was that helpful? was that
I: it was helpful but anything you would think it's really
important to mention? (.) i missed it
P: no but have you- do you wanna talk to more people about
climate justice? cause i do know a bunch of people here
that are working very [yeah] deeply
I: would be great for (.) example from transnational
movements or networks
P: yeah let me give you one person to start talking to and
then he can tell you a bunch of other (.) (Name) (.)
I: ok i can write it down
P: and how did you feel like being interviewed now?
I: oh good
P: was it ok?
I: yeah
P: are you often being interviewed?
I: yeah <<lachend> i got interviewed a lot>
P: thank you
I: Zu Beginn würde mich einfach erst einmal interessieren wie
sie eigentlich zur Klimaallianz gekommen sind, als
Organisation.

P: Erstens sind wir das Klima-Bündnis [ja Climate Alliance]
Ja Climate Alliance ja es gibt ja die Klimaallianz also
das nur zur Unterscheidung ne in Deutschland dass das ein
Zusammenschluß von mehreren NGOs ist zur Klimaallianz und
wir sind das Klima-Bündnis (.).

I: Was denken sie denn was die Rolle von dem Klima-Bündnis
ist?

P: Bei was? Bei den internationalen Verhandlungen jetzt oder
überallgemeinsam im Klimaschutz}?

I: {gemeinsam} überhaupt die Rolle der Organisation

P: Das denke ich muss man einfach gucken auf welcher Skala
man immer schaut (.), das ist in Europa denke ich ist es
(.), eine wichtige Bewegung gewesen (??) das Klima-Bündnis-
est es natürlich immernoch- also wir sind gegründet worden
einfach schon bevor Rio war 1990 also bevor eigentlich
diese ganze lokale Agenda Klimaprozess und so weiter
überallgestartet wurde (.), und aus dem Bewusstsein
heraus es muss auf lokaler Ebene sich was ändern
eigentlich muss man nicht warten bis oben sich irgendwas
ändert sondern an vielen- viele Menschen an vielen Orten
und so weiter was tun dann wird sich was ändern das waren
engagierte Kommunen die auf indigene Völker der
Regenwälder- Vertreter dieser Organisationen gestoßen sind
(.), darauf aufmerksam geworden sind und dann diese
Partnerschaft gegründet haben also dieses Bündnis von
Städten Emissionen reduzieren wollen und indigene Völker
die dabei unterstützt werden den Regenwald- die
Regenwaldzerstörung zu stoppen (.).

I: ##kurze Unterbrechung des Interviews# Wir müssen gucken
dass wir hier nicht für invent gehalten werden

P: Ja genau wir haben mit denen nichts zu tun wir sitzen hier
nur ((lacht))#.

I: Was glauben sie denn was so wichtige Höhepunkt der letzten
Jahre für die Arbeit von der- des Klima-Bündnisses waren?

P: Die Arbeit lässt sich glaube ich in zwei Phasen teilen das
erste ist 2007 also eigentlich fast siebzehn Jahre (.), wo
Bewusstseinsbildung hauptsächlich betrieben wurde A auf
kommunaler Ebene- was man allein daran sieht dass die
Mitgliederzahl des Klima-Bündnisses so gewachsen ist- wir
haben angefangen mit zwölf Kommunen und sind- jetzt vor
drei Wochen haben wir die tausendfünfhunderter Grenze
überschritten (.) eigentlich ein sehr (.) rasantes
Wachstum über all die Jahre (.) also A Bewusstsein
Kommunen können was tun auf- in ihrem Handlungsbereich
direkt sie sind die Ebene die den Bürgern am nächsten sind
sie haben die Entscheidungskraft über wichtige
Weichenstellungen vor Ort (.) und dann das zweite denke
ich ist die Bewusstseinsänderung auf nationaler und EU
Ebene (.) weil da war- erst nicht so sehr für den
Klimaschutz an sich sondern eher was die Kommunen da für
eine Rolle spielen (.) und dass wir irgendwelchen
anspruchsvollen Ziele eigentlich auch nur erreichen können
wenn sie gefälligst die richtigen Rahmenbedingungen für
Kommunen bereitstellen damit diese die dann entsprechend
vor Ort umsetzen können (.) und dann kam im Prinzip diese
zweite Phase nach 2007 als dann mit Al Gore Film
(?)Meseberg?) was weiß ich ne also wirklich Klimaschutz in
aller Munde war- und seit dem geht es bei uns eher darum
praktische Lösungen zu geben (.) wir haben auch vorher
schon Empfehlungen Leitlinien alle möglichen Handbücher
Fortbildungen und so weiter angeboten für Kommunen aber
seit dem ist die Nachfrage noch viel größer also der Wille
ist jetzt da wir müssen niemanden mehr überzeugen sondern
es geht eher darum jetzt praktische Tipps zur Umsetzung zu
geben

I: Was würden sie denn sagen wäre der größte Erfolg für das
Klima-Bündnis wann bräuchte es die Organisation nicht
mehr?
P: Dann wenn Klimaschutz (.) Pflichtaufgabe ist für Kommunen
das heißt es gibt kein Hadern mehr machen wir es machen
wir es nicht dann wenn die Rahmenbedingungen so sind dass
keine Gebäude mehr gebaut werden können beziehungsweise so
saniert werden müssen dass entsprechende Reduzierungen
erreicht werden (.) dass im Endeffekt
Klimaschutzreduktionen- also Treibhausgasreduktionen
erreicht worden sind in dem Umfang wie wir sie brauchen
(.) dann braucht es auch das Klima-Bündnis nicht mehr [Ok]
dann gehen wir in Rente (((lacht)))

I: Können sie mir nochmal was über die wesentlichen
Tätigkeitsschwerpunkte des Klima-Bündnisses erzählen?
P: Wir haben ja im Klima-Bündnis zwei Hauptarbeitsbereiche
das eine ist der kommunale Klimaschutz also wo wir die
Kommunen in Europa betreuen und unterstützen dazu gehört
dann aber auch Lobbyarbeit auf nationaler und EU Ebene für
bessere Rahmenbedingungen für Kommunen (.) und dann haben
wir den zweiten Bereich die Kooperation mit den indigenen
Völkern (.) und da geht es darum (.) a (??) Initiativen zu
unterstützen von indigenen Völkern der Regenwälder sei es zur Sicherung ihrer Territorien im Regenwald was ja dann auch wieder Regenwaldschutz ist derzeit machen wir viele Aktivitäten zur Bewusstseinsbildung hier was- also zum Beispiel Ölförderung oder Ressourcenförderung da, Ausbeutung da für Folgen hat für die indigenen Völker wie dort ihre Gebiete zerstört werden ihre Lebensgrundlagen (.) und wir machen auch konkrete Projektunterstützung also das wäre bei unseren Mitgliedskommunen Partner suchen für konkrete Projekte im Regenwald die von den Indigenen vorgeschlagen werden

I: Zu- In Bezug auf den Klimawandel was glauben sie denn ist das eigentliche Problem der globalen Erwärmung?

P: Also das eigentliche Problem das ist schwer zu sagen weil einfach ja die Auswirkungen des Klimawandels so vielfältig sind und das heißt eigentlich wird jetzt in einem extrem kurzen Zeitraum sehr viel zerstört (.) auf erstmal lange Zeit unwiderruflich und dass man einfach schauen muss wie wollen wir- (.) naja (?) bestimmte Lebensräume bestimmte Gegenden für Menschen bewohnbar und (.) ja also für mich ist einfach die größte Herausforderung dass man das Wirtschaften ändern muss (.) also dass man zu einer Art globale Wirtschaft umdenken muss (.) ja ich weiß jetzt nicht was ich dazu noch sagen soll weil ich denke es sind-(.) wenn sie jetzt meinen welche Auswirkungen des Klimawandels am schlimmsten sind oder?- ich weiß nicht was die Frage- ja für uns ist es jetzt im Moment auch wichtig einfach zu zeigen wenn darüber diskutiert wird zwei Grad wärmer oder ne (.) es geht nicht darum dass es zwei Grad wärmer ist und viele sich dann freuen ne also es gibt dann so Pressemeldungen wir bauen jetzt Wein an und so was und einfach dieses Bewusstsein zu schärfen das heißt was ganz anderes (.) das heißt Stürme Überflutungen Dürren einfach dramatische Änderungen der Lebensumstände für viele Menschen und damit auch Schädigung der Wirtschaft während halt jetzt investieren in erneuerbare Energien und in Energieunabhängigkeit (.) von fossilen Energiequellen einfach bedeutet die Wirtschaft zu sichern [mmh] auf lokaler Ebene und dann natürlich hält auch auf größerem Maßstab

I: Können sie mir erzählen- sagen was für sie wichtige real solutions bezüglich des Klimawandels wären?

P: <<lachend> Energiesparen> sofort (.) also einfach die Weichen entsprechend stellen einfach an allen Stellen weil es wird- im Moment ist es noch viel zu sehr Einzelprojekte und dann wird sich gefreut über irgendwie jetzt ein Haus oder ein Kindergarten der jetzt Passivhausstand- bauweise saniert wird (.) aber das wird die Änderung nicht bringen (.) was wir brauchen das ist (.) Mainstreaming nenne ich das immer (.) also in jeder politischen Entscheidung muss
Klimaschutz ganz oben stehen und nicht immer erst an
dritter Stelle und dann eventuell wegen Finanzmangel noch
wegdiskutiert werden (.) und dann kann auch wirklich
schnell was passieren und eine zweite wichtige
Herausforderung ist den privaten Sektor an Bord holen weil
(.) das Geld was gebraucht wird- also die ersten Maßnahmen
die rechnen sich ja meistens ne aber dann wenn es an
weitere Maßnahmen geht dann braucht man einfach
zusätzliches Geld das haben die Kommunen nicht das haben
die Staaten nicht und deswegen geht es einfach darum den
privaten Sektor ins Boot zu holen und Finanzierungsmodelle
zu entwickeln die diese Umsetzung dieser Maßnahmen halt
dann wirklich (??)

I: Gibt es da noch weitere Lösungen, Lösungsmöglichkeiten?
P: (.) Ja, ist immer die Frage wie weitgehend man das jetzt
betrachtet ne weil im Endeffekt wenn man es immer weiter
durch dekliniert dann sind es natürlich ganz radikaler
Wandel der da eigentlich auf einen zukommt und nicht mal
nur ein bisschen Schule sanieren und (.). vielleicht auf
den Bus umzusteigen (.). ja deswegen (.). für mich ist es
einfach das sich konzentrieren auf die Kommune weil wir
reden jetzt hier von Städten Gemeinden und einfach zu
schauen wie kriege ich A meinen Energieverbrauch oder
meinen Energiebedarf runter und wie decke ich B diesen
(?letzten/ganzen?) Energiebedarf durch lokale Energie das
sind dann Erneuerbare meistens

I: Gibt es auch was wo wie sagen würden das sind false
solutions falsche Lösungen?
P: Ja da haben wir gerade Klima-Bündnis ziemlich viele
identifiziert und werden auch nicht müde die immer wieder
anzupreisen (.). also das Klima-Bündnis steht sehr stark
dafür ein alle Arten der Kompensationswirtschaft wie sie
läuft zu unterbinden und (.). diese Schlupflocher die da
geschaffen werden- also einfach das sich Stehlen aus der
eigenen Verantwortung und sich frei zukaufen- sind wir
ganz stark dagegen und haben dazu auch Positionspapiere
und mehrere Kampagnen laufen (.). CCS ist für uns genau so
eine falsche Lösung weil es bemüht einfach nur Mittel und
Energie die viel besser jetzt sofort in andere Lösungen
investiert werden könnten

I: Gut gibt es noch weitere? Oder-
P: Ja das sind jetzt die Haupt- (??) man kann jetzt sagen
Atomkraftlanglaufzeitverlängerung ist natürlich auch eine
falsche Lösung Großkraftwerke bauen Kohlekraftwerke sind
wir genau so dagegen (??) aus genau dem gleichen Grund wie
CCS also es wird einfach jeder Euro gebraucht der in die
richtige Richtung investiert wird und nicht in solche
Sackgassen

I: Was verstehen sie denn unter dem Begriff
Klimagerechtigkeit?

P: Klimagerechtigkeit ist-

I: Ich muss eher fragen [ja] was verstehen sie unter dem Begriff Climate Justice?

P: Ja ja ja Climate Justice naja es ist ein Begrenzen des Ressourcenverbrauchs derer die zu viel verbrauchen (.) [mh] und aber gleichzeitig die Schaffung der Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu einer (??/?-vollen) Entwicklung derer die im Moment sozusagen noch unter diesem Niveau sind und dann das Einpendeln auf ein Niveau an Emissionen die (.) ja irgendein Fortbestehen der (??) Klimawandel (?)verändert? und das heißt ja über achtzig Prozent müsten wir runtergehen (.) mindestens

I: Würden sie den Begriff verwenden?

P: Wir benutzen den sehr oft (.) also gerade in Kooperation mit den indigen Völkern (.) und im Zusammenhang mit den Projekten die ich ebenso erwähnt hab dass die Erdölförderung auch angeht einfach weil wir das als Aufhänger sehen was unser Energiehunger hier woanders bewirkt und auf wessen Kosten wir eigentlich leben

I: Jetzt in Bezug auf die Verhandlungen hier wie bewerten sie die Klimaverhandlungen?

P: Ja so wie es im Moment aussieht ist es ja sehr sehr sehr schwierig also ich muss gestehen dass ich im Vorhinein nicht gedacht habe dass es so problematisch werden würde und (.) also auch wenn hart verhandelt wird und nach einer Lösung gerungen aber im Moment muss ich sagen bin ich wirklich pessimistisch (.) ja mal schauen wie sich das die nächsten tage weiter entwickelt aber (.) also vielleicht bewirkt es ja doch dass so viele Leute hier sind und dass noch mal so ein Druck erzeugt wird also wie wichtig das der Welt da draußen ist und dass das hier nicht nur ein paar Bürokraten sind die hier verhandeln also ich hoffe dass was passiert aber viele Hoffnungen habe ich im Moment eigentlich nicht

I: Wie beurteilen sie die Chancen den Prozess zu beeinflussen?

P: Gering (.) weil wenn man sieht über was da verhandelt wird da kommen wir mit unseren Angeboten und solutions gar nicht so weit ran weil es wird ja hauptsächlich verhandelt wer mit wem zu welchen Paragraph streichen wir es geht ja gar nicht darum abzuschätzen wie viel wäre denn erreichbar (.) also was wir eigentlich benutzen in unserer ganzen Lobbyarbeit ist zu zeigen Leute guckt Kommunen haben- können das und das erreichen und so viel zu anspruchsvollen Zielen beitragen (.) wenn ihr die Rahmenbedingungen richtig macht wenn ihr sie entsprechend unterstützt (.) also den Rücken stärkt auch jetzt nicht
nur finanziell sondern auch wirklich politisch dann kann viel erreicht werden aber die Richtung muss halt stimmen (.). dann nicht laute kontraproduktive Politiklinien wieder auf nationaler Ebene dagegen vor allem auf EU Ebene (.). und das ist eigentlich unser Hauptding (.). anerkennen Leute ihr müsst die Politik auf lokale Ebene runter brechen und dann besteht auch die Chance anspruchsvolle Ziele zu schaffen aber (.). das kann man hier vielen Leuten sagen alle nicken und finden das auch wichtig aber die eigentlichen Verhandlungen da geht es um ganz andere Sachen (.). von daher sind wir relativ- wir haben im Vorfeld haben wir viel Lobbyarbeit ge- betrieben das war auch wichtig einfach um zu sehen dass in wichtigen Dokumenten dann von der EU auch drinnen stand dass ja das die lokale Ebene wichtig ist und anerkannt werden muss jetzt kommt natürlich dann die nächste Stufe mit (.). Finanzierung und anderen (??) Rahmenbedingungen (.). aber hier jetzt direkt (.). noch groß was zu reißen würde ich sagen ist relativ aussichtslos

I: Was will das Klima-Bündnis denn in Kopenhagen erreichen?
P: Naja unser Mindestziel wäre gewesen dass es hier zu einer Einigung kommt zu einer verbindlichen Einigung was jetzt passieren soll als nächstes selbst wenn es noch kein Dokument für die nächste Periode ist aber zumindest (.). also ein klarer Wegweiser was jetzt in kürzester Zeit passieren kann und muss weil das dann schon wieder ein heraus zögern ist es gab eigentlich die Bali (?road map?) wo man gesagt hat man gibt sich die nächsten zwei Jahre um hier zu einer Lösung zu kommen (.). ich sehe die Lösung nicht

I: Können sie sich vorstellen dass ein Freund oder eine Freundin sie fragt wer nimmt den so an der Klimakonferenz oder an Klimakonferenzen teil was würden sie da antworten?
P: Gott und die Welt offenbar ne also weil man fragt sich ja schon wo die ganzen Leute herkommen die jetzt hier vertreten sind (.). was ich halt immer wieder erstaunlich finde also jetzt abgesehen von den normalen Delegationen und so weiter (.). was ich halt immer wieder erstaunlich finde ist auch so diese Zusammensetzung der Lobbygroups ne weil es gibt halt die traditionellen NGOs (.). die dann wirklich den Druck machen dass da was passiert und in die richtige Richtung umgelenkt wird die auch wirklich gute Aktionen machen die auch (.). berühren und vielleicht über den Weg am ehesten noch es irgendwie schaffen das in die richtige Richtung zu lenken (.). aber dann ist es halt auch total viele Gruppen die echt aus dem ganzen Ding ihr Geschäft machen wollen (.). also diese Ganzen die da irgendwelche carbon rights verkaufen wollen und (.). also davon leben dass Emissionshandel und CDMs und so weiter gibt (.). das finde ich schon sehr extrem gerade wenn man
mal so auf die side events guckt dann hat man das Gefühl
(also im Klimaschutz sind- das kann man an einer Hand
abzählen wie viele side events es gibt aber (.)) irgendwie
trading was weiß ich was wir haben diese Lösung und wir
bringen diese Partner zusammen (.). das sind so viele

I: Würden sie sagen es fehlt wer?
P: Es würde mir jetzt ad hoc niemand einfallen weil es ist
wirklich eine absolut bunte Mischung (.), von Nord nach Süd
(sog er klei (.)) also (.), wüsste ich jetzt nicht

I: Können sie mir erzählen wie das Klima-Bündnis hier so in
Kopenhagen wahrgenommen wird?
P: Von Leuten die am Klimaschutz interessiert sind und an
Kommunen (.), denke ich gut und interessiert aber das ist
wie eben geschildert nur eine kleine Gruppe weil das
interessiert kein Schwein (.), eigentlich was- ja das muss
man ganz deutlich sagen beziehungsweise (.), es spielt
jetzt in den konkreten Verhandlungen (.), nicht die große
Rolle es ist motivierend für die die sowieso aktiv sind in
dem Feld aber das ist was man aus allen Sachen kennt (.),
und die Delegation- also es hilft uns bestimmt für die
langfristige Zusammenarbeit mit den Delegationen aus den
Ländern einfach dass man da Bewusstsein hat dass man dann
später wenn die Konferenz vorbei ist auf nationaler (?EU?)
Ebene wieder weiter verhandelt dann wieder
Rahmenbedingungen verbessert also dafür ist es auf jeden
Fall gut [mhm]

I: Wenn sie sich vorstellen dass- diese Klimaverhandlungen
wären ein Fußballspiel [mhm] wie würden sie das
kommentieren?
P: Ich könnte jetzt sagen Abseits aber <=lachend>nein> also
(ja (.)) im Moment (.), es ist ja eher ja so ein wildes
Rumgekicke im Strafraum ne ((lacht)) ich bin kein
Fußballkenner das ist jetzt das einzige was mir so
einfällt weil es geht- eigentlich ist ja mehr kaputt
gemacht worden jetzt am Anfang in der ersten Woche als
aufgebaut worden das heißt es gab eigentlich nur blutige
Schienbeine Tore Null zu Null (.)) ((lacht)) definitiv (.)
ja ((lacht))

I: Können sie mir nochmal erzählen was ihre Organisation zum
Klimathema eigentlich macht?
P: Zum Klimathema (.), wir arbeiten hauptsächlich zum Klima-
kommunalen Klimaschutz und das heißt (.), wir unterstützen
Kommunen dabei (.), ja konkrete Maßnahmen zu ergreifen (.),
nehmen das immer je nach Projekten je nach wahrgenommenen
Schwerpunkten von den Kommunen wahr (.), vertiefen das dann
per Erfahrungsaustausch Guidelines Fortbildungen und so
weiter (.), was wir gerade jetzt im letzten Jahr viel
gemacht haben ist eine Art Berichtswesen der Kommunen dazu
beizutragen (.) das Klima-Bündnis ist ja das einzige Netzwerk wo sich die Kommunen zu einem konkreten Reduktionsziel verpflichten wenn sie beitreten (.). und deswegen ist natürlich auch immer die Frage wie viel haben sie denn erreicht (.). deswegen haben wir ein CO2 Monitoring Tool entwickelt für Kommunen das ist als Internetplattform verfügbar und da-. (.) das haben wir jetzt vor einem Jahr in Deutschland gestartet wir haben mehr als 200 Kommunen die das bis jetzt nutzen und weiter das jetzt aus auf weitere Länder also das heißt da wird jetzt demnächst etwas vorhanden sein was es bisher noch nicht gab nämlich ganz viele lokale CO2 Bilanzen (.). und das ist natürlich auch wieder sehr interessant für uns um dann einfach wieder belegen zu können was haben Kommunen bis jetzt erreicht und was könnten sie erreichen (.). wenn die entsprechenden Rahmenbedingungen stimmen und was wir auch (??) gerade vor ein paar Wochen (.). gestartet haben ist ein Benchmarksystem für den kommunalen Klimaschutz [mhm] (.). das heißt wo Kommunen sich praktisch einordnen können anhand der Maßnahmen die von Ihnen umgesetzt werden und anhand der Ergebnisse die sie erzielt haben wie sie dastehen im Vergleich zu den anderen analogisiert also das ist keine Rankingliste mit den Ersten Zweiten Dritten sondern nur im Vergleich zum besten der Gruppe also nach Größenkategorien und dann (.). und zum Durchschnitt der Gruppe und zum nationalen Mittelwert

I: Und was macht das Klima-Bündnis hier in Kopenhagen?

P: Ja wir informieren über diese Ergebnisse dieser Arbeit und finden da auch eigentlich ein sehr großes Interesse also gerade für diese CO2 Bilanzierung und das Benchmarksystem (.). weil ja das suchen noch viele andere Länder eine Möglichkeit der Bewertung von kommunalem Klimaschutz

I: Welche Organisationen unterstützen- Aktionen unterstützt das Klima-Bündnis hier vor Ort?

P: Aktionen ja (.). <<lachend> (??) (.). ich weiß nicht> [ok] nein also wir sind eben überall mit dabei und ein paar Kollegen gehen auch brav auf Demos aber ansonsten (.). wir sind (.). ansonsten keinen weiteren Aktionen angeschlossen (.). das ist hauptsächlich hier so eine Art (??) des Austauschs und der Möglichkeiten und einfach auch ein Treffpunkt weil man hat natürlich die Chance so viele Leute die vielleicht vom anderen Ende der Welt kommen mal hier zu sehen und auch weitere Aktionen zu vereinbaren (.).

[mhm]

I: Wie stehen sie denn zu den Protesten außerhalb des Gipfels?

P: Die finde ich sehr gut ganz einfach weil sie nochmal zusätzlichen Druck machen (.). und einfach ja wirklich zeigen dass den Menschen was daran gelegen ist (.). was
natürlich wirklich nicht schön war waren diese- die Art wie damit umgegangen wurde (. und ich denke das wird hier in Dänemark bestimmt auch noch ein großes Nachspiel haben wenn man das so mitkriegt in den Nachrichten

I: Können sie das nochmal konkreter

P: {{gleichzeitig}beschreiben naja} es sind ja sehr viele Leute verhaftet worden mussten stundenlang in der Kälte auf dem Boden sitzen und (. also ohne dass was passiert ist (. und das ist halt eine also gerade hier in Dänemark eine Art des Umgangs (.) der einfach nicht nachvollziehbar ist [mhm] und mein dänisch ist jetzt nicht perfekt aber was ich so mitkriege in den Nachrichten ist das ein mittlerer Skandal kein mittlerer ein großer Skandal

I: Was halten sie denn von der Mobilisierung von diesen autonomen Gruppen nach Kopenhagen?

P: Ja das ist dann halt wirklich kontraproduktiv ne weil dann kommt dadurch dann- so gerade wenn dann wirklich Gewalt und so was ins Spiel kommt (. dann kommt es ganz schnell alle in Misskredit und das wäre natürlich sehr schade weil wirklich wenn man es sich anschaut die Masse der Leute die da sind sind das sind wirklich die die es ernst meinen und wirklich voll dahinter stehen und die zu hause ihre ganze Arbeit da rein stecken

I: Können sie mir sagen mit wem sie zusammen arbeiten?

P: Generell?

I: Generell das Klima-Bündnis

P: Also wir arbeiten generell mit anderen Städtenetzwerken zusammen die in dem Thema aktiv sind (. das sind eigentlich unsere wichtigsten Partner ganz einfach um auch um (??konzertierte?) Aktionen sozusagen zu starten (. auch uns abzusprechen was es an Angeboten gibt für Kommunen oder an Initiativen wir treten oft gemeinsam auf weil wir halt auch unterschiedliche Mitgliedergruppen haben und dadurch dass wir dann gemeinsam auftreten - sie sehen es ja hier auch an der Präsentation die wir laufen haben- das ist ein Zusammenschluss von vier Netzwerken (. die wir einfach dann wirklich gut Europa abdecken

I: Gibt es bestimmte Standpunkte von anderen NGOs oder sozialen Bewegungen wo sie sagen würden da würde ich fundamental widersprechen?

P: Wenn sie mir einen Standpunkt nennen würden dann könnte ich ja oder nein sagen <<lachend> aber mir fällt gerade keine ein ich bin ehrlich gesagt ein bisschen müde> (. was könnte das denn sein (.)

I: In Bezug auf die Klimapolitik-

P: Ja ja (. ne aber eigentlich fordern doch alle (.}
ziemlich das gleiche oder (..) mir fällt kein (??)
Standpunkt ein ((lacht))
I: Ich habe zum Schluss noch so ein paar konkretere Fragen
(.) zum Beispiel die was sie eigentlich so zum Thema
Klimawandel Klimapolitik lesen wenn sie sich da- wenn sie
da mehr wissen wollen (.). was sie zum Thema Klimawandel
Klimapolitik lesen
P: Meistens (.) von den entsprechenden Organen die uns
angehen also das ist hauptsächlich EU und Nationalstaaten
(.) internationale (.). #kurze Unterbrechung des
Interviews#
I: die Frage was sie lesen zum Thema Klimawandel Klimapolitik
P: Also so zu wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen Klimawandel da
lese ich meistens entweder vom PIK oder von der (?WNO?)
Publikationen weil die eigentlich immer gut und
übersichtlich und schnell lesbar dargestellt sind (.).
Klimapolitik ja da verfolgen wir natürlich dauernd was auf
internationaler EU nationaler Ebene läuft also
Gesetzesvorhaben und andere Politikinitiativen
I: Was lesen sie auf keinen Fall?
P: Al Gore Texte <<lachend> nein>
I: Können sie da mehr dazu sagen?
P: Ja das ist halt- der ist ja sehr in Verruf gekommen
dadurch dass er am Anfang die Riesenshow gemacht hat und
dann im Nachhinein dann (??) drei hunderttausend Euro und
was weiß ich was zu haben war also von daher (.). ist er ja
im Moment eher als Geschäftemacher (.). verschrien und
keiner will mehr was mit ihm zu tun haben (.). nein das war
jetzt so im übertragenen Sinne also alle die irgendwie
versuchen da ihren Profit raus zu ziehen und eine Show zu
machen- (.). es gibt viele Leute die es ehrlich meinen und
das für einen Bruchteil des Geldes tun
I: Gibt es zentrale Stellen an denen ich mich über die
Forderung und Inhalte vom Klima-Bündnis informieren kann?
P: Auf der Webseite ((lacht)) können sie ja
I: Seit wann- also können sie sich erinnern wann sie den
Begriff Klimagerechtigkeit das erste Mal gehört haben?
Oder das kennen gelernt haben?
P: Ja ich glaube wir verwenden den eigentlich schon ziemlich
lange bevor er so in Mode gekommen ist weil es für uns
eigentlich (.). ein fundamentaler Ansatz eigentlich ist (.).
also gerade in der (??) mit den Indigenen deswegen (.). ich
glaube man muss eher danach fragen wann der eher so ins
Publikum gekommen ist ja so breit irgendwie aufgestellt
(??)
I: (??) würden sie das {{gleichzeitig}({??})}
P: Ja so (??) 2008 also noch nicht so lange her

I: Seit wann benutzt den das Klima-Bündnis?

P: Also vielleicht nicht von Anfang an aber auf jeden Fall einige Jahre länger

I: der Anfang wäre?

P: 1990

I: Können sie mir zum Schluss sagen wie sich das Klima-Bündnis eigentlich finanziert?

P: Ja zu einem kleinen Teil aus Mitgliedsbeiträgen von den Kommunen (.) und jetzt zum großen Teil aber aus (??) das heißt nationalen oder EU Projekten

I: Von meiner Seite wäre es das ich weiß jetzt nicht ob sie noch irgendwelche Themen haben oder Inhalte wo sie sagen ja das wäre aber eigentlich interessant gewesen oder wichtig {{gleichzeitig} das habe ich gar nicht gefragt/nein ich glaube}

P: ich habe alles angebracht was ich sagen wollte ((lacht))

I: Wie haben sie sich so gefühlt interviewt zu werden?

P: Das ist ungefähr das zehnte Interview jetzt die Tage <<lachend> von daher> (. ) Normalzustand ((lacht))

I: Ich bedanke mich
A.3.14 Transkript »Oxfam International«

I: could you tell me how was it that you joined oxfam?

P: 

I: what do you think is the role of oxfam?

P: i mean, our mission in the global south is to reduce poverty and suffering, so we have three areas of work. one is the humanitarian response which is, you know budget-wise, half of our budget (cause to?) disaster response, emergency response whether it’s natural disasters or conflict. so, there’s a lot of response there but also more and more preparedness. so, preparing communities to anticipate this so that they can react betters when disaster strikes. that’s one area of work. the second area is what we call development work. so, that’s working with people in poverty to improve their lives whether it’s livelihood, health care, education. so, that’s working with people in communities with ngos in the south. and then the last work, that’s the area that i am working at the moment, is advocacy and campaigning. So, you know, all these projects ultimately are just small initiatives, you know there’s so much suffering going on that in order to make a change you need to change the policies, the practices whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public. so, that’s what we do in ‘advocacy and campaigning’. We try to raise awareness to change policies, practices and attitudes. so, these are kind of the three roles for oxfam.

I: could you tell me something about the most critical stage when you have been discussing your political agenda? what have been central occurrences in the last years?

P: well, for us, the emergence of climate change as an issue that is really a development issue, you know, has been critical. i mean since a few years (.) let me say (.) we’ve worked and we’ve seen the impacts of climate change for a while already, you know, and as oxfam we have done some work on it. but it’s basically since 2006/2007 that we saw in a much more stronger way the impacts of climate change and the need to address it and that climate change is much more than an environmental-ecological disaster but it’s a clear development crisis as well because climate change is impacting those who are least responsible actually for causing it, you know, the people in the
south, their emissions historically have been very very little. yet they are first impacted and have the least capability to overcome the challenges, the impacts caused by climate change. so, it’s a development crisis and if we don’t find sustainable solutions to climate change, it runs the risk to setting back, to kind of cancel all the progress we’ve done in the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction. moreover, we know climate change is happening. even if here in copenhagen people find a very ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gases, we know climate change is going to happen. so, communities need already to be assisted to adapt to climate change that is already visible, but that is already kind of in the system and will happen, you know, in the coming 50 years. so, we are locked into a certain amount of climate change already, even if we stop greenhouse gases from today onwards. and that’s what we call adaptation. so, that’s also the area of work we have been focusing on.

I: what do you think would be the greatest success for oxfam (??)?

P: here in copenhagen?

I: or in general.

P: on climate change, you mean?

I: in general.

P: you know, for the organization in general, it’s to reduce poverty and suffering. so, that is basically, you know, making sure that (?the number of?) people living in poverty dramatically reduces and people are given chances to improve their lives and have a decent livelihood, live in good health, have proper access to education, health care and all the basic social service. that’s our overall mission. But as i said, we work on climate change, we work on issues of livelihoods, health care (.) so, for each of those areas there are kind of very specific objectives if you want.

I: what do you think is the real problem of climate change or global warming? is there a ‘real’ problem?

P: well, in essence, it is an issue of (.) us developing without the use of carbon. we need to change our development model or the economic model in such a way that we basically become carbon-neutral. so, the kind of development that the industrialized world has embarked upon since the beginning of the industrial revolution is no longer viable, you know. we can’t sustain that, you know. so, that’s the greenhouse gas emissions caused by, you know, production, by carbon producing systems is the fundamental cause. so, we need to kind of mitigate that, to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. that means on the one hand, the developed world, the industrialized world
needs to cut down dramatically its greenhouse gas emissions. That’s on the other hand, the developing world that is in the process of, you know, becoming more wealthy and increasing its standard of living needs to develop in such a way that is low-carbon. So, it can no longer pursue the same strategies that the developing world has done for the past two centuries, you know. So, there’s the dual challenge in the developed world to, you know, basically change their economic model to a low-carbon economy and on the other hand, the developing world, we need to allow them to develop because, you know, poverty reduction must be their main priority. But to do that in such a way (without?), you know, pursuing the same strategies that the industrialized countries did for the past two centuries. So, that’s the fundamental solution that is required. But part of it is also the (.) I mean, the first part is what people call mitigation. The other part is adaptation which recognizes that climate change is happening, will happen and we need to start assisting those who will be impacted by it. And so, that requires finance, that requires certain interventions from disaster risk reduction to improved agriculture strategies to new ways of building houses to ultimately, in some cases, relocation because people can no longer live in the places where they used to because, you know, the sea will take over their land.

I: What would be false solutions?

P: False solutions? One thing that we are concerned about, for example, is the whole mechanism of carbon markets (CDM?) you know. While there is indeed a place for carbon markets. For (.) No, let me go back. There is a need for a carbon price because in our economic model, economic actors and consumers will only make the necessary changes in form by or forced to price signals. If the price of something increases or decreases, economic actors and consumers change their behavior. You know, that’s how our economic system functions, that’s how our society functions. Of course, that needs to be supported by all sorts of policies that governments can initiate subsidies. But, you know, we do need a price signal. That’s important. Where we are concerned about in terms of false solutions is for example carbon markets where you say ‘ok, we can buy carbon in the developing world, buy a carbon credit and then basically continue to do what we do in the north but we kind of offset it in the south. I mean, this is a false solution because at best it’s a zero sum, you know. You just continue in the north, emitting, and you offset this with something in the south. Now, that’s just a zero sum. There’s no reduction there. At worst and that is the problem with carbon markets at the moment it’s even not a zero sum. There is (.) the reduction or the supposed
reduction in the south is not happening. all sorts of problems, with monitoring, with the implementation of these so-called cdm-projects. so, the promotion of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets is problematic. we recognize the place of it but the way it’s currently happening is very problematic. so, that would be one of (??) for example.

I: are there some more?
P: other loop holes for example, i mean, just building on the same, if you want, is (.) developed countries saying ‘look, we will reduce our greenhouse gases, you know, but we will offset’. this will not all be done through domestic action. so, let’s say the european union says ‘we are going to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 30%’, you know, but actually that 30% is not happening in the e u it is partly or mainly done by buying credits in the developing world, you know. and as for the current regime and the current proposal, you know, more than half of that reduction that e u is committing to may actually happen through offset in the south. so, you know, all these are kinds of false solutions. what is absolutely crucial here is not only an ambitious set of targets and commitments but also making absolutely sure that the compliance regime, that the rules und regulations that will govern these commitments are very tight.

I: what do you understand by ‘climate justice’?
P: well, there are many dimensions in terms of climate justice. i mean, one issue in terms of climate justice is that people who are least responsible of causing the problem, i.e. the poor in the south, are the most and the first impacted by climate change. and also, there is an injustice there. so, if we look at solutions, we need to have solutions that are (?”equitable?”) that is one form of injustice. another injustice is (.) if you look at who has the responsibility to act first and (?”farthest?”), you need to look at historical emissions. countries have been emitting greenhouse gases since the industrial revolution. if you look at the historical responsibility, it is overwhelmingly with the industrialized countries. now, 76% of the historic emissions come from the developed world. and it is true that china and india. because these are such big countries are rapidly increasing their emissions and therefore need to be part of the solution in the future. now, their responsibility at the moment is very different from the industrialized countries, you know. so, that’s another thing of justice that needs to be recognized, you know, the historical responsibility between developed world and the industrialized world is of a complete different order. and if you bring this even today to, let’s say, per capita emission in the u s, it’s
20 tons per year CO2, per individual. While in China (.)
well, in India it’s 2 to 4 and in China it’s 6. So, you
know, there is massive gas. Of course, you know, it’s
perfectly right to say that India and China are massive
countries. So, by the virtue of their massive population,
that adds to a lot of carbon and that needs to be
recognized. But it is important in terms of moving forward
towards a new climate regime, that these issues of justice
are recognized in identifying who needs to do what first,
furthest and fastest.

I: Would you make use of the term ‘climate justice’?

P: Yes. But it has different meaning to different people, you
know. So, for us, when we talk about climate justice, it
is about looking at historic responsibilities, it’s about
recognizing that some people are much more vulnerable than
others and so that needs to be resolved in an equitable
manner. It has also to do with development models. You
know, many people see the impact of climate change as part
of the broader development model where natural resources
have been exploited at the expense of, you know, poor
people in the south, just to service the economy of the
elites. So, climate justice as a term you know, people
have many different views on it and definitely, we as
Oxfam, for us climate justice is important. For us it’s
looking particularly at making sure that the most
vulnerable (?often times individuals’ communities from the
most vulnerable countries?) are being properly supported.
That’s the core of our interpretation of climate justice.
But we as well are concerned about the issues of access to
natural resources, development model, which is, let’s say,
a slightly broader definition of ‘climate change’.

I: (??) How would you assess the climate negotiations?

P: Well, this is the moment we have been working towards for
almost two years now. When we started in Bali with this
negotiation process towards an agreement for the post-2012
climate regime. So, you know, this is the moment. I think
we’ve seen a lot of developments in the last week that are
very welcome, that have created settings, that can result
in a good outcome. The fact that we have so many leaders
coming here is important, it’s a very good moment for
countries to indeed commit to ambitious action. At the
same time, there is a risk, the risk being that leaders
come here and leaders will present whatever is agreed as
the most important agreement on climate change. You know,
Obama and Hu Jintao everybody is here, everybody will sell
it as a fantastic deal that’ll save the planet. We need to
make sure that we really are very clear about what’s
adequate, you know, what is needed to avoid catastrophic
climate change is to keep us below two 2 degrees of global
warming, what will, you know, promote this low-carbon
development, what will be made available to assist
countries to adapt climate change. So, we need to have
very clear benchmarks. I think we would be more optimistic
that Copenhagen can deliver a good outcome. But there’s
also a risk that there’s a lot of green-wash. People will
say ‘this is fantastic’ and everybody will say ‘OK, we’re
happy with it’ and people move on. We need to make sure
that what is agreed will be adequate in terms of avoiding
two degrees of global warming. And, you know, I think that is
our biggest concern, there’s a big opportunity here. But,
there are concerns that, you know, people who will just
sell it and say ‘we’ve done it, wow!’ – You know, and it
will not necessarily be adequate.

I: Imagining a friend is asking you ‘Who is participating in
the climate conference, in the climate negotiations. What
would you answer?
P: ‘Who is (.)?’
I: Who is participating in these conferences? What would be
your answer to a question like that ‘Who is participating
at the conference?’
P: Well, the people here in the conference you mean? In terms
of NGOs or (.)?
I: ‘Who’s participating in the climate negotiations?’
P: In terms of individual part (.) Sorry, I’m trying to
understand the question better (.)
I: Ok, let me ask in some other way. Is someone missing if
you look at the people participating?
P: Well, as always in international negotiations, the voices
of the voiceless are lacking. You know, this is very much
elite politics. And that’s what Oxfam wants to bring
together with civil society, to the table, it’s to make
sure that when people talk about, you know, ‘flexible
mechanisms’ or, you know, ‘mitigation targets’ that
ultimately reassess all these agreements and initiatives
against what this will mean in terms of global warming and
therefore the impact that will have on people and eco-
systems and everything else. And so, bringing that human
voice, you know, is something that is important. And the
voices of those who are and will be impacted here first
and hardest by climate change is not always heard. And
that’s with any international process. So, in terms of
‘Who is lacking here?’, that will be the obvious
constituency
I: And someone who shouldn’t be here, but is here?
P: Well, I think everyone has a right to participate. I mean
(. ) I think, what is important is that (. ) I would hope
that everybody who’s here is here with a name to agree to
a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal. And, you know,
I’m sure there are interest groups here who, you know, are not necessarily participating for that. There are still quite a number of people, climate skeptics, around and there is a lot of media attention around that, it’s very tactical and very well timed to create such a media hype around emails put completely out of context and undermine the whole consensus view about the reality of climate change, you know. So, their role would be very critical off. Similarly, I’m sure we have seen certain business lobbies, you know, walking around here and (.) cautioning leaders to take the necessary action because of economic interests and I think it’s important to recognize that, of course, climate change is urgent, it will require financial efforts and costs, but equally, it’s an opportunity. And you know, you’d be better part of that economic opportunity, create green jobs, green investments that’s the future. So, I’m sure there are a few constituencies here who, rather than aiming for ambitious outcome, are lobbying for the weakest outcome possible.

I: If you look at the conference, what do other people say about Oxfam?

P: Well, you should ask them, right? (.) I mean we work very much for the civil society organizations to, you know, highlight the human impact of climate change and based on that to lobby for specific elements in the climate regime which is we need ambitious targets that are divided in an equitable way, we need adequate finance on the table to assist those impacted by climate change, we need a binding agreement that locks in countries to deliver that with a strong compliant system without loop holes. That’s the area we focus on. Alongside we want to make sure that gender is in it, that agriculture issues are addressed because most people still depend on agriculture in the developing world. These are the areas. So, (.) I would hope that, if you ask people about our work, they would say ‘well, you know, Oxfam is doing that and they are doing a good job.’

I: Regarding climate change and this issue, what is your organization (.) generally speaking, what are their activities regarding climate change?

P: So, we are working here a lot on the global negotiations, you know. So, for us, that’s a lot of lobby influencing, (?we’ve tracked this?) from Bali, from before Bali, all these (?intersessionals?), the cops (.) so, it’s a lot of lobby work, speak to delegates, support delegates from the south, provide analyses, do media work, but also join quite a bit of mobilization activities outside, to pressure on leaders here to make the right decisions. So, there’s the whole process on these negotiations and all work around it. Alongside, we do that also at the national
level, so, domestic legislation for example in the us is very important. so, we have been campaigning around in the us, around making sure that legislation is passed. we’ve done that in the uk, in the eu so, there is that work on an international and national level. and, most importantly in many ways, it’s working in the south. so, with communities on adaptation, you know, to make them prepared for the impacts of climate change, to help them adapt to the impacts of climate change and make sure that, you know, the governments in those countries are organized to have the necessary programmes, policies, and interventions that will actually, you know, promote adaptation in those countries.

I: if you look at this place, copenhagen, which activities are supported by oxfam?

P: (.) as I said, it’s lobby work. we have a big lobby team here, we have a media team here, so we do media work, we speak to the media, we have a few (??) and activities, we’re part of the 12th december manifestation, we’re working with tcktcktck, coalitional partners, we have a lot of people from the south here, partners with whom we work in the developing world who come here, who will work with their government to make sure they’re (?assertive?) in terms of these negotiations. so, there is kind of a whole range of activities here.

I: what about the protest activities outside in the streets?

P: well, public mobilization is important, you know. leaders often need to feel the heat and see that this issue is of a massive public concern, that people are concerned about it and demand their leaders to take action, you know, and therefore, that expression of that anger, that concern is important, whether it is here or whether it’s in their home country. so, from that logic, we are part of lots of these mobilization activities, just outside or in the city centre. i recognize there are different strategies, some are a bit more radical than others, we recognize that there are going to be different strategies we have our own. for us, it’s always important to make sure that we, you know, (.) mobilization is providing solutions, is a positive mobilization, it must always remain non-violent. there may be some groups who think otherwise. i don’t think we would disagree in terms of tactics but, you know, the purpose of mobilization and, you know, highlighting the need for change from the public is important because ultimately, that is what does change, what puts pressure on politicians and decision makers.

I: let me ask again (.) who do you cooperate with?

P: right. so, we have kind of, if you want to ‘strategic’,
alliances. so, there is ‘climate action network’, can just
kind of a coalition of ngos working on climate change.
They do very much, let’s say the ‘inside lobby work’. So,
we’re part of that, we work very closely with them. and
then the other strategic alliance is the coalition of
global climate action. it’s called something like the
‘gccca’ ‘global coalition for climate action’ which is kind
of the network of organizations who has coordinated their
campaigning. publicly, you see the logo of
tcktcktck, this symbol (. ) so, these are kind of the two
strategic allies and coalitions we work with
I: would you strictly contradict certain positions of some
ngos or movements?
P: there are differences, you know. i think, civil society is
a house with many rooms. i think, broadly speaking within
‘can’, there is consensus on a lot of issues in terms of,
you know, we need to stay as far below two degrees as
possible, you know, you need, you know, 200 billion dollars a year
for climate finance, with adaptation and mitigation, you
know, the role of carbon markets, redd, you know (.) there
is broad consensus on many of these things, on let’s say
‘the building blocks’. of course, on some issues, there is
difference, you know. some people have different views in
terms of ‘what’s the role of carbon markets?’ , market
solutions, market base solutions and interventions that’s
true. but (.) i think it’s the issues where we have common
agreement that unites us. that’s more important than the
other issues (.) you know, people have different views.
I: i got some more concrete questions (.) what are you
reading regarding climate politics and climate change?
P: reading?
I: reading.
P: tons of emails. like in books, magazines, or (.)? [yeah]
to be honest, i don’t think there is kind of any specific
climate literature that i would track except that, you
know, in today’s world through email, you know, you have
people sending articles that come out in scientific
magazines, whether it’s ‘nature’, you know, articles in
‘foreign affairs’ to (.) you know, there’s the whole range
of, you know, media publications that’s available. for me,
there’s not a single specific, climate-specific
publication that i would track. so it’s really (?) across
anything.
I: are there any particular places where oxfam (.) has stated
its programme, so, its demands and objectives?
P: what do you mean by ‘places’?
I: some printed stuff or (.) [yes] {{unverständlich}}
P: sure, i mean, we have if you go to our website you know,
we have a whole set of, i don’t know, 20+ what we call 
briefing papers on various specific issues that articulate 
our views in terms of, let’s take the example of 
(?‘finance adaptation’?), you know, ‘how much finance is 
needed, how should the finance be governed, how can the 
finance be collected? how should it be distributed?’ so, 
we have a whole set of proposals around that. equally, we 
have proposals on, you know, when we talk about effort-
sharing in terms of mitigation, actions and commitments, 
you know, ‘who should do what or how do we find equitable 
division of responsibilities there?’ so, there’s a whole 
set of documents there, you know, let’s say the (?policy-
wonky-stuff‘?), these briefing papers (??), beyond that 
there’s a lot of material. you know, one thing that we 
brought here and i can give you (.) is for example a 
collection of climate hearings. we have organized in the 
past year hundreds of climate hearings where people in the 
developing world gave testimonies of the impact of climate 
and brought that to policy-makers and said, you know, ‘we 
need this type of interventions at a national level and 
that’s what we expect from the international climate 
regime’. so, if you were to got to our website, that’s 
where you would find, let’s say most if not all of our, 
you know, material and positions and views that we have on 
climate change.

I: do you know when you heard of the term ‘climate justice’ 
the first time?

P: i started working on climate change a little bit before 
bali. so, that’s like a bit more than two years ago. 
before, i was working on agriculture issues. you know, i 
think that the ideas and the views of climate justice 
became more (??) to me around that time. fairly recent, if 
you want.

I: and a very special question could you tell me something 
about the fundings of oxfam?

P: most of our funding (. ) well, let me (. ) oxfam is a 
confederation, we work across more than one hundred 
countries and we have (??) 15 (?affiliates?), so, we have 
an oxfam in great britain, we have one in the u s, we have 
one in germany, in belgium, holland, hongkong, china, 
india. so, we have offices in different countries, a bit 
like greenpeace or (?action aid?), you know, we work as a 
kind of confederation. so, funding for each one of them is 
slightly different. typically, it is private funding, so, 
funding from private donations from individuals and public 
finance, whether it’s through (?brands?) or funding from 
the e u or the government as part of the (?o d a?). some 
countries, like in the u k the majority, the overwhelming 
majority is private funding, in belgium and holland, it’s 
mostly public funding, in the u s it’s lots of
foundations. so, it depends very much on, i would say, the
way ngos typically finance or secure their funds in their
country. every country has slightly different set-up.

I: that’s it as far as i’m concerned. but perhaps you think
there is something important which is missed and we should
mention.

P: no, I hope this was useful. i babbled a lot, i think

I: yeah, but that was very very nice.

P: alright.

I: how did you feel about being interviewed?

P: (.) always stressful

I: <<lacht>> stressful.

P: no, it’s ok.

I: and your reasons to give me the interview? is it (.)

P: no, i mean, it’s great. i mean (.) i (.), you know, i (.)
these were very general questions, so that’s fine. i mean,
we have a massive policy team here who knows much more,
let’s say about specific of adaptation (??) or
mitigations, so, if ever you have specific questions, on
topics or on the negotiations, then i can always link you
with them. this was fairly general, so this was ok.

I: fantastic.

P: alright? you have my email? whenever you have any
questions (.)
I: so my first question is (. ) how was it that you get to the peoples' protocol on climate change?

P: i have done all my political work with movements. since i

convinced myself that i need to participate in struggles of justice for myself and others i did realize that the energy to do so it is in the very least recognized forces or energy of communities of ordinary people. people who struggle to make ends meet in their lives because of many threats that they experience.

so generally i grew up with a very critical mind. for example why some people are more richer than others. [mhm] the inequality in society, the injustices in society, the responsibility in the society, the unaccountability in the society. this issues i grew up wondering and at the university i was able now to find frameworks to interrogate and to inform [mhm] those issues. i read all the great thinkers of the time, franz vernant, marx, (??), mao zedong, and that opened more networking opportunities especially with matters of trade, debt, and aid [mhm] and the environmental question because of ecological debt. [mhm] so it is with those processes that ended up in bringing my activism closer to the global networking of the world social forum [mhm] and i became an active actor of the world social forum and even was instrumental in having the world social forum take place in africa.
picked up the process of the peoples’ protocol and became part of that process and that is how we have been working and we've been instrumental in building the mobilization towards the peoples' protocol and that's why i am here and i am glad to say today i also participated in making the ratification of the peoples' protocol with all the others that we have come here in denmark.

I: what would you think would be the greatest success for the peoples' movement on climate change?

P: the greatest success is to have the platform and a framework of building the synergy and the energy of alternative thinking that is located in peoples' experience and self-determination. because as we speak there is a growing momentum of people reclaiming their sovereignty. their sovereignty of the people is becoming a power and a force to reckon with. because the sovereignty of the state has excluded majority of the people from this decision-making processes. (.). even the experience here in copenhagen in denmark, at klimaforum you can feel the connection of the synergy of the discussion for focussing so much on proclaiming and reclaiming the basis of the sovereignty of the people that is where do we place the center of power in decision-making in matters that concern our lives? and speaker after speaker they're saying the decision-making has to be with the people because people have solutions to climate change and to climate issues. they have capacities to redress these issues within the knowledge they have always had, which the market has ignored and which the market want to delay and to distort. so there is some self-determination of (AAC) of the contradiction between the sovereignty of the people and the sovereignty of the state. [mhm] and the sovereignty of the state can no longer be trusted to transact affairs for people. [mhm] so states will have to reconstruct themselves a new and redefine themselves where the value of their decision-making or the politics that they must engage with is the politics to serve people not to represent people. people don't want to be represented. people want to have service delivered to them by states, which means states here in copenhagen have a problem to the deal-(AAC) that they must do [mhm] because the
powers that be can agree on deals but those deals will not be acceptable by the people at home because people don't want for example carbon trading [mhm] but the leaders will accept the carbon trading because they want money. but people are aware and like i know in kenya you know i will not accept because carbon trading will put us in more debts and we are trying to find how do we reconstruct our societies within a political framework that is going to be guided by the wishes and the concerns and the interests of the people [mhm] where the resources are utilized to serve the people themselves. their nationals themselves. but not negotiate the power balance of the world, [yea] yea.

I: how long has it been that you are in (. ) that climate and climate change has been part of your work?

P: climate change has been my work i would say because climate change politically is the question of justice. and i have done work on justice where climate change becomes important it is because of the way it has been taken within the framework of environmental concerns. since rio ( . ) [mhm] to w s s d in johannesburg and to now. [mhm] but in rio they were just talking about global warming and environmental questions. but by the time we were coming to johannesburg it was clear that we can't talk about (. ) environment without talking economics. [yea] and therefore for me economic justice is also climate justice.

I: (. ) ok. is there anything more you might want to add to the understandings of climate justice?

P: what i'm trying to avoid even in this interview is to (?compatimarize?) or other to put issues in categories. issues of justice. [yea] issues of justice must be seen from a holistic perspective. because the politics, the economics, and the social dynamics are a one and the same thing. [mhm] but the way we interrogate issues at=of great concern to our lives today. take for example governance. [mhm] you look at governance without understanding what politics drives governance and what economics drives that politics [mhm] and therefore we would never never have a very clear strategy to engage with the problems. because when we talk about poverty for example we talk a alleviating poverty alling=eradicating poverty. but you alleviating poverty and are eradicating poverty within a very unequal international economic arrangement, where access and distribution of resources is based on very unequal domain. [mhm] so for me i interrogate matters of justice including climate justice from a power relation (. ) and that power relation i try to understand it within the basis of who controls the resources on how we access and how we distribute. [mhm] because the power that controls or determine how wealth is created and how wealth is distributed. [mhm] and that is on the way i can
I understand why I am marginalized as a women and not only as a women as an african and not only as an african as a person coming from the so-called developing country. [mhm] so, the issues of politics of injustices is what it needs to be interrogated holistically.

I: but would you make use of the term climate justice?

P: to me climate justice is just like human rights. [mhm] or women rights. or gender rights. or indigenous rights. or the disadvantage youth (. ) you say? but the bottom ( ?rain?) of why there is injustices like i am saying it is how the world is organized economically, politically, and socially [mhm] so for me climate justice now (. ) gives us the light to see that is neither the developed world or the developing world (. ) that might speak to this issues, but the people of the world must take a concerted effort to speak to issues of climate justice in finding who is the cause of climate global warming [mhm] and why. and who suffers most. and that's why i am saying we can not afford to look at the issues without looking at the economics [mhm] because climate doesn't change [mhm] it is us who change the factors that affect climate. [mh] we cut trees for economic interests for example, we pollute rivers for economic interests for example, and i can go on and on. so the issues of climate justice is the issues actually of denouncing the system as it is now and work out a system that can work [mhm] or continue just singing climate justice to (?panobid?) and to say you are doing justice to resolving climate change (. ) when you bring carbon trading. [mhm] carbon trading is greatest climate injustice that is going to happen [mhm] yea.

I: let me ask (. ) how would you assess the climate negotiations?

P: for me climate negotiations are irrelevant as far as i'm concerned. that's a game that the united nations has played since after the second world war. because i'm still holding very strongly (. ) to the values that guides my thinking [mhm] the power relations i repeat to answer again. [mhm] so (. ) after the second world war those that had won out of the war led by the united states of america decided to build a framework of the united nations to keep the balancing (. ) of power relation [mhm] and that's why (. ) even if it's a united nations framework, it's a framework of the powerful. [mhm] it's the powerful who decide in the united nations. so it's not everyone. so it's not in the discussion.

I: imagine a friend is asking you who is participating at the climate negotiations what would you answer?

P: the big powers (. ) the big powers {gleichzeitig} the big powers anything more} like i told you in the beginning.
the big powers are trying to force there's morer powers including everybody in the world to legitimize decisions which they have already made. decisions on how to deal with the climate change questions. [mhm] they have done extensive researches. they sponsored the researches. they sponsors the greatest thinkers in terms of scientist (.). to help them come with justification as to why they must continue with the same economic models even when they don't work. the world bank themselves have confess in these things happen to be.

I: (.). ok. (.). could you tell me (.). what do you think, do people say about (.). here in copenhagen about the peoples' movement on climate change?

P: the people inside the copenhagen (.). might not be able to speak so much to the peoples' movements. [mhm] because the u n framework is not a peoples' movements framework. it's a state framework. state to states. states are discussing. but what i observe (.). and what i hear, there is lots of mobilization of movements coming to say no to what is being discussed here at copenhagen. [mhm] yea. and what i see because i'm here in copenhagen i see police on a lot. why is the police on a lot. because the movements are vibrant. and because the movements are not going to prescribe to the negotiations [mhm] yea. and this we have seen in seattle, (.). we have seen in cancun, (.). i witnessed in genoa, [mhm] so movements are not processes which you can put in a pipeline organized framework. movements are dynamic and they emerge according to what is driving them. [yea] and as we speak with this climate question, there are many movements of people who see no answer can be found in this negotiations other than change of the system. [mhm] and the negotiations don't want to change the system. [mhm] i know of a movement in the united kingdom which is mobilizing and saying (.). let the coal remain on the ground. [mhm] so what (repute?) has those kind of movements? they will not listen to any negotiations but they are there and the negotiators must respond to them because they are building momentum with their argument that the only way to rethink alternative energy is (fossil war?) (.). to stop the coal remaining on the ground not being dug anymore. [mhm] which means business has to hold to some extent.

I: (.). so regarding climate change, what are your organization speak the

P: my {{gleichzeitig} organization kenya}

I: {{gleichzeitig} the peoples'} protocol on climate change what are the activities of it but ok you can also tell me about the kenya debt relief

P: kenya debts relief network would believe in building
movements. [mhmm] and we don't build movements we just make linkages. ea? [mhmm] and build a framework of why the movements seek and find one another. [mhmm] with the different issues which at the end of the day are one and the same. [mhmm] because if you are talking about education for all, and you are talking about food crisis, and you are talking about shelter for all, you are talking about environment, you are talking about gender equality. you see all these issues are addressing some injustices then. [mhmm] so movements, my work, my work at the kenya debt relief network and that's why i prescribe to the peoples' climate- peoples' movement climate change protocol is because it's giving us a framework where people will build synergy and find each other [mhmm] for a qualitative very strong voice and face [mhmm] in the messaging that we have alternatives from the people to redress pertinent issues of our time. [mhmm] issues like climate change. issues like poverty. issues like you know marginalization. [mhmm] issues like you know tensions in society from race, gender, all of this issues we need to redress them because the economic political framework we live in, is very violent [mhmm] and keeps us at war all the time [mhmm] and that is what people are saying they're tired of. [mhmm] especially the young people. why what if- why must they continue being intension of fear? [mhmm] or of anxiety, of helplessness [mhmm] of hopelessness? why? why? because of just a few a few people who control the world and must keep their wealth to themselves so we need to rethink the world we live into.

I: what do you think of the mobilization of autonomous groups to protests at copenhagen?

P: autonomous groups (?who would be?) there because like i'm saying movements is not a wishful thing. movements are born out of necessity and out of need. when people are dissatisfied. when people are angry. when people are convinced there is something that must be saved or abandoned. then they organize and mobilize. [mhmm] and they do so because there are lots of omissions. so autonomous groups will be there and especially at this time we are living because many people are excluded [mhmm] from determining their own destiny.

I: (.) ok let me shortly explain what i mean with autonomous groups=i mean sorts of direct action which could be a form people=some people would make the term violent. (.) so do you think these {{gleichzeitig} these (?sorts?) protests}

P: {{gleichzeitig} i have already}

I: are a help for the movement?

P: i have already said the system we live in itself is violent. [mhmm] is very violent=was. one we resisted it
tells us we are violent. (.) i refuse (.) victim to take
responsibility. [mhm] so those autonomous group (.) they
have no no opportunity to redress their issues. they have
not been allowed. [yea] they have not been provided for.
so they live in a life-scenario of seeking some freedom or
liberation or emancipation. there is a burden that they
are carrying. [mhm] and that burden needs to be taken
somewhere. and it is taken too long to find where to take
it. so naturally they become what you are calling violent
but from my point of view is they are not violent. who is
more violent than the police? the {{gleichzeitig} police
go and (??)}

I: {{gleichzeitig} i don't} want to call it violent i want to
say (.) some people would call it violent.
P: this is what i am saying and some people will call it
because they will be standing up against the violence that
is systemic and that is institutionalized and legalized.
it is not only systematic and institutionalized but
legalized [mhm] as an normal way. that's why we have
standing armies, that's why we have all this instruments
of state [mh] to operate sometimes violence with impunity.
like the country i come from, the police shoot with
impunity [mh] to keep the state security. again it's the
movements who are trying to raise up and say (.) things
are not right here. [mh] yea.

I: could you tell me, who do you cooperate with?
P: (.) i cooperate with people who have vision and missions
to work out self-determination in making a world that will
respect the principles of justice for all. (.) i believe
we all have a right to participate in live to a fullness
in making a contribution to human prosperity. (.)
everybody has a right to make that contribution in their
own way. and i say this because many of us are excluded.
[mhm] i'm in copenhagen because of my struggles to stand
for justice for all. many people of my age who did it
don't even understand why they complain all the time. some
are even now have died (.) out of despair. people of my
age. but i keep my self-determination. (.) and i get
energized because i believe justice for all, is a noble
cause. yea.

I: how did you prepare for copenhagen?
P: well i have been in the process of the (.) peoples'
movement protocol for climate change processes. [mhm] (.)
so like i said i participated in bangkok and we also
participated in nairobi. [mhm] and here i am.

I: (.) let me ask you (.) would you strictly oppose certain
positions of some n g os or movements?
P: yes. some n g os are n g os to co-opt or to get co-opted.
[mhm] to derail the motion of the movements that are
moving towards constructing (.) social transformation. (.)
and n g os like international n g os let me say
international n g os for example. they have been there as
long as (.) the states have been [mhm] but they have not
made any enroot. (.) they have not made any enroot to
making any transformation. [mhm] yea. (.) so (.) i go with
n g os for the values that they stand for and for the
mission that they transact. [mhm] values within the bases
of struggles for social transformation agency [mhm] (.)
because we must transform to building societies of peace
[mhm] and societies of peace will be guaranteed when
economics works for live [mhm] and politics determines
governance that is to serve people [mhm] and a scenario of
political social economics that allows people to live in
harmony. [mhm] so if you are working towards those values
then i work with you because this is a struggle we
founded. people like gandhi were there [mhm] doing this
struggle. martin luther king was there

#Unterbrechung des Interviews – 20 sec#
I: i got a provocative question (.) [mhm] (.) how do you
think the secret service would refer to the peoples'
protocol on climate change?
P: the secrets?
I: the secret service? the
P: oh the secret {{gleichzeitig} service}
I: {{gleichzeitig} police}
P: police the i know they are not happy about it. but there
is very little they can do because the peoples' (.)
movement process (.) to my point of view [mhm] just
happened to be strategic [mhm] in that they have found
their enroot in working in an acceptable environment.
[mhm] and that is also another manifestation to show (.)
people who work for justice are not violent. [mhm] they
become violent because they are not given opportunity.
[mhm] let them have their space (.) [mhm] to put their
case on the table [mhm] like the peoples' protocols have
done. [mhm] and that's why i can be inside the green rooms
there with this badge [mhm] and i can also be at
klimaforum [mhm] with the movements because this issues
are our concerns and this world is our world all of us.
[mhm] and we all seeking solutions to one objective like i
said. [mhm] building societies of peace. (.) even cop 15
are saying they're here to negotiate deals that will work
for humanity. [mhm] (.) how they work those deals and
affirm (?in did/ indeed?) they have worked for human
prosperity is another posture. [mhm] we are here as
movements saying we're also working for social
transformation agency [mhm] for better for all. for human
prosperity (.) how we affirm that history (?oo/ will?)
judges. (.) you say what i'm saying [mhm] because to us
it's history. to the u n f c c process we are here to
judge them [mhm] like i' doing this very harsh judgment
[mhm] that i can't trust them [yea] because deliberation
after deliberation=negotiation after negotiation, they
have not delivered justice to all of us. [mhm] yea.

I: (. ) i get some concrete questions at the end [mhm] could
you tell something about what you read regarding climate
politics or climate change? is there something you read on
this issue?

P: i have read the much material but what i'm interested a
lot is to understand the justification of carbon trading.
[mhm] because i know it's so dangerous but the scientists
have succeeded in writing about it in such a convincing
literature [mhm] that we can easily fall into large
trouble. [mhm] so i am very keen in reading everything
that informs me on carbon trading. ( .) and especially
because i am from the south. and that is going to be our
big issue because to me ( .) from a sound perspective
carbon trading is just like the scrump for africa in 1878.
[ok] yea. ( .) and 1878 too but we didn't have anybody to
critique the scrump for africa. [mhm] we have a historical
duty and responsibility [mhm] to critique what carbon
trading is=because we are here [mhm] and we can be heard
and we can influence.

I: are there particular places where your demands are put.
the demands of your organization. where can (. ) see where
you put your demands?

P: yes our demands are put like now have put our demands on
the people in the peoples' movement climate change
protocol. [mhm] we do put our demands prescribed to that.
we made a declaration out of the process like i said when
we were in nairobi and sent it even to the african union.
so our demands is so much in building solidarity and this
big voice and presence to say things must change. [mhm]
#Unterbrechung des Interviews – 10 Sekunden#

I: i got only two short questions. do you remember when you
first met the term climate justice?

P: yes in the process of the world summit for sustainable
development because i was a delegate.

I: when was it?

P: 2002 in johannesburg. [mhm] actually the peoples'='we the
movements we are the ones who started talking about
climate justice. [mhm] because we were interrogating
environmental question. the agenda 21. [mhm] within the
context of the economics and the politics that determined
agenda 21.

I: there has been the term climate justice?
P: not really the term climate justice (.)is a very late term
[mhm] towards copenhagen. [ok] but i do remember in the
world summit for sustainable development in the minute
groups that we were discussing. we were going (?orderly?)
to that [mhm] because the ecological question that the
debt is question of ecological justice [mhm]
just like we have economic justice. so=so speak we should
have climate justice, [mhm] gender justice. because human
rights are not watched. the human rights framework was
becoming more widened. [mhm] yea.

I: could you tell me a little bit about the fundings of the
peoples' protocol and the peoples' movement on climate
change?

P: that i wouldn't be able to tell you a lot because we work
with the solidarity (?org?) with the ibon international.
[mhm] and the we=we we appreciate their efforts they put
in sourcing resources to making these things happening.
[ok] and i don't=i'm not private to how they do about it.
[ok] i only locate myselves within the events [ok] and
work together. yea.

I: as far as i'm concerned it's the end of the interview=but
if you are thinking there is something important which is
missing then you should tell me about it.

P: i think we have done extensively good and i know (.) i did
not answer your questions the way you wanted them answered
(.) to some extent because i don't answer questions within
a framework that is not within my framework of thinking.
so i talk a lot to each question. [mhm] so i hope you'll
be able to get the information you are seeking.

I: it was great.

P: because i tried to express myself as intensively as i can
[mhm] to elaborate on this very=very dear, you know issues
that i hold very closely to my heart.

I: how did you feel being interviewed?

P: to me it was not really an interview=is a discussion we
have had.

I: <<lachend>ok>

P: yea it's another workshop ((lacht))

I: ok

P: and actually i don't allow anybody to interview me

I: really? <<lachend>ok>

P: ((lacht)) why {{gleichzeitig} why should}

I: {{gleichzeitig} thank you}

P: you interview (?me?)? you can only provoke me
[very=very=mu-] to speak my thinking [yea] ((lacht))
I: my first question is (.) how was it that you joined the world council of churches?

P: the role has changed over time, i think. the working group on climate change of the wcc started around 1990 or maybe 1989, so it was one of the first groups i think, that started working on climate change in a focused way and became an observer organization of the unfccc-process and in the beginning they were very active in raising issues that we addressed in the whole field of negotiations. for instance, they started discussions on the moral acceptability of emission trading and issues like that. a couple of years later, they focused attention on adaptation because by then it was feared that in the unfccc-process the focus was very much on the mitigation issue which was and is much more an issue of the north than an issue of the south. and from the beginning, wcc has focused on the interest of the people of the south related to climate change. and adaptation obviously is one of the issues that is very important for people in the south. so, from time to time they have raised issues and focused attention to some issues that were lacking in the real negotiations. and that, i think, was an important role of wcc in the beginning. they are really an observer organization, so they do not really engage in technical and political lobby like many environmental organizations and organizing can do. but they indeed more or less observe what is the (.) main trend in the negotiations, what is lacking in the negotiations. in every cop they feed back some of their observations through the statement to the high plenary session in the end of the cop. so, they are observers how to describe it? try to motivate and influence the negotiations from a moral point of view mostly.
I: what do you think have been the most critical stages when discussing the political agenda of the world council of churches? central occurrences in the last years for the political agenda of the world council?
P: do you mean moments or stages in the, well, one could say the inner wcc politics or stages in the unfccc-process?
I: (.) i think, more general.
P: well, pose your question again because (.)
I: it’s about the whole work of the world council of churches in general and what there have been some central occurrences and central happenings which were very important for your agenda, for what you were working on.
P: you mean changes or moves within wcc in general or in the work of wcc itself or changes in the unfccc-process? because, those are different things, of course.
I: i think more in the unfccc-process because that’s what i’m interested in.
P: ok, but there are (.) ok. well, one very critical moment where wcc has played a good role, i think, was when the kyoto protocol had to be signed. i was not there at that moment because it was 1997 but (.) what i’ve been told and what i saw was that wcc played a good role because they had good contacts to the russian delegation. it was in the end the russian delegation that played a substantial role in signing the kyoto protocol at that moment. so, there wcc had a pretty crucial role, i think, and maybe it was the most concrete, most physical role of the wcc in the whole process, a role that was the most directly connected to the unfccc-process itself. (.) maybe that’s the most critical moment in the whole history of unfccc where wcc played a role. and further, i think, wcc has from time to time tabled issues that were in our view lacking in the negotiations. like the adaptation issue and like (.) the substantial funding for (?) and mitigation in the south and like, more in general, the justice component in the negotiations.
I: could you tell me, is there a real problem of climate change? what do you think is the real problem of global warming climate change?
P: what is the real problem?
I: yes. what do you answer?
P: it depends on where your attention is. if you are focused on the impacts, it’s difficult to say what’s the real problem, because it’s such a broad problem that affects people but also nature itself. and I think from the point of view of world council of churches, both are important. if you focus on impacts on people, from a wcc point of
view, i think one would say that it’s in the first place
the impacts in the south in the island states, the coastal
areas where many poor people live, in the arid areas in
africa and asia, where people barely survive on a
subsistence level which will be threatened by any small
climate change problem. so, on the impact side, the impact
on the poor people in those kind of regions is maybe the
most important - again, it’s a very broad problem on the
impact side and i think, from a world council of churches
point of view, every one of these impacts is important. if
you focus on the causes it’s obvious that the main
responsibility is in the north. and well, in the mean time
you can also say that there is a north in the south like
it is being said so often, so also the rich or the middle
class people in some big developing countries play a
growing role on the causes side. but obviously, the
historical responsibility in the north is much larger than
in the south. and i would say from this side of where the
causes are it’s mostly a problem of lifestyle, of wealth
and the economic development that has (.) gone how do you
say? - in the wrong direction, in the direction of too
much material-based and energy-based economy. i think
there is a lot of work to be done and i think wcc should
play a role in that.

I: what do you think would be real solutions to this problem?

P: (.) there are again many aspects to that, probably. there
is definitely a part of solution in new technology,
renewable energy, more nature-conform production etc. but
there is also a change needed in ‘where do we put our
value?’ ‘what is the real importance of (.) where is the
real value of having a good life?’ is that in having a lot
of material products or is that in having good
relationships to each other, and having enough space and
time to flourish as a person? and that kind of things. so,
there is part of the solutions. we all have to change our
mindsets in the prospect. but then again, there is also
(.) the solution should also be sought in setting up new
institutions, for instance to do economic politics, to
regulate productions, maybe to regulate the use of energy
and material resources etc. etc. there is a personal
lifestyle component, there is a technological component,
there is an institutional component in all these fields,
solutions have to be sought.

I: let me ask you on the other side: do you think there are
some false solutions? What would be false solutions?

P: (. ) well, it’s, i think it’s always (. ) you have to be
very careful what you say because it’s so easy to
misunderstand it. but i think a false solution would be to
look in the direction of solving the problem only through
strengthening market mechanisms. i do think markets play a
role and can play and should play a role but it’s probably
a mistake to bet on market solutions only and give them
free space to flourish. and it would also be a false
solution to just how do you say? give in to every energy
need that rises because then you end up in building new
coal power plants, building new nuclear power plants
because they are the obvious solutions. but in the end,
that will be a mistake, probably.

I: what do you understand by ‘climate justice’? what is your
idea?
P: climate (.) ?

I: climate justice. what is your idea of climate justice?
P: it is about dividing the use of the atmosphere as more or
less a sink for atmosphere waste in a fair way. it’s also
about dividing the costs of adapting and mitigating the
climate change in a fair way and the other part of that
is, it’s about dividing (.) supporting people that are
most vulnerable to impacts of climate change in a good
way. So, again, justice has many dimensions. there is a
dimension on the mitigation-side of climate change, there
is a justice dimension on the adaptation dimension, there
is a justice dimension in the process of negotiations
because, well, look at what is going on here. there are
many many different sub-processes within the whole
negotiation process and that is (?easy?) (??) to be
addressed by big delegations from the north but it’s
impossible to have a real impact from the small
delегations from developing countries. so, bringing more
balance in the amount of influence that different parts of
the world, different countries have in these negotiations
is an important justice issue as well.

I: how would you assess the climate negotiations?
P: at this moment?
I: in general.
P: i think, at least until recently, it has been a process
more of defending interests than of bringing just and
adequate solutions to climate change. and maybe that
changes a little bit because i see some signs that the
attention for the justice component is growing but still,
it’s difficult to make a connection between what would be
scientifically and morally necessary and what is really
going within the negotiations. there is a divide between
them.

I: what do you want to achieve in copenhagen?
P: like we all do, we want to achieve a fair and binding and
adequate ambitious deal.
I: what would it be?
P: i think, there we agree with most ngos that (.) it’s in
the well-known terms of staying well below 2-degrees-
warming, heading for a 350ppm-co2-concentration level, and
addressing fairness in a sense that i indicated just
now in the sense of a just (?distribution?) of the real
responsibilities for addressing climate change, for
carrying the burden of the costs of climate change, of
adaptation and mitigation (.) but indeed, also the
strengthening the role of developing countries in the
process. that’s an important part of our (.)

I: imagining there’s a friend asking you ‘who is
participating in the climate negotiations. what would you
answer?

P: ‘who is participating?’ (.) again, that’s a multi-layered
question. i guess, if you look at where the real influence
is, it’s in the u s block. u s, china, india, brazil,
Japan, those are the countries with the main influence, i
guess. but at crucial moments, the developing countries
(. ) at least (. ) i think it’s difficult to say. the (??)
will (. ) they can be heard in the negotiations, but in the
end, they can’t define the (?)articles?) of the
negotiations. that’s what i say. that’s one of the
problems of injustice in the whole process that those
countries, in the end, don’t really have a big impact in
the negotiations. probably.

I: could you tell me what people think about the world
council of churches? how do they access the world council
of churches?

P: i’m afraid that more and more people get a little bit
disappointed in the world council of churches. Because and
that’s my own feeling as well they have been more or less
effective at least in the first maybe ten years of the
unfccc, the kyoto process (.) there are different things
 going on. on the one hand, other ngos have come to the
forefront more than they were in the beginning – and of
course, can international is a very well organized a group
with a lot of visibility, with a lot of impact. in the
beginning, can was mostly a group of environmental ngos
but these last couple of years, development ngos have
entered the process as well. and they have brought (. )
they are focusing on this international justice component
much more than the environmental ngos did and so they take
some of the agenda of wcc, they are (. ) taking over to
some extent because they have much more capacity to follow
and to influence these kind of processes. so, that’s one
of the reasons why wcc has become a little bit less
visible but I think there are also internal changes,
within wcc, within the working group on climate change
that make it a little bit weaker in its impact and
visibility, i think. at the same time, there are many
people, many organizations that would like WCC to play a
more visible role, but then I think not a role of directly
influencing negotiations but more addressing the kind of
issues that I started with, that address lifestyle, that
address what we mean with the paradigm shift that has to
be realized in order to create the ground for really
effective climate policy. Because of course, if you would
like to have a really effective climate policy that affect
economic developments both in the north and in the south
(.) as long as you cannot make clear to people that there
is a way of economic development that can be both climate-
friendly and attractive for people’s well-being etc., then
you won’t ever get enough support for really effective
climate policy. So, we really have to address that kind of
issues and I think there would be one of the important
roles for WCC, to address those issues. And people are
expecting that, I think.

I: Can you tell me something about the activities of the WCC,
generally speaking?

P: Of the climate change working group, you mean then? Or
maybe I can make it a little bit more general. The climate
change working group itself (.) maybe there are two
moments during the year that are most important for that
working group. One is the (?Cop?) itself because obviously
this is the moment where many of the people connected to
this working group are together so that is also the moment
to do some homework. And within the (?Cop?) we do our
homework but we also (.) one of the most visible moments
is that we address the high-level segment, the high-level
plenary in the end of the Cop and we prepare a statement
for that. That’s one of the activities that has some
impact. Then during the year, there mostly is another
meeting where we gather on our own to prepare for what we
would like to address in the statement in the Cop, what
are the issues we would like to work on and how can we
divide the tasks among us. So, that’s the moment for more
in-depth reflection in our own group. Then, these last
couple of years, we have been engaged in the global
campaign on climate action, the GCCA, which has (???) on
the tcktcktck.org, we from WCC are one of the founders of
this GCCA and we are represented in the board and in some
of the bodies within GCCA. So, supporting that global
campaign is one of our activities and another important
point is that we are engaged in the ‘countdown to
Copenhagen’ campaign which is more a faith-based campaign
originating from the development agencies in Europe with a
faith-base. But by now it’s a broad campaign with support
from faith-based development agencies in North Americas
and of course with contact to partner organizations of all
these development agencies, partner organizations from the
south and all over the world.
I: how would you assess the protests outside the conference?

P: how would i assess them? i must say i haven’t seen much protests until now, outside. only the small gatherings when we entered here the bella centre and came from the metro. (.) and they are very variable (.) some of them are good reminders. so, they remind people, they remind negotiators to issues to peoples for whom in fact they are working or should be working. but i must say there are also some protests or activities that i think (.) i don’t get their point. so, they are more or less marginal, i think.

I: but there will be big manifestations from saturday on (.)

P: yeah. that’s a different piece of cake. i think that’s pretty important because it’s a very very large, very broad cooperation of civil society organizations. in denmark, it has a large support base and in fact, it has a global support base through the cooperation with this global campaign, through the cooperation with ‘countdown to copenhagen’. so, i think this manifestation this march on saturday is one of the big moments to show that civil society worldwide is waiting for a fair ambitious and binding deal.

I: how would you assess the mobilization of autonomous groups towards copenhagen?

P: i don’t know. i have no real picture of it. i only hear some rumours that they are (.) they may be doing something during this big march. But i don’t know anything more concrete.

I: who do you cooperate with, wcc? who is your ally?

P: well, i already said it. our allies are (.) for one part within can because we are member of can. so, there are some of our allies. we are participating in this global campaign and by now, it’s such a big group of organizations that is connected to this global campaign that we are cooperating with almost everyone. but originally, it was wcc, greenpeace, oxfam (.) the u s part of can, and wwf that were the originators of this global campaign. so, one could say, those are our allies – which doesn’t imply that we agree on all points. and within this ‘countdown to copenhagen’ coalition, we are very intensively cooperating with these faith-based development agencies, in the first place those from Europe organized in ‘aprodév’ and including organizations like ‘christian aid’ in the u k, ‘brot für die welt’ in germany, (?‘eco’?) in the netherlands, ‘dan church aid’ in denmark, church of sweden in sweden, ‘norwegian church aid’

I: are there any certain positions you strictly contradict of other ngos or social movements regarding climate change?
P: I would say there is one (.) more or less (.) clear division of opinion where we (.) I must say where we agree with the ‘countdown to Copenhagen’ organizations but where we more or less disagree with some of the organizations cooperating in the global campaign. Our feeling is that some of the organizations within the global campaign (.) are so much focused on having an effective, adequate deal in Copenhagen from an environmental point of view, that they tend to neglect the justice component of climate change. And well, it’s more or less a difference of strategy as well. The most clear points to indicate this that some of these organizations within GCCA have put some pressure on India, on Indian civil society to pressure their government to come with very (.) pretty ambitious steps in order to facilitate the whole negotiation process. Whereas we say, you know, it’s not China and India that have to do the first steps. Because we understand their point that they can do steps (??) of course, they are powerful nations but they have very poor parts as well so, we understand their point, that they say ‘climate change is in the first place the responsibility of the Northern countries and until now they have not lived up to their commitments, to their promises. So, rich world, show your responsibility, meet your commitments and then we will be prepared to make our moves as well’. So, that’s a difference in strategy but it’s also a difference in judgement on responsibility and justice.

I: at the end, I got some more concrete questions, more concrete questions like this one: what do you read when you want to know about climate change and climate politics. and what don’t you read?

P: what do I read? A lot of documents that go over internet from various organizations. Of course, we read the IPCC- reports. At least, I don’t read them integrally but important parts of it. I read some more popular literature on climate change and the politics around it in order to get a quick grasp on where the issues are and where the science is.

I: are there some places where I can have a look on the demands of WCC regarding climate politics?

P: there is a website where we collect some of the materials. I must say that it’s not a very successful website. And in fact, there are two places on the WCC-website where you can find some materials. One is more or less integrated in the main structure of the website and you almost have to know where to go on the website to find it. And the other one is a special website for the climate change working group. But in terms of the demands you will find reference to in fact – the same demands that I phrased within this
‘countdown to copenhagen’ coalition and also reference to
this global campaign thing which in its demands is not so
much different from ‘countdown to copenhagen’.

I: do you remember when you first met the term climate
justice?

P: (.) no. i’m not sure. (.) that is to say when I started to
work on it, on climate change, it was clear from the
beginning for me that there is a justice component to
climate change, a justice and development component. but
in this concise form of (.) formulation of climate
justice, i don’t think i came across that formulation when
i started this kind of work. i wouldn’t be surprised if i
came up with that formulation myself at some moments. and
maybe it has come up in other places as well. but i don’t
recall that i read or heard this phrase climate justice at
that moment. when i started to use it it must be 2004.

I: the last question from my side (.) can you tell me
something about the funding of wcc, how is it financed?

P: i am not well aware of this, but i think most of the
funding of wcc comes through the member churches in the
different countries. and until now, it’s mainly the member
churches in the north so, in europe, in germany, the
netherlands, sweden, norway and u s and canada, they are
the biggest contributors, probably. and in fact, that’s a
strange situation, because, of course, they are the
richest churches, probably. but they are not the largest
churches any more. in many ways, the southern part of the
world is more christian than the north, by now.

I: that’s it as far as i am concerned. but perhaps there is
something that you think is really important and i missed
it and you want tell?

P: well, maybe going back to one of your questions (.) what
is wcc doing apart from what the climate change working
group of wcc does. there is also water and climate change
networks. so, that is related and they are doing a lot of
work focusing mostly on the water issue. but of course,
the water issue is very much connected to climate change
if you think about it. and they have a whole network and
program of activities of their own that i am not
completely aware of. and then there is a working group on
(??), wealth and ecology and that’s an interesting group
because, in fact, they address the same issue of what
should low-carbon/low-material-intense economy look like.
they are addressing issues like ecological debt and that
kind of things. that’s not directly climate change but
it’s addressing important issues that are important to
rediscuss and to get clear views on in order to develop
support ways for real effective climate policy. So, that’s
maybe interesting to mention.
I: thank you very much. I don’t know (. ) how did you feel like being interviewed? Strange?
P: well, (. ) they are very open questions you ask. so, like you say, it’s an unstructured or semi-structured interview and it’s difficult to answer those kind of questions. because, like I indicated, almost any of these questions are multi-layered, they’re multi-facetted probably there is much more to say than I did now.
I: nobody knows.
P: no.
I: so what was your motivation to be interviewed, to give this interview.
P: because I was asked to do that and I said ‘no problem’
I: do you often give interviews to people, to researchers?
P: no.
I: thank you very much.
I: the first question would be could you tell me a little bit about how was it that you joined wetlands international?

P: 

I: could you tell me what you think is the role of wetlands international?

P: the role of wetlands international is the promotion of the importance of wetlands ecosystems for people and for nature. and that happens in the field by active field working with local communities on conservation of ecosystems but it also ends up high up in the policy arena. like here in the climate negotiations. we're trying to influence (?both things. that relate one way another two weapons?) [yea]

I: what would be the greatest success for wetlands international? when do you think wetlands international (. ) doesn't have to be have to exist any more?

P: in general or specifically for this meeting here?

I: general

P: if all people in the world use wetland ecosystems in a sustainable manner. [mhm] if wetlands are well protected. if biodiversity is conserved [mhm] and if people and nature in wetlands can live alongside each other in a good manner. if that happens (. ) which is a utopia. if that happens then there's no need for us anymore. [<<lachend> ok>]

I: what are the main areas of the work of wetlands international?

P: we work among others on biodiversity conservation focusing mainly on water birds [mhm] but also on for example freshwater fish we work on promoting, studying, and
piloting the role of wetlands ecosystems for poverty alleviation food security and we have a significant proponent on climate change, looking at both climate change mitigation, for example the storage of carbon in peat lands and the importance of that. as well as on climate change adaptation promoting the role of wetlands for creating resilience against the impacts of climate change.

I: how long is wetlands international working on the issue of climate change?

P: on climate change mitigation we have been working for nearly ten years now. for climate change adaptation i think we've been active in this field for more or less three years.

I: now for climate politics itself. what do you think is the real problem of global warming?

P: the real problem of too much carbon dioxide emissions and other greenhouse gases. caused by people. [ok]

I: and what do you think would be real solutions to climate change?

P: significant change of our way of producing things and our way of living. making production chain more effective. decreasing our consumption pattern. [mhm] and and specifically in relation of ecosystems it will be very important to hold the degradation of ecosystems and carbon emissions that are reasonable of it. and it (?=it is?) protecting forests but also people (??) in a=(?in other/ another?) wetlands systems.

I: are there any more real solutions?

P: i think if we do all this we have pretty much solved the thing. yea of course you could think of capturing carbon that is already in the air in redrawing it from the atmosphere but i think (.) we can think of doing that in a hundred years times also. we don't really have the capacity to do that on a large scale right now. so

I: are there any-

P: or am i forgetting any thing?

I: i don't know

P: <<lachend>ok>

I: are there any false solutions you could think of?

P: yes i think palm oil policies should be significantly revised because in many case they cause significant emissions of greenhouse gases like nitroxs, carbon dioxide, the transport of biofuels often brings along significant carbon footprint. so we should think three times before we further develop these policies. and
there's also to the second generation biofuels, there's also significant risks that are related in terms of introducing exotic species of algae for example. [mhm] or we're drawing to much to much (?) to much nutrients from systems [mhm] or having to much input of nutrients in other systems. other risks are nuclear power. it's not a solution. just a very very temporary solution. yea i think these are the most important ones i can think of right now.

I: what do you understand by the term climate justice?

P: climate justice. for me climate justice would be developed countries taking there responsibility for their harm they have caused. it would be all countries taking their fair share of solving the problem. and it's not just (.). developed countries with some certain extent also developing countries. it would be ensuring that people that are affected by climate change (.). are well compensated for the damage and well supported in terms of solving the (?) they face.

I: would you make use of the term?

P: not too much because my work on climate change is much more specific than the broad discussion around climate justice and rights and- so we won't use within our organization ourselves so much.

I: how do you assess the climate negotiations?

P: we analyze many of the (?non?) papers and other documents that are being produced. we have people of our organizations participating in delegations. and thereby on a regular basis we review the process, look at what kind of text is incorporated. and yea and then trying to find out yea what we should do to get our points in. and yea so far it's hard to judge what has come out of the negotiations till now because so much is still in between brackets and it's for our points within our organization it can still go in any directions.

I: how do you assess the chances to influence the process?

P: we are already working for quite a long time to try to influence the process. (.). so to an extent we have managed to incorporate many of our points already in texts. [mhm] that has taken several years. in this stage getting new issues on the agenda will be virtually impossible. [mhm] so most of our efforts to influence policies is insuring that (?) in the text arguing and rechange [mhm] and considering the network that we have developed over the last few years manly on climate change mitigation [mhm] we are quite confident that we can make a difference.

I: imagine a friend is asking you, who is participating at
these negotiations? what would you answer?
P: i would say primarily government representatives, people working with government agencies would also- people that are negotiating parties working outside the government for research institutes or for n g os. [mhm] of course to a certain extent media and n g os also have influence and i think this influence is quiet significant.
I: is there anythi- anyone missing? at the conference.
P: and scientists by the way. they also have i think a big impact through ipcc. is anyone missing? i think not (??). no.
I: (.) or
P: the question remains of course, do all people represented have sufficient impact. and as an n g o representative i would of course say, no, we want more impact. [ok] but in principle everyone interested to engage in the process does have access to it.
I: who should not be here?
P: i am biased, but i would say people with economic interests that are just reaching for their own (??hood?) like for example representatives of coal burning factories or other private sector people that try to block the process that's taken the place here. like large (??scale?).
I: could you tell me, what do people say about wetlands international in copenhagen?
P: i think people perceive it's (??) quite positively. we are recognized not just as an organization that screams a lot but also an organization that provides useful materials. we are taken seriously in discussions with delegations. and there's always of course people that are less happy with us because of what we aim for is against what they aim for. and (??) people within delegations as well as southern n g os.
I: could you tell me some more about that?
P: yes. we have for example in our agenda a big effort to push for the (??) of emissions of soils from peat lands in a framework for redd. and we are very much against incorporating in developments of plantations (??) because we think not looking at soils incorporating plantations would in one way or another provide incentive for deforestation not looking at soils of course makes that you miss a lot of emissions that take place and actually then you pay peoples for the whole thing. namely only give of (??m?) biomass. but of course there are certain people that do want to develop on (??) countries that (??) plantations that are very much in favor of people bringing
plantations in the framework. and we are beside the
countries or organizations that—yea who’ve not agreed
with agrofuel. and they might not be very happy with us.

I: imagine the climate conference as a football match. what
would your comment be?

P: by now i would say zero zero. it can go all directions
still. the signs are not very positive but that’s never
the case in a cop, i think. (..) so yeah i would stick to
zero zero with a chance of loosing.

I: (..) could you tell me when climate is the issue, what
activities is wetlands international dealing with?

P: like i quickly mentioned we are working in relation to
climate change in two topics. mitigation, insuring that
the government (?stores?) in all kind of wetland systems
but mainly in peat lands. this being taken into account
and that those wetlands are being protected for climate
change adaptation we try to promote maintenance and
restoration of the natural functioning of wetland
ecosystems to help people and nature adapt to climate
change. and you can think of, for example restoring the
mangrove forests as protection against storm damage and
wave power. or restoring for example of flood plain along
the river [mhm] and ensuring that the water retention
capacity of these systems is being restored. so that you
can avoid for example floods to take place.

I: and what are your organizations activities at copenhagen?

P: we are (..) we have identified a number of quite specific
points we want to aim for. (..) specific to the extent that
we really (..) propose textual changes in the draft texts
that have been identified so far. and among others we’re,
like i just mentioned, going for incorporating soils, soil
emissions under a redd framework and ensuring that redd
does not only consider forest ecosystems but hopefully
also other land users like wetlands that store a lot of
carbon (??). we go for mandatory accounting in annex one
countries [mhm] of all kinds of different emissions. so
not just from for example forestry and agriculture but
also other land users. [mhm] and we go for recognition on
an adaptation side of the role of ecosystems for
protecting people and avoiding adverse impacts of
adaptation measures such as infrastructure or development
on wetlands. and therefore yea hoping to try to avoid now
adaptation to take place. [mhm]

I: what do you think about the protests outsides the
conference?

P: i think they are quite useful. the fact that there are
people protesting in (..) yea quite an intensive way [mhm]
does open up opportunities for organizations that are more
working on biolog like us (.) to be listened to. it counts
for us to be listened to by delegations but of course also
by for example private sector. it(?’s?) might be pushed to
act by these protesters. so i think that balance between
having people that think and (?coop/ go?) [mhm] and people
that yea just protest and walk around and scream is a very
good balance.

I: what do you think about the mobilization of these
autonomous groups to copenhagen? as forms of direct action
(.) i don't know how to translate it.
P: could you explain it a bit more?
I: this (.) black block to copenhagen?
P: the extremists type of people?
I: yea
P: i think they are idiots. yea i don't know it's- they don't
even know what's going on in here (.) and they just want
to smash windows with stones, i think. so i think these
are yea- it's not useful for the whole of the process.
I: could you tell me, who do you cooperate with? wetlands
international?
P: we cooperate with a very broad range of partners. people
from government. government agencies. [mhm] research
institutes bring in a lot of science from these institutes
which we use for our outreach, as you can see here on(?e
thing?). [mhm] we work of course with partner n g os from
both the cultivation and the development sector [mhm] and
of course the way in which we work together depends very
much on what we do. i mean if we work in the field, we
would much more easily work with the local grassroots
organization or research institutes. where as if we work
on policy, the link with governments agencies or
international agencies would be much much stronger. [mhm]
I: are there any certain positions of n g os or movements
which you- where you think (.) you would fundamentally
contradict those positions?
P: yeah of course there are the climate skeptics [mhm] which
i very much contradict. i think they are very harmful
because they do have an impact on public opinion. i think
they're not really taken seriously in this context here.
[mhm] for example in the netherlands (.) i think it’s
something 22 or 22 per cent of the dutch population
considered they're are climate skeptics. and that's a
direct result of these kind of idiot organizations. (.) i
think also many organizations here have quite a tunnel
vision in terms of trying to address certain issues [mhm]
and are insufficiently outward looking and willing to
incorporate the views of others. but climate change being
very broad issue. particularly climate change adaptation
just needs an integrated approach and needs for people to align their views to each other. and that doesn't happen enough i think.

I: at the end i got some more concrete questions. one of those what are you reading regarding climate politics and climate change?
P: about what i am reading? [yea] in literature you mean?
I: if you want to know about climate change and climate politics.
P: so about climate change. the scientific background to it would be information available through internet. like through google scholar for example or review studies provided by ng os that bring together all this information. and if it's about climate politics it would be the general media as well as documents that come out of these kind of convention and meetings.
I: could you tell me, what you- when- you remember when you heard the term climate justice the first time?
P: ooh- i think two or three years ago.
I: any special occurrence?
P: no. i don't know.
I: (. ) are there particular places where your organization has stated its demands and perspectives?
P: oh sorry. could you repeat the whole?
I: are there any particular places where wetlands international has stated its demands?
P: you mean in the policy climate arena, right? [yea] yeah we said our demands of course here in the climate (?talk?).
within (. ) delegations we reached out to the and through our personal contacts as well as through our press releases and our website. we do the same within other conventions trying to influence for example this cop through the convention on biodiversity or the convention on wetlands. the ramsar convention. and then directly with individual governments. through our (?open?) network we engage to influence people and their organizations and their position of course here.
I: are there any texts of documents where you- i can read about these?
P: yea on our website you can find all our policy documents yeah what we try to accomplish. this card summarizes our website, our youtube channel, so yea you can look at this to find out what we say and do.
I: the last question would be could you tell me a little bit about the fundings of wetlands international? how is it
financed?

P: ok. we are mainly funded by donors. dutch government is an
important donor for us but also other governments in
europe. and also some u n organizations that provides a
(??) for us. we have some private sector funding. [mhm]
and we have country members, that are member of our
organization and also provide small annual fee to be a
member. this provides some important co-funding for us. ya
that's say 99 per cent of all together what we get.

I: i get only a last question (. ) because i just finished it
from my side, i think so. if there are any more things you
think which are really important to tell me, points i
missed, then {{gleichzeitig} please tell me}

P: {{gleichzeitig} not necessarily.} i think i pretty much
covered it all this (??). i hope it's a use.

I: how do you feel being interviewed?

P: how do i feel being interviewed. i'm happy to contribute
to your research [thank you] so i feel good about it.

I: thank you very much.

P: very welcome.
I: let me start with the first question. how was it that you joined w w f?

P:

I: (.) and what do you think is the role of w w f?

P: (.) i think w f's role as i see it in these sorts of negotiations is to provide a independent critical voice that's based on credible scientific research or at least an analysis with such research. and quite (commonly?) to the people who support w w f, the people around the world who are members of w f we don't represent them as such but we communicate their views, yea they joined us for (a?) reason for their believes and we engage and come on their behalf in the negotiation that we engage with other parties such as governments and business and try to have a constructive dialogue by these things.

I: what do you think would be the greatest success for w w f? when do you think we aren't in need of w [when w f] w f anymore

P: yea i guess all charities or n g os work to put themselves out of business essentially. that would be the (way so?). for w w f it would be when we're living in a sustainable one-planet kind of future. i guess we won't call it so. [mhm] at the moment globally we consume far too many resources and it's unsustainable. at the u k were i am from we live three planet lifestyles. so if everybody in the way- in the world lives the way that they (commutate?) it, it needs three planets to sustain them [mhm] so that's unsustainable. it's not possible to- for everybody to be that way so we do manage our resource use better and yea so if we achieve the one-planet future than w f would no longer need to exist in my view. but this is much more complicate from just saying one-planet future because always there's lots of things under their advice
what we need to preserve and how we need to (general?)
manage resources.

I: (.) could you tell me a little bit about the main areas of
w w f, of the work of w w f?

P: (.) yea i mean w f's origins were in mainly in
conservation and in developing (?fundings?) from there the
original name came from. it's world wild life fund. so
generating funds that could be used to conserve and
protect environments, habitats, and species [mhm]. we've
evolved i think a lot from them in still an important
(co?) - part of my work. we still do it a lot of the
majority of my budget goes to projects where we're
conserving and protecting environment species and habitats
[mhm] but we've also developed (?) as an international
organization and as the national offices of our
organization we've had to develop structures that service
our membership well, that service the press and other
audiences like business and of course we then have
communications and campaigning which is where i work in.
and that's because you know we have just said we've
could have represent the views of our members and
supporters in engaging with various audiences and
background issues. [mhm]

I: (.) how long has w w f working on the climate issue?

P: (.) i don't know the exact time or year but i know that
it's certainly decades. i think (?) late seventies or
eighties maybe. we were working on climate change to a
great or less extent. obviously in the last ten years it's
become a much bigger part of our work. and in the last
five years even more so. so but we're on - were one of the
first environmental non-governmental organizations that
worked on climate change.

I: (.) regarding climate change or global warming, what is-
what would, do you think, is the real problem of global
warming?

P: (.) i think there's not one problem. it's a combination of
problems. i mean if you want to distill it to one problem
i think it's the way we live our lives. but then, who's
the we there. there're some people in the world who the
way they live their lives has a very, very minimal impact
and contribution to climate change. where's the way that i
live my life has a much greater impact. so (.) but
collectively we know that we're causing a greater amount
of climate changing gases to be put into the atmosphere
than the natural systems of the earth can take them out of
the atmosphere again. and that's causing the warming. so
one major cause of that, that we know is proven by science
is we're putting carbon dioxide and another climate
changing gases into the atmosphere through energy use and
through our industry. that's not to say that we have to
stop using energy and stop be- being industrialized. but
it means that we can do more efficient and we can use
alternatives that are established within the environment.
and that's (?)this one thing?) that we will work to
achieve.

I: (.) what would you call real solutions to climate change?
P: (.) well it depends again on who's solutions and who's
perspective. so we all have our part to play (?and that is
the?) important thing as a individual stake of a bind
solution so the way that they live their lives, they can
do something- we calculated when i used to work at the u k
office, that of those three planets that i mentioned if we
look at the three planet lifestyle, one of those planets
can be kind of (.) reduced to two planets through
individual actions. so that's by the way that you shop,
the way that you- where you live and the way that you
commute to work for example. the type of way that you get
around and you personal so you- the way you insulate your
house (?,or people house??) that can be done by an
individual. then the other planet is- it needs business
and government to tackle that [mhm]. so it's more about
the infrastructure in which we live. so making things,
infrastructure more efficient. having energy supply this
more efficient and also having legislation (?numbers/ than
those?) caps on (.) on the way that we (.)(??) regulates
the way that we live our lives essentially. so there're
the sorts of things that collectively we can all we can
all do at different levels. so it's responsibility of
individuals and business and government. (?)it's a?) kind
of work together on it. and there's a great (?) that sort
of need.

I: (.) the other way round. what do you think regarding w w
f, would be false solutions? (.) to climate change

P: (.) it's difficult because. it would be, it would be ideal
and wonderful if there was a kind of silver bullet. if
there was a- something that we knew that we can do and
that would mean that we can carry on living the way that
we do and not have to change. people don’t like change
fundamentally. so we could look for that silver bullet.
but i think that's short-sighted. because fundamentally
the problem is the way we're living of fossil fuels for
example that are gonna run out one day. so (.) even beside
of climate change, they gonna run out and there (??)

enough problem left. so we need to assess things from that
point of view. but if we do change the way that we
generate energy for example, we will move our ability, we
can manage things much better. [mhm] so don’t think
there's one thing and there's the false things that being
suggested are things that mask the problem than tackling
the problem. and i think that's the false thing to do. we fundamentally need to tackle the root cause of the problem rather than trying to mask the problem. we're getting to the stage now, if the deal here in copenhagen isn't done or if it's a big delay to it, we may have to look to alternatives. because (. ) the climate doesn't wait for an agreement here. (? then the ?) global warming is happening regardless what we gonna get agreed on here. so if we get delay (. ) we may have (?to stop things that are ?) more and more difficult and more and more technologic advancing, more and more costly solutions that do mask the problem or work against the technological fixes. but at the moment the fundamental thing we should be doing is tackling the root cause.

I: (. ) are there anymore (??) false solutions you can think of?

P: (. ) are you looking for specifics?

I: i'm not looking anything- ((lacht)) perhaps you - you think of other false solutions? only to ask you.

P: (. ) well (. ) yea i've been- i work in the campaigns of communications kind of field and i personally consider a false solution to be just a political agreement that people set, the politicians agree that there's a problem and they say that they recognize the scale and they put in place some ambition bag what to do. but if it's not legally binding and it doesn't bind them to the solution [mhm] we have that's a false solution in my sense because then it's promises that might not ever be fulfilled from fulfilled for political reasons or for other reasons. and it's not a fundamental solution that we need to tackle the problem.

I: (. ) what do you understand by climate justice?

P: (. ) that's a very good question. again i mean justice for who and who's point of view. (??) climate justice is about those who suffer most [mhm] (. ) are the one who have least responsibility for the causes of climate change. so then the question of well who should (. ) in a justice system, who's the offending party and who's the victim. that's the it=we could think about it. so it's quite clear that there are certain countries that have a far greater historical responsibility for causing the problem. [mhm] industrialized countries that developed first.
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P: where were we?

I: (. ) the issue of climate justice.

P: climate justice. yea. so (??like? ) victims that perpetrates of any other (??). there're countries with about a great responsibility and the question then is what do they have
to do to make reparations of anything or compensate those who suffer and already are suffering most. it's a very difficult question and i think because of my background in such law and i think if states came here for example and started saying that they recognize the (end up in any ??) responsibility for compensation they would open up a huge (??) of issues and problems and that which is why i think they aren't doing that. they're talking about accepting that there is a historical responsibility but their line tends to be the they work (away?) of the problem when they're doing this kind of, you know, ignorance of the law as ways of (it would be?) equivalent but (. ) now i think there's a greater recognition that there does have to be at least some wrecker-(pats?) for the suffering the people are gonna have and already having because of climate change and that's gonna coming for (with?) financial systems for developed- and for mitigation policies and adaptation to climate change as well. [mhm]

I: would you or w w f make use of the term climate justice?

P: we don't make- we don't have a problem with the term in any way and a lot of our partner organizations that we work with in coalition do use the term and we think it's a violent term but we choose to phrase things in a different way. so we don't really refer to climate justice (. ) in very many cases.

I: (. ) how do you assess the climate negotiations?

P: (. ) at the moment? (. ) this week?

I: in general?

P: (. ) it's very difficult. <<=lachend> and> [ok] understandably so, but i think (. ) fundamentally there's a recognition that there's a problem that needs to be solved and needs (?humans?) as much as we can [mhm] to solve it and at least that generally held common recognition (. ) (?it's?) difficult to (?say?) in detail about, well how much it certain comes to reduce by and by when and what should those finance figures be, what should the access to the clean technologies that would have been need to be. (?so we take?) the poor countries active out of poverty (?than?) to develop but still not contribute to much to climate change (??). and it's in those things in that taking all those issues into this specific political event, negotiation arena, diplomatic arena, is gonna cause problems and difficulties but it's the pretty only way that we gonna get through this is by this countries talking together in the way they are doing here at copenhagen. and i think they are (. ) slowly but shortly getting there [mhm]. i hope they'll be there by next thursday, friday but we'll see.

I: (. ) how do you assess the influ- the chances to influence
P: (. . ) well the (. . ) you can look (?upon?) different ways, there's the u n f triple c they make space for observer organizations like ours and non-governmental organizations to participate and observe the process and the times contribute to it in various ways certain interventions. the parties and the other groups that are involved also by in large do allow good access to lobbying but of course more beside this there's lobby from n g os on the other side there's lobby from business. (??) you get pretty good invoked from both sides of the argument. and that's not to say for all business a bad either but yea there are some vested interests and certain areas of business at society as well, that are more interested in (. .) maintaining the status quo for short-time gain, [mhm] i suggest than looking at the long-term (??). but i think there is generally a good opportunity for us to influence negotiations in various ways through lobbying, through media work, through campaigning action(??), through engaging our public audiences about what's going on here. [mhm]

I: (. . ) what do you want to achieve at copenhagen?

P: (. .) our (. .) our call publicly is for a fair ambitious and binding deal. those three things are kind of fundamental to what most of the n g os are campaigning on. at least to be fair in that it has to recognize the common rates, a common and differentiated responsibilities issues, so. we all have responsibility for problem but (?who's??) of us have a great ability or responsibility to deal with it [mhm] and we also need to be just in that sense as well. in that at least we recognize the needs of poor countries. it needs to be ambitious. so it's no point in us adopting just piecemeal targets than just tackle it a bit of a problem we need to address (?) at all?) based on the science. and the much recent science is quite clear and it goes much further than the science of the i p c c has been- the i p c c science review closed for new papers and round about 2005 it was published in 2007. so now in 2009 we're four years out of date. a lot of changed in four years about measurements who've proven that the warming is happening faster and more and more deeply and more rapidly than predicted or the i p c c have predicted. so we need to base these targets (?) in copenhagen on the current science the up to date peer reviewed science. and the last thing is that as i said it before it needs to be legally binding. it has to commit countries to deliver. it has to have penalties and hot-spots. if they don't deliver it has some compliance regime. so there we're coming to three things that we're looking for. then of course there're lots of things under that that specify what specific groups of countries should do or what figures for finance
should be. that sort of thing as well. and mention
actually forests for example.

I: imagine a friend is asking you, who is participating in
these negotiations. what would you answer?

P: a lots of men in grey suits ((lacht)). a hundred and
ninety two countries of the world. don't know how many
hundred organizations. observer organizations there are.
there is a 5000 media here (.). i think at only one day
there are around about 25.000 people in the whole process.
so that's a real, it's a big effort of big (?) they're
trying to solve this problem and like some of them are
going try not to solve this <<lachend>problem> but the
majority of them are.

I: how would you value it? do you think there are some people
missing?

P: (.). i won't say there're some people missing but there's
some voices that could be louder and stronger. we've tried
to bring some people that we called climate witnesses,
they're people from developing countries who, and
developed countries as well, the people who are in front-
line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-
day lives by testimony to that. they it's difficult and
expansive to bring them here and there's always the ju-
=the need to justify why we would fly them all the way or
otherwise transport in what way to copenhagen or to where
the other meetings like this (.). just to tell their story.
so we are trying to find other ways to tell their story
through other means. likewise there're other groups that
aren't represented here. i think women are probably
underrepresented in this whole process (.). and there are
groups that are looking at (.). gender issues related to
climate change. and then there of course there's the
youth(?) there's a big youth contention in the
people in their kind of late teens and early twenties. (.).
but the children really aren't represented here very well
at all and after all yea the future is co-=is theirs.
maybe they should have more to say in the debate.

I: (.). also the other way round. do you think there are
people (.). voices here who shouldn't be at the
negotiations?

P: (.). i think personally and i (.). i'm sure this would be
<<lachend?>>the view of w w f as well>> that everybody has
the right to make their case heard at an event like this
and it should be the weight of argument and and
credibility that decides through a (?damned?) process
whether that view should be heard or not. so there are
people here who (.). i would rather (??) didn't come but
they have a right to be here and they have a right to make
their case know and then it's (?as i said?) it's for the
democratic process it's just still there and way up
against the evidence the other way so. i think everybody
has a right (?) so they have to be accredited and have to
have a present personality in the negotiations but (.) i
think people do have a right to be here to put their view
across.

I: could you tell me (.) what do other people say about w w f
in copenhagen?
P: (.) which other people?
I: (.) tell me.
P: (.) i think our n g o partners (.) we're in coalition on
the policy level with about three hundred (.) three
hundred or four hundred organizations as part of the
climate action network [mhm] (.) and on the campaigning
and communications we work with about two hundred also and
(?organizations?) as well often the same organizations (.)
and i think we have a respected position with our partner
organizations as credibly scientifically based
organization there's a a large international membership
(and such?) a presence. we've a policy team here that
represents a lot of countries. so it's very diverse. north
and south mix policy team. (??) people do generally
respect our (.) our interventions and our contributions to
the system.

I: (.) could you tell me a little bit about the activities of
w w f at copenhagen? (.) or first generally speaking
P: generally speaking [yea] sorry
I: in generally speaking the activities of (.) w w f.
P: ok. we have a policy team here that are engaged on they
break down into (?climate?) country issues or issue leads
so the policy issues that the negotiations break down into
[mhm]. this lobbying work is done direct with them (.) and
they follow the negotiations, observe the negotiations as
well. then we have a communications and campaigns sub-
units as well. just engaging many media. because of the
group people who are doing other events trying make the
whole event here accessible to public audience. so we have
a communications unit that has t v (??) but it's (?a sort
of international?) tell out sort audiences what's going on
here and make that available through the internet. and we
do campaign activities and stands as well. so we've done a
couple of stands here (.) three so far this week and we'll
probably another two or three next week. (.) and they're
designed to attract media attention and also give them a
platform for our policy speakers (??) spokespeople (.) to
go to (??) from the (??) and put our position across.
[mhm]
I: (.) what do you think about the protests outside the
negotiations.

P: (...) we don't tend to comment on what other groups' tactics are because that (??) to do. we believe in the right to peaceful protest and non-violent direct action and we will have our own presence at some of the organized events. (.) and that (??remains?) to be peaceful and constructive.

I: (...) how do you assess the mobilization of autonomous groups=i mean direct action what have been happened to copenhagen, towards copenhagen?

P: i just said they have (...) they all chose their tactics to engage in this process in whatever way they can. there may be different tactics to what we've employed but they yea they have a right to to protest if they chose to do so within the law, fine if they do so without the law then the law will (?de...?) them.

I: could you tell me a little bit about the cooperation of w w f. who do you cooperate with?

P: (...) who do we cooperate with? or? [yea] ok. we cooperate with as i said with climate action network, about four hundred organizations and then with g c c a about (??) hundred organizations. g c c a is the global campaign for climate action.

I: (...) would you strictly contradict any certain positions of other n g os or movements.

P: we do have different positions to other n g os but i think constructively that they're know and accepted by both parts (??) parties. (.) so where we disagree and we're the same we're united so i don't (?think?) there's a problem with disagreements and we manage them and yea we do have a different reasons for our disagreement.

I: could you tell me a little bit more specific what

P: i am not really a policy specialist. so i'm not really able to pick on one because i then wouldn't also explain it properly enough but i know there are certain disagreements about how this deal should be. but together (?such when you get learn?) into more the detail about the reduced emissions of deforestation and degradation issue for example there may be groups that have different opinions on, on (??) towards but again (.) we have different opinions but different for reasons.

I: (...) i get at the end some more concrete questions. so (.) for example what do you read if you want to know about climate change and climate politics?

P: (...) information sources or specific (.) sources the internet, there're a number of- i read about what partner organizations are doing. i read the news. i read the u n f triple c website. the cop 15 website has been pretty
useful as well. some publications the nature magazine, the newspaper and press what (?) as well. so you have a broad broad range of (.) of of (?) the internet these days but from a broad range of different media outlets and organizations.

I: (.) is it what you read?

P: yea oh sorry do you wanna know (if?) (?) read?

I: what you are reading (.) to know about climate politics.

P: yea the same sorts of things but i've also read some books that've been written (.) both on the kind of (?) on global warming or (?) in favor of (.) climate change and also some of the sceptical books as well to understand what the (.) positions are. (.) i wouldn't say they are hugely scientifically detailed because (.) yea i'm not a policy specialist i'm (??) but i think it's important to know the both sides of the issue.

I: and anything you won't ever read?

P: i've never thought that there- i would ever exclude any- anything like that. so now i- there've all the things i haven't been (.) been aware of (.) had time to read yet but i wouldn't say that's definitely (?) inappropriate (?) to read.

I: do you remember when you first met with the term climate justice?

P: (.) (.) it would have been in the last three years but i don't remember specific (.) time.

I: (.) could you tell me about particular places where the w w f is has stated it's program? (.) it's demands

P: (.) i don't understand the question.

I: (.) where could i find your demands and aims (.)

{{gleichzeitig}} in a written form

P: {{gleichzeitig}} oh right yeah we have- for me it's one the reasons i got these two things it's just two examples of (.) the materials that we've produced. so one is a kind of accessible pocket guide for public audiences (.) and this is also a specific media advisory (.) it tells the media what we're doing but also then includes (.) our top ten steps of success in copenhagen. (.) and that's also available on the internet as are our more detailed policy positions. so there are different levels of information available, depending on different audiences. they are available on the internet and there are (?) hard printed as well.

I: (.) the last question i got (.) could you tell me a little bit about the fundings of (.) w w f? (.) how is it financed?
P: (...) it's financed in a mixture I don't know the exact figures or proportions but it's a mixture of the the contributions we got from individual members and family memberships. (...) W F operates (...) as the international organizations [mhm] in different countries and then there's also an international secretariat. so the international secretariat is as such funded by the movement. it does get some money as well from trusts and donor foundations and from corporate donors [mhm] (...) and that's the same with national organizations as well it's (...) membership, corporate contributions of partnerships, foundations and trusts and also some government aid as well.

I: (...) that's it. so- as far as I'm concerned but (...) perhaps there's some thing you have (...) to say. (...) I missed it. it's very important.

P: mmh can't think of anything now. [<<lachend>ok>] but I now really gotta kind have get on. but I think- I think we've(??)

I: (...) how did you feel being interviewed?

P: (...) fine. (...) yeah. yea

I: did you- do you make such interviews often?

P: I've done a few things like this before (...) yea. for different (??) things on work issues and a (??) things as well.

I: (...) yea I'm very happy that you get some time.
A.4 Storylines und Syllogismen

A.4.1 Vorbemerkung

Anhang 4 umfasst die im Untersuchungsmaterial identifizierten Stories und deren Reproduktion anhand von Syllogismen. Im Interview implizit bleibende Prämissen oder Konklusionen werden im Folgenden bei der Darstellung der Syllogismen durch KAPITÄLCHEN hervorgehoben.

Zur Generierung von Stories und Syllogismen vergleiche im Weiteren Kapitel V.2.4 der Arbeit.
A.4.2 Storylines und Syllogismen »350.org«

Story 1: »a maximum of 350 ppm CO2 will solve the climate«

[= im Transkript Zeile 54 bis 80 ]
Storyline: To solve climate change we have to consider science. Science says that for a safe, stable climate 350 ppm has to be the bottom line for CO2.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To solve climate change we have to consider science.
Science says that for a safe, stable climate 350 ppm has to be the bottom line for CO2.
Therefore to solve climate change we need to get (back) to 350 ppm

Story 2: »the international day of climate action as a grassroots effort«

[= im Transkript Zeile 63 bis 71 ]
Storyline: The international day of climate action (24th of october 2009) was still very much of a grassroots effort and therefore was not an effort of professionals.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The international day of climate action (24th of october 2009) had a huge quantity of events in several countries (5200 events in 181 countries).
Because of the huge quantity of events in several countries CNN spoke of the most widespread day of political action in history.
Therefore the international day of climate action (24th of october 2009) was what CNN called the most widespread day of political action in history.

An effort of professionals is contrary to grassroots effort.
The international day of climate action (24th of october 2009) was still very much of a grassroots effort.
Therefore the international day of climate action (24th of october 2009) was not an effort of professionals.

Story 3: »350.org shifting the debate to the science of 350 ppm«

[= im Transkript Zeile 72 bis 90 ]
Storyline: This is a story about the goals of 350.org. 350.org had the goals to shift the debate. In the negotiations as well as the public who is interested in climate change one should consider the science of 350 ppm CO2.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Almost anyone who cares about climate change knows the science of 350 ppm as a bottom line.
One of the goals of 350.org was that the science of 350 ppm as a bottom line is well known.
Therefore one of the goals of 350.org was, what almost anyone who cares about climate change knows.
One of 350.org goals was to shift the debate in the negotiations (to shift the demand for maximum 450 ppm CO2 and 2 degrees warming to the demand for maximum 350 ppm CO2 and 1.5 degrees warming).

Over 100 countries (a lot of the island states, the aosis delegations, the least developed countries, the africa group) supporting the demand for maximum 350 ppm and 1.5 degrees warming show a shift in the debate in the negotiations. Therefore over 100 countries supporting the demand show that 350.org reached its goal.

**Story 4: »too much carbon in the atmosphere is causing global warming«**

[*im Transkript Zeile 91 bis 94*

**Storyline:** Too much carbon in the atmosphere is causing global warming.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

We are putting too much carbon in the atmosphere.

**Too much carbon in the atmosphere is causing global warming.**

Therefore we are causing global warming.

**Story 5: »Smart government action will solve climate change«**

[*im Transkript Zeile 95 bis 131*

**Storyline:** This is a story about solutions to climate change. To solve climate change we are in need of a rapid reduction of an huge amount of CO2 emissions. Only government action could reach this goal by setting limits and standards by which the entire society can change rapidly. It has to be smart government action which is protecting the people’s rights as well as biodiversity. Also behavioural action is an important thing but it could only be additional to governmental action to reach the required amount of reduction.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To solve climate change different important and good things have to be added together.

**Behavioural change is an incredible important thing.**

Therefore to solve climate change behavioural change has to be considered.

To solve climate change we are in need of an huge amount of reduction of CO2 emissions.

**Government action can cause the amount of reduction we are in need of.**

Therefore government action could solve climate change.

To solve climate change limits and standards have to be set to change the entire society rapidly.

**Government action sets limits and standards by which the entire society can change rapidly (because it’s an agreed upon treaty or action).**

Therefore government action could solve climate change.
Government action has to be smart government action. Smart government action is protecting the peoples’ rights, so that biodiversity is protected, so that we are healing the planet at the same time that we’re reducing carbon, not one and not the other. Therefore government action has to protect the peoples’ rights, so that biodiversity is protected, so that we are healing the planet at the same time that we’re reducing carbon, not one and not the other.

To solve climate change we are in need of an huge amount of reduction of CO2 emissions. Behavioural change (changing light bulbs, buying (??), turning down the thermostat, unplugging computers) won't have the amount of reduction we are in need of. Therefore behavioural change won't solve climate change.

To solve climate change limits and standards have to be set to change the entire society rapidly. Behavioural change does not set limits and standards by which the entire society can change rapidly (because it’s an agreed upon treaty or action). Therefore behavioural change could not solve climate change (for its own).

Governments have to initiate an entire system change. Initiating an entire system change means removing all subsidies from fossil fuels or investing in the technologies that will be reducing carbon. Therefore governments have to remove all subsidies from fossil fuels or invest in the technologies that will be reducing carbon.

Government action hast to be smart government action. Smart government action is contrary to things like massive tree plantations in brasil after cutting down the rain forest and loosing all the biodiversity and kicking indigenous people off the land. Therefore government action is contrary to things like massive tree plantations in brasil after cutting down the rain forest and loosing all the biodiversity and kicking indigenous people off the land.

**Story 6: »Climate Justice: pro-active and reactive«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 132 bis 159 ]

**Storyline:** The idea of Climate Justice is combining a pro-active part with a reactive part. Pro-active means to adress concerns of oppressed peoples around the world in anticipation of climate impacts. Reactive means making reparations for damage already done. Reparations have to be done by the countries which have caused the vast amount of emissions.
The vast amount of carbon in the atmosphere is causing climate impacts right now. The US has been burning fossil fuels for 200 years and that has contributed the vast amount of carbon into the atmosphere. Therefore the US is causing climate impacts right now.

To insure as fair as possible a system to address concerns of oppressed peoples around the world in anticipation of climate impacts is the pro-active part of climate justice.

To insure as fair as possible a system to address concerns of oppressed peoples around the world means drastic mitigation efforts to reduce CO2, so that further impacts aren’t imposed on especially poor people // it also means financing (by countries like the u.s. that have caused most of the problem), adaptation fundings so that for instance island states that are in danger of going under water are able to protect their lands and their livelihoods. Therefore drastic mitigation efforts to reduce CO2, so that further impacts aren’t imposed on especially poor people is the pro-active part of climate justice.

The idea of climate debt is the reactive part of climate justice.
Climate debt (i.e. recognizing that people are dying, that people have had their livelihoods taken away from them by this historic carbon emissions from (??) countries) basically means making reparations for damage already done. Therefore making reparations for damage already done is the (reactive) part of climate justice.

The climate debt (i.e. recognizing that people are dying, that people have had their livelihoods taken away from them by this historic carbon emissions from (??) countries) is an argument. Therefore the climate debt could be used to institute programs for emissions reductions, financing or technology transfer.

Story 7: »Climate justice is not part of climate science«
[= im Transkript Zeile 160 bis 174 ]
Storyline: As 350 is mostly focused on the messaging of climate science the idea of climate justice isn’t much a message of 350. 350 also talks about the fair, bold, ambitious ways of getting back to 350. The idea of climate justice could be included as one possible definition of such a way to get back to 350.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
350 believes in 350 tries to get into our work.
Therefore 350 tries to get the idea of climate justice into its work.
350 is mostly focused on the messaging of climate science. The idea of climate justice is not part of climate science. Therefore climate justice isn't much a message of 350.

350 talks about the fair, bold, ambitious ways of getting back to 350. The fair, bold, ambitious ways of getting back to 350 is what the idea of climate justice is about. Therefore 350 is talking about what the idea of climate justice is about.

There are different definitions among people of what is the fair, bold and ambitious way of getting back to 350. Climate justice could be considered to be part of a fair, bold and ambitious way of getting back to 350. Therefore climate justice belongs to one of different definitions among people.

**Story 8: »the UN: representativeness with flaws«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 175 bis 201]

*Storyline:* Global warming as a global problem has to be solved with the cooperation of all countries. The UN climate negotiations are the best forum for such cooperation. The UN is one of the most representative global institutions, although it has incredible flaws. On the one hand every state has a seat at the table. On the other hand not every state has enough delegates to fill all the roles that need to be filled at the negotiations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**Representativeness in global institutions is also about every country having a seat at the table.**

At the UN every country has a seat at the table. Therefore the UN are representative in that way.

Global warming as a global problem has to be solved with the cooperation of all countries. The climate negotiations are the best forum for cooperation of all countries (for problem-solving in a comprehensive way). Therefore the climate negotiations are necessary to solve global warming.

**Representativeness in global institutions is also about states having enough delegates to fill all the roles that need to be filled at the negotiations.**

At the UN not every state has enough delegates to fill all the roles that need to be filled at the negotiations. Therefore the UN are not representative in that way (the UN has incredible flaws).

**At some global institutions not every country has a seat at the table.**

At the UN every country has a seat at the table. Therefore the UN differ from some global institutions.
**Story 9: »350 can change the debate«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 202 bis 210 ]

**Storyline:** Difficult global processes like the climate negotiations can be changed with added components of civil society organising. Global negotiations can be influenced with available access and ways to change the debate. 350's civil society organising has such access and ways to change the debate in the global (climate) negotiations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Difficult global processes can be changed with added components of civil society organising.
The climate negotiations (180, 190 countries trying to come to consensus on something) are a difficult global process.
The climate negotiations can be changed with added components of civil society organising.

GLOBAL NEGOTIATIONS CAN BE INFLUENCED WITH AVAILABLE ACCESS AND WAYS TO CHANGE THE DEBATE.
350's civil society organising has access and ways to change the debate.
Therefore with 350's civil society organising the global (climate) negotiations can be influenced.

Influencing a global process of a 180, 190 countries with civil society organising is difficult.
With its work 350 is trying to influence a global process of a 180, 190 countries with civil society organising.
**Therefore the work of 350 is difficult.**

**Story 10: »silencing action-oriented tactics with the constituency status«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 211 bis 232 ]

**Storyline:** In general action-oriented and confrontational tactics are feared in the climate negotiations. The allocation of constituency status to groups which use such tactics could be seen as a way of silencing by institutionalising them. Young people received constituency status at the climate negotiations and therefore could now have less room to speak up.

A FAIR DECISION-MAKING WOULD INCLUDE THE UNDERREPRESENTED VOICES.
In the actual debate of the treaty text the underrepresented voices are not include (governments are the ones that make all the decisions).
**Therefore the actual debate of the treaty text isn’t a fair decision-making.**

Receiving constituency status means giving more access but getting more institutionalised.
Young people received constituency status at the climate negotiations.
**Therefore young people got more access but got more institutionalised.**
Institutionalisation (like receiving constituency status) could mean having less room to speak up. Young people received constituency status at the climate negotiations. Therefore young people could have less room to speak up.

In general action-oriented and confrontational tactics are feared in the climate negotiations. What is feared in the climate negotiations is frowned upon, is discouraged and silenced a little bit. Therefore action-oriented and confrontational tactics are frowned upon, discouraged and silenced a little bit.

The allocation of constituency status to groups which used action-oriented or confrontational tactics could be seen as silencing them by institutionalising them. The group of young people which used action-oriented or confrontational tactics received constituency status. Therefore the group of young people could be silenced by institutionalising them.

Story 11: »350.org: less organisation, more campaign«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 247 bis 274 ]

Storyline: As 350.org is not exactly an organisation it is not doing long-term planning. 350.org is working on movement building and growing the social movement around climate change. In this regard it prepared the international day of climate action on October 24th and is trying to continue the work done at that day at Copenhagen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Organisations are doing long-term planning.
350.org is not exactly an organisation.
Therefore 350.org is not doing any long-term planning.

350.org is working on movement building and growing the social movement around climate change.
350.org prepared the international day of climate action on October 24th.
Therefore the international day of climate action on October 24th is a tool for movement building and growing the social movement around climate change.

350.org is trying to continue the international day of climate action on October 24th at Copenhagen.
Continuing the international day of climate action on October 24th means representing the voices of all the people who have been organised with October 24th into the negotiations and reporting out what is going on at Copenhagen back to the global movement.
Therefore 350.org is trying to represent the voices of all the people who have been organised with October 24th into the negotiations and report out what is going on at Copenhagen back to the global movement.
350.org was preparing the international day of climate action on October 24th.

Preparing the international day of climate action on October 24th meant working on a lot of different things (a bit of capacity-building work with young people organising on climate change in Africa and Turkey; working with people in a lot of the UN conferences; trying to build up the representation and diversity of youth). Therefore 350.org worked on a lot of different things.

**Story 12: »the good peaceful protest vs. the bad violent protest«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 275 bis 311 ]

**Storyline:** For successful negotiations anyone who has decision-making authority needs to feel that the entire world is watching them. Peaceful protest will be a means to reach that goal. On the contrary protest which may turn violent will lead to losing the backing in society. As realising radical demands means bringing as much of society with one as possible radical demands will not be realised with protest which may turn violent.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

For successful negotiations the delegates need to feel that the entire world is watching them (an air of heightened tension to the negotiations).

Protests could produce a feeling that the entire world is watching the negotiators (lend an air of heightened tension to the negotiations).

**Therefore protests are needed for successful negotiations.**

It is important to continue to draw the world’s eyes to Copenhagen and recognize how important this decision could be if done well or if done incredibly poorly // to make anyone who has decision-making authority in the negotiation process fell civil society pressure.

Peaceful protest will continue to draw the world’s eyes to Copenhagen and recognize how important this decision could be if done well or if done incredibly poorly // to make anyone who has decision-making authority in the negotiation process fell civil society pressure.

**Therefore peaceful protest is important.**

Anyone who has decision-making authority in the negotiation process has to feel civil society pressure.

Heads of state, environmental ministers and the delegates have decision-making authority in the negotiations.

Therefore heads of state, environmental ministers and the delegates have to feel civil society pressure.

I am concerned about bringing the wrong kind of attention to Copenhagen.

Violent protest will bring the wrong kind of attention to Copenhagen.

Therefore I am concerned about violent protest.
Realising radical demands means bringing as much of society with one as possible. Protest which may turn violent would not bring as much of society with one as possible. Therefore radical demands will not be realised with protest which may turn violent.

**Story 13: »a partner of 350.org: what it is«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 312 bis 330 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the supporters of 350.org. Anyone who is willing to support the ideas of 350.org and pushing the idea of the international day of climate action on October 24th is a partner.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Anybody that is willing to help organise or help spread the word about October 24th events, pushing the 350-target and the climate science behind it and getting there in a fair and just way is a partner of 350.org. Groups like the climate action network to groups like the belize botanical gardens are willing to help organise or help spread the word about October 24th events, pushing the 350-target and the climate science behind it and getting there in a fair and just way. Therefore groups like the climate action network to groups like the belize botanical gardens (in total something like 400 partners around the world) are partners of 350.org.

**Story 14: »safety is behind us«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 331 bis 371 ]

**Storyline:** The critical limit decided in the climate negotiations should comply with the prevention of bad things happening. Stabilising at two degrees of temperature raise would not mean to stop bad things but to increase them. To solve climate change we need to get back to 350 ppm CO2 in the atmosphere (safety is behind us). Targets of temperature raise are not very well to measure and not easy to implement, therefore parts-per-million targets should be implemented in climate politics.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A decision about critical limits in climate politics should be based on a well-defined prognosis of the amount of degrees warming. A critical limit of 450 parts per million CO2 gives a 50%-chance of 2 degrees warming and therefore is not based on a well-defined prognosis of the amount of degrees warming. Therefore 450 ppm CO2 should not be the decided as a critical limit in climate politics.
The critical limit decided in the climate negotiations should comply with the prevention of bad things happening (the melting of the Arctic and the dying of 300,000 people each year as a direct or indirect result of climate change).

With the current global temperature raise of a little less than one degree Celsius bad things are happening (the Arctic is melting and 300,000 people are dying each year as a direct or indirect result of climate change).

Therefore a global temperature raise of a little less than one degree Celsius should not be the critical limit of temperature raise decided on in the climate negotiations.

The critical limit decided in the climate negotiations should comply with the prevention of bad things happening (the melting of the Arctic and the dying of 300,000 people each year as a direct or indirect result of climate change).

With 350 ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere as a critical limit there won’t be bad things happening (a melting of the Arctic and 300,000 people dying each year as a direct or indirect result of climate change).

Therefore 350 ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere should be the critical limit decided on in the climate negotiations.

To solve climate change we need to get back to 350 ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere (safety is behind us).

Stabilising at two degrees of temperature raise would not mean to get back to 350 ppm CO₂ in the atmosphere. Therefore stabilising at two degrees of temperature raise would not solve climate change.

The critical limit decided in the climate negotiations should prevent an increasing of bad things.

A temperature raise of two degrees would increase bad things. Therefore the critical limit decided in the climate negotiations should not be a two degrees temperature raise.

Critical limits in climate politics should be measurable and easy to implement.

Parts-per-million targets are measurable and easy to implement. Therefore parts-per-million targets should be used as critical limits in climate politics.

Critical limits in climate politics should be measurable and easy to implement.

Targets of temperature raise are not very well to measure and not easy to implement. Therefore targets of temperature raise should not be used as critical limits in climate politics.
Story 15: »the "in general" good idea of off-setting«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 372 bis 389 ]
Storyline: In general the idea of off-setting (carbon trading or cdm projects) is a good one. The current implementation by governments has been a incredibly poorly so far // Currently there are a lot of flaws with this idea.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Things that can be done well, should be done well.
The idea of carbon markets or carbon trading can be done well.
Therefore the idea of carbon markets or carbon trading should be done well.

In general the idea of off-setting is a good one.
The current implementation of the idea of off-setting (carbon trading or cdm projects) by governments has been a incredibly poorly so far // Currently there are a lot of flaws with the idea of off-setting.
Therefore the general good idea is contrary to its incredibly poorly current implementation.

Story 16: »350.org: focussed, united, successful«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 449 bis 468 ]
Storyline: With the strategy of 350.org being successful, climate change could be solved. To make the strategy of 350 successful it is incredibly powerful and important to create a sense of unity and a sense of shared purpose. This unity and shared purpose has been created because of the focussing on science and the simple message of '350 ppm CO2'. 350.org showed the breadth, diversity and power of the global movement on climate change which makes one optimistic that solving climate change is possible.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

With the strategy of 350.org being successful, climate change could be solved.
To make the strategy of 350 successful it is incredibly powerful and important to create a sense of unity and a sense of shared purpose.
Therefore creating a sense of unity and a sense of shared purpose is incredibly powerful and important to solve climate change.

A breadth, diversity and power of the global movement on climate change gives optimism that solving climate change is possible.
350.org showed the breadth, diversity and power of the global movement on climate change.
Therefore 350.org gives optimism that solving climate change is possible.
Focussing on the science and being open to partnering with a lot of different groups makes an organisation able to get a widespread of organisations and social movements that organise on climate change to participate together.
350.org focused on the science and is open to partnering with a lot of different groups.
Therefore 350.org was able to get a widespread of organisations and social movements that organise on climate change to participate together.

Keeping the message simple and focussed makes a lot of groups able to engage with it.
The message of 350.org was kept simple and focussed (while at the same time 350.org had a very pointed political demand which is ‘350’).
Therefore a lot of groups could engage with 350.org.
A.4.3 Storylines und Syllogismen »CAN – Climate Action Network International«

Story 1: »coordination and a unified voice vs. businesses' investments«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 39 bis 61 ]

Storyline: Businesses is looking to maintain the status quo, not to pertain to climate policy. Therefore they are investing a immense amount of money and resources. Civil society is contradicting businesses. To tackle the investments of businesses civil society is in need of coordination and a unified voice. CAN is allocating that by identifying opportunities where cooperation can be most effective and creating tools.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CIVIL SOCIETY IS CONTRADICTING THE MAINTAINANCE OF THE STATUS QUO.
Businesses is looking to maintain the status quo, not to pertain to climate policy.
THEREFORE CIVIL SOCIETY IS CONTRADICTING BUSINESSES.

Businesses is looking to maintain the status quo, not to pertain to climate policy.
To maintain the status quo, not to pertain to climate policy businesses are investing a immense amount of money and resources.
Therefore businesses is investing a immense amount of money and resources.

Businesses is investing a immense amount of money and resources to maintain the status quo.
Investing a immense amount of money and resources to maintain the status quo is a challenge to civil society.
Therefore businesses are a challenge to civil society.

Investments of a immense amount of money and resources to maintain the status quo is a challenge to civil society.
A challenge to civil society could be tackled with coordination and with a unified voice.
Therefore the investments of a immense amount of money and resources to maintain the status quo could be tackled with coordination and with a unified voice.

Civil society could be most effective with coordination and with a unified voice.
CAN is coordinating and giving civil society unified voice.
Therefore civil society could be most effective with CAN.

CAN is coordinating and giving civil society unified voice.
Coordinating and giving civil society unified voice means to identify opportunities where cooperation can be most effective and to create tools.
Therefore CAN is identify opportunities where cooperation can be most effective and to create tools.
It is a success that many organisations and people understand the importance of the way that CAN cooperates. Therefore people taking the time to invest in climate action network activities is a success.

A successful outcome at the bali negotiations in 2007 could be achieved because of the capital role CAN played. CAN playing a capital role identified a strategy of isolating the US administration's policies and positions. Therefore achieving a successful outcome at the bali negotiations in 2007 was rooted in a strategy of isolating the US administration's policies and positions.

A successful outcome at the bali negotiations in 2007 could be achieved because of the capital role CAN played. CAN playing a capital role because it was able to cooperate. Therefore achieving a successful outcome at the bali negotiations in 2007 was rooted in CAN's ability to cooperate.

Burning fossil fuels is one of the bigger causes to climate change. The business models of the fossil fuel industry is resulting in burning fossil fuels, which is one of the bigger causes to climate change. The fossil fuel industry is using immense amounts of resources to avoid a change of its business models. Also the governments' policies are allowing the fossil fuel industry to continue its business models.
The business models of the fossil fuel industry (especially oil companies, but also coal companies and others) are causing climate change in a lot of ways.
The fossil fuel industry is using immense amounts of resources to avoid a change of its business models.
Therefore the immense amounts of resources used are causing climate change.

The business models of the fossil fuel industry (especially oil companies, but also coal companies and others) are causing climate change in a lot of ways.
The governments' policies are allowing the fossil fuel industry to continue its business models.
Therefore the governments' policies are allowing a continuation of the causes of climate change.

Story 4: »cooperation compensating limited NGO resources«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 120 bis 129 ]

Storyline: Limited resources is a disadvantageous basis for effectiveness. Compared to its opposition NGOs have limited resources. Those could be compensated with cooperation.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Compared to its opposition NGOs have limited resources.
LIMITED RESOURCES IS A DISADVANTAGEOUS BASIS FOR EFFECTIVENESS.
Therefore NGOs a disadvantageous basis for effectiveness.

LIMITED RESOURCES IS A DISADVANTAGEOUS BASIS FOR EFFECTIVENESS.
A DISADVANTAGEOUS BASIS FOR EFFECTIVENESS COULD BE COMPENSATED WITH COOPERATION.
Therefore limited resources could be compensated with cooperation.

Story 5: »climate change being very dispersed«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 129 bis 140 ]

Storyline: Climate change is very dispersed, i.e. what one can see in countries that have the biggest responsibility is in contradiction to what you can see in countries in africa. Countries that have the biggest responsibility (the US or Europe) effects of climate change do not see the effects of climate change first hand. Not seeing the effects first hand allows to push it aside/ not focus on it as much.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
In countries that have the biggest responsibility effects of climate change is not effident.
Countries in africa that are already seeing effects of climate change (like desertification and other effects).
Therefore what one can see in countries that have the biggest responsibility is in contradiction to what you can see in countries in africa (i.e. climate change is very dispersed).
Countries that have the biggest responsibility (the US or Europe) effects of climate change do not see the effects of climate change first hand. Not seeing the effects first hand allows to push it aside/ not focus on it as much. Therefore countries that have the biggest responsibility (the US or Europe) effects of climate change are able to push it aside/ not focus on it as much.

**Story 6: »differentiated responsibility to reduce emissions«**

*Storyline: To save the climate emissions have to be reduced. African countries are causing emissions to a low degree. The US or Europe are causing emissions to a high degree. Therefore the US or Europe could save climate to a high degree/ the US or Europe have high impact.*

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Emissions are causing climate change.
- African countries are causing climate change to a low degree.
- Therefore African countries are causing emissions to a low degree.

- To save the climate emissions have to be reduced.
- African countries are causing emissions to a low degree.
- Therefore African countries could save climate to a low degree/ African countries have less impact.

- To save the climate emissions have to be reduced.
- The US or Europe are causing emissions to a high degree.
- Therefore the US or Europe could save climate to a high degree/ the US or Europe have high impact.

**Story 7: »governmental policies can cause a shift«**

*Storyline: Emissions continuing to rise have to be stopped. Problematic patterns of government policies are driving emissions to continue to rise. Focussing on those patterns is more important than focussing on personal action. The internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles will cause a shift of government policies and therefore can create jobs and make cleaner air/ can be attractive to investors. It could be the heightening of efficiency, which would be the cheapest solution to climate change. It could also be the shift to renewable electricity and renewable power resources (such as wind and solar). Fossil fuels subsidies and other government policies in a lot of countries are opposed to such a shift.*

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Emissions continuing to rise have to be stopped.
- Problematic patterns of government policies are driving emissions to continue to rise.
- Therefore problematic patterns of government policies have to be stopped/ shifted.
Problematic patterns of government policies have to be stopped/shifted.
The internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles will cause a shift.
Therefore problematic patterns of government policies have to internalise greener technologies and healthier lifestyles.

Shifting problematic patterns of government policies is to focus on the internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles.
Focussing on the internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles is more important than focussing on personal action.
Therefore shifting problematic patterns of government policies is more important than focussing on personal action.

Shifting problematic patterns of government policies could be the heightening of the efficiency.
Heightening of the efficiency is about saving energy.
Therefore shifting problematic patterns of government policies could be about saving energies.

The heightening of efficiency is about saving energy.
Saving energy is the cheapest solution to climate change.
Therefore heightening of efficiency is the cheapest solution to climate change.

Shifting problematic patterns of government policies could be the shift to renewable electricity and renewable power resources (such as wind and solar).
INTERNALISING DIRTY TECHNOLOGY IS OPPOSED TO A SHIFT TO RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY AND RENEWABLE POWER RESOURCES.
Therefore the internalisation of dirty technology is opposed to shifting problematic patterns of government policies.

INTERNALISING DIRTY TECHNOLOGY IS OPPOSED TO A SHIFT TO RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY AND RENEWABLE POWER RESOURCES.
In a lot of countries, fossil fuels subsidies and other government policies are internalising dirty technology.
Therefore in a lot of countries fossil fuels subsidies and other government policies are opposed to a shift to renewable electricity and renewable power resources.

A shift of government policies will be caused by the internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles.
The internalisation of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles can creat jobs and make cleaner air/ can be attractive to investors.
Therefore a shift of government policies can create jobs and make cleaner air/ can be attractive to investors.
Story 8: »false solutions to climate change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 177 bis 225 ]

Storyline: False solutions to climate change won't solve the problem. Green coal or carbon sequestration and nuclear power are (two of the biggest) false solutions to climate change because they are very costly and one has to worry about their waste. One should invest in new cleaner technologies, where one does not have to worry about the waste.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

FALSE SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE WON'T SOLVE THE PROBLEM.
GREEN COAL OR CARBON SEQUESTRATION AND NUCLEAR POWER ARE (TWO OF THE BIGGEST) FALSE SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE.
THEREFORE GREEN COAL OR CARBON SEQUESTRATION AND NUCLEAR POWER WON'T SOLVE THE PROBLEM.

Because of limited resources (in a downturned economy) one should not invest in costly solutions to climate change.
Nuclear power is very costly solution to climate change.
Therefore because of limited resources (in a downturned economy) one should not invest in nuclear power.

One should not invest in technologies, where one has to worry about the waste.
Nuclear power or so-called clean coal is a technology, where one has to worry about the waste.
Therefore one should not invest in nuclear technology.

One should not invest in technologies, where one has to worry about the waste.
With new cleaner technologies one does not have to worry about the waste.
Therefore one should invest in new cleaner technologies.

To solve climate change solutions are needed.
Shifting away from coal power is a solution.
Therefore to solve climate change a shift away from coal power is needed.
(Climate Justice means) Specific people are most affected by climate change. The developing world needs to develop/ become prosperous. This means they have to move away from dirty technologies/ use cleaner technologies. As developing countries might not be able to do that on their own, developed countries have the responsibility to help them.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

(Climate Justice means) Specific people are most affected by climate change.
(Climate Justice means) Specific people are the least responsible for causing it.
(Climate Justice means) Therefore those, who are the most affected by climate change, are the least responsible for causing it.

(Climate Justice means recognising that) The developed world developed/ became prosperous on very dirty technologies.
(Climate Justice means recognising that) Very dirty technologies polluted the atmosphere/ caused climate change.
(Climate Justice means recognising that) Therefore the developed world polluted the atmosphere/ caused climate change.

Very dirty technologies polluted the atmosphere.
To solve climate change very dirty technologies have to be stopped.
Therefore to solve climate change the pollution of the atmosphere has to be stopped.

The developing world needs to develop/ become prosperous (lift their citizens out of (an extreme) poverty).
Becoming prosperous (lift their citizens out of (an extreme) poverty) means moving away from dirty technologies/ using cleaner technologies.
Therefore the developing world needs to move away from dirty technologies/ use cleaner technologies.

Becoming prosperous (lift their citizens out of (an extreme) poverty) means moving away from dirty technologies/ using cleaner technologies.
Developing countries might not be able to move away from dirty technologies/ use cleaner technologies.
Therefore developing countries might not become prosperous.

Developing countries becoming prosperous (lift their citizens out of (an extreme) poverty) means moving away from dirty technologies/ using cleaner technologies.
Developed countries have the responsibility to help to move away from dirty technologies/ use cleaner technologies.
Therefore developed countries have the responsibility to help developing countries.
Story 10: »CAN considering the key part of Climate Justice in all of its positions«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 254 bis 265 ]
Storyline: The key part of the (Climate) Justice frame is the equity issue. CAN as a network takes it into account, when it considers principles of equity, justice and fairness into all of its positions.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
CAN as a network takes principles of equity, justice and fairness into account and into all of its positions.
The key part of the (Climate) Justice frame is the equity issue.
Therefore CAN as a network takes the key part of the justice frame into account into all of its positions.

Story 11: »incorporated geopolitical issues make the negotiations challenging«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 266 bis 294 ]
Storyline: The international climate negotiations are incredibly complicated and incredibly challenging, because geopolitical issues are incorporated into the discussions.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
CAN had a lot of lofty goals for Copenhagen.
The government didn’t achieve the lofty goals for Copenhagen.
Therefore the governments didn’t achieve what CAN was demanding for.

There are geopolitical issues incorporated into the discussions at the international climate negotiations.

Geopolitical issues being incorporated makes things incredibly complicated and incredibly challenging.
The international climate negotiations are incredibly complicated and incredibly challenging.

There are geopolitical issues incorporated into the discussions at the international climate negotiations.

Geopolitical issues are issues with limited relevance to climate getting.

Issues with limited relevance to climate incorporated into the discussions at the international climate negotiations.

Story 12: »variety of people participating at the negotiations«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 295 bis 331 ]
Storyline: Governments, very experienced NGO-actors, experts, activist oriented organisations, independent scientists, businesses and indigenous people are participating at the negotiations.
Governments are participating at the negotiations. Governments are including a variety of different types of government actors that attend, everything from scientists and sort of well-level bureaucrats to political appointees and ministers. Therefore a variety of different types of government actors that attend, everything from scientists and sort of well-level bureaucrats to political appointees and ministers is participating at the negotiations.

Very experienced NGO-actors are participating at the negotiations. Very experienced NGO-actors have been far in the negotiations and maybe have been a part of government delegation in the past. Therefore some, who have been far in the negotiations and maybe have been a part of government delegation in the past are participating at the negotiations.

Experts that have no association with governments are participating at the negotiations. Experts that have no association with governments are qualified and very innovative and putting forward very creative solutions. Therefore some, who have no association with governments are qualified and very innovative and putting forward very creative solutions are participating at the negotiations.

Activist oriented organisations are participating at the negotiations. Activist oriented organisations are focussed on simply making the public awareness about the issue (an incredibly important part of the movement). Therefore some, who are focussed on simply making the public awareness about the issue (an incredibly important part of the movement) are participating at the negotiations.

Independent scientists and others are participating at the negotiations. Independent scientists and others are trying to put out very different proposals and models and other possible ways of looking at the issue. Therefore some, who are trying to put out very different proposals and models and other possible ways of looking at the issue are participating at the negotiations.

Tons of medias are participating at the negotiations. Tons of medias have the object in public interest in the issue. Therefore some, who have the object in public interest in the issue are participating at the negotiations.
Businesses are participating at the negotiations. Businesses are trying to either be a part of the solution and sort of take advantage of the new way for a new area for investment and innovation. Therefore some, who are trying to either be a part of the solution and sort of take advantage of the new way for a new area for investment and innovation are participating at the negotiations.

Other businesses are participating at the negotiations. Other businesses are trying to maintain the status quo and maintain their dominance in the market and their ability to make money of the dirty energy. Therefore some, who are trying to maintain the status quo and maintain their dominance in the market and their ability to make money of the dirty energy are participating at the negotiations.

Indigenous people are participating at the negotiations. Indigenous people are paying attention to the issue. Therefore some, who are paying attention to the issue are participating at the negotiations.

A variety of different people are participating at the negotiations. A variety of different people are paying attention to the issue and coming to a negotiation grown tremendously. Therefore some, who have are participating at the negotiations.

Story 13: »government policies have to be affected before the negotiations«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 332 bis 358 ]

Storyline: A variety of groups needs to see drastic changes at the negotiations. Changing the government policy or having a huge effect on the trajectory at the negotiations itself, is limited. Governmental negotiators being hands tight or having only some wiggle room. Changing a government policy could be successful, on the one hand when governments are developing their position beforehand the negotiations in the capitals or on the other hand, when affecting political discussions in the capital during the negotiations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
At the negotiations itself the governmental negotiators are hands tight or have only some wiggle room. Governmental negotiators being hands tight or having only some wiggle room means changing a government policy or having a huge effect on the trajectory is limited. Therefore at the negotiations itself changing a government policy or having a huge effect on the trajectory is limited.
Governments are developing their position beforehand the negotiations in the capitals.
Changing a government policy could be successful, when governments are developing their position.
Therefore changing a government policy could be successful beforehand the negotiations in the capitals.

A variety of groups that need to see drastic changes have to change the government policy.
Changing a government policy could be successful beforehand the negotiations in the capitals.
Therefore a variety of groups that need to see drastic changes could be successful beforehand the negotiations in the capitals.

A variety of groups that need to see drastic changes have to change the government policy.
Changing a government policy could be successful when affecting political discussions in the capital during the negotiations.
Therefore a variety of groups that need to see drastic changes could be successful when affecting political discussions in the capital during the negotiations.

Story 14: *the disruption of negotiations is inappropriate*

*Storyline: Various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the UN climate negotiations as the only objective. This is not the right strategy as the UN is the most appropriate place to see these negotiations take place, as it is the most transparent and open process and allows for the most the widest variety of voices to be heard and as it has been agreed by over 180 countries.*

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Having a disruption or stop of the negotiations as the only objective is not the right strategy.
Various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the negotiations as the only objective.
Therefore various NGOs or businesses do not have the right strategy.

The UN framework convention on climate change is the most appropriate place to see these negotiations take place.
Various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of UN framework convention on climate change as their only objective.
Therefore various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the most appropriate place to see these negotiations take place as their only objective.
The UN framework convention on climate change is the most transparent and open process and allows for the most the widest variety of voices to be heard. Various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the most transparent and open process and allows for the most the widest variety of voices to be heard as their only objective. Therefore various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the most transparent and open process and allows for the most the widest variety of voices to be heard as their only objective.

The negotiations have been agreed by over 180 countries. Various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the negotiations as the only objective. Therefore various NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of what has been agreed by over 180 contries as the only objective.

Story 15: »reflected increase of the voices of those, who are most affected«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 373 bis 389 ]

Storyline: At the negotiations the voices of indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change aren't heard well enough, because there would be stronger action being agreed instead. An increase of those voices by bringing themselves to negotiations or finding other ways to lift their voices in the dialogue has to be reflected. Developing country activists or experts could represent those, who are most affected. They should be able to have direct communication with government delegations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

At the negotiations the voices of indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change aren't heard well enough.
The voices of indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change heard well enough would mean, there is strong action being agreed.
Therefore at the negotiations there is no strong action being agreed.

The voices of those, who are most affected by climate change being heard in the negotiations should be increased by several means (bringing themselves to negotiations or finding other ways to lift their voices in the dialogue).
An increase by several means, has to be reflected.
Therefore an increase of the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change being heard in the negotiations, has to be reflected.

The voices of those, who are most affected by climate change should to be increased in the negotiations.
Developing country activists or experts could represent those, who are most affected by climate change.
Therefore developing country activists or experts should be increased in the negotiations.
Developing country activists or experts could represent those, who are most affected by climate change. Developing country activists should be able to have direct communication with government delegations. Therefore those, who represent the people, who are most affected should be able to have direct communication with government delegations.

Story 16: »CAN aiming at affecting various events«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 390 bis 432 ]
Storyline: CAN is working on specific campaigns or specific lobby efforts around various events (the UN climate negotiations or the G20 or other regional events). By doing so CAN is aiming at affecting those events.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
CAN is working on specific campaigns or specific lobby efforts around various events (the UN climate negotiations or the G20 or other regional events).
Work on specific campaigns or specific lobby efforts around various events is aiming at affecting those events.
Therefore CAN is aiming at affecting those events.

Story 17: »CAN working on southern capacity building«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 432 bis 445 ]
Storyline: CAN is holding a southern capacity building program, which is working on building the capacity of the developing country members of CAN and partners of CAN (for a better position to advocate for climate solutions and for vested policies about climate change within the countries but also at the international negotiations).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
CAN is holding a southern capacity building program.
The southern capacity building program is working on building the capacity of the developing country members of CAN and partners of CAN (for a better position to advocate for climate solutions and for vested policies about climate change within the countries but also at the international negotiations).
Therefore CAN is working on building the capacity of the developing country members of CAN and partners of CAN (for a better position to advocate for climate solutions and for vested policies about climate change within the countries but also at the international negotiations).
Story 18: »the necessity of encouraging progress at the UNFCCC«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 446 bis 474 ]

Storyline: There should be effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the UNFCCC as the best venue for these negotiations to take place. Protests that are saying that the UN isn’t the right place for these negotiations to take place are no such effort. Some protests or activities that are raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue or the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries, are such an effort. They are raising the level of awareness of the public and therefore can help to encourage/pressure governments to take stronger action.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

There should be effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the best venue for these negotiations to take place. The UNFCCC is the best venue for these negotiations to take place. Therefore there should be effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the UNFCCC.

There should be effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the UNFCCC. Protests that are saying that the UN isn’t the right place for these negotiations to take place are no effort to facilitate and encourage progress. Therefore protests that are saying that the UN isn’t the right place for these negotiations to take place should take place at the UNFCCC.

There should be effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the UNFCCC. Some protests or activities that are raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue or the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries, are an effort to facilitate and encourage progress. Therefore protests or activities that are raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue or the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries, should take place at the UNFCCC.

Protests or activities that are raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue or the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries, are raising the level of awareness of the public. Raising the level of awareness of the public can help to encourage/pressure governments to take stronger action. Therefore protests or activities that are raising the awareness of the urgency of the issue or the lack of acceptable or sufficient response to the issue, especially by developed countries, can help to encourage/pressure governments to take stronger action.
The vast majority of the marchers and activists at the hundred thousand persons march at the middle saturday were pushing for strong action on climate change/for action in the negotiations. Pushing for strong action on climate change/for action in the negotiations raised a lot of awareness and injected a whole lot of energy into the negotiations. Therefore the vast majority of the marchers and activists at the hundred thousand persons march at the middle saturday raised a lot of awareness and injected a whole lot of energy into the negotiations.

The vast majority of the marchers and activists at the hundred thousand persons march at the middle saturday was not saying that the whole process is a shame. Not saying that the whole process is a shame is useful. The vast majority of the marchers and activists at the hundred thousand persons march at the middle saturday was useful.

**Story 19: »CAN focussing on capacity building for developing countries«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 529 bis 545 ]

**Storyline:** CAN in its southern capacity building program is focussing on the capacity building effort to help developing countries participation and capacity building.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- CAN is holding a southern capacity building program.
- The southern capacity building program is focussing on the capacity building effort to help developing countries participation and capacity building.
- Therefore CAN is focussing on the capacity building effort to help developing countries participation and capacity building.
A.4.4 Storylines und Syllogismen »CIDSE – Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité«

Story 1: »the role of CIDSE«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 14 bis 39 ]

**Storyline:** The church development agencies are in partnership with developing countries/ supporting local organisations to do the work in the country, which is contrary to just donating or doing service delivery. CIDSE member organisations coming together at a network level can heightened influence, which is needed to change international policies that are impacting on the communities in the south CIDSE member organisations work with.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The church development agencies are in partnership with developing countries/ supporting local organisations to do the work in the country.
Being in partnership with developing countries/ Supporting local organisations to do the work in the country is contrary to just donating or doing service delivery.
Therefore the church development agencies are contrary to just donating or doing service delivery.

To change international policies that are impacting on the communities in the south CIDSE member organisations work with, influence is needed.
CIDSE member organisations coming together at a network level can heightened influence.
Therefore CIDSE member organisations coming together at a network level can change international policies that are impacting on the communities in the south CIDSE member organisations work with.

Story 2: »subsidiarity is needed«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 40 bis 62 ]

**Storyline:** Global governance is relevant for different areas of politics CIDSE is working on (like climate change; resources for development; food agriculture and sustainable trade).

*Global governance is about decision-making. Currently decisions are made by global structures.* Decision-making has to follow the principle of subsidiarity

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Global governance is relevant for different areas of politics (like climate change; resources for development; food agriculture and sustainable trade).
CIDSE is working on different areas of politics (like climate change; resources for development; food agriculture and sustainable trade).
Therefore global governance is relevant for CIDSE.

Global governance is influencing decision-making.
*Currently decisions are made by global structures.*
Therefore global governance is currently influenced by global structures.
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE IS ABOUT DECISION-MAKING.
Decision-making has to follow the principle of subsidiarity
(decisions have to be made as close to the people as possible).
Therefore global governance has to follow the principle of subsidiarity.

Story 3: »advocacy work to tackle the real causes of Climate Change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 63 bis 84 ]
Storyline: To solve the problem of climate change the real causes need to be tackled. Member organisations of CIDSE have been working on disaster resolution a lot, which is tackling the effects of climate change. To tackle the real causes advocacy work is needed. Advocacy work can cause political change. The UN negotiation process gives room for political change. To realise political change the UN negotiations need to be impacted. An international campaign could impact the UN negotiations. Developing a policy or doing research would not suffice.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Member organisations of CIDSE have been working on disaster resolution a lot.
Disaster resolution is tackling the effects of climate change/ is not tackling the real causes of climate change.
Therefore member organisations of CIDSE have been tackling the effects of climate change/ have not been tackling the real causes of climate change.

To solve the problem of climate change the real causes need to be tackled.
Tackling the effects of climate change is not equal to tackling the real causes.
Therefore tackling the effects is not equal to solving the problem of climate change.

To solve the problem of climate change the real causes need to be tackled.
To tackle the real causes advocacy work is needed.
Therefore to solve the problem of climate change advocacy work is needed.

To solve the problem of climate change advocacy work on the issue of climate change is needed.
CIDSE is doing advocacy work on the issue of climate change.
Therefore to solve the problem of climate change CIDSE is needed.

To solve the problem of climate change political change is needed.
Advocacy work on the issue of climate change can cause political change.
Therefore to solve the problem of climate change advocacy work on the issue of climate change is needed.

To solve the problem of climate change political change is needed.
The UN negotiation process gives room for political change.
Therefore the UN negotiation process gives room for solving the problem of climate change.
To realise political change the UN negotiations need to be impacted. An international campaign could impact the UN negotiations. Therefore an international campaign could realise political change.

To realise political change the UN negotiations need to be impacted. Developing a policy or doing research would not suffice to impact the UN negotiations. Therefore developing a policy or doing research would not suffice to realise political change.

Story 4: »man-made climate change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 85 bis 103 ]
Storyline: Burning the fossil fuels is causing too many greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and thereby climate change. As humankind is burning fossil fuels climate change is man-made.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Burning the fossil fuels is causing too many greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.
Too many greenhouse gases in the atmosphere cause climate change.
Therefore burning fossil fuels is causing climate change.

Burning fossil fuels is causing climate change.
Humankind is burning fossil fuels.
Therefore climate change is man-made.

Story 5: »a right solution to climate change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 104 bis 119 ]
Storyline: A solution to climate change requires drastical cut of greenhouse gas emissions. This could be achieved with a fundamental shift in the way of thinking about development, growth, gain, happiness and well-being and the change of the source of energy. To change the source of energy a change of the lifestyles is necessary. A solution to climate change also requires adaptation of some countries.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
A solution to climate change requires drastical cut of greenhouse gas emissions.
A drastical cut of greenhouse gas emissions requires a fundamental shift in the way of thinking about development, growth, gain, happiness and well-being.
Therefore a solution to climate change requires a fundamental shift in the way of thinking about development, growth, gain, happiness and well-being.
A solution to climate change requires drastic cut of greenhouse gas emissions. Drastically cutting greenhouse gas emissions means changing the source of energy. Therefore a solution to climate change requires a changing of the source of energy.

A solution to climate change requires a changing of the source of energy. Changing the source of energy means changing the lifestyles. Therefore a solution to climate change requires a changing of the lifestyles.

A solution to climate change requires adaptation of some countries. Adaptation of countries requires financing. Therefore a right solution to climate change requires financing.

**Story 6: "false solutions to climate change"**

[= im Transkript Zeile 120 bis 141]

**Storyline:** A false solutions to climate change is having negative impact on the environment or on poor countries and communities. CDM is a false solution as it has negative impacts. Markets have potential for positive as well as negative impacts. They are used to implement adaptation measures. Adaptation measures therefore have to avoid negative impacts. Therefore adaptation measures have to be planned holistically. CIDSE looking at adaptation processes on community, regional or national level is supporting this holistical planning.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A false solutions to climate change is having negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. CDM has negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. Therefore CDM is a false solution to climate change.

A false solutions to climate change is having negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. Markets have potential for negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. Therefore markets could be false solutions to climate change.

A SOLUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IS HAVING POSITIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT OR ON POOR COUNTRIES AND COMMUNITIES. Markets have potential for positive impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. Therefore markets could be a solution to climate change.

Markets have to avoid negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. MARKETS ARE USED TO IMPLEMENT ADAPTATION MEASURES. Therefore adaptation measures have to avoid negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities.
Adaptation measures have to avoid negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities. HOLISTICALLY PLANNING (WITH REGIONAL COOPERATION) WILL AVOID NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT OR ON POOR COUNTRIES AND COMMUNITIES. THEREFORE ADAPTATION MEASURES HAVE TO BE PLANNED HOLISTICALLY.

CIDSE looking at adaptation processes on community, regional or national level is supporting a holistical planning. THEREFORE CIDSE LOOKING AT ADAPTATION PROCESSES ON COMMUNITY, REGIONAL OR NATIONAL LEVEL IS TRYING TO AVOID NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT OR ON POOR COUNTRIES AND COMMUNITIES.

**Story 7: »definition of Climate Justice«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 142 bis 161 ]

**Storyline: A solution to climate change has to be characterised by Climate Justice, i.e. stopping future climate change and providing adaptation to the climate change committed to.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A SOLUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE HAS TO BE CHARACTERISED BY CLIMATE JUSTICE. Climate Justice means stopping future climate change (esp. stopping further damage to communities that have not contributed to climate change) and providing adaptation to the climate change committed to (esp. ensuring that communities that have not contributed to climate change are able to develop). Therefore a solution to climate change need to stop future climate change (esp. stop further damage to communities that have not contributed to climate change) and provide adaptation to the climate change committed to (esp. ensure that communities that have not contributed to climate change are able to develop).

Affected people require resources to be able to adapt to the effects Future warming is causing affected people. THEREFORE FUTURE WARMING REQUIRES RESOURCES TO BE ABLE TO ADAPT TO THE EFFECTS.

Humans already committed to future warming. Future warming is affecting people. Therefore humans already committed to affect people.

**Story 8: »Climate Justice as fundamental to faith-based groups«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 162 bis 166 ]

**Storyline: As a faith-based network the social justice approach is fundamental to CIDSE’s reflections, analysis or messages.**
CIDSE is a faith-based network. At a faith-based network the social justice approach is fundamental to its reflections, analyses or messages. Therefore the social justice approach is fundamental to CIDSE’s reflections, analysis or messages.

**Story 9: “the figures are on the table”**

[= im Transkript Zeile 167 bis 192 ]

**Storyline:** Things have to shift to solve climate change. A deal should comprise commitments about stopping what’s happening and ensuring that people are able to develop. The figures showing the way are on the table. But the specific mitigation and financing commitments, which would be necessary are not existent yet. Civil society can make governments realise that people care. The call for climate justice from a broad alliance is needed at Copenhagen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

THINGS HAVE TO SHIFT TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE.
At Copenhagen no shift of things is occuring yet.
Therefore at Copenhagen climate change has not been solved yet.

A deal should comprise commitments about stopping what’s happening and ensuring that people are able to develop. Figures are on the table showing what is necessary to stop what’s happening and to ensure that people are able to develop. Therefore figures are on the table showing what a deal should comprise.

Specific mitigation and financing commitments are necessary. Currently specific mitigation and financing commitments are not existent. Therefore what is necessary is not existent.

Civil society can make governments realise that people care. Making governments realise that people care is very important. Therefore civil society is very important.

The call for climate justice/ the justice message is needed at Copenhagen.
A very broad alliance is calling for climate justice/ sending the justice message. Therefore the broad alliance is needed at Copenhagen.
Story 10: »people can change things«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 193 bis 204 ]
Storyline: Power can change things. Therefore civil society can achieve a lot, if there are many people constituting it.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Many people have power.
Power can change things.
Therefore many people can change things.

Civil society action can be many people.
Many people can change things.
Therefore civil society can change things.

Story 11: »protest show that people care«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 205 bis 212 ]
Storyline: With protests people show that they care. Showing that people care let negotiators know that they have to act. Therefore to achieve solutions to climate change protests are necessary.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To achieve solutions to climate change it is necessary that people show that they care.
Protest show that people care.
Therefore to achieve solutions to climate change protests are necessary.

Protest show that people care.
Showing that people care let negotiators know that they have to act.
Therefore protest let negotiators know that they have to act.

Story 12: »a fair, effective and binding outcome«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 216 bis 223 ]
Storyline: CIDSE wants to achieve a fair, effective and binding outcome, i.e. to achieve binding emission reductions and sufficient secure financing for developing countries to help them to adapt and to develop sustainably.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CIDSE wants to achieve a fair, effective and binding outcome.
A fair, effective and binding outcome ensures binding emission reductions and sufficient secure financing for developing countries to help them to adapt and to develop sustainably.
Therefore CIDSE wants to achieve binding emission reductions and sufficient secure financing for developing countries to help them to adapt and to develop sustainably.
At the climate negotiations discussion around the issue of technology have been about mitigation technologies or about technologies of advanced developing countries. Adaptation technologies didn't get enough attention in the negotiations. The organisations CIDSE is working with small-field adaptation technologies. This technologies also have to be recognised in the negotiations. CIDSE launched a report on small-field adaptation technologies to further them. In lobbying governments to come to join their message, see the church voices and the southern voices of our partners CIDSE has been effective.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

At the climate negotiations discussion around the issue of technology occur.
Discussion around the issue of technology are about mitigation technologies or about technologies of advanced developing countries.
Therefore at the climate negotiations discussions around mitigation technologies or about technologies of advanced developing countries occur.

Adaptation technologies didn't get enough attention in the negotiations.
CIDSE launched a report on adaptation technologies in June.
Therefore CIDSE launched a report on what is not getting enough attention in the negotiations.

The organisations CIDSE is working with small-field adaptation technologies.
Small-field adaptation technologies have to be recognised in the negotiations.
Therefore the organisations CIDSE is working with have to be recognised in the negotiations.

Small-field adaptation technologies have to be recognised in the negotiations/ have to be part of the technology and adaptation negotiations.
CIDSE launched a report on small-field adaptation technologies.
Therefore CIDSE launched a report on what has to be recognised in the negotiations/ have to be part of the technology and adaptation negotiations.

CIDSE has been lobbying governments to come to join their message, see the church voices and the southern voices of our partners.
Lobbying governments has been effective.
Therefore CIDSE has been effective.
A.4.5 Storylines und Sylogismen »Focus/ CJN! – Focus on the Global South/ Climate Justice Now!«

Story 1: »the foundation of CJN!«
[= im Transskript Zeile 1 bis 33 ]
Storyline: During the COP 13 at Bali there was the 'solidarity village for a cool planet', an outside alternative space organised by the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia. Those organisers started some actions or commentaries on the negotiations, which have been a sort of an anti-CAN/ alter-CAN space. The actions or commentaries on the negotiations have been a good experience of working together and led to the decision to form Climate Justice Now (CJN!).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

During the COP 13 at Bali there was the 'solidarity village for a cool planet', an outside alternative space organised by the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia. During COP13, the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia started some actions or commentaries on the negotiations. Therefore during COP13 an outside space was organised by people, who started some actions or commentaries on the negotiations.

During COP13, the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia started some actions or commentaries on the negotiations. Actions or commentaries on the negotiations have been a sort of an anti-CAN/ alter-CAN space. Therefore during COP13 the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia started some sort of an anti-CAN/ alter-CAN space.

During COP13, the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia started some actions or commentaries on the negotiations. The actions or commentaries on the negotiations have been a good experience of working together. Therefore during COP13, the indonesian civil society and other networks from asia, especially people, who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across asia had a good experience of working together.
During COP13, the Indonesian civil society and other networks from Asia, especially people who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across Asia had a good experience of working together. The good experience of working together led to the decision to form Climate Justice Now (CJN!). Therefore during COP13, the Indonesian civil society and other networks from Asia, especially people who've been involved in the anti-globalisation campaigns across Asia led to the decision to form Climate Justice Now (CJN!).

**Story 2: »CJN! linking the official process to the real struggles of movements«**

* [ im Transkript Zeile 35 bis 85 ]

**Storyline:** The role of CJN! initially was to be a kind of alternative to CAN, which meant to create a little bit of a climate justice space inside the UNFCCC frame. *Climate Justice is about the resources, equity, the development model and rights.* The idea of climate justice is resonating a lot with movements and organisations from the south, who are active in the outside space. Climate Justice opens up the politics of climate change for people, who've been involved in other campaigns, in other struggles. CJN! is articulating linkages between the real struggles and the sort of more official elements of the climate debate and therefore makes itself interesting for movements.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The role of CJN! initially was to be a kind of alternative to CAN.
Being a kind of alternative to CAN meant to create a little bit of a different/ a climate justice space inside the UNFCCC frame.
Therefore the role of CJN! initially was to create a little bit of a different/ a climate justice space inside the UNFCCC frame.

Being a kind of alternative to CAN meant to create a little bit of a different/ a climate justice space inside the negotiations.
To create a little bit of a different/ a climate justice space inside the negotiations meant pushing much more a justice framework and supporting more the position of the south governments, trying to have a more systemic critique, a more system-critical approach to the climate negotiations, more critical of the market solutions and so on.
Therefore being a kind of alternative to CAN meant pushing much more a justice framework and supporting more the position of the south governments, trying to have a more systemic critique, a more system-critical approach to the climate negotiations, more critical of the market solutions and so on.

The idea of climate justice is resonating a lot with movements and organisations from the south.
Movements and organisations from the south have been involved in a lot of resource-based struggles or struggles against large-scale development and sort of neoliberal economic policies (on the trade campaigns and the worldbank campaigns, the privatisation campaigns).
Therefore the idea of climate justice is resonating a lot with groups, who have been involved in a lot of resource-based struggles or struggles against large-scale development and sort of neoliberal economic policies (on the trade campaigns and the worldbank campaigns, the privatisation campaigns).

**To address climate issues one has to take climate justice (the resources, equity, the development model and rights) into account.**

CJN! is taking climate justice (the resources, equity, the development model and rights) into account.

Therefore CJN! is taking into account what is needed to address climate change.

**Climate justice is about the resources, equity, the development model and rights.**

Movements and organisations from the south see that climate justice has to be taken into account to address climate issues. Therefore movements and organisations from the south see that the resources, equity, the development model and rights have to be taken into account to address climate issues.

CJN! or the idea of climate justice is taking the resources, equity, the development model and rights into account to address climate issues.

Taking the resources, equity, the development model and rights into account to address climate issues opens up the politics of climate change for people, who've been involved in other campaigns, in other struggles.

Therefore CJN! or the idea of climate justice is opening up the politics of climate change for people, who've been involved in other campaigns, in other struggles.

Movements like via campesina have a critical interest in CJN!.

CJN! is making a bridge between via campesina’s campaign for agrarian reform, for food sovereignty and use the climate debate as a way to challenge the dominant agricultural system to talk about alternative agriculture and so on.

Therefore movements like via campesina have a critical interest in making a bridge between via campesina’s campaign for agrarian reform, for food sovereignty and use the climate debate as a way to challenge the dominant agricultural system to talk about alternative agriculture and so on.

Movements have a critical interest in CJN!

CJN! is articulating linkages between the real struggles and the sort of more official elements of the climate debate.

Therefore movements have a critical interest in the articulation of linkages between the real struggles and the sort of more official elements of the climate debate.

---

**Story 3: movements/ CJN! aiming at social transformation**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 87 bis 150 ]

**Storyline:** Social transformation will always be needed. Movements like CJN! are aiming at social transformation.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

WE WILL ALWAYS BE IN NEED OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION.
Movements are aiming at social transformation.
Therefore we will always be in need of movements.

Movements are aiming at social transformation.
CJN! is a movement.
Therefore CJN! is aiming at social transformation.

Story 4: »Climate Justice as a means to reassert the right political agendas and demands«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 87 bis 150 ]

Storyline: What is on the political agenda is an opportunity to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time. The issue of climate is on the political agenda. CJN! is focussing at the issue of climate. To use the opportunity CJN! is using the term Climate Justice and is building new alliances, expanding the movement for transformation.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

The issue of climate is on the political agenda.
WHAT IS ON THE POLITICAL AGENDA IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO REASSERT AGENDAS AND DEMANDS THAT HAVE BEEN THERE FOR A LONG TIME.
Therefore the issue of climate is an opportunity to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time.

The issue of climate is an opportunity to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time.
CJN! IS FOCUSING AT THE ISSUE OF CLIMATE.
Therefore CJN! is using an opportunity/ political space to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time.

CJN! is using an opportunity/ political space to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time.
The term Climate Justice is used by CJN!
THEREFORE CLIMATE JUSTICE IS ABOUT USING AN OPPORTUNITY TO REASSERT AGENDAS AND DEMANDS THAT HAVE BEEN THERE FOR A LONG TIME.

CJN! is using an opportunity/ political space to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time. Using an opportunity/ political space to reassert agendas and demands that have been there for a long time is realised by building new alliances, expanding the movement for transformation.
Therefore CJN! is building new alliances, expanding the movement for transformation.
Climate Justice is about a reframing of the alternatives. Reframing the alternatives means talking about alternatives in the framework of the ecosystem or mother earth or redefining what it means to live well (buen vivir) (like indigenous people's movements are demanding for). Therefore Climate Justice means talking about alternatives in the framework of the ecosystem or mother earth or redefining what it means to live well (buen vivir) (like indigenous people's movements are demanding for).

The ecological questions have not always been evident for the classic left. Climate Justice is forcing to be very conscious of the ecological questions. Therefore Climate justice is forcing to be very conscious about something, which not always has been evident for the classic left.

For the classical left, the social justice issues are clear. CLIMATE JUSTICE IS PUTTING THE SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES INTO A LARGER ECOLOGICAL ENVELOPE. THEREFORE CLIMATE JUSTICE IS PUTTING, WHAT IS CLEAR FOR THE CLASSICAL LEFT INTO A LARGER ECOLOGICAL ENVELOPE.

Some of the traditional left believed in modernity, progress and development. Some of the traditional left are forced by the Climate Justice debate to reconsider about the social and ecological consequences. Therefore the Climate Justice debate is forcing the believe in modernity, progress and development to reconsider about the social and ecological consequences.

CLIMATE JUSTICE IS ABOUT SOCIAL JUSTICE COMBINED WITH ECOLOGICAL JUSTICE Social justice combined with ecological justice means considering the social and the ecological questions together. THEREFORE CLIMATE JUSTICE IS ABOUT CONSIDERING THE SOCIAL AND THE ECOLOGICAL QUESTIONS TOGETHER.
Climate Justice is highlighting the linkage of decisions (about the allocation, the use of resources, natural resources, ecosystems, biodiversity, water, soil, air, etc.) and how they are made with questions of social justice.

The highlighting of the linkage of decisions and how they are made with questions of social justice is a transformative potential. Therefore Climate Justice has a transformative potential.

CJN! has been beginning to shift a little bit the discourse about climate.
Shifting a little bit the discourse about climate means highlighting that the technical debates are not abstracted of the social reality and the social impacts. Therefore CJN! is highlighting that the technical debates are not abstracted of the social reality and the social impacts.

Story 6: the principles of CJN!
[= im Transkript Zeile 151 bis 167]

Storyline: CJN! has principles. On the one hand it is rejecting false solutions of nuclear, of geo-engineering, of carbon markets, of off-sets, of market-based solutions. On the other hand it is working together to build responses to climate change based on energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, people's participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights, a just transition for workers.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

CJN! has principles.
The principles are a rejection of the false solutions of nuclear, of geo-engineering, of carbon markets, of off-sets, of market-based solutions. Therefore CJN! is rejecting false solutions of nuclear, of geo-engineering, of carbon markets, of off-sets, of market-based solutions.

CJN! has principles.
The principles are about working together to build responses to climate change based on energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, people's participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights, a just transition for workers. CJN! is working together to build responses to climate change based on energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, people's participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights, a just transition for workers.
Story 7: »the crisis of the planetary ecosystem«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 168 bis 193 ]

Storyline: The rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction is causing a crisis of the planetary ecosystems. This crisis is constituted by climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils, which are all interrelated. Climate change is the most visible and potentially irreversible expression of this crisis. To overcome the crisis of the planetary ecosystems one has to rebuild and replenish ecosystems in a sustainable way. Geo-engineering would not be such a solution.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To overcome the crisis of the planetary ecosystems its cause have to be overcome.
Consuming resources, particularly fossil fuels, at a rate, which far exceeds the earth's capacity to absorb and regenerate and replenish itself is causing a crisis of the planetary ecosystems.
Therefore consuming resources, particularly fossil fuels, at a rate, which far exceeds the earth's capacity to absorb and regenerate and replenish itself has to be overcome.

To overcome the crisis of the planetary ecosystems its cause have to be overcome.
The rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction is causing a crisis of the planetary ecosystems.
Therefore the rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction has to be overcome.

The rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction is causing a crisis of the planetary ecosystems.
The crisis of planetary ecosystems is constituted by climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils.
Therefore the rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction is causing climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils.

The crisis of planetary ecosystems is constituted by several things.
Among several things climate change is the most visible and potentially irreversible.
Therefore the crisis of planetary ecosystems is constituted amongst others by the most visible and potentially irreversible climate change.

Climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils are interrelated.
Interrelation means consequences of climate change and response to climate change will affect soils and biodiversity.
Therefore regarding climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils consequences and responses are combined to each other.
To overcome the crisis of the planetary ecosystems one has to rebuild and replenish ecosystems in a sustainable way. Geo-engineering is not rebuilding and replenishing ecosystems in a sustainable way. Therefore geo-engineering won't overcome the crisis of the planetary ecosystems.

**Story 8: »reduction of consumption as a solution«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]

**Storyline:** Consumption on every level (energy, material goods, meat, etc.) has to be reduced.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Consumption on every level/ in general has to be reduced. Consumption in general means consumption of energy, consumption of material goods, consumption of meat, etc. Therefore consumption of energy, consumption of material goods, consumption of meat, etc. has to be reduced.

**Story 9: »changing the energy system as a solution«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]

**Storyline:** The energy systems are organised completely wrong. They are a sort of large scale, inefficient massive infrastructure which is heavily dependent up on coal and other non-renewable resources. The energysystem has to use renewable energy sources, scale down and localise energy production instead. Therefore it would be more democratic, more efficient and more on the actual needs and it would be opposed to a lot of waste and being very energy inefficient.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The energy systems are organised completely wrong. A sort of large scale, inefficient massive infrastructure which is heavily dependent up on coal and other non-renewable resources is a wrong organisation. Therefore the energy systems are a sort of large scale, inefficient massive infrastructure which is heavily dependent up on coal and other non-renewable resources.

The energy systems have to be shifted. Shifting means using renewable energy sources, scaling down and localising energy production. Therefore the energy system has to use renewable energy sources, scale down and localise energy production.

The energy system has to scale down and localise energy production. Scaling down and localising energy production means to be more democratic, more efficient and more on the actual needs. Therefore the energy system has to be more democratic, more efficient and more on the actual needs.
A large scale energy system is opposed to down-scaled and localised energy production. A large scale energy system has a lot of waste and is very energy inefficient. Therefore a down-scaled and localised energy production is opposed to a lot of waste and is very energy inefficient.

Story 10: »changing the agricultural system as a solution«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]
Storyline: The current agricultural system needs a transformation. It is a basically industrial model of agriculture, which is water-intensive, mono-growing, export-oriented, depending a lot on transportation, a lot of processing involved, has terrible impacts on local markets and small-scale farmers and very devastating environmental impacts. A transformation has to reduce transport, reduce the inputs to have more diverse agricultural production and therefore has to protect and regenerate biodiversity and soils.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
The current agricultural system is a basically industrial model of agriculture. A basically industrial model of agriculture is water-intensive, mono-growing, export-oriented, depending a lot on transportation, a lot of processing involved, has terrible impacts on local markets and small-scale farmers and very devastating environmental impacts. Therefore the current agricultural system is water-intensive, mono-growing, export-oriented, depending a lot on transportation, a lot of processing involved, has terrible impacts on local markets and small-scale farmers and very devastating environmental impacts.

The current agricultural system needs a transformation. A transformation has to reduce transport, reduce the inputs to have more diverse agricultural production and therefore has to protect and regenerate biodiversity and soils. Therefore the current agricultural system has to reduce transport, reduce the inputs to have more diverse agricultural production and therefore has to protect and regenerate biodiversity and soils.

Story 11: »smart, socially just and people-based solutions can adress the crisis«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]
Storyline: The social questions, the questions of food and access to food, biodiversity, dependency on fossil fuel, CO2 emissions need to be addressed to solve the crisis. Smart, socially just and people-based solutions, which are no high-tech solutions can address a lot of different issues simultaneously.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

THE SOCIAL QUESTIONS, THE QUESTIONS OF FOOD AND ACCESS TO FOOD, BIODIVERSITY, DEPENDENCY ON FOSSIL FUEL, CO2 EMISSIONS NEED TO BE ADDRESSED TO SOLVE THE CRISIS.

Smart solutions can address a lot of different issues (the social questions, the questions of food and access to food, biodiversity, dependency on fossil fuel, CO2 emissions).

Therefore smart solutions can solve the crisis.

Smart, socially just and people-based solutions can address a lot of different issues simultaneously.

Smart, socially just and people-based solutions are no high-tech solutions.

Therefore it's no high-tech solutions, which can address a lot of different issues simultaneously.

**Story 12: »reorganisation of cities as a solution«**

 [= im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]

Storyline: Cities need to be reorganised, which means shifting them to accessible low-cost public transport. Accessible low-cost public transport makes it possible for people to live without cars or to reduce their dependency on cars a lot.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Cities need to be reorganised.

Reorganisation means a shift to accessible low-cost public transport.

Therefore cities need to shift to accessible low-cost public transport.

Reorganisation means a shift to accessible low-cost public transport.

Accessible low-cost public transport makes it possible for people to live without cars or to reduce their dependency on cars a lot.

Therefore reorganisation means making it possible for people to live without cars or to reduce their dependency on cars a lot.

**Story 13: »interrelating the social and the ecological to solve the crisis«**

 [= im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 255 ]

Storyline: Solving the crisis means to interrelate the social and the ecological. This means dealing with questions of consumption and over-production of greenhouse gas emissions at the same time as transforming production systems and improving social conditions, redistributing the benefits of the economic production to a much larger group of people and making live be better for the majority of people (and it means that live will change).
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Solvend the crisis means to interrelate the social and the ecological.
Interrelating the social and the ecological means dealing with
questions of consumption and over-production of greenhouse gas
emissions at the same time as transforming production systems
and improving social conditions, redistributing the benefits of
the economic production to a much larger group of people and
making live be better for the majority of people (and it means
that live will change).
Therefore solving the crisis means dealing with questions of consumption and
over-production of greenhouse gas emissions at the same time as transforming
production systems and improving social conditions, redistributing the
benefits of the economic production to a much larger group of people and
making live be better for the majority of people (and it means that live
will change).

Solving the crisis means that the elite that makes the decisions is changing
their lifestyle.
Changing their lifestyle means that their lifestyle will be worse.
Therefore solving the crisis means that the elite that makes the decisions has a lifestyle, which will be worse.

Story 14: »business as usual but for the short term interest«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 256 bis 286 ]

Storyline: The protection of the economic interests has to be done with a long term view.
At the negotiations all of the major economies are having a short term view, which will
condemn us to ecological kind of chaos (which is gonna affect everyone and everything).
The northern countries have forced the developing countries into a position of accepting
the terms of the deal. The terms of the deal have been put on the table by the rich
countries and are allowing the developing countries not to not change (they are not
affecting the way of life in the developing countries and their potential for growth).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The protection of the economic interests has to be done with a long term view.
At the negotiations all of the major economies want to protect their economic interests.
Therefore at the negotiations all of the major economies have to use a long term view.

At the negotiations all of the major economies want to protect their economic interests.
The protection of the economic interests is done with a short term view.
Therefore at the negotiations all of the major economies are having a short term view.
The current protection of the economic interests is done with a short term view. A short term view will condemn us to ecological kind of chaos (which is gonna affect everyone and everything). Therefore the current protection of the economic interests will condemn us to ecological kind of chaos (which is gonna affect everyone and everything).

The northern countries have forced the developing countries into a position of accepting the terms of the deal. The terms of the deal have been put on the table by the rich countries. Therefore the northern countries have forced the developing countries into a position of accepting what has been put on the table by the rich countries.

The northern countries have forced the developing countries into a position of accepting the terms of the deal. The terms of the deal are allow the developing countries not to change/ are not affecting the way of life in the developing countries and their potential for growth.

### Story 15: »no agreement reached means building a movement on the national level«

[= im Transkript Zeile 287 bis 325]

**Storyline:** At the negotiations there is no legally binding agreement. A legally binding agreement would be a paralysis for the next five or ten years, because it would provoke the vast majority of people to think that the problem is solved and there is no need to worry anymore. No legally binding agreement means that there will be potential to continue to build a climate justice movement. It has to be realised with work at the national level. Opposed to an UN agreement, work at the national level is a sufficient response to the climate crisis.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CJN! does not have much chance to influence the negotiations. Having not much chance to influence the negotiations means to do kind of damage control. Therefore CJN! does damage control.

At the negotiations there is no legally binding agreement. A legally binding agreement would be a paralysis for the next five or ten years. Therefore at the negotiations there is no paralysis for the next five or ten years.

A legally binding agreement would be a paralysis for the next five or ten years. For the next five or ten years the vast majority of people would think that the problem is solved and there would be no need to worry anymore. Therefore legally binding agreement would provoke the vast majority of people to think that the problem is solved and there is no need to worry anymore.
At the negotiations there is no legally binding agreement. No legally binding agreement means that there will be potential to continue to build a climate justice movement. Therefore the negotiations imply that there will be potential to continue to build a climate justice movement.

A specific minimum outcome is required to solve climate change. The negotiation's (COP15) announcement is in no way the specific minimum outcome. Therefore the negotiation's (COP15) announcement is in no way the specific minimum outcome.

The negotiations imply that there will be potential to continue to build a climate justice movement. The potential to continue to build a climate justice movement has to be realised with work at the national level (by building movements and campaigns and coalitions and political forces, which push governments to put in place (even unilateral) policies). Therefore the negotiations imply a work at the national level (by building movements and campaigns and coalitions and political forces, which push governments to put in place (even unilateral) policies).

Work at the national level is a sufficient response to the climate crisis. An UN agreement could not be a sufficient response to the climate crisis. Therefore work at the national level is opposed to an UN agreement.

Story 16: »corporations as an active but splitted force in the negotiations«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 329 bis 360 ]

Storyline: The corporations are an active force in the negotiations, but they are splitted in different sectors of capitalism with contradicting interests (supporting a shift to a green capitalism or the maintainance of the status quo).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

At the negotiations the most powerful countries (the G8) are participating. The most powerful countries (the G8) are dominating a lot of the discussions. Therefore at the negotiations there is dominance in a lot of the discussions.

The corporations are an active force in the negotiations. The corporations are splitted in different sectors of capitalism with contradicting interests (supporting a shift to a green capitalism or the maintainance of the status quo). Therefore different sectors of capitalism with contradicting interests (supporting a shift to a green capitalism or the maintainance of the status quo) are an active force in the negotiations.
Story 17: »social forces for transformation nearly absent in the negotiations«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 329 bis 360 ]

Storyline: Some social forces, who are nearly absent from the negotiations, are talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or are articulating a very transformative agenda. Among the governments bolivia is belonging to those forces. Outside the negotiations the transformative agenda has a lot of supporters.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Some social forces are talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or are articulating a very transformative agenda.
Some social forces are nearly absent from the negotiations. Therefore talks about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or the articulation of a very transformative agenda is nearly absent from the negotiations.

Some social forces are talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or are articulating a very transformative agenda. Among the governments bolivia is talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or is articulating a very transformative agenda. Therefore among the governments bolivia is belonging to some social forces.

Among the governments bolivia is articulating a very transformative agenda. Articulating a very transformative agenda means to say that the ecological crisis of the planet can not be dealt with in a capitalist framework. Therefore among the governments bolivia is saying that the ecological crisis of the planet can not be dealt with in a capitalist framework.

Among the governments bolivia is articulating a very transformative agenda. A very transformative agenda has a lot of supporters outside the negotiations. Therefore bolivia has a lot of supporters outside the negotiations.

Story 18: »Climate Justice is about the people's voices and alternatives«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 361 bis 381 ]

Storyline: The Climate Justice framing is to talk about the people’s voices and alternatives and justice-based responses to climate change. It is very dominant in the Klimaforum and in the Reclaim Power! action.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

CJN! didn't have a very high visibility inside the bella center.
The not very high visibility inside the bella center led that it's unknown to people.
Therefore CJN! is unknown to people to some degree.

The Climate Justice framing is to talk about the people's voices and alternatives and justice-based responses to climate change.
The Climate Justice framing is very dominant in the Klimaforum and in the Reclaim Power! action.
Therefore to talk about the people's voices and alternatives and justice-based responses to climate change is very dominant in the Klimaforum and in the Reclaim Power! action.

CJN! created ideas and spaces both inside and outside the negotiations.
The created ideas and spaces both inside and outside the negotiations have been important.
Therefore CJN! has been important.

Story 19: »CJN! connecting the outside with the inside in both ways«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 382 bis 421 ]
Storyline: CJN! has been connected the outside with the inside in both ways and therefore is opposed to CAN.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

CJN! has been connected the outside with the inside in both ways.
CAN has not connected the outside with the inside in both ways (CAN is very inside-focussed).
Therefore CJN! is opposed to CAN.

Story 20: »RP! giving a sense of unity«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 422 bis 473 ]
Storyline: The Reclaim Power! action showed that there is a radical movement, which has a purpose, commitment and courage of convictions. The Reclaim Power! action and the people's assembly gave the participating people an sense of unity that people, when they work together and stay together can achieve things.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

A global demand for something to be done about the crisis is encouraging the solution of the crisis.
The demonstrations on the 12th has been a very strong expression of a global demand for something to be done about the crisis.
Therefore the demonstrations on the 12th have been encouraging the solution of the crisis.
The Reclaim Power! action showed that there is a radical movement. The radical movement has a purpose, commitment and courage of convictions. Therefore the Reclaim Power! action showed a purpose, commitment and courage of convictions.

The Reclaim Power! action and the people’s assembly gave the participating people an sense of unity. A sense of unity is the believe that people, when they work together and stay together can achieve things. Therefore the Reclaim Power! action and the people's assembly gave the participating people the believe that people, when they work together and stay together can achieve things.

**Story 21: »RP! indicating a visible and noisy movement«**

[ = im Transskript Zeile 422 bis 473 ]

**Storyline:** At the Reclaim Power! action there have been many police men on the street, which indicates a visible and noisy movement.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

An invisible and silent movement would lead to no single police man on the street. At the Reclaim Power! action there have been many police men on the street. Therefore the Reclaim Power! action has been a visible and noisy movement.

**Story 22: »the dominance of people supporting a non-violent action in CJA«**

[ = im Transskript Zeile 474 bis 504 ]

**Storyline:** A lot of people in CJA having more links with some parts of the black block, in general are contradicting people supporting a non-violent direct action. In CJA the people supporting a non-violent direct action have actively been build a consensus.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

In CJA the people supporting a non-violent direct action have actively been build a consensus. A LOT OF PEOPLE IN CJA HAVING MORE LINKS WITH SOME PARTS OF THE BLACK BLOCK, IN GENERAL ARE CONTRADICTING PEOPLE SUPPORTING A NON-VIOLENT DIRECT ACTION. Therefore a lot of people in CJA having more links with some parts of the black block, would not actively build a consensus.

**Story 23: »false solutions to climate change«**

[ = im Transskript Zeile 536 bis 547 ]

**Storyline:** Some NGOs, who are part of the climate negotiations, are promoting false solutions like market-based solutions (like global carbon markets or CDMs) or geo-engineering or the privatisation of the forests are false solutions.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Market-based solutions (like global carbon markets or CDMs) or geo-engineering or the privatisation of the forests are false solutions.
Some NGOs, who are part of the climate negotiations, are promoting market-based solutions (like global carbon markets or CDMs) or geo-engineering or the privatisation of the forests. Therefore some NGOs, who are part of the climate negotiations, are promoting false solutions.

Story 24: »CJN! maybe perceived as some dangerous tendencies«
[= im Transkript Zeile 548 bis 555 ]
Storyline: CJN! is maybe perceived as some dangerous tendencies and therefore might be on the secret service's watch list rather than on their hit list.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Some dangerous tendencies would be on the secret service's watch list rather than on their hit list.
CJN! is maybe perceived as some dangerous tendencies. Therefore CJN! maybe is on the service's watch list than rather on their hit list.

Story 25: »the necessity of reframing the climate debate«
[= im Transkript Zeile 556 bis 585 ]
Storyline: The climate debate needs to be reframed/ rethought about or reconstructed, which means to make it more transformative.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Regarding the climate issue we are now in a political debate. A political debate is not a scientific debate. Therefore regarding the climate issue we are not in a scientific debate.

The climate debate needs to be reframed/ rethought about or reconstructed. Reframing/ Rethinking or reconstructing means making it more transformative. The climate debate needs to be made more transformative.

Story 26: »Focus on the Global South using parts of the Climate Justice framing for a long time«
[= im Transkript Zeile 586 bis 610 ]
Storyline: Focus on the Global South used parts of the Climate Justice framing for a long time, like the rejection of carbon markets and the understanding the Kyoto Protocol as a complete sell out, but it did not incorporated the Climate Justice framing into their work (before two years).
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Rejecting the carbon markets and feeling that the Kyoto Protocol was a complete sell out is part of the Climate Justice framing for a long time.
Focus on the Global South has been rejecting the carbon markets and has been feeling that the Kyoto Protocol was a complete sell out.
Therefore Focus on the Global South has been using parts of the Climate Justice framing for a long time.

Focus on the Global South has been rejecting the carbon markets and has been feeling that the Kyoto Protocol was a complete sell out for a long time.
Rejecting the carbon markets and feeling that the Kyoto Protocol was a complete sell out did not mean to incorporated this framing into one's work.
Therefore Focus on the Global South has not been incorporating the Climate Justice framing into their work (before two years).
A.4.6 Storylines und Syllogismen »GenderCC – Women for Climate Justice«

Story 1: »die Genese von Gender CC«

 [= im Transkript Zeile 3 bis 52]

Storyline: Auf der COP9 war Gender nicht Thema, weshalb sich eine Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten gefunden, eine Diskussionsveranstaltung zu Gender zu machen, die auf großes Interesse stieß. Die Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) wurde als informelles Netzwerk GenderCC fortgeführt. GenderCC unterstützt Frauen aus dem Süden dabei, dass sie zu den Konferenzen kommen können, was einer Finanzierung bedarf. Möglichkeiten der Finanzierung bietet eine formalisierte Organisation, weshalb der deutsche aber international ausgerichtete Verein GenderCC Women for Climate Justice gegründet wurde.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Auf der COP9 war Gender nicht Thema. 
Weil Gender nicht Thema war, hat sich eine Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten gefunden, eine Diskussionsveranstaltung zu Gender zu machen. 
Deshalb hat sich auf der COP9 eine Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) gefunden, eine Diskussionsveranstaltung zu Gender zu machen.

Auf der COP9 hat sich eine Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) gefunden, eine Diskussionsveranstaltung zu Gender zu machen.

Die Diskussionsveranstaltung zu Gender stieß auf großes Interesse (dreißig bis fünfunddreißig TeilnehmerInnen). 
Deshalb hat sich auf der COP9 eine Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) gefunden, eine Veranstaltung durchzuführen, die auf großes Interesse stieß.

Die Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) hat sich in ihrer Zusammenarbeit verstetigt. 
Verstetigte Zusammenarbeit bedeutete Fortführung als informelles Netzwerk GenderCC (Aufbau einer Mailingliste, etc.). 
Deshalb wurde die Gruppe von Gleichgesinnten (Energia, WCF, LIFE) als informelles Netzwerk GenderCC fortgeführt.

GenderCC unterstützt Frauen aus dem Süden dabei, dass sie zu den Konferenzen kommen können. 
Damit Frauen aus dem Süden zu den Konferenzen kommen können bedarf es einer Finanzierung. 
Deshalb bedarf GenderCC einer Finanzierung.

Möglichkeiten der Finanzierung bietet eine formalisierte Organisation. 
EIN INFORMELLES NETZWERK, WIE GENDERCC, BRAUCHT FINANZIERUNG.
Ein informelles Netzwerk, wie GenderCC, braucht eine formalisierte Organisation.
Ein informelles Netzwerk, wie GenderCC, braucht eine formalisierte Organisation. Der deutsche aber international ausgerichtete Verein GenderCC Women for Climate Justice ist eine formalisierte Organisation. Deshalb braucht ein informelles Netzwerk, wie Gender CC, den deutschen aber international ausgerichteten Verein GenderCC Women for Climate Justice.

**Story 2: »GenderCC thematisiert Gender erfolgreich in den Verhandlungen«**

*Storyline:* Gender war auf den Klimaverhandlungen lange Zeit kein Thema. Das Auftreten von GenderCC macht Gender zum Thema.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Gender war auf den Klimaverhandlungen lange Zeit kein Thema. Das Auftreten von GenderCC macht Gender zum Thema. Deshalb thematisiert das Auftreten von GenderCC das, was lange Zeit kein Thema war.

- GenderCC thematisiert Gender auf den Klimaverhandlungen. Die Thematisierung von Gender finden nur Wenige schlecht. Deshalb finden nur Wenige das was GenderCC thematisiert schlecht.

- Die Thematisierung von Gender auf den Klimaverhandlungen ist ein Erfolg. GenderCC thematisiert Gender auf den Klimaverhandlungen. Deshalb ist GenderCC erfolgreich.

**Story 3: »Vor- und Nachteile einer Anerkennung als Constituency«**

*Storyline:* GenderCC wurde als Constituency anerkannt, was ein Erfolg ist. Die Anerkennung bedeutet einerseits, sich an den Prozess anpassen zu müssen. Statements müssen in Interventions gegeben werden, für die GenderCC (gegenüber CAN) Positionen neu erarbeiten und sich in den Verhandlungs-Strukturen orientieren muss. Andererseits bedeutet die Anerkennung auch, mehr Einflussmöglichkeiten zu erhalten, wie die grundsätzliche Möglichkeit Statements geben zu können, Einladungen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- GenderCC wurde als Constituency anerkannt. Eine Anerkennung als Constituency bedeutet, sich an den Prozess anpassen zu müssen (ständige Anfragen zu Interventions, etc.) aber gleichzeitig auch mehr Einflussmöglichkeiten zu erhalten (wie die Möglichkeit Statements geben zu können, Einladungen). Deshalb wurde muss GenderCC sich an den Prozess anpassen zu müssen (ständige Anfragen zu Interventions, etc.) aber gleichzeitig auch mehr Einflussmöglichkeiten zu erhalten (wie die Möglichkeit Statements geben zu können, Einladungen).
Die Anerkennung als Constituency ist ein Erfolg. GenderCC wurde als Constituency anerkannt. Deshalb ist GenderCC erfolgreich.

Eine Anerkennung als Constituency bedeutet, sich an den Prozess anpassen zu müssen (ständige Anfragen zu Interventions, etc.). Sich an den Prozess anpassen zu müssen bedeutet, Statements in Interventions geben zu müssen. Eine Anerkennung als Constituency bedeutet, Statements in Interventions geben zu müssen.


Story 4: »Notwendigkeit der Integration von Genderaspekten auf allen Ebenen«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 119 bis 144 ]

Storyline: Da nicht auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden, muss kein Paragraph zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC eingeführt werden. GenderCC muss nicht aktiv sein, wenn auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden. Auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitzudenken bedeutet auch auf nationaler und lokaler Ebene neben der internationalen genderorientiert gehandelt wird. Partner von GenderCC in Afrika, Asien, Lateinamerika und Pazifik setzen sich dafür ein.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Wenn auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden, muss kein Paragraph zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC eingeführt werden. GenderCC ist aktiv dazu einen Paragraphen zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC einzuführen. Deshalb muss GenderCC nicht aktiv sein, wenn auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden.

GenderCC zielt darauf einen Paragraphen zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC einzuführen. Ein Paragraphen zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC einzuführen, wäre ein Erfolg. Deshalb zielt GenderCC auf einen Erfolg.
GenderCC muss nicht aktiv sein, wenn auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitgedacht werden. Auf allen Ebenen Genderaspekte mitzudenken bedeutet auch auf nationaler und lokaler Ebene neben der internationalen genderorientiert gehandelt wird. GenderCC muss nicht aktiv sein, wenn auch auf nationaler und lokaler Ebene neben der internationalen genderorientiert gehandelt wird.

PartnerInnen von GenderCC in Afrika, Asien, Lateinamerika und Pazifik zielen darauf, dass auch auf nationaler und lokaler Ebene neben der internationalen genderorientiert gehandelt wird. Deshalb muss GenderCC nicht aktiv sein, wenn auch die PartnerInnen von GenderCC in Afrika, Asien, Lateinamerika und Pazifik erfolgreich sind.

Story 5: »die Beziehung von Geschlechterverhältnissen zur Klimakrise«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 145 bis 212 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC versucht in die Diskussions-Schwerpunkte (bspw. Financing, Technologie-Transfer, Mitigation) der Verhandlungen Genderaspekte zu integrieren.
In die Diskussions-Schwerpunkte (bspw. Financing, Technologie-Transfer, Mitigation) der Verhandlungen Genderaspekte zu integrieren ist vor allem im Bereich Mitigation schwierig. Deshalb versucht GenderCC vor allem im Bereich Mitigation etwas schwieriges.

Mitigations-Maßnahmen sollten von den entwickelten Industrieländern durchgeführt werden.
Die entwickelten Industrieländern handeln vor den Entwicklungsländern.
Deshalb sollten Mitigations-Maßnahmen anschließend von Entwicklungsländern durchgeführt werden.

Die traditionelle Ökonomie hat in allem Priorität. Die traditionelle Ökonomie schließt den Bereich der Versorgungsökonomie aus. Deshalb schließt das, was Priorität hat den Bereich der Versorgungsökonomie aus.

Die traditionelle Ökonomie resultiert in Planungen und ökonomischen Entwicklungen die zu erhöhten Emissionen führt. GenderCC arbeitet in Deutschland mit der AGV im Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung zu den Folgen der traditionellen Ökonomie. Deshalb arbeitet GenderCC in Deutschland mit der AGV im Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung zu Planungen und ökonomischen Entwicklungen die zu erhöhten Emissionen führen.


GenderCC arbeitet zur Beziehung von Geschlechterverhältnissen zur Klimakrise. Die Verhandler in der UNFCCC verstehen die Beziehung von Geschlechterverhältnissen zur Klimakrise nicht. Deshalb verstehen die Verhandler in der UNFCCC nicht, wozu GenderCC arbeitet.


Story 6: »Androzentrismus und Wachstum als das Grundproblem der Klimakrise«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 213 bis 244 ]
Storyline: Das Problem des Klimawandels ist eine androzentrische Planung und Denkweise, die Männlichkeitsrollen oder -rezeptionen in den Mittelpunkt stellt/ und die sich an einigen wenigen Menschen (nicht allen Männern) und bestimmten Männlichkeitskonzepten orientiert die auf Wachstum fokussieren. Um die Klimakrise zu beheben muss die Idee grenzenlosen Wachstums gestoppt werden. Auch grünes Wachstum im Green New Deal ist begrenzt. Eine Gesellschaft ohne Wachstum ist möglich und hat eine eigene Lebensqualität.
Um die Klimakrise zu beheben muss grenzenloses Wachstum gestoppt werden. Ein Stopp des grenzenlosen Wachstums ist möglich und hat eine Lebensqualität. Deshalb muss das, was möglich ist und Lebensqualität behält getan werden um die Klimakrise zu beheben.


Das Problem des Klimawandels ist eine androzentrische Planung und Denkweise. Eine androzentrische Planung und Denkweise stellt die Männlichkeitsrollen oder -rezeptionen in den Mittelpunkt oder orientiert sich an einigen wenigen Menschen (nicht allen Männern) und bestimmten Männlichkeitskonzepten die auf Wachstum fokssieren. Deshalb ist das Problem des Klimawandels das in den Mittelpunkt stellen der Männlichkeitsrollen oder -rezeptionen in den Mittelpunkt/ die Orientierung an einigen wenigen Menschen (nicht allen Männern) und bestimmten Männlichkeitskonzepten die auf Wachstum fokssieren.


Story 7: »Klimawandel als Gerechtigkeitskrise«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 245 bis 280 ]

Storyline: Um die Krise zu lösen bedarf es einer Diskussion darüber, wie wir mit wenigen Ressourcen und mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit leben können. Eine solche ist zum einen mehr als die Lösung des Klimawandels verstanden als ein Umweltproblem. Zum anderen ist eine solche Diskussion das Gegenteil davon Pläne am Schreibtisch zu entwickeln oder "real solutions" auf den Tisch zu legen. Klimaschützer sagen, es gibt keine Zeit zur Diskussion, was eine weltweite Gerechtigkeit bedeutet - es gäbe also keine Zeit zur Diskussion einer Lösung der Krise.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Um die Krise zu lösen bedarf es einer Diskussion darüber, wie wir leben wollen. **Wir wollen mit wenigen Ressourcen und mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit leben.** Deshalb bedarf es um die Krise zu lösen einer Diskussion darüber, wie wir mit wenigen Ressourcen und mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit leben.

Um die Krise zu lösen bedarf es einer Diskussion darüber, wie wir mit wenigen Ressourcen und mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit leben. **Eine Diskussion darüber, wie wir mit wenigen Ressourcen und mit einer weltweiten Gerechtigkeit leben ist mehr als die Lösung des Klimawandels verstanden als ein Umweltproblem.** Deshalb bedarf es um die Krise zu lösen mehr als der Lösung des Klimawandels verstanden als ein Umweltproblem.

Klimaschützer sagen, es gibt keine Zeit zur Diskussion, was eine weltweite Gerechtigkeit bedeutet. **Um die Krise zu lösen bedarf es einer Diskussion darüber, was eine weltweite Gerechtigkeit bedeutet. Deshalb sagen Klimaschützer, es gibt keine Zeit zur Diskussion darüber, wie die Krise zu lösen ist.**

**Story 8: »False solutions«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 281 bis 339 *]

**Storyline: False solutions sind Ansätze, die glauben schnell etwas technologisch verändern zu können (wie bspw. CCS oder Atomenergie) oder Ansätze die sich am Markt orientieren (der jedoch die Krisensituation hervorgerufen hat). Bei all diesen Ansätze wird jedoch keine Diskussion darüber geführt, wie wir leben wollen. Zur Lösung der Krise bedarf es jedoch der Diskussion darüber.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

False solutions sind Ansätze, die glauben schnell etwas technologisch verändern zu können (wie bspw. CCS oder Atomenergie).

Schnell etwas technologisch verändern zu können (wie bspw. CCS oder Atomenergie) bedeutet dabei keine Diskussion darüber führen, wie wir leben wollen.

Deshalb sind false solutions Ansätze, die keine Diskussion darüber führen, wie wir leben wollen.

Die Krisensituation ist ein Resultat des Marktes. Marktbasierter Lösungsansätze orientieren sich am Markt. DESHALB RESULTIEREN MARKTBASIERTE LÖSUNGSANSÄTZE IN DER KRISENSITUATION.

**Zur Lösung der Krise bedarf der Diskussion darüber, wie wir leben wollen. False solutions sind Ansätze, die keine Diskussion darüber führen, wie wir leben wollen. Deshalb bedarf es zur Lösung der Krise keiner false solutions.**
False solutions sind Ansätze, die keine Diskussion darüber führen, wie wir leben wollen.
Marktbasierte Lösungsansätze sind false solutions.
Deshalb sind marktbasierte Lösungsansätze Ansätze, die keine Diskussion darüber führen, wie wir leben wollen.

**Story 9: »Verhandlungen als Schlagabtausch statt sich zuzuhören und miteinander zu reden«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 281 bis 339 ]

Storyline: Der Verhandlungsprozess ist ein Schlagabtausch von Argumenten in dem nicht miteinander geredet bzw. sich zugehört wird.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


**Story 10: »der Verhandlungsprozess wird keine Lösung bringen ist aber alternativlos«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 281 bis 339 ]

Storyline: Der Verhandlungsprozess wird keine Lösung bringen, ist aber alternativlos.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Der Verhandlungsprozess wird keine Lösung bringen. Der Verhandlungsprozess ist alternativlos. Deshalb ist das was keine Lösung bringen wird alternativlos.

**Story 11: »Verständnis von (Klima-)Gerechtigkeit«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 340 bis 376 ]

Storyline: Gerechtigkeit heißt, denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben. Entwicklung ist mit Emissionen verbunden. Die Industrieländer haben sich in der Vergangenheit stark (auf Kosten der Südländer) entwickelt. Den Südländern leben in Armut. Ihnen muss die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung und damit die Möglichkeit zu Emissionen gegeben werden. Gleiché pro-Kopf-Emissionen geben denjenigen, die in Armut leben nicht die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung. Um Gerechtigkeit zu erzielen muss jede Stimme/ jedes Land den gleichen Wert haben, was im UN-System nicht der Fall ist.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Gerechtigkeit heißt, denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben. Denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben, heißt Verzicht auf bestimmte Dinge. Gerechtigkeit erreichen heißt Verzicht auf bestimmte Dinge.
Gerechtigkeit heißt, denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben. Denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben, heißt ihnen die Möglichkeit zu Emissionen zu geben und Auswirkungen des Klimawandels zu verhindern. Deshalb heißt Gerechtigkeit die Möglichkeit zu Emissionen zu geben und Auswirkungen des Klimawandels zu verhindern.

Klimagerechtigkeit heißt, dass alle Menschen auf der Welt dieselben Möglichkeiten haben, die wir mal gehabt haben. Für Klimagerechtigkeit müssen sich alle einsetzen. Deshalb müssen sich alle dafür einsetzen, dass alle Menschen auf der Welt dieselben Möglichkeiten haben, die wir mal gehabt haben.

Gerechtigkeit heißt, denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben. Die Südländer leben in Armut. Deshalb muss den Südländern die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung gegeben werden.

Entwicklung ist mit Emissionen verbunden. Die Industrieländer haben sich in der Vergangenheit stark (auf Kosten der Südländer) entwickelt. Deshalb haben die Industrieländer in der Vergangenheit stark (auf Kosten der Südländer) emittiert.

Entwicklung ist mit Emissionen verbunden. Den Südländern muss die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung gegeben werden. Deshalb muss den Südländern die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zu Emissionen gegeben werden.

Gerechtigkeit heißt, denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung zu geben. Gleiche pro-Kopf-Emissionen geben denjenigen, die in Armut leben nicht die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung. Deshalb sind gleich pro-Kopf-Emissionen ungerecht.

Um Gerechtigkeit zu erzielen muss jede Stimme/ jedes Land den gleichen Wert haben/ gleichwertig berücksichtigt werden. Im UN-System hat nicht jede Stimme/ jedes Land den gleichen Wert/ wird nicht gleichwertig berücksichtigt. Deshalb wird mit dem UN-System derzeit nicht Gerechtigkeit erzielt.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC verwendet den Begriff Climate Justice, weil er ein eingeführter Begriff ist und mit anderen Gerechtigkeitsaspekten kombinierbar ist (Gender and Climate Justice).

Klimagerechtigkeit ist kein eingeführter Begriff und ist weniger mit anderen Gerechtigkeitsaspekten kombinierbar/ ist ein eingeschränkter Begriff.

Deshalb verwendet GenderCC den Begriff Klimagerechtigkeit nicht.

Story 13: »inhaltliche vs. zahlenmäßige Dominanz bei den Verhandlungen«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 402 bis 422 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

An den Klimaverhandlungen nehmen Vertreter verschiedener Observer-Organisationen teil.

Zu den Observer-Organisationen gehören Vertreter der Bereiche Business, Umweltorganisationen, Gender-, Trade-Unions, Jugend und andere.

Deshalb nehmen an den Klimaverhandlungen Vertreter der Bereiche Business, Umweltorganisationen, Gender-, Trade-Unions, Jugend und anderen teil.

An den Klimaverhandlungen nehmen mehr Vertreter der Industrieländer als der Südländer teil.

Mehr Vertreter der Industrieländer als der Südländer nehmen teil, weil Südländer weniger Ressourcen.

Deshalb haben Südländer weniger Ressourcen um an den Klimaverhandlungen teilzunehmen.

Observer-Organisationen haben bei den Klimaverhandlungen nichts zu sagen.

Observer-Organisationen haben eine zahlenmäßige aber nicht inhaltliche Dominanz.

Deshalb haben die die bei den Klimaverhandlungen nichts zu sagen haben eine zahlenmäßige aber nicht inhaltliche Dominanz.

Story 14: »Geld führt in der UNFCCC zu Einfluss«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 423 bis 435 ]

Storyline: Auf den Klimaverhandlungen hat jeder eine Berechtigung jeder zu sein.

Negativ zu bewerten ist die Struktur des Prozesses die bedingt, dass die Verfügung von TeilnehmerInnen bei der UNFCCC über viel Geld zu zahlenmäßig und in der Selbstdarstellung höherer Präsenz und einem höheren Einfluss führt.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**VIELE PERSONEN UND GRUPPEN SIND AUF DEN KLIMAVERHANDLUNGEN.**

Auf den Klimaverhandlungen hat jeder eine Berechtigung jeder zu sein.

**DESHALB HABEN VIELE PERSONEN UND GRUPPEN EINE BERECHTIGUNG ZUR ANWESENHEIT.**

Der Umstand, dass die Verfügung von TeilnehmerInnen bei der UNFCCC über viel Geld führt zu zahlenmäßig und in der Selbstdarstellung höherer Präsenz und einem höheren Einfluss ist negativ zu bewerten.

In der Struktur des Prozesses führt die Verfügung von TeilnehmerInnen bei der UNFCCC über viel Geld zu zahlenmäßig und in der Selbstdarstellung höherer Präsenz und einem höheren Einfluss.

Deshalb ist die Struktur des Prozesses negativ zu bewerten.

Die Verfügung von TeilnehmerInnen bei der UNFCCC über viel Geld führt zu zahlenmäßig und in der Selbstdarstellung höherer Präsenz und einem höheren Einfluss.

**EINZELNE TEILNEHMERINNEN VERFÜGEN ÜBER VIEL GELD.**

Deshalb haben einzelne TeilnehmerInnen bei der UNFCCC zahlenmäßig und in der Selbstdarstellung höhere Präsenz und einen höheren Einfluss.

**EINE ZAHLENMÄßIGE UND HINSICHTLICH DER RESSOURCEN VORLIEGENDE DOMINANZ IST VERBESSERUNGSWÜRDIG.**

Im Prozess Klimaverhandlungen dominieren die Industrieländer die Entwicklungsländer zahlenmäßig und hinsichtlich der Ressourcen.

**DESHALB IST DER PROZESS DER KLIMAVERHANDLUNGEN VERBESSERUNGSWÜRDIG.**

---

**Story 15: »Dominanz der Industrieländer in Verhandlungen«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 440 bis 465]

**Storyline: Im Prozess Klimaverhandlungen dominieren die Industrieländer die Entwicklungsländer zahlenmäßig und hinsichtlich der Ressourcen, was verbesserungswürdig ist.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**EINE ZAHLENMÄßIGE UND HINSICHTLICH DER RESSOURCEN VORLIEGENDE DOMINANZ IST VERBESSERUNGSWÜRDIG.**

Im Prozess Klimaverhandlungen dominieren die Industrieländer die Entwicklungsländer zahlenmäßig und hinsichtlich der Ressourcen.

**DESHALB IST DER PROZESS DER KLIMAVERHANDLUNGEN VERBESSERUNGSWÜRDIG.**

---

**Story 16: »ausschließlich die Verursacher sind am Entscheidungsprozess beteiligt«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 440 bis 465]

**Storyline: Am Entscheidungsprozess bei den Klimaverhandlungen sind ausschließlich die Verursacher des Klimawandels vertreten. Auch die Betroffenen des Klimawandels sollten am Entscheidungsprozess teilnehmen.**
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Die Betroffenen des Klimawandels sollten bei den Klimaverhandlungen am Entscheidungsprozess teilnehmen.
Am Entscheidungsprozess bei den Klimaverhandlungen sind ausschließlich die Verursacher des Klimawandels vertreten. Deshalb sind aufgrund der ausschließlichen Anwesenheit der Verursacher des Klimawandels die Betroffenen des Klimawandels abwesend.

Story 17: »Aktivitäten von GenderCC«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 466 bis 531 ]


GenderCC ist focal-point der Gender-Constituency bei der UNFCCC. Eine Constituency bei der UNFCCC organisiert Statements und stimmt ab, wer eine Intervention hält. Deshalb organisiert GenderCC Statements und stimmt ab, wer eine Intervention hält.


GenderCC stellt seit drei/ vier Jahren einen Informationsstand auf den Konferenzen. Ein Informationsstand ist eine ideale Möglichkeit für einen Austausch mit den Delegationen und Participants. Deshalb stellt GenderCC einen ideale Möglichkeit für einen Austausch mit den Delegationen und Participants.

GenderCC richtet (eigentlich) nicht mit UN-Organisationen zusammen Side-Events aus. Bei der COP15 richtet GenderCC ein Side-Event mit Habitat zusammen aus. Deshalb ist die Zusammenarbeit mit Habitat eigentlich nicht typisch.

Story 18: »Forderung nach Gender-Mainstreaming vs. Forderung nach Transformation der Gesellschaft«

[ im Transskript Zeile 466 bis 531 ]

Storyline: GenderCC reicht Gender-Mainstreaming als Forderung nicht aus, sonder eine Transformation der Gesellschaft muss gefordert werden.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC reicht Gender-Mainstreaming als Forderung nicht aus. Das Gender-Mainstreaming als Forderung nicht ausreicht bedeutet, dass eine Transformation der Gesellschaft gefordert wird. Deshalb fordert GenderCC eine Transformation der Gesellschaft.

Story 19: »Protest außerhalb erzeugt Druck«

[ im Transskript Zeile 536 bis 603 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Story 20: »alternativlos bedeutet nicht unverbesserlicher«

[ im Transskript Zeile 536 bis 603 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Das Climate Justice Action Network ist ein sehr linkes, sehr radikales Netzwerk, das die Verhandlungen stoppen will. Das Climate Justice Action Network hat ein Video verbreitet, das fordert Kopenhagen abzufackeln. Deshalb hat ein sehr linkes, sehr radikales Netzwerk, das die Verhandlungen stoppen will ein Video verbreitet, das fordert Kopenhagen abzufackeln.

Der Verhandlungsprozess ist ungerecht strukturiert. Ungerecht strukturiert bedeutet, dass Länderdelegationen zahlenmäßig sehr ungleich besetzt sind. Deshalb sind im Verhandlungsprozess Länderdelegationen zahlenmäßig sehr ungleich besetzt.


Ein Schwierigkeit ist kein Grund eine Lösung zu erzwingen oder die Verhandlungen bzw. ein Ergebnis zu verhindern. Die Forderung des Climate Justice Action Network hat gefordert Kopenhagen abzufackeln ist zielt auf das Erzwingen einer Lösung oder das Verhindern der Verhandlungen bzw. eines Ergebnisses. DESHALB IST EINE SCHWIERIGKEIT IM VERHANDLUNGSPROZESS KEIN GRUND FÜR DIE FORDERUNG DES CLIMATE JUSTICE ACTION NETWORK.


Story 21: »Offenheit verschiedener VertreterInnen bei UNFCCC gegenüber Genderaspekten«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 604 bis 681 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC arbeitet zu Gerechtigkeits- und Gender-Aspekten.
Deshalb sind die Gruppen der Constituencies Jugend, Trade-Unions, Indigene und Entwicklungsorganisationen näher an GenderCC.

Offenheit gegenüber Genderaspekten bedeutet einen gewissen Frauenanteil in der Gruppe zu haben.
Die Business-Gruppe hat den geringsten Frauenanteil in der UNFCCC.
Deshalb hat Business keine Offenheit gegenüber Genderaspekten.

GenderCC arbeitet für die Integration von Gender-Aspekten.
Umweltverbände zeigen relativ wenig Offenheit gegenüber der Integration von Gender-Aspekten.
Deshalb sind Umweltverbände relativ wenig offen gegenüber der Arbeit von GenderCC.

Story 22: »GenderCC stimmt sich ab«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 604 bis 681 ]

Storyline: GenderCC stimmt sich mit Constituencies im UNFCCC-Prozess ab um nicht gegeneinander zu arbeiten.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC stimmt sich mit Constituencies im UNFCCC-Prozess ab. Die Abstimmung mit Constituencies im UNFCCC-Prozess dient dem Vorsatz nicht gegeneinander zu arbeiten. Deshalb hat GenderCC den Vorsatz nicht gegeneinander zu arbeiten.

Story 23: »GenderCC fordert eine Transformation der Gesellschaften«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 604 bis 681 ]
Storyline: GenderCC setzt sich mit ihren Forderungen für eine Transformation der Gesellschaften ein, wozu die Global Gender and Climate Alliance von ihrer Struktur her nicht in der Lage ist.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

GenderCC würde Verbesserungen des Wordings der Texte angehen, wenn dies nicht andere übernehmen würden. Die Global Gender and Climate Alliance setzt sich für Verbesserungen des Wordings der Texte ein. Deshalb übernimmt die Global Gender and Climate Alliance das, was GenderCC andernfalls angehen würde.

Viele Frauen von GenderCC lehnen Projekte ab, die livelyhoods zerstört werden und die Zerstörer davon profitieren. REDD oder CDM-Projekte zerstören livelyhoods und die Zerstörer davon profitieren davon. Deshalb lehnen viele Frauen von GenderCC REDD oder CDM-Projekte grundsätzlich ab.

Wer Waldprojekte fördert hat eine positive Einstellung gegenüber REDD. UNDP und die UNEP fördern Waldprojekte. Deshalb hat UNDP und die UNEP eine positive Einstellung gegenüber REDD.

Ausschließlich die Gender-Abteilungen von UN-organisationen zu organisieren limitiert die Offenheit der Positionen. In der Global Gender and Climate Alliance waren ursprünglich ausschließlich die Gender-Abteilungen von UN-organisationen organisiert. Deshalb ist in der Global Gender and Climate Alliance ursprünglich die Offenheit der Positionen limitiert.

GenderCC setzt sich mit ihren Forderungen für eine Transformation der Gesellschaften ein. Die Global Gender and Climate Alliance kann sich in ihren Forderungen nicht für eine Transformation der Gesellschaften einsetzen. Deshalb unterscheiden sich GenderCC und die Global Gender and Climate Alliance.
**Story 24: »Umweltorganisationen und ihre Positionierung gegenüber Marktinstrumenten«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 682 bis 712 ]

**Storyline:** Marktinstrumente (vom Emissionshandel bis CDM) wurden durch den offiziellen Prozess praktisch festgeschrieben. Gerade Umweltorganisationen (bspw. der WWF) haben sich seit der Konferenz in Den Haag in ihren Forderungen immer stärker an dieses Festgeschriebene angepasst. Im Moment (so der Eindruck) äußern Umweltorganisationen zunehmend Kritik an Marktinstrumenten.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**MARKTINSTRUMENTE (VOM EMISSIONSHANDEL BIS CDM) WURDEN DURCH DEN OFFIZIELLEN PROZESS PRAKTISCH FESTGESCHRIEBEN.**

Gerade Umweltorganisationen (bspw. der WWF) haben sich seit der Konferenz in Den Haag in ihren Forderungen immer stärker an Marktinstrumente (vom Emissionshandel bis CDM) angepasst. Deshalb haben gerade Umweltorganisationen (bspw. der WWF) sich seit der Konferenz in Den Haag immer stärker an das, was durch den offiziellen Prozess praktisch festgeschrieben wurde angepasst.

Gerade Umweltorganisationen (bspw. der WWF) haben sich seit der Konferenz in Den Haag in ihren Forderungen immer stärker an Marktinstrumente (vom Emissionshandel bis CDM) angepasst. Im Moment (so der Eindruck) äußern Umweltorganisationen zunehmend Kritik an Marktinstrumenten. Deshalb wird dort wo seit der Konferenz in Den Haag Forderungen immer stärker an Marktinstrumente (vom Emissionshandel bis CDM) angepasst wurden im Moment (so der Eindruck) zunehmend Kritik an Marktinstrumenten geäußert.

**Story 25: »Zum Begriff Climate Justice bzw. Klimagerechtigkeit«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 713 bis 732 ]

**Storyline:** Climate Justice als Begriff tauchte im UNFCCC-Prozess vor der Konferenz in Bali auf, als CJN! Aktionen durchführte und Grassroots-Organisationen in den Prozess gebracht wurden. *Unter dem Begriff Klimagerechtigkeit wird seit kurzem diskutiert, was gerechte Verteilungen von Emissionen sind, oder was gerecht ist. Was gerechte Verteilungen von Emissionen sind, oder was gerecht ist wurden bereits seit längerer Zeit diskutiert.*

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Unter dem Begriff Klimagerechtigkeit wird seit kurzem diskutiert, was gerechte Verteilungen von Emissionen sind, oder was gerecht ist. Was gerechte Verteilungen von Emissionen sind, oder was gerecht ist wurden bereits seit längerer Zeit diskutiert. Deshalb wurde das, was unter dem Begriff Klimagerechtigkeit seit kurzem diskutiert wird, bereits seit längerer Zeit diskutiert.

Story 26: »das Thema Klimawandel eröffnet Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 733 bis 769 ]
Storyline: Für Arbeit zum Thema Klimawandel gibt es Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten, weshalb viele Organisationen zum Thema Klimawandel arbeiten.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
GenderCC führt mit seiner Partnerin/ dem Vocal Point in Südafrika ein Zweijahres-Projekt zu Gender-Kommunikation und Capacity Building durch.
Das Zweijahres-Projekt zu Gender-Kommunikation und Capacity Building findet in Südafrika und auf der Ebene des internationalen Prozesses statt.
Deshalb führt GenderCC mit seiner Partnerin/ dem Vocal Point in Südafrika etwas durch, was in Südafrika und auf der Ebene des internationalen Prozesses stattfindet.

Für Arbeit zum Thema Klimawandel gibt es Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten.
Viele Organisationen suchen Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten.
Deshalb arbeiten viele Organisationen zum Thema Klimawandel.
A.4.7 Storylines und Syllogismen »GFN – Global Footprint Network«

**Story 1: »an agreement to cope with the challenge«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 1 bis 24 *]

**Storyline:** The people of the world need to cope with challenges like climate change. An agreement is needed that world leaders can move forward together. Events like Copenhagen are at least a chance to cope with challenges like climate change. But hundreds of people trying to come to an agreement, like at Copenhagen, seems to be a very difficult situation.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

That world leaders can move forward together an agreement is needed.
It's very difficult to create an agreement.
**Therefore it is very difficult to create what is needed that world leaders can move forward together.**

The people of the world need to cope with some challenges (like climate change).
Events like Copenhagen are at least a chance to cope with some challenges (like climate change).
**Therefore events like Copenhagen are at least a chance for the people of the world.**

Hundreds of people trying to come to an agreement seems to be a very difficult situation.
At Copenhagen there are hundreds of people trying to come to an agreement.
**Therefore at Copenhagen it seems to be a very difficult situation.**

---

**Story 2: »Global Footprint Network's mission«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 89 bis 106 *]

**Storyline:** More demand than annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity is a current problem. Global Footprint Network lays its first focus on this issue.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Global Footprint Network's first focus is the issue of bio-capacity production.
The issue of bio-capacity production covers the ability of the natural world to generate natural capital or bio-capacity, the demand of nations and other institutions on that bio-capacity, the balance between the production and the consumption of bio-capacity and the determinations of the extend to which the earth can actually support the demand being made.

Therefore Global Footprint Network's first focus is on the ability of the natural world to generate natural capital or bio-capacity, the demand of nations and other institutions on that bio-capacity, the balance between the production and the consumption of bio-capacity and the determinations of the extend to which the earth can actually support the demand being made.
More demand than annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity (→ overshoot) is a problem. 
Currently there is more demand than annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity (→ overshoot). 
Therefore currently there is a problem.

Global Footprint Network's mission is to draw attention to the problem of 'overshoot' or 'demanding too much from the natural world'.
More demand than annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity is called 'overshoot' or 'demanding too much from the natural world'. 
Therefore Global Footprint Network's mission is to draw attention to more demand than annual production of natural capital or bio-capacity.

**Story 3: »improving energy efficiency with the ecological footprint approach«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 107 bis 147]

**Storyline:** The current bio-capacity demand is problematic, as it causes environmental impacts. The bio-capacity demand can be examined with the ecological footprint approach, which aims at improving energy efficiency. Improving energy efficiency means ending overshoot or reversing the trends to manage natural resources in a more efficient way. GFN worked with nations and corporations across the world about this issue and had great success.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**The ecological footprint approach aims at improving energy efficiency.**
**Improving energy efficiency means ending overshoot or reversing the trends to manage natural resources in a more efficient way.**
**Therefore the ecological footprint approach aims at ending overshoot or reversing the trends to manage natural resources in a more efficient way.**

GFN had great success in working with nations and corporations (two dozen nations across the world in the last five years and corporations, both individually and in collectives – for example, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development).
Working with nations and corporations meant presenting the application of the overshoot approach and the nations' necessary solutions.
**Therefore GFN had great success in presenting the application of the overshoot approach and the nations' necessary solutions.**

The current bio-capacity demand has environmental impacts.
**Continuing environmental impacts is a problem.**
Therefore continuing the current bio-capacity demand is a problem.
The current bio-capacity demand has environmental impacts. The environmental impacts can be examined with the ecological footprint approach (which has been created to examine a variety of different land types, the production of bio-capacity or natural capital within those land types and the impact of human activities on that production mostly represented by the demand, but at the same time represented by the construction of infrastructure and the environmental effects of that work essence).

**Therefore the current bio-capacity demand can be examined with the ecological footprint approach.**

Ending overshoot or reversing the trends to manage natural resources in a more efficient way means improving energy efficiency.

GFN worked with nations across the world about ending overshoot or reversing the trends to manage natural resources in a more efficient way.

**Therefore GFN worked on improving energy efficiency.**

---

**Story 4: »two causes of climate change: the supply and the demand side«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 148 bis 182 ]

**Storyline:** There are two causes of climate change: On the one hand it’s the continous demand for fossil fuels, which are jeopardizing the balance between oxygen and CO2 on the planet. On the other hand it's the on-going demand for energy, which is associated with the western consumption patterns (which even developing countries aim for). To adress climate change therefore one has to effectuate reasonable solutions on the supply side and the demand side of energy.

**Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:**

JEOPARDIZING THE BALANCE BETWEEN OXYGEN AND CO2 ON THE PLANET IS A PROBLEM.

Fossil fuels are jeopardizing the balance between oxygen and CO2 on the planet.

Therefore fossil fuels are a problem.

Developing economies ask for a transfer of the western consumption patterns.

THE WESTERN CONSUMPTION PATTERNS IS ONE CAUSE OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

The developing economies ask for a transfer of one cause of climate change.

To adress climate change one has to effectuate reasonable solutions.

To effectuate reasonable solutions one has to focus on the supply side and the demand side of energy.

Therefore to adress climate change one has to focus on the supply side and the demand side of energy.
The on-going demand for energy is one cause of climate change. The on-going demand for energy is associated with the continued consumption of goods and services certainly in the west / associated with the western consumption patterns. Therefore the continued consumption of goods and services certainly in the west / the western consumption patterns is one cause of climate change.

Fossil fuels are a problem.
Humans are are continously demanding for fossil fuels.
Therefore humans are continously demanding for a problem.

**Story 5: »solutions to climate change«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 183 bis 229 ]

**Storyline:** To solve climate change one needs to work on the supply side, as a continued dependency on fossil fuels will lead to disastrous consequences. This is containing a clear movement away from fossil fuels, which means using more other sources of energy like renewables or the nuclear option. It is also containing a reduction of the carbon content of human emissions, which can be achieved with continued improvements in pollution control or pollution prevention devices. To solve climate change one also needs to work on the demand side, which is optimising people's consumption. Optimising people's consumption is a slow process of trying to change the behavioural habits of hundreds of millions or billions of people. Solving climate change therefore is a long-term shift. Governments, many corporations and non-profit groups are encouraging people to optimise their consumption.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Working on the supply side contains a reduction of the carbon content of human emissions.
A reduction of the carbon content of human emissions can be achieved with continued improvements in pollution control or pollution prevention devices.
Therefore working on the supply side contains continued improvements in pollution control or pollution prevention devices.

Working on the supply side contains contains a clear movement away from fossil fuels.
A clear movement away from fossil fuels means using more other sources of energy like renewables, especially 'pink power' or the nuclear option.
Therefore working on the supply side contains using more other sources of energy like renewables, especially 'pink power' or the nuclear option.

Disastrous consequences have to be avoided.
A continued dependency on fossil fuels will lead to disastrous consequences.
Therefore a continued dependency on fossil fuels has to be avoided.
To solve climate change one needs to optimise people's consumption. Optimising people's consumption is a slow process of trying to change the behavioural habits of hundreds of millions (if not billions) of people. Therefore to solve climate change is a slow process of trying to change the behavioural habits of hundreds of millions (if not billions) of people.

To solve climate change one needs to optimise people's consumption. Governments, many corporations and non-profit groups are encouraging people to optimise their consumption. Therefore governments, many corporations and non-profit groups are encouraging people to solve climate change.

To solve climate change one needs to work on the supply side. To work on the supply side is shifting the demand away from fossil fuels or reducing the carbon content of the human emissions. Therefore to solve climate change one needs to shift the demand away from fossil fuels or reduce the carbon content of the human emissions.

To solve climate change one needs to work on the demand side. To work on the demand side is optimising people's consumption (changing people's behaviours and way to think about the demand for products and for services). Therefore to solve climate change one needs to optimise people's consumption (to change people's behaviours and way to think about the demand for products and for services).

To solve climate change people's behaviour needs to be changed. Changing people's behaviour is a long-term shift. Therefore to solve climate change is a long-term shift.

**Story 6: »adequate climate politics will act before 2020/2030«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 230 bis 252 ]

**Storyline:** The science about climate change is very clear, i.e. continuing to debate it is wrong. Politics needs to avoid the worst effects of climate change. Acting effectively before 2020 or 2030 will avoid dramatic climate change (→ Stern Report). Investing appropriately in alternative energy and shifting consumer behaviour and demand will avoid the worst effects of climate change (→ Stern Report). As climate change is a global phenomenon, all people will feel the effects of it.

**Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:**

**NECESSARY POLITICS NEEDS TO AVOID DRAMATIC CLIMATE CHANGE.**
Acting effectively before 2020 or 2030 will avoid dramatic climate change. **THEREFORE THE NECESSARY POLITICS NEEDS TO ACT EFFECTIVELY BEFORE 2020 OR 2030.**
Climate change is a global phenomenon. 
A global phenomenon means all people will feel the effects of it. 
Therefore all people will feel the effects of climate change.

Continuing to debate something, which science is very clear is wrong. 
The science about climate change is very clear. 
Therefore continuing to debate climate change is wrong.

Politics needs to avoid the worst effects of climate change. 
Investing appropriately in alternative energy and shifting consumer behaviour and demand will avoid the worst effects of climate change. 
Therefore politics needs to invest appropriately in alternative energy and shift consumer behaviour and demand will avoid the worst effects of climate change.

Story 7: »Climate Injustice as a imbalance of bio-capacity production and consumption«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 253 bis 325 ]

Storyline: Climate Justice like Environmental Injustice is a social injustice like a localised impact, an inequality or an unequally shared burden, which is related back to emissions or pollution of some kind. It could be the shifting patterns of rainfall and temperature, dramatic changes across the planet in terms of the ability of the land base to provide of food and other basic needs for people, the poor communities, the developing economies, the ones that are currently stressed or unstable being the ones affected by climate change first and perhaps worst. Problems of imbalance associated with bio-capacity production and consumption is one cause of climate injustice. GFN is making an effort to educate leaders in various nations (particular in Africa) about those problems. Many nations (in Africa, for example) have a surplus of bio-capacity (where the demand for bio-capacity is less than the ability of the land base to produce natural resources or natural capital), where some other nations (like China, for example) are looking at access to. Specific trade relationships taking shape between the nations in Africa and nations like China constitute the flow of bio-capacity from one continent to another. As the maintenance of a surplus bio-capacity production in a nation is important to enable climate justice this trade is contradicting the idea of climate justice. The Ecology of Trade reveals patterns of bio-capacity flows and ask questions about optimising the energy and environmental component of trade. GFN is working with it. Adopting the ecological footprint and building it into its political structure is a first step on the way to change peopleis thinking about the production and consumption of natural capital.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Environmental injustice is a burden, which is unequally shared. 
An burden, which is unequally shared tends to impact the poor communities more, the less educated and less well-off communities. 
Therefore environmental injustice tends to impact the poor communities more, the less educated and less well-off communities.
Environmental injustice is a social injustice like a localised impact, an inequality or an unequally shared burden. In regard of social injustices climate injustice is the same like environmental injustice. Therefore climate justice is a social injustice like a localised impact, an inequality or an unequally shared burden.

Many nations (in Africa, for example) have a surplus of bio-capacity (where the demand for bio-capacity is less than the ability of the land base to produce natural resources or natural capital). Some other nations (like China, for example) are looking at access to surplus bio-capacity and begin to appropriate it for their own needs. Therefore some other nations are looking at access to many nations.

Environmental injustice is a social injustice like a localised impact, an inequality or an unequally shared burden. The localised impact, inequality or unequally shared burden is related back to emissions or pollution of some kind. Therefore environmental injustice is related back to emissions or pollution of some kind.

Specific trade relationships taking shape between the nations in Africa and nations like China constitute the flow of bio-capacity from one continent to another. The flow of bio-capacity from one continent to another is contradicting the idea of climate justice. Therefore specific trade relationships taking shape between the nations in Africa and nations like China are contradicting the idea of climate justice.

Maintaining a surplus bio-capacity production in a nation is important to enable climate justice. Ecuador is an example of a nation that understood the importance of maintaining a surplus bio-capacity production in a nation. Therefore Ecuador is an example of a nation that understood to enable climate justice.

Climate injustice is a social injustice. A social injustice could be the shifting patterns of rainfall and temperature, dramatic changes across the planet in terms of the ability of the land base to provide of food and other basic needs for people, the poor communities, the developing economies, the ones that are currently stressed or unstable being the ones affected by climate change first and perhaps worst. Therefore climate injustice could be the shifting patterns of rainfall and temperature, dramatic changes across the planet in terms of the ability of the land base to provide of food and other basic needs for people, the poor communities, the developing economies, the ones that are currently stressed or unstable being the ones affected by climate change first and perhaps worst.
PROBLEMS OF IMBALANCE ASSOCIATED WITH BIO-CAPACITY PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION IS ONE CAUSE OF CLIMATE INJUSTICE.

GFN is making an effort to educate leaders in various nations (particular in Africa) about problems of the imbalance associated with bio-capacity production and consumption. Therefore GFN is making an effort to educate leaders in various nations (particular in Africa) about one cause of climate injustice.

The Ecology of Trade reveals patterns of bio-capacity flows and ask questions about optimising the energy and environmental component of trade.

GFN is working with the Ecology of Trade approach. Therefore GFN reveals patterns of bio-capacity flows and ask questions about optimising the energy and environmental component of trade.

Adopting the ecological footprint and building it into its political structure is a first step on the way to change people’s thinking about the production and consumption of natural capital.

Ecuador adopted the ecological footprint and built it into its political structure (that every agency is required to report the status of bio-capacity that the agency is responsible for). Therefore Ecuador did a first step on the way to change people’s thinking about the production and consumption of natural capital.

Story 8: »the positive outcome at Copenhagen«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 326 bis 359 ]

Storyline: GFN liked to see a sort of tightly written inforceable agreement as outcome at Copenhagen. GFN was prepared to observe an upright failure at Copenhagen, but there have been some positive outcomes: First, Copenhagen’s voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions is an agreement on the part of all nations, which is visible and which people are paying attention to and are reporting about. Second, with the REDD agreement the ecological asset management idea (rewarding nations for restoring of natural capital) is implemented.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

An upright failure at Copenhagen would be no positive outcome at all.
GFN was prepared to observe an upright failure at Copenhagen. Therefore GFN was prepared to observe no positive outcome at all.

An outcome, which is visible and which people are paying attention to and are reporting about is a positive sign. Copenhagen’s voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions is an outcome, which is visible and which people are paying attention to and are reporting about. Therefore Copenhagen’s voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions is a positive sign.
Implementing the ecological asset management idea (rewarding nations for restoring of natural capital) is a positive development.
With the REDD agreement the ecological asset management idea (rewarding nations for restoring of natural capital) is implemented.
Therefore implementing the REDD agreement is a positive development.

GFN liked to see an outcome at Copenhagen.
The outcome at Copenhagen should have been a sort of tightly written enforceable agreement.
Therefore GFN liked to see a sort of tightly written enforceable agreement.

AN AGREEMENT ON THE PART OF ALL NATIONS IS A POSITIVE OUTCOME.
Copenhagen's voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions is an agreement on the part of all nations.
Therefore Copenhagen's voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions is a positive outcome.

Story 9: »the climate conferences ultimately leading to the right solutions«
[= im Transskript Zelle 360 bis 390 ]

Storyline: The climate conference is a complete cross-section of humanity, i.e. a complete cross-section of humanity is covering the world leaders, the heads of nations, government agency representatives and non-government organisations. At the climate conference the opportunity to talk about many good ideas is also brought forward by NGOs bringing a wide-ranging set of materials with them. This will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we're looking for.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
The opportunity to talk about many good ideas will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we're looking for.
At the climate conferences there is the opportunity to talk about many good ideas.
Therefore the climate conferences will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we're looking for.

The climate conference is a complete cross-section of humanity. A complete cross-section of humanity is covering the world leaders, the heads of nations, government agency representatives and non-government organisations.
Therefore the climate conference is covering the world leaders, the heads of nations, government agency representatives and non-government organisations.
The opportunity to talk about many good ideas is brought forward by NGOs bringing a wide-ranging set of materials with them.

The opportunity to talk about many good ideas will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we’re looking for. Therefore NGOs bringing a wide-ranging set of materials with them will ultimately lead to the kinds of solutions that we’re looking for.

---

**Story 10: »participation at the climate conferences«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 391 bis 404 ]

**Storyline:** Anybody having the opportunity to be at the climate conferences would make it possible to hear as many different points of view as possible and would be a great education for the individuals. Everybody attending the large meetings/sessions would be difficult to work with/become chaotic and has to be avoided.

---

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- **Syllogism 1:** Something getting difficult to work with/ becoming chaotic has to be avoided.
  - Everybody attending the large meetings/ sessions would be difficult to work with/become chaotic.
  - Everybody attending the large meetings/ sessions has to be avoided.

- **Syllogism 2:** To hear as many different points of view as possible is a good thing.
  - Anybody having the opportunity to be at the climate conferences would make it possible to hear as many different points of view as possible.
  - Therefore anybody having the opportunity to be at the climate conferences is a good thing.

- **Syllogism 3:** Education for individuals is a good thing.
  - Anybody having the opportunity to be at the climate conferences would be a great education for the individuals.
  - Therefore anybody having the opportunity to be at the climate conferences is a good thing.

---

**Story 11: »indigenous peoples bringing wisdom into the climate meetings«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 405 bis 417 ]

**Storyline:** A great deal of wisdom or some quite extraordinary ideas that more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration could be heard from the experience of indigenous peoples.

Therefore indigenous peoples have to be represented at the climate meetings.
A great deal of wisdom or some quite extraordinary ideas that more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration could be heard from the experience of indigenous peoples. It is not appropriate to not represent this great deal of wisdom or some quite extraordinary ideas that more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration at the climate meetings. Therefore it is not appropriate to not represent indigenous people at the climate meetings.

It is important that there’s an opportunity for people to voice frustrations with the negotiation process. People have frustrations with the negotiation process. Therefore it is important that people have the opportunity to voice themselves.

It is appropriate to have an opportunity to make an urgent situation known to decision-makers and leaders. Climate change is an urgent situation. Therefore it is appropriate to have an opportunity to make climate change known to decision-makers and leaders.

Making statements that aren’t relevant to the discussions is not appropriate. Protest activities, which are not focussed on the issue at hand are statements that aren’t relevant to the discussions. Therefore protest activities, which are not focussed on the issue at hand are not appropriate.

The education of people about the need for 'carbon-plus' thinking is work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy. The issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy are linking the climate change debate and the work GFN does. Work on this issues is not limited to the carbon component, i.e. it is not excluding the connection to all of the other natural capital (besides carbon) and bio-capacity production issues and other different land types but proving the energy efficiency of those activities and its environmental effects of bio-capacity demand.
Reprouktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

At Copenhagen GFN was active with several activities. Several activities means side events, press conferences and social events as well as a stand to present some of the materials related to bio-capacity production and consumption and the relationship of natural capital to the issues at hand. Therefore at Copenhagen GFN was active with side events, press conferences and social events as well as a stand to present some of the materials related to bio-capacity production and consumption and the relationship of natural capital to the issues at hand.

Work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy is not limited to the carbon component. Limiting to the carbon component would exclude the connection to all of the other natural capital (besides carbon) and bio-capacity production issues and other different land types. Therefore work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy is not excluding the connection to all of the other natural capital (besides carbon) and bio-capacity production issues and other different land types.

Work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy is not excluding the connection to all of the other natural capital (besides carbon) and bio-capacity production issues and other different land types. Not excluding the connection to all of the other natural capital and bio-capacity production issues and other different land types means proving the energy efficiency of those activities and its environmental effects of bio-capacity demand. Therefore work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy means proving the energy efficiency of those activities and its environmental effects of bio-capacity demand.

Energy efficiency and the embodied energy is linking the climate change debate and the work GFN does. The education of people about the need for 'carbon-plus' thinking is work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy (associated with trade). Therefore the education of people about the need for 'carbon-plus' thinking is linking between the climate change debate and the work GFN does.

GFN's education of people about the need for 'carbon-plus' thinking is work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy. Work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy is not limited to the carbon component. Therefore GFN's education of people about the need for 'carbon-plus' thinking is not limited to the carbon component.
A.4.8 Storylines und Syllogismen »GJEP/ CJN! – Global Justice Ecology Project/ Climate Justice Now!«

Story 1: »The founding/ composition of CJN!«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 3 bis 33 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the composition of CJN! and CAN. On the one hand many organisations in CAN are conservative and follow pro-corporate policies. On the other hand some organisations active in CAN have been kind of critical. These groups formed an informal alliance to strengthen their common aims.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The founding members of CJN! got an critique on very conservative, very pro-corporate policies in the climate process.
Many of the really large NGOs in CAN (like world wild life fund and conservation international and nature conservancy) had very conservative, very pro-corporate policies.
Therefore the founding members of CJN! didn’t feel that CAN would be an appropriate place.

The use of genetically engineered trees and carbon plantations provokes criticism.
The UN climate convention made a decision allowing the use of genetically engineered trees and carbon plantations.
Therefore the UN climate convention provoked criticism.

Alliances are strengthening the work of similar organisations.
Many organisations critical of the UN climate process are doing similar work or have similar aims (are similar organisations).
Therefore an alliance between organisations critical of the UN climate process would strengthen their work.

Story 2: »The climate justice manifestation within UNFCCC«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 35 bis 49 ]

Storyline: The access of organisations to NGO ressources within UNFCCC is important to highlight their policies. That’s why CJN!’s access to NGO ressources is equal to the manifestation of climate justice within UNFCCC.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The access of an organisation to NGO ressources is equal to a manifestation of its policies within UNFCCC.
CJN! got access to the NGO ressources.
Therefore the policies of CJN! (i.e. climate justice) got manifest within UNFCCC.

The access to NGO ressources should not be exclusive.
CAN’s monopoly of access to NGO ressources has been exclusive.
Therefore it is eligible that CAN lost its monopoly.
Story 3: »the revolutionary vision of a new social structure«
[= im Transkript Zeile 55 bis 61]
Storyline: CJN!’s vision is to overcome capitalism and set a new social structure in place.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CJN! IS AGAINST A SYSTEM WHICH IS DEPENDED ON CAPITALIST ECONOMICS.
A whole new system is not depended on capitalist economics.
Therefore we won’t be in need of CJN! anymore, if there is a whole new social structure in place.

The current economic system is dependend on capitalism.
CAPITALISM IS INTENSIFYING THE CLIMATE PROBLEMS.
Therefore to keep hold of the current economic system will continue to intensify climate problems.

Story 4: »Including the excluded«
[= im Transkript Zeile 64 bis 78]
Storyline: This is a story about the work of CJN!. As it is working on human rights as well as climate justice issues, CJN! is trying to get the messages and voices of the people who are marginalised (who are outside the talks) heard inside the talks.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

IT’S A HUMAN RIGHTS AS WELL AS CLIMATE JUSTICE ISSUE TO GET THE VOICES AND MESSAGES OF THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE THE TALKS HEARDED INSIDE.
CJN! is working on human rights as well as climate justice issues.
CJN! tries to make the voices and messages of people who are outside of the talks heard inside the talks.

Story 5: »Frame for work on climate change«
[= im Transkript Zeile 89 bis 94]
Storyline: Alliance building as well as movement building for climate justice can provide a useful frame for work on climate change. GJEP is experiencing it.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

WORKING ON ALLIANCE BUILDING AND BUILDING THE CLIMATE JUSTICE MOVEMENT SEEMS TO PROVIDE A BETTER FRAME FOR WORK ON CLIMATE CHANGE.
GJEP is working on alliance building and building the climate justice movement.
GJEP seems to have a better frame for its work.
Infinite growth is the idea that we can continue exploiting more and more resources every year on the planet without any ecological consequence like climate change to that. Therefore infinite growth is the underlying driver of climate change.

If it is overused the ecosystem will collapse and eventually the human population is going to end up. Humankind overused the ecosystem. Therefore the ecosystem now is starting to collapse eventually the human population is going to end up.

A system of infinite growth is ecologically destructive when it's causing climate change. A new society is not going to be destructive. Therefore the real solutions to climate change is the transformation away from the system of infinite growth.

Approaching not to be ecologically destructive will simultaneously start to see how to live in a more socially just way. A transformation to a new society is about figuring out, how to live in a way that's not ecologically destructive. Therefore a new society will also be socially just.

The new society will be a way of living which is not destructive. Many indigenous groups come with a lot of knowledge (millennia of experience) about how we can actually live on this planet in a way that's not destructive. Therefore to build the new society we need to draw from the experience of many indigenous groups.
Story 8: »'Climate justice' as an umbrella for social and ecological issues«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 138 bis 157 ]
**Storyline:** This is a story about the concept of climate justice. Climate Justice could be understood as an umbrella that highlights the interconnectedness of social and ecological issues, i.e. that exploiting the earth and engendering injustice have the same root causes.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Exploiting the earth and violating human rights/ engendering injustice have the same root causes.
Climate justice is dealing with ecological and social issues. Therefore Climate justice is exploring that these issues have the same root causes.

Story 9: »COP15, common agreement for voluntary action«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 160 bis 181 ]
**Storyline:** This is a story about the output of COP15. The narrator is assessing the current climate negotiations as the worst. COP15 won't achieve the goal of binding emission targets but will set voluntary targets in place. This will get common support but will be counterproductive regarding the solution of climate change.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

An agreement that everybody has come to is worse than nothing. An agreement achieved at COP15 will be one that everybody has come to. Therefore an agreement achieved at COP15 will be worse than nothing.

**Carbon offsets and voluntary emission targets are not addressing climate change.**
There's agreement of everybody for carbon offsets and voluntary emission targets. Therefore climate change is not addressed with this common agreement.

If the climate negotiations fail to come up with the next round of commitments under Kyoto they are bad.
The climate negotiations at COP15 are failing to come up with the next round of commitments under Kyoto. Therefore the negotiations at COP15 are bad.

COP15 is about carbon offset (and voluntary emission targets). Carbon offsets (and voluntary emission targets) are not proven to address climate change. Therefore COP15's effect to address climate change is not proven.
**Story 10: »Participate the UNFCCC negotiations only to abolish them«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 184 bis 190 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the process of negotiations within UNFCCC. As they are a fraud, the only reason to participate should be to expose it and abolish it. Solving the climate crisis is about something else than the UNFCCC.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**The process of negotiation is a fraud.**

Therefore one should only participate in the current process of negotiation to expose it and abolish it.

**Story 11: »(Repressed) social movements expose the UNFCCC«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 194 bis 210 ]

**Storyline:** The mobilisation of social movements around COP15 and especially its extreme repression is exposing the UNFCCC process as unfair, unjust and showing, that it's about empowering corporations to continue business as usual.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**The mobilisation of social movements is a real opportunity to expose the issue of its critique.**

Therefore at the UNFCCC talks at Copenhagen there is a real opportunity to expose this process.

**Story 12: »decision making within UNFCCC = continuation of imperialism, colonialism«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 215 bis 240 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the exclusiveness of the negotiation process within UNFCCC. The process is hierarchically and patriarchically and developing country delegations, non-governmental and indigenous peoples' organisations. Decisions are made by developed country delegations in a conspirative way which the narrator is valueing as a continuation of an imperialist, colonialist model.
The UNFCCC process is extremely hierarchically and patriarchically. Hierarchy and patriarchy are excluding developing country delegations, non-governmental and indigenous peoples' organisations. Therefore the UNFCCC process is excluding developing country delegations, non-governmental and indigenous peoples' organisations.

The imperialist, colonialist model, that's been going on for a long time, is the collaboration and conspiracy of the big powers (the developed countries) to figure out how to control everything and use the developing countries for their own means. The 'danish text' at COP15 is a dealmaking of the developed country delegations behind closed doors. Therefore the 'danish text' is a continuation of the imperialist, colonialist model.

**Story 13:** »The strength and weaknesses of CJN!«

[= im Transkript Zeile 245 bis 257]  
**Storyline:** This is a story about the strengths and weaknesses of CJN! CJN! is sharing the voices from the people outside and is constituting an alternative to CAN which the narrator is counting as a possible benefit. As CJN! is very involved in the internal process and many groups do not have a very radical position, some people might ask them for being more vocal and militant in their demands.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

(SOME PEOPLE SAY) CJN! is very involved in the internal process (in the arguing of the text and trying to get countries to do this and that) and many of the groups in CJN! do not have a very radical position. (SOME PEOPLE SAY) INVOLVEMENT IN THE INTERNAL PROCESS AND BEING NOT VERY RADICAL IN ITS POSITIONS WON'T LEAD TO SUCCESS. Therefore (SOME PEOPLE SAY) to be successful CJN! should be putting a little more pressure on, being a little bit more vocal and militant in what they're demanding.

**Story 14:** »CJN! as outside/inside intermediator«

[= im Transkript Zeile 270 bis 285]  
**Storyline:** CJN! is acting as an intermediary outside and inside the negotiation process. On the one hand CJN! is trying to get a venue for voices of people who would otherwise not be heard inside and outside. On the other hand CJN! is trying to broadcast the inside of the negotiation process to the outside.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**For solving the climate crisis it is necessary that some peoples’ voices are being heard.**

CJN! is trying to get a venue for some peoples’ voices being heard.

**Therefore CJN! is trying to solve the climate.**

**It is very valuable that the rest of the world should have an understanding of what’s happening inside the negotiations.**

CJN! is trying to broadcast what’s going on inside the negotiations out to the rest of the world.

Therefore CJN! does very valuable stuff.

---

**Story 15: »Angry protest outside will put things forward«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 286 bis 298]*

**Storyline:** This is a story about the role of angry protests outside the negotiations. Angry protests will stop stagnation and will put things forward as they are potentially reason for governments to think about listening.

---

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Big angry/ very militant angry protest outside the convention centre is the only way that governments were potentially even gonna think about listening. // Angry protest outside is a really critical part of trying to put things forward.

At COP15 for the first time we have angry protest outside.

Therefore at COP15 governments would potentially think about listening // things might be put forward.

---

**Story 16: »A corrupt process causes militant action«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 305 bis 314]*

**Storyline:** This is a story about militant action. As the narrator is assessing the UNFCCC process as thoroughly corrupt, militant actions (like those of the black block) are comprehensible as a way of taking out anger.

---

In a process which is thoroughly corrupt from top to bottom, people (like the black block) want to take out some of their anger.

**The UNFCCC process is totally corrupt from top to bottom.**

Therefore people (like the black block) want to take out their anger at the UNFCCC process.

---

**Story 17: »CJN! making coordinated activities between 'inside' and 'outside' possible«**

[* = im Transkript Zeile 319 bis 329]*

**Storyline:** To make coordinated activities between 'inside' and 'outside' possible, work between groups located there have to work together. CJN! and CJA are doing so.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

TO HAVE COORDINATED ACTIVITIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE IT IS NECESSARY THAT GROUPS INSIDE THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS AND GROUPS MOBILISING ON THE OUTSIDE ARE WORKING TOGETHER.
With CJN! and CJA groups inside and groups mobilising on the outside are working together.
Therefore CJN! and CJA makes coordinated activities inside and outside possible.

Story 18: »Radicalness strengthens climate justice«
[ = im Transkrip Zeile 333 bis 355 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the role of being radical. A legitimate demand developing countries which is looking the most extreme in the negotiations could be made more reasonable if their is a more radical demand. That's why NGOs should be more radical.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

TO REACH CLIMATE JUSTICE ITS NECESSARY TO REALISE THE MOST EXTREM LOOKING BUT LEGITIMATE DEMANDS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.
A more radical position set up by NGOs makes the until then most extreme demands of developing countries look more reasonable/ moderat.
Therefore NGOs should be more radical in their demands to achieve climate justice.
A.4.9 Storylines und Syllogismen »Greenpeace International«

**Story 1: »Greenpeace als political pressure group«**  
\[ = \text{im Transkript Zeile 14 bis 17} \]  
**Storyline:** Als political pressure group übt Greenpeace Druck für den Einsatz von Umweltschutztechnologien, für Umweltschutz und Klimaschutz aus.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:  
- Political pressure groups üben Druck für ein bestimmtes Thema aus.  
- Greenpeace übt Druck für den Einsatz von Umweltschutztechnologien, für Umweltschutz und Klimaschutz aus.  
- Deshalb ist Greenpeace eine political pressure group.

**Story 2: »politischer Erfolg ist oft kein mediäler Höhepunkt«**  
\[ = \text{im Transkript Zeile 18 bis 39} \]  
**Storyline:** Greenpeace organisiert Protestaktionen (gegen Kohle oder die Brent Spar). Diese sind mediale Höhepunkte. Politischer Erfolg hingegen, ist oft kein mediäler Höhepunkt. Er zeigt sich in Gesetzesmaßnahmen oder der Schaffung gesellschaftlicher Rahmenbedingungen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:  
- Protestaktionen sind mediale Höhepunkte.  
- Greenpeace organisiert Protestaktionen (gegen Kohle oder die Brent Spar).  
- Deshalb hat Greenpeace mediale Höhepunkte.  

- Politischer Erfolg zeigt sich in Gesetzesmaßnahmen oder der Schaffung gesellschaftlicher Rahmenbedingungen.  
- Gesetzesmaßnahmen oder die Schaffung gesellschaftlicher Rahmenbedingungen sind oft keine medialen Höhepunkte.  
- Deshalb ist politischer Erfolg oft kein mediäler Höhepunkt.

**Story 3: »Greenpeace ist nicht mehr erforderlich, wenn...«**  
\[ = \text{im Transkript Zeile 40 bis 48} \]  
**Storyline:** Greenpeace braucht es nicht mehr, wenn sein Ziel erreicht ist. Das Ziel von Greenpeace ist es die Umwelt zu retten. In den Klimaverhandlungen ist es das Ziel von Greenpeace, bis Mitte des Jahrhunderts eine Gesellschaft zu schaffen, die kein CO2 mehr aus stößt und die damit klimaverträglich.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:  
- GREENPEACE BRAUCHT ES NICHT MEHR, WENN SEIN ZIEL ERREICHT IST.  
- DAS ZIEL VON GREENPEACE IST ES DIE UMWELT ZU RETTEN.  
- Deshalb braucht es Greenpeace nicht mehr, wenn die Umwelt gerettet ist.
GREENPEACE BRAUCHT ES NICHT MEHR, WENN SEIN ZIEL ERREICHT IST.
In den Klimaverhandlungen ist es das Ziel von Greenpeace, bis Mitte des Jahrhunderts eine Gesellschaft zu schaffen, die kein CO2 mehr aus stößt/ die klimaverträglich ist (Treibhausgasreduktion bis zum Jahr 2050 auf nahe Null).
Deshalb braucht es Greenpeace in den Klimaverhandlungen nicht mehr, wenn die Treibhausgasreduktion bis zum Jahr 2050 auf nahe Null gesenkt ist.

Story 4: »Klimawandel als Gerechtigkeitsproblem«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 66 bis 78 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Story 5: »real solutions«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 79 bis 88 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
LÖSUNGEN DES KLIMAWANDELS MÜSSEN DIE GRUNDPROBLEME ANGEHEN.
GRUNDPROBLEME DES KLIMAWANDELS IST DIE ART DER ENERGIENUTZUNG UND DIE RESSOURCENVERSCHWENDUNG.
Deshalb müssen Lösungen des Klimawandels die Art der Energienutzung und die Ressourcenverschwendung angehen.

Story 6: »false solutions«

Storyline: False solutions sind Ansätze die das Problem nicht an der Wurzel anpacken bzw. ein Risiko mit einem anderen Risiko aufwiegen. Zu diesen Ansätzen zählen CCS Technologie, Nukleartechnologie und all die Geotechnologien die versuchen Wetter über Geoingeneering zu beeinflussen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

False solutions packen das Problem nicht an der Wurzel an. CCS Technologie packt das Problem nicht an der Wurzel an. Deshalb ist CCS Technologie eine false solution.


Story 7: »Verständnis von Klimagerechtigkeit«


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Klimagerechtigkeit heist jeder Mensch hat die gleichen Pflichten zur Begrenzung von Emissionen. Gleiche Pflichten zur Begrenzung von Emissionen jedes Menschen heist, dass jeder Mensch eine begrenzte CO2 Menge emittieren darf (etwa eine Tonne pro Person). Deshalb heist Klimagerechtigkeit, dass jeder Mensch eine begrenzte CO2 Menge emittieren darf (etwa eine Tonne pro Person).


Story 8: »Greenwashing droht«

[ = im Transskript Zeile 116 bis 132 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Kopenhagen könnte Greenwashing sein. Greenwashing ist es, wenn sich nicht auf das bekannte Ziel verschrieben wird die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren. Deshalb könnte sich in Kopenhagen nicht auf das bekannte Ziel verschrieben werden, die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren.

Die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren ist laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig. Die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren ist technisch möglich. Deshalb ist das, was laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig ist technisch möglich.

Die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren ist laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig. Um das umzusetzen was laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig ist müssen die Industriestaaten drastische Treibhausgasreduktionen anbieten. Deshalb müssen die Industriestaaten drastische Treibhausgasreduktionen anbieten um die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren.
Die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren ist technisch möglich und laut Wissenschaft ist es klimapolitisch notwendig. Der politische Wille fehlt, die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren. Deshalb fehlt der politische Will dafür das umzusetzen, was technisch möglich ist und laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig.


Story 9: »der Einbezug von Staatschefs als Erfordernis für Erfolg«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 133 bis 143 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Story 10: »ein faires, ambitioniertes und rechtlich verbindliches Klimaabkommen«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 144 bis 149 ]

Storyline: Greenpeace möchte ein faires, ambitioniertes und rechtlich verbindliches Klimaabkommen erreichen.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Ein Klimaabkommen sollte fair sein. Bezüglich ’fair’ spielt Klimagerechtigkeit eine Rolle. Deshalb spielt bei einem Klimaabkommen Klimagerechtigkeit eine Rolle.

**Story 11: »Einbezug der armen und betroffenen Menschen notwendig«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 150 bis 160 ]

**Storyline:** Für eine Lösung des Klimaproblems sollten die Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen, die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel auf internationalen Verhandlungen gehört werden.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**Die Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen, die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel sollten für eine Lösung des Klimaproblems gehört werden.**

**Auf internationalen Verhandlungen wird die Lösung des Klimaproblems verhandelt.**

Deshalb sollten die Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen, die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel auf internationalen Verhandlungen gehört werden.

**Die Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen, die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel werden für eine Lösung des Klimaproblems (zu) wenig gehört.**

**Auf internationalen Verhandlungen wird die Lösung des Klimaproblems verhandelt.**

Deshalb werden die Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen, die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel auf internationalen Verhandlungen (zu) wenig gehört.

**Story 12: »UN als offener Raum für Diskussionen«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 161 bis 172 ]

**Storyline:** Die Industrielobby hat Eigeninteressen. Es ist diskussionswürdig, ob Eigeninteressen zu einer Teilnahme an UN Konferenzen berechtigen sollte. Das Grundprinzip der UN ist, dass alle miteinander reden. **Die Präsenz der Industrielobby ist Ausdruck dessen.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Das Grundprinzip der UN ist, dass alle miteinander reden. Die Präsenz der Industrilobby ist Ausdruck dessen, dass alle miteinander reden. Deshalb gehört es zum Grundprinzip der UN, dass die Industrilobby anwesend ist.

**Story 13: »UN als Forum von Verhandlungen«**

*Storyline: Unter dem Dach der UN hat jeder Staat Rederecht und die Ärmsten der Armen können ihre Stimme erheben. Deshalb sollten Verhandlungen dort stattfinden. Unter dem Dach der UN spielen jedoch bestimmte Staaten (bspw. die USA) und die großen Emittenten eine dominierende Rolle, weshalb dort eine faire Verhandlung erschwert wird.*

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Verhandlungen sollten dort stattfinden, wo jeder Staat Rederecht hat und die Ärmsten der Armen ihre Stimme erheben können.

Unter dem Dach der UN hat jeder Staat Rederecht und die Ärmsten der Armen können ihre Stimme erheben. Deshalb sollten Verhandlungen unter dem Dach der UN stattfinden.

Unter dem Dach der UN spielen bestimmte Staaten (bspw. die USA) und die großen Emittenten eine dominierende Rolle. Eine faire Verhandlung wird erschwert, wenn bestimmte Staaten (bspw. die USA) und große Emittenten eine dominierende Rolle spielen. Deshalb wird unter dem Dach der UN eine faire Verhandlung erschwert.

**Story 14: »Lobbying und Aktivismus sind notwendig«**


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**Greenpeace ist Teil der Klimabewegung.**


**Story 15: »Greenpeace auf gewaltfreie Aktionen fokussiert«**


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Gesellschaftlicher Protest gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen ist notwendig.
- Greenpeace beteiligt sich an gesellschaftlichem Protest gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen.
- Deshalb ist Greenpeace Teil des gesellschaftlichen Protests.

- Greenpeace ist auf gewaltfreie Aktionen fokussiert.
- Greenpeace beteiligt sich an gesellschaftlichem Protest gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen.
- Deshalb ist der Protest gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen auf gewaltfreie Aktionen fokussiert.

**Story 16: »Vorbereitung auf die Konferenzen ist notwendig«**


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Die Vorbereitung auf Kopenhagen bedurfte dem Besuch der Vorkonferenzen mit einer Delegation.
- Greenpeace hat sich auf Kopenhagen vorbereitet.
- Deshalb hat Greenpeace mit einer Delegation die Vorkonferenzen besucht.

- Die Vorbereitung auf Kopenhagen bedurfte der inhaltlichen Abstimmung.
- Greenpeace hat sich auf Kopenhagen vorbereitet.
- Deshalb hat Greenpeace sich inhaltlich abgestimmt.
Um bestimmte Aktionen machen zu können bzw. schnell reagieren zu können, ist eine internationale Abstimmung notwendig. Greenpeace hat sich international abgestimmt. Deshalb ist Greenpeace in der Lage bestimmte Aktionen zu machen und schnell reagieren zu können.

Story 17: »die Gerechtigkeitsfrage muss thematisiert werden«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 252 bis 279 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Greenpeace fokussierte auf technische Konzepte (mit Studien zu technischen Fragen wie der Revolution des Energiesystems von Fossilen hin zu Erneuerbaren).

Die Fokussierung auf technische Konzepte vernachlässigt das Gerechtigkeitsthema.

Deshalb vernachlässigte Greenpeace das Gerechtigkeitsthema.

**Um den berechtigten Anspruch nach Gerechtigkeit umzusetzen, muss Greenpeace auf die Gerechtigkeitsfrage stärker eingehen.**

Mit einer Studie zu Klimaflüchtlingen geht Greenpeace auf die Gerechtigkeitsfrage ein.

**Deshalb leistet Greenpeace mit einer Studie zu Klimaflüchtlingen einen Beitrag um den berechtigten Anspruch nach Gerechtigkeit umzusetzen.**

Gerechtigkeit ist eine berechtigter Anspruch.

Die Climate Justice Now Bewegung (CJN!, CJA, FoE) beansprucht Gerechtigkeit.

Deshalb erhebt die Climate Justice Now Bewegung einen berechtigten Anspruch.

Story 18: Wachstumskritik implizit in den Verhandlungen«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 280 bis 296 ]

**Storyline:** In den Verhandlungen geht es um den notwendigen Reduktionspfad von CO2. Wachstum ist mit diesem unvereinbar. Damit wird in den Verhandlungen die Notwendigkeit eines Stopps des Wirtschaftswachstums implizit thematisiert.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

In den Verhandlungen geht es um den notwendigen Reduktionspfad von CO2.

Der notwendige Reduktionspfad von CO2 ist unvereinbar mit einem ressourcen-verschwenderischen Lebensstil und (Wirtschafts-)Wachstum.

Deshalb geht es in den Verhandlungen um etwas das unvereinbar ist mit einem ressourcen-verschwenderischen Lebensstil und (Wirtschafts-)Wachstum.
Viele Industriegesellschaften fordern Wachstum. Wachstum ist unvereinbar mit dem notwendigen Reduktionspfad von CO2. Deshalb ist das, was viele Industriegesellschaften fordern, unvereinbar mit dem notwendigen Reduktionspfad von CO2.


**Story 19: »Orte des Protests der Forderungen von Greenpeace«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 313 bis 320 ]

**Storyline:** Greenpeace protestiert und stellt seine Forderungen bei den Klimaverhandlungen bzw. an den Quellen der Verursacher (bspw. Kohlekraftwerke).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Greenpeace protestiert und stellt seine Forderungen an wichtigen Orten.
Die Klimaverhandlungen bzw. die Quellen der Verursacher (bspw. Kohlekraftwerke) sind wichtige Orte.

**Story 20: »Unabhängigkeit von Politik und Industrie«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 334 bis 347 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Kein Geld von der Politik oder der Industrie anzunehmen heisst Unabhängigkeit zu bewahren.
Deshalb bewahrt das Kernprinzip von Greenpeace dessen Unabhängigkeit.

Greenpeace nimmt kein Geld von der Politik oder der Industrie an.
Viele andere NGOs nehmen Geld von der Politik oder der Industrie an.
Deshalb unterscheidet sich Greenpeace von vielen anderen NGOs.
Die Autonomen fordern im Kontext der Klimaverhandlungen "ein ganz anderes Klima".

Die Forderung im Kontext der Klimaverhandlungen nach einem "ganz anderen Klima" ist die Forderung nach einem anderen Gesellschaftssystem.

Deshalb fordern die Autonomen ein ganz anderes Gesellschaftssystem.

Die Klimaverhandlungen beschränken sich auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen. Mit der Reduktion von Treibhausgasen werden nicht alle Probleme der Welt gelöst. Deshalb werden die Klimaverhandlungen nicht alle Probleme der Welt lösen.

Die Klimaverhandlungen beschränken sich auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen. Mit der Reduktion von Treibhausgasen wird nicht das Gesellschaftssystem geändert. Deshalb werden die Klimaverhandlungen nicht das Gesellschaftssystem ändern.


Die Klimaverhandlungen beschränken sich auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen.
ÜBER DIE REDUKTION VON TREIBHAUSGASEN SOLLTEN ALLE 192 STAATEN DER WELT MITEINANDER VERHANDELN.

Die UN sind das Gremium in dem alle 192 Staaten der Welt vertreten sind. Deshalb sollten die UN das Gremium sein/ die UN ist legitimiert, in dem über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen verhandelt wird.

ÜBER DIE REDUKTION VON TREIBHAUSGASEN SOLLTEN ALLE 192 STAATEN DER WELT MITEINANDER VERHANDELN.

Die G8 oder die G20 sind keine Gremien in denen alle 192 Staaten der Welt vertreten sind. Deshalb sollten die G8 oder die G20 nicht die Gremien sein (sind nicht legitimiert), in dem über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen verhandelt wird.

Eine Debatte über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen muss auf sachlich fundierter Basis stattfinden. Der IPCC bietet eine sachlich fundierte Basis. Deshalb kann eine Debatte über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen auf Grundlage des IPCC stattfinden.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

ÜBER DIE REDUKTION VON TREIBHAUSGASEN SOLLTEN ALLE 192 STAATEN DER WELT MITEINANDER VERHANDELN.

Die UN sind das Gremium in dem alle 192 Staaten der Welt vertreten sind. Deshalb sollten die UN das Gremium sein/ die UN ist legitimiert, in dem über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen verhandelt wird.

ÜBER DIE REDUKTION VON TREIBHAUSGASEN SOLLTEN ALLE 192 STAATEN DER WELT MITEINANDER VERHANDELN.

Die G8 oder die G20 sind keine Gremien in denen alle 192 Staaten der Welt vertreten sind. Deshalb sollten die G8 oder die G20 nicht die Gremien sein (sind nicht legitimiert), in dem über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen verhandelt wird.

Eine Debatte über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen muss auf sachlich fundierter Basis stattfinden. Der IPCC bietet eine sachlich fundierte Basis. Deshalb kann eine Debatte über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen auf Grundlage des IPCC stattfinden.
A.4.10 Storylines und Syllogismen »GROOTS – Grassroots Organisations Operating Together in Sisterhood«

**Story 1: »GROOTS at the periphery, the grassroots groups at the center«**

*Storyline:* This is a story about the impetus of GROOTS. There has been a absence of grassroots women representing themselves and their interests in (local, national and international) decision-making processes. GROOTS is trying to remove this absence with opening up space and opportunities for grassroots women in decision-making processes.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

* THERE HAS BEEN A ABSENCE OF GRASSROOTS WOMEN WHO REPRESENT THEMSELVES AND THEIR OWN INTERESTS IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES.
* GROOTS is opening up space and opportunities for grassroots women to represent themselves and their own interests in decision-making processes.
* THEREFORE WITH GROOTS THERE IS NO ABSENCE OF GRASSROOTS WOMEN REPRESENTING THEMSELVES AND THEIR OWN INTEREST IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES ANYMORE.

**Story 2: »Effective policies and programs only with grassroots' solutions and practices«**

*Storyline:* This is a story about how the process of decision-making should look like. The process of decision-making has to include the people who are victims of climate change and disaster. Basically women and poor people are constituting this group. Those people are already using solutions and practices which the process has to draw on. Only with drawing on them policies and programs at the national, global or regional level will be effective. As the narrator is not counting on the official process (the national governments) to involve the affected people in the process other, like GROOTS, have to do so.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

* People who are victims of disaster or climate change have to be brought into the decision-making process.
* Women and poor people are basically victims of climate change and victims of disaster.
* Therefore Women and poor people have to be brought into the decision-making process.

* Policies and programs (at the national, global or regional level) will be effective (for poor peoples' groups) if the real solutions and practices will be advocated.
* Organised grassroots groups have the real solutions and practices.
* Therefore policies and programs will be effective if the solutions and practices of organised grassroots groups are advocated.
VICTIMS OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND VICTIMS OF DISASTER MUSTN’T BE MARGINALISED FROM DECISION-MAKING.
Women are basically victims of climate change and victims of disaster. Therefore women mustn’t be marginalised from decision-making.

THE RIGHT PROCESS IS ONE WHERE (AFFECTED) LOCAL PEOPLE ARE BE INVOLVED IN. National governments will not involve (affected) local people at any special time. Therefore you shouldn’t count on national governments to realise the right process.

THE RIGHT PROCESS IS ONE WHERE LARGE POOR PEOPLES' CONSTITUENCIES (AND THEIR SOLUTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS) HAVE A VISIBILITY. GROOTS is creating visibility for large poor peoples' constituencies. Therefore GROOTS is promoting the right process.

Story 3: »Climate change politics as an opportunity to guide development«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 110 bis 179 ]
Storyline: This is a story about climate change politics as an opportunity to guide development processes in the sense of poor constituency groups. Policies and programs have to deal with the needs of people at the grassroots level. Those people are in need of development. To achieve the needs of the people at the grassroots level those people need the opportunity to impact what happens in terms of policy formulations. GROOTS wants provide this opportunity. As it has been active in work on resilience it could use its experience to the very similar work on the topic of adaption.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylllogismen:

POLICIES AND PROGRAMS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE, DISASTER OR OTHER TOPICS HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE AT THE GRASSROOTS LEVEL. People at the grassroots level care about development (about food security, livelihoods, water housing, governance). Therefore policies and programs about climate change, disaster or others have to deal with development.

GROOTS WANTS GUIDE DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES (WANTS TO ACHIEVE THAT WOMEN ARE INVOLVED IN SHAPING DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AND COULD MAKE DEVELOPMENT WORK FOR THEMSELVES). Working on the topic of climate change is an opportunity to guide development processes. Therefore GROOTS is working on the topic of climate change.

For GROOTS work on resilience means giving constituency-based groups the opportunity to impact what happens in terms of policy formulations. Work on resilience is not very different from work on adaption. Therefore work on adaption also means giving constituency-based groups the opportunity to impact what happens in terms of policy formulations.
Groups that do not have a lot of access to energy and are not creating a lot of emissions are not central regarding mitigation. Constituency-based groups are groups which do not have a lot of access to energy and are not creating a lot of emissions. Therefore the constituency-based groups are not central regarding mitigation.

Story 4: »Macro climate business VS. effective programming on the ground«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 185 bis 225 ]

Storyline: The climate talks as well as the agreements are more general wording on the macro level. What is needed is a benefit for poor people on the ground achieved with effective programming. So far there has been no such a benefit. The climate talks and agreements have been more about big business which up to now has shown no benefit.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllisismen:

The climate talks are about big business (carbon trading, CDM). Big business (CDM) so far has not been a benefit for poor people. The climate talks so far have not been a benefit for poor people.

The agreements of the climate negotiations are general wording on the macro level. General wording on the macro level is not equal to effective programming on the ground. Therefore the agreements of the climate negotiations are not equal to effective programming on the ground.

Story 5: »The current climate change politics disempowers poor people«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 228 bis 268 ]

Storyline: To empower poor people they need to be seen as serious stakeholders in the process. The current climate change politics focusses on the old paradigm of development. This old paradigm means rich countries are making money at the cost of poor countries. Carbon trading or technology transfer are examples for this kind of politics. The old paradigm of development in this sense does not see poor people as serious stakeholders. To empower poor people therefore one has to change the old paradigm of development - a demand which the environmental movement has been articulating for many years.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllisismen:

The center piece of the climate change agreement is the focus on the old paradigm of development. The old paradigm of development is the rich countries selling something to the poor countries. Therefore center piece of the climate change agreement is the rich countries selling something to the poor countries.
To empower poor people they need to be seen as serious stakeholders in the process.

Seeing poor people as serious stakeholders in the process means changing the paradigm of development.

Therefore to empower poor people means changing the paradigm of development.

The old paradigm of development is the rich countries selling something to the poor countries.

With the offsetting process or technology transfer rich countries are selling something to poor countries.

Therefore the offsetting process or technology transfer is an expression of the old paradigm of development.

Mitigation means taking into consideration carbon neutral processes and reduce emissions.

The environmental people are demanding a consideration of carbon neutral processes and reduction of emissions for years.

Therefore what mitigation means the environmental people are demanding for years.

---

**Story 6: »Action for one's rights, not waiting for the bestower«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 269 bis 289 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the necessity not to wait for a bestower of rights but to act for oneself. The narrator is understanding Climate Justice as an aim for programs and policies for poor people. As it is a term originating from rights-based language, it reflecting a perspective of a claimant and a bestower of rights. Therefore one should not use the term Climate Justice, e.g. one, like GROOTS, is believing in the value of the own action for an advancement of one’s rights.

---

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**The rights-based language aims at programs and policies working for poor people.**

Climate Justice comes from rights-based language.

Therefore Climate Justice aims at programs and policies working for poor people.

**The term Climate Justice comes from rights-based language.**

Rights-based language is a perspective in which somebody is the entitled/ the claimant and somebody is the bestower.

Therefore the term Climate Justice comes from a perspective in which somebody is the entitled/ the claimant and somebody is the bestower.

**Using the term Climate Justice means waiting for the bestower of rights and not doing everything you can do yourself.**

GROOTS is not waiting for the bestower of rights but doing everything they can do themselves.

Therefore GROOTS is not using the term Climate Justice.
Story 7: »Grassroots will get eaten up if they try to take on government«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 328 bis 380 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the role of adversarial politics. Although adversarial politics like protests and demonstration could get the attention of common people, show that people care about the issue of climate change or get media attention, if the protests are smart, it is problematic. As it is all about changing the government to advance things protests is not the effective form of politics for poor peoples' groups. Protests are aiming to take on the power/ the government. Only professional groups could be able to take on the power/ the government. Poor peoples' groups are not. Instead, they are able to collaborate with the people in power to advance things.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Protest activity is getting the attention of common people. There are protest activities about the issue of climate change. Therefore the issue of climate change is getting attention of common people.

Organising protest is something for people living at one place. The members of GROOTS are not living at Copenhagen. Therefore GROOTS is not organising protest

Many protests and demonstrations are showing that people care about one issue. There are many protests and demonstrations about the issue of climate change. Therefore people care about the issue of climate change.

The media is looking for something that's visually stimulating. Smart protests are visually stimulating. Therefore smart protests will get media attention.

Adversarial politics aims at taking on the power/ government. Poor peoples' groups/ grassroots groups can not take on the power/ government. Therefore poor peoples' groups/ grassroots groups should not pursue an adversarial politics.

Changing governments is essential to advance things. Power/ governments could be changed with collaboration of poor peoples groups/ grassroots groups or adversarial politics of professional groups. Therefore collaboration of poor peoples groups/ grassroots groups or adversarial politics of professional groups is essential to advance things.

Protests are a kind of adversarial politics. All kind of adversarial politics are problematic. Therefore protests are problematic.

Adversarial politics aims at taking on the power/ government. Professional groups could take on the power/ government. Therefore professional groups could pursue an adversarial politics.
INJUSTICES WILL NOT BE SOLVED WITH ANY KIND OF VIOLENCE.
The negotiation process is characterised by lots of injustices. Therefore any kind of violence will not be a solution of the negotiation process.

Violence will cause negative effects (more security loads at the conferences/ policing/ an adverse response (a kind of boomerangs on civil society)/ a barrier between the governments).
NEGATIVE EFFECTS ARE NO GOOD IDEA.
Violence is no good idea.

GROOTS is trying to come to an agreement at COP15.
Violence will not lead to an agreement.
THEREFORE GROOTS DEFEATS VIOLENCE.
A.4.11 Storylines und Syllogismen »Hopenhagen«

Story 1: »Renewing of climate politics needs demand for it«

*Storyline:* For a renewing of climate politics it is important that the world constituency/affected people demand it. A precondition for such a demand is awareness about climate change and the UN’s role in climate politics. The advertising community is able to raise such awareness. 'Ogilvy Sustainability Marketing Practices' is able to create a strategy for an awareness raising campaign, as the UN itself is lacking of any leadership.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Copenhagen conference is incredibly important for renewing of climate politics.
  - The awareness of the affected people/world constituency about Copenhagen conference is important for the success of the Copenhagen conference.
  - The awareness of the affected people/world constituency about Copenhagen conference is important for the renewing of climate politics.

  - The UN needs leadership to create a strategy for awareness raising about climate change and the UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it.
  - Ogilvy Sustainability Marketing Practices is able to take leadership.
  - Therefore Ogilvy Sustainability Marketing Practices is able to create a strategy for awareness raising about climate change and the UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it.

  - The UN needs leadership to create a strategy for awareness raising about climate change and the UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it.
  - There is absence of any leadership in the UN organisation.
  - Therefore the UN is not able to create a strategy for awareness raising about climate change and the UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it.

  - Awareness for climate change and UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it is the base for demand for renewed climate politics.
  - Demand for renewed climate politics is necessary for a renewing of climate politics.
  - Therefore building awareness for climate change and the UN’s role in creating the international standards and frameworks for combating it is necessary for a renewing of climate politics.
Story 2: »Climate politics needs to be relevant and inspiring«

[= im Transkript Zeile 41 bis 77 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the preconditions to achieve an agreement at COP15: An agreement could only be achieved, if the people of the world demand for it. To demand it means to be aware of it. Awareness of people is achieved by showing relevance as well as inspiration. Climate change and solutions to climate change could be made relevant to the people by linking it to their first priority: the economy. Making it inspiring means giving hope. The Hopenhagen campaign’s strategy is based on these insights and therefore is a contribution to successful climate politics.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The demand of people of the world is necessary for an agreement at COP15
The people of the world’s awareness about COP15 is necessary for the people of the world’s demand for an agreement.
**Therefore the people of the world’s awareness about COP15 is necessary for an agreement at COP15**

The people of the world’s awareness about COP15 is necessary for the people of the world’s demand for an agreement.
The relevance of COP15 to people of the world is necessary for an awareness of the people of the world about COP15.
**Therefore the relevance of COP15 to people of the world is necessary for the people of the world’s demand for an agreement.**

The people of the world would not demand for an agreement at COP15 unless it would be made relevant to them.
Hopenhagen makes COP15 relevant to the people of the world.
**Therefore the people of the world would demand for an agreement at COP15.**

The relevance of climate change to people is about personal priorities.
The first priority for people (amidst international economic crisis) is economy.
Therefore to make climate change and solutions to climate change relevant to people is about making a link to the economy (solutions to economic crisis)

People would engage in something if it inspires their hope.
Current dealing with climate change and solutions to climate change is not inspiring hope.
**Therefore people are not engaged in climate change and solutions to climate change.**

A precondition for successful climate politics is that climate change and solutions to climate change are made relevant and inspiring to the people of the world.
The Hopenhagen campaign’s strategy highlights relevance and gives inspiration.
**Therefore the Hopenhagen campaign is a contribution to successful climate politics.**

Story 3: »The tide that lifts all boats/ green economy«
THE JOB OF THE HOPENHAGEN CAMPAIGN IS TO ADVOCATE A GREEN ECONOMY.
TO ACHIEVE A GREEN ECONOMY WE ARE IN NEED OF AN UNIVERSAL DEMAND (OF THE
WORLD CITIZENS).
Therefore the Hopenhagen campaign will have done it's job when
there is universal demand for an international shift towards a
green economy.

A transition to a green economy is solving all problems (is the
tide that lifts all boats).
We are in need of solutions to climate change as well as to
economic crisis.
A transition to a green economy will solve climate change and
economic crisis.

For achieving a green economy we are in need of a shift.
The united nations will not be the nexus/ leader of that shift.
Therefore we won't achieve a green economy with the united
nations as the nexus/ the leader.

INDUSTRIALISATION AND PERVERSIVE MATERIALISM IN THE DEVELOPED
WORLD CAUSE THE RISE OF GHG EMISSIONS.
The rise of ghg emissions cause things as rising sea levels.
Therefore industrialisation and pervasive materialism cause things as rising
sea levels.

The US are heavily dependent on national coal reserves.
Those ressources will run out.
Therefore the US will loose its energy independence.

SUSTAINED ECONOMIC GROWTH IS BASED ON THE SUPPLY OF RESSOURCES.
If not shifting to renewable ressources, we're going to run out
of ressources.
Therefore to safeguard economic growth we have to shift away
from using these non-renewable ressources.
AN UMBRELLA CONCEPT IS STANDING FOR AT LEAST TWO SEPARATE IDEAS. Global warming is standing for destructive natural phenomenons as well as for a disruption of economic growth. Therefore global warming is sort of an umbrella concept.

**Story 5: »It’s going to be companies not countries«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 156 bis 169 ]

**Storyline:**
This is a story about how to achieve a carbon neutral economy. The narrator mentions that the right solutions won’t come as a mandate from intergovernmentality. Instead it will be free competition between companies which will create innovation and will solve climate change without hurting productivity.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Countries will not create innovation.
Innovation will allow us to achieve a carbon neutral economy.
Therefore, countries will not allow us to achieve a carbon neutral economy.

The right solutions to climate change can not come as a mandate from any intergovernmental body.
Market forces are not mandated.
Therefore, solutions to climate change can come from market forces.

The right solutions to climate change can not come as a mandate from any intergovernmental body.
The rules of the United Nations are like a mandate.
Therefore the right solutions to climate change will not come from the United Nations.

Free competition capitalises on the growth opportunities. Capitalising on the growth opportunities means finding solutions to global warming and limiting greenhouse gases without hurting productivity.
Therefore, free competition means finding solutions to global warming and limiting greenhouse gases without hurting productivity.

Companies will create innovation.
Innovation will allow us to achieve a carbon neutral economy.
Therefore, companies will allow us to achieve a carbon neutral economy.

**Story 6: »Solutions to climate change will come from business innovation«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 170 bis 185 ]

**Storyline:** The green economy driven by business innovations will solve climate change. That’s why companies should be brought into force - like the Hopenhagen campaign is doing - rather than being alienated.
Companies are creating the solutions that will drive the green economy.
A transition to renewable based industry is a solution that will drive the green economy.
**THEREFORE COMPANIES ARE CREATING A TRANSITION TO RENEWABLE BASED INDUSTRY.**

Other E-NGOs and other climate justice based groups are alienating the corporate community.
The Hopenhagen campaign differs from those groups.
**Therefore the Hopenhagen campaign is not alienating the corporate community**

Companies are innovating.
Innovation will drive the green economy.
**Therefore companies are driving the green economy.**

---

**Story 7: »the market's ability to solve climate change«**

[ im Transkript Zeile 188 bis 205 ]

**Storyline:** To achieve a low-carbon economy the money which is available should not be used for preparation to the effects of climate change but for investments in the markets on the forefront of the technology. Mandating, regulating and artificially capping g h g emissions would intervene into the markets ability to continue to function in an optimal level.

---

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The market is able to bare g h g emissions and still continue in an optimal level.

**MANDATING, REGULATING AND ARTIFICIALLY CAPPING G H G EMISSIONS WOULD INTERVENE INTO THE MARKET'S ABILITY.**
**THEREFORE MANDATING, REGULATING AND ARTIFICIALLY CAPPING G H G EMISSIONS WOULD INTERVENE IN THE MARKET’S CONTINUATION IN AN OPTIMAL LEVEL.**

Climate change will be solved with investments in technologies and innovations.
**THE MARKET’S ABILITY TO BARE G H G EMISSIONS AND STILL CONTINUE IN AN OPTIMAL LEVEL WILL BE PROMOTED WITH INVESTMENTS IN TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIONS.**
**THEREFORE PROMOTING THE MARKET’S ABILITY TO BARE G H G EMISSIONS AND STILL CONTINUE IN AN OPTIMAL LEVEL MEANS SOLVING CLIMATE CHANGE.**

Preparing for the effects of climate change is not solving climate change.
A mass wealth re-distribution scheme are apologized payments to developing world’s governments to help them prepare for the effects of climate change.
**Therefore a mass wealth re-distribution scheme would not solve climate change.**

Solving climate change means shifting to a low-carbon/ carbon-neutral economy.
Investments in technologies and innovations will solve climate change.
**Therefore investments in technologies and innovations will prepare us to shift to a low-carbon/ carbon-neutral economy.**
Story 8: »'Climate Justice', a look behind«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 213 bis 245 ]

Storyline: The storyteller summarises the term 'Climate Justice' as a backward oriented concept, which stands for the demand for reparations and shifting around of resources. In contrast to solve climate change it is necessary to accept the status quo and look ahead, i.e. promote the highest innovative potential and technological advance.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The amount of GHGs in the atmosphere is caused by industrialisation.
Industrialisation occurred differently in several countries and economies.
Several countries and economies have a prior role in the amount of GHGs in the atmosphere.

To solve climate change it is necessary to look ahead/ accept the status quo.
Looking ahead/ accepting the status quo means to promote the highest innovative potential and technological advance.
Therefore to solve climate change it is necessary to promote the highest innovative potential and technological advance.

Sticking a morally charged word with a naturalistic term is non sequitur.
The term climate justice is doing it.
Therefore climate justice is non sequitur.

Looking behind/ at prior role of several countries/ economies won’t solve climate change.
Making reparations or shifting around resources is a way of 'looking behind'.
Therefore making reparations or shifting around resources won’t solve climate change.

Looking ahead/ accepting the status quo means determining what will be.
To promote the highest innovative potential and technological advance is a way of determining what will be.
Therefore promoting the highest innovative potential and technological advance means looking ahead/ accepting the status quo.

Story 9: »Hope(hagen) for a new economic model«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 254 bis 280 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the Hopenhagen campaign. As a 'forward looking' campaign it is promoting a transition to a new economic model. If there is universal demand for such a model, leaders will implement it. A transition to a new economic model has nothing to do with reparations or the idea of climate justice as they are backward oriented.
Reproduction der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**CLIMATE JUSTICE IS A BACKWARD ORIENTED IDEA.**
Hopenhagen is a forward looking campaign. Therefore the idea of climate justice does not enter into the paradigm of the Hopenhagen campaign.

To achieve prosperity on as broad a scale as possible, a transition to a new economic model is necessary. A new economic model is based on renewable resources, low-carbon production and new technologies. **THEREFORE TO ACHIEVE PROSPERITY ON AS BROAD A SCALE AS POSSIBLE IS BASED ON RENEWABLE RESOURCES, LOW-CARBON PRODUCTION AND NEW TECHNOLOGIES.**

A transition to a new economic model has nothing to do with the idea of apologising. Apologising presents itself as charity/ reparations. Therefore a transition to a new economic model has nothing to do with charity/ reparations.

People can lead and leaders will follow. **LEADERS WILL IMPLEMENT SOLUTIONS.**
If people demand a green economy/ a low-carbon economy, solutions will be

**Story 10: »Free markets create the solutions to climate change«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 289 bis 340 ]

**Storyline:** COP15 on the one hand stands for the failed idea of an international accord to solve climate change. On the other hand, with its failing it created a 'framework of freedom' for companies to lead innovation. Market will reward companies' innovation which will solve climate change.

Reproduction der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**COP15 stands for the failed idea of an international accord to solve climate change.**
**WITH THE FAILING OF THE IDEA OF AN INTERNATIONAL ACCORD, A 'FRAMEWORK OF FREEDOM' FOR COMPANIES BEING ABLE TO INNOVATE IS CREATED.**
Therefore COP15 stands for the creation of a 'framework of freedom'.

There are market rewards to innovation. **INNOVATIONS WILL SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE.**
Solving climate change will give market rewards.

Companies are leading innovation. **INNOVATIONS WILL SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE.**
Companies will solve climate change.

Companies are leading innovation. **LEADING INNOVATION WILL BE REWARDED BY THE MARKET.**
Companies will be rewarded by the market.
Story 11: »Space race' for best solutions to climate change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 319 bis 330 ]

Storyline:
The absence of the leadership from the UN results in the expansion of the free market's ability to create and innovate. Any regulating agreement would jeopardise this ability.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
The absence of the leadership from the United Nations left the market free.
A FREE MARKET IS INNOVATIVE/ CAN GAIN LEADERSHIP.
Therefore the absence of the leadership from the UN leads to innovation/ leadership of the market.

Free market leads to a 'space race' for the best and quickest solutions.
Any international agreement about limiting, capping and penalising is jeopardising the free market.
Therefore any international agreement about limiting, capping and penalising would jeopardise the 'space race' for the best and quickest solutions.

Story 12: »Hopenhagen succeeded«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 371 bis 398 ]

Storyline: This is a story about why Copenhagen succeeded and other organisations failed regarding their activities at COP15. Hopenhagen's purpose was to raise awareness. Other more metric organisations wanted to dictate an international agreement. As there is no agreement but a raised awareness Copenhagen succeeded and the other organisations failed.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Hopenhagen's purpose was awareness raising that the conference was happening and that solutions are possible.
After COP15 there was much greater awareness that the conference was happening and that solutions are possible.
Therefore Copenhagen succeeded.

Some more metric organisations had the purpose to dictate an international agreement.
COP15's outcome hasn't been an international agreement.
Therefore some more metric organisations failed.
Story 13: »All are equal partners in dialogue«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 402 bis 439 ]

Storyline: This is a story about protest at COP15. For the storyteller the framework the UN set in place is a (inclusive) space for dialogue between equal partners. That’s why protest is discrediting the approach and viewpoints of the protesters. - Although some people got a legitimate anger because they are affected or marginalised in negotiations the most or although the UN didn't manage the organisation of COP15.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

If there is an inclusive space for discussions people should be willing to come to the table as equal partners in dialogue and as contributors to solutions.
At COP15 the UN set an inclusive space for discussions in place.
Therefore at COP15 people should be willing to come to the table as equal partners in dialogue and as contributors to solutions.

Activists of the developing world are most affected by climate change and the most marginalized at negotiations
To be most affected by climate change and the most marginalized at negotiations gives reason to be angry at the climate consequences and the UN framework.
Therefore activists have reason to be angry at the UN framework and climate consequences

If there is an inclusive space for discussions, protest is discrediting activists' approach and viewpoints.
At COP15 the UN set an inclusive space for discussions in place.
Therefore at COP15 protest is discrediting activists' approach and viewpoints.

To make it easy for attendees to take advantage of discussions means that organisers have to be prepared for the number of attendees and the types of attendees who are there.
The UN as organisers of COP15 were unprepared for the number of attendees and the types of attendees who were there.
Therefore the UN didn't make it easy for attendees to take advantage of discussions.

Story 14: »The 'inclusive' and optimistic Hopenhagen campaign«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 443 bis 467 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the character of the Hopenhagen campaign. Because of its open-ended mantel and optimistic point of view about how to solve climate change the Hopenhagen campaign alienated few and brought together many.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

A CAMPAIGN WITH AN OPEN-ENDED MANTEL AND AN OPTIMISTIC POINT OF VIEW ABOUT HOW TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE (TO BELIEVE THAT SOLUTIONS ARE POSSIBLE AND INCREDIBLY BENEFICIAL AND COME WITHOUT A PRICE AND WITHOUT COMPROMISE) CAN BRING TOGETHER SEVERAL ACTORS WITH A WIDE ARRAY OF VIEWPOINTS. The Hopenhagen campaign had an open-ended mantel and an optimistic point of view. Therefore the Hopenhagen campaign could bring together several actors with a wide array of viewpoints.

To be the nexus of a group effort it is necessary not to contradict other environmental organisations/ to be neutral/ not to make strict demands. Hopenhagen didn't contradict other environmental organisations/ was neutral/ never sought to make strict demands. Therefore HOPENHAGEN QUALIFIES ITSELF FOR BEING A NEXUS OF A GROUP EFFORT.

Pursuing one's own proprietary message/ Being competitive is counterproductive to realise the common goal. Some groups are are pursuing their own proprietary message/ are competitive. Therefore SOME GROUPS ARE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE TO REALISE THE COMMON GOAL.

TO GET TO SOLUTIONS (OF CLIMATE CHANGE) A GROUP EFFORT IS NECESSARY. A GROUP EFFORT CAN BE REALISED WITH A NEXUS (LIKE THE HOPENHAGEN CAMPAIGN) OF SEVERAL GROUPS. Therefore a nexus (like the Hopenhagen campaign) of several groups will lead to solutions.
A.4.12 Storylines und Syllogismen »International Youth Climate Movement«

Story 1: »Collusion between fossil fuel industry and government«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 94 bis 152 ]

Storyline: To solve climate change renewable energy sector is in need of subsidies. Because of the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government subsidies are made towards coal, oil and gas. Therefore the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government is suppressing solving climate change.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Subsidies towards the renewable energy sector are not made because the subsidies are made towards coal, oil and nuclear energy.
Subsidies are made towards coal, oil and nuclear energy because of the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government.
Therefore subsidies towards the renewable energy sector are not made because of the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government.

TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE SUBSIDIES TOWARDS THE RENEWABLE ENERGY SECTOR ARE NEEDED.
Subsidies towards the renewable energy sector are not made because the subsidies are made towards coal, oil and nuclear energy.
THEORETICALLY CLIMATE CHANGE IS NOT SOLVED BECAUSE THE SUBSIDIES ARE MADE TOWARDS COAL, OIL AND NUCLEAR ENERGY.

TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE SUBSIDIES TOWARDS THE RENEWABLE ENERGY SECTOR ARE NEEDED.
Subsidies towards the renewable energy sector are not made because of the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government.
THEORETICALLY CLIMATE CHANGE IS NOT SOLVED BECAUSE OF THE POWER AND INFLUENCE OF THE FOSSIL FUEL INDUSTRY ON THE GOVERNMENT.

Story 2: »Solution to Climate Change: Moving towards renewable energy sources«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 128 bis 166 ]

Storyline: The green house gas emissions are at the root of climate change. As they are result of burning fossil fuels, it is necessary to move away from fossil towards renewable energy sources and cut emission immediately. Massive inveesments as well as energy efficiency on national and global level are means to achieve that goal. Carbon offset would not get off fossil fuel and therefore would not be a real solution to climate change.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To get off fossil fuels it is needed to move towards renewable energy sources.

Moving towards renewable energy resources means countries committing to serious energy efficiency (national and global) and massive investments in clean and renewable energies (like solar and wind).

Therefore to get off fossil fuels means countries committing to serious energy efficiency (national and global) and massive investments in clean and renewable energies (like solar and wind).

At the root of climate change are the greenhouse gas emissions.
The greenhouse gas emissions come from burning the fossil fuels.

Therefore burning the fossil fuels is at the root of climate change.

The real solution to climate change would be to get off fossil fuels.

To get off fossil fuels it is needed to move towards renewable energy sources.

Therefore to move towards renewable energy sources is part of the real solution to climate change.

The real solution to climate change would be to get off fossil fuels.

Carbon offset would not be equal getting off fossil fuels.

Therefore carbon offset would not be part of the real solution to climate change.

The real solutions are real equitable and just mechanisms (that keep trees standing, keep the natural carbon sinks that exists in the world standing, treat biodiversity with respecting care).
The way of exploiting natural ressources is not a equitable and just mechanism.

Therefore holding on the way of exploiting natural ressources is not a real solution.

Story 3: »Climate Justice, the meaning of«

[= im Transkript Zeile 167 bis 217 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the meaning of climate justice. Climate Justice is about resolving the unjust happening of climate change and climate change politics. Climate change is happening unjust as the country and peoples that are most impacted by climate change are the people that have done the least to introduce to it. Climate change politics is happening unjust as many of the people that are the most impacted are excluded from talks and decisions about climate change. Therefore Climate Justice means resolving the clash of responsibility opposite to vulnerability and the exclusion of the people suffering the most from the negotiation process.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CLIMATE JUSTICE IS ABOUT MAKING CLIMATE CHANGE AND CLIMATE CHANGE POLITICS HAPPENING IN A JUST WAY.
CLIMATE CHANGE AND CLIMATE CHANGE POLITICS IS HAPPENING UNJUST, AS THERE IS A CLASH OF RESPONSIBILITY OPPOSITE TO VULNERABILITY AND AN EXCLUSION OF THE PEOPLE SUFFERING THE MOST FROM THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS.

Therefore CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS RESOLVING THE CLASH OF RESPONSIBILITY OPPOSITE TO VULNERABILITY AND THE EXCLUSION OF THE PEOPLE SUFFERING THE MOST FROM THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS.

It is not just, if people that didn't do anything to create a problem are suffering the most because of it. The country and peoples that are most impacted by climate change are the people that have done the least to introduce to it. Therefore the way that climate change is happening unjust.

IT IS NOT JUST, THAT PEOPLE THAT ARE THE MOST IMPACTED BECAUSE OF A PROBLEM ARE EXCLUDED FROM TALKS AND DECISIONS ABOUT THIS PROBLEM. Many of the people that are the most impacted are excluded from talks and decisions about climate change. Therefore CLIMATE CHANGE POLITICS IS HAPPENING UNJUST.

CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS RESPECTING THE BASIC RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLE IN THEIR SOVEREIGNTY.
REDD schemes and carbon trading schemes at their very nature are not respecting the basic rights of indigenous people in their sovereignty.

Therefore REDD SCHEMES AND CARBON TRADING SCHEMES ARE NOT ACHIEVING CLIMATE JUSTICE.

It is not just, if poor mostly minority people are being impacted the most.
Within climate change and politics within the US is impacting poor mostly minority people are the most.
Therefore climate change and politics within the US is not just.

Story 4: »The responsible countries need to take leadership«
[ = im Transkripf Zeile 223 bis 253 ]

Storyline: To solve climate change we need to change the highest impacts to climate change which is caused by the countries that are the most responsible. Those countries need to take leadership in the climate change negotiations. That means they first have to take the issues of climate change seriously.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE WE NEED TO CHANGE THE HIGHEST IMPACTS.
The highest impacts are caused by the countries that are responsible the most to climate change.
To solve climate change we are in need of the countries that are responsible the most to climate change.
To solve climate change it is important to take the issues of climate change seriously. Thousands of people at the UN climate negotiations are taking the issues of climate change seriously. Therefore the thousands of people at the UN climate negotiations show a precondition that climate change could be solved.

**Story 5: »The unjust structure of the UN«**

[= im Transskript Zeile 257 bis 283 ]

**Storyline:** The UN's structure is generating an unjust setting at the climate negotiations: Many of the people that are impacted by climate change are not able to be at the climate negotiations or are not able to be a vital part of the conversations and decision making but there is a high influence of corporations and fossil fuel industry on the negotiations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The people that are impacted by climate change should be at the climate negotiations and should be a vital part of the conversations and decision making. The UN's structure is excluding many of the people that are impacted by climate change. Therefore the UN's structure is partly exclusive regarding participation and decision making.

At the Climate negotiations there should not be a collusion of governments and corporations and fossil fuel industry. (vorher im Interview geäußert)

There is a collusion of governments and corporations' and the fossil fuel industry's because of the current influence of corporations and the fossil fuel industry. (vorher im Interview gehäuft)

Therefore at the climate negotiations the corporations and the fossil fuel industry should not have the current influence.

**Story 6: »AVAAZ helping civil society«**

[= im Transskript Zeile 287 bis 297 ]

**Storyline:** Civil society should show a strong force to governments around the world that people want a fair ambitious and obliging treaty. AVAAZ is helping civil society.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Civil society should show a strong force to governments around the world that people want a fair ambitious and obliging treaty. AVAAZ is helping to show a strong force to governments around the world that people want a fair ambitious and obliging treaty. Therefore AVAAZ is helping civil society.
Story 7: »Global and visible power and movement needed«
[= im Transskript Zeile 312 bis 327 ]

Storyline: To solve climate change there needs to be a global and visible power and movement demanding real action from governments. This power and movement could be realised with activities inside and, which is equally important, demonstrations outside the negotiations. But it is not only about what is happening at place at the negotiations but about activities of global civil society. AVAAZ therefore has been active regarding a petition which has been signed by 10 million people.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**ACTIVITIES OF GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY** are more important than what is happening at COP15. 
(For example) AVAAZ getting ten million people signing a petition calling for a binding treaty **IS AN ACTIVITY OF GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY**. 
Therefore more important than what is happening at COP15 is (for example) AVAAZ getting ten million people signing a petition calling for a binding treaty.

**TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE** there needs to be a global and visible power and movement demanding real action from governments. 
A global and visible power and movement demanding real action from governments could be realised with activities inside and (equally important) demonstrations outside the negotiations. 
**THEREFORE TO SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE** activities inside and demonstrations outside the negotiations are needed.

Story 8: »Change means direct action and civil disobedience«
[= im Transskript Zeile 334 bis 344 ]

Storyline: Climate change has a social movement for change to it, as every major issue that is needed to change has. For social movements for change direct action is absolutely necessary and important. Direct action means a strong civil disobedience and non-violent action.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Climate change, like civil right or the women suffragette, is a major issue that is needed to change. 
It is normal, that every major issue that is needed to change has a strong civil disobedience and non-violent direct action movement to it. 
Therefore it is normal that climate change, like civil right or the women suffragette, has a strong civil disobedience and non-violent direct action movement to it.
For social movements for change direct action is absolutely necessary and important. Direct action means a strong civil disobedience and non-violent action. Therefore for social movements for change a strong civil disobedience and non-violent action is absolutely necessary and important.

**Story 9: »Equitable policies relying on the up-to-date science are possible«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 360 bis 373]

*Storyline:* Climate policies need to reflect that we can have policies that are equitable and in-line with what sciences are.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Policies are necessary that reflect the truth. Reflecting the truth means to recognise that we can have policies that are equitable and in-line with what sciences are. Therefore policies are necessary that are equitable and in-line with what sciences are.

**Story 10: »A benign movement isn't a concern of the secret service«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 376 bis 391]

*Storyline:* Movements which have a real impact with direct action could be a concern of the secret service. AVAAZ and the Global Youth Movement do not have this impact with direct action and therefore are not a concern of the secret service.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A movement which has a real impact with direct action (starts shutting down coal plants) could be a concern of the secret service. The Global Youth Movement may arise to a movement which has a real impact with direct action. Therefore the Global Youth Movement may be a concern of the secret service in the future.
A.4.13 Storylines und Syllogismen »Klima-Bündnis«

Story 1: »das Klimabündnis treibt Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene voran«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 19 bis 37 ]

*Storyline:* Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene sind unabhängig von einer höheren Ebene. Das Klimabündnis möchte Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene vorantreiben.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene sind unabhängig von einer höheren Ebene.

Das Klimabündnis möchte Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene vorantreiben.

**Deshalb ist das Klimabündnis unabhängig von höheren Ebenen.**

Das Klimabündnis ist ein Bündnis von Städten die Emissionen reduzieren wollen und indigenen Völker die unterstützt werden Regenwaldzerstörung zu stoppen.

Deshalb ist ein Bündnis von Städten die Emissionen reduzieren wollen und indigenen Völker die unterstützt werden Regenwaldzerstörung zu stoppen unabhängig von höheren Ebenen.

Story 2: »Rolle des Klimabündnisses«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 42 bis 74 ]

*Storyline:* Klimaschutz hat etwas mit den entsprechenden Weichenstellungen auf lokaler Ebene zu tun.


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**KLIMASCHUTZ HAT ETWAS MIT DEN ENTSPRECHENDEN WEICHENSTELLUNGEN AUF LOKALER EBENE ZU TUN.**

Kommunen haben die Entscheidungskraft über entsprechende Weichenstellungen auf lokaler Ebene.

**Deshalb hat Klimaschutz etwas mit Kommunen zu tun.**

**KLIMASCHUTZ HAT ETWAS MIT DEN ENTSPRECHENDEN WEICHENSTELLUNGEN AUF LOKALER EBENE ZU TUN.**

**KLIMASCHUTZ BEFÄHRT EINES BEWUSSTSEINS.**

Deshalb eine entsprechende Weichenstellung auf lokaler Ebene der Bewusstseinsbildung.

Anspruchsvollen Ziele können nur erreicht werden, wenn die richtigen Rahmenbedingungen für Kommunen bereitsgestellt werden.

Handeln auf nationaler und die EU-Ebene resultiert im Bereitstellen von Rahmenbedingungen für Kommunen.

Deshalb können anspruchsvolle Ziele nur erreicht werden, wenn die nationale oder die EU-Ebene richtig handeln.
Seit Al Gores Klimafilm ist ein breiter Wille zum Klimaschutz vorhanden.
Ein breiter Wille zum Klimaschutz resultiert in der Nachfrage nach praktischen Lösungen zum Klimaschutz.
Deshalb resultiert Al Gores Klimafilm in der Nachfrage nach praktischen Lösungen zum Klimaschutz.

Da Klimabündnis bietet praktische Lösungen zum Klimaschutz (Empfehlungen, Leitlinien, Handbücher oder Fortbildungen für Kommunen).
Ein breiter Wille zum Klimaschutz resultiert in der Nachfrage nach praktischen Lösungen zum Klimaschutz.
Deshalb resultiert ein breiter Wille zum Klimaschutz in der Nachfrage nach dem Klimabündnis.

Story 3: »Klimaschutz in Kommunen«

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Klimaschutz bedarf der Reduktion von Treibhausgasen.
Treibhausgase können mit Maßnahmen in Kommunen reduziert werden.
Deshalb können Maßnahmen in Kommunen zum Klimaschutz beitragen.

Treibhausgase können mit Maßnahmen in Kommunen reduziert werden.
Ein Verbot des Baus bestimmter Gebäude bzw. die Pflicht zur Gebäudesanierung sind bestimmte Maßnahmen in kommunen.
Deshalb können Treibhausgase durch ein Verbot des Baus bestimmter Gebäude bzw. die Pflicht zur Gebäudesanierung reduziert werden.

Das Klimabündnis braucht es nicht mehr, wenn die erforderliche Reduktion von Treibhausgasen erreicht ist.
Die erforderliche Reduktion von Treibhausgasen kann dadurch erreicht werden, dass Klimaschutz zur Pflichtaufgabe für Kommunen wird.
Deshalb braucht es das Klimabündnis nicht mehr, wenn Klimaschutz zur Pflichtaufgabe für Kommunen wird.
Story 4: »Regenwaldschutz ist Klimaschutz«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 88 bis 107 ]

Storyline: Um dem Klimawandel zu begegnen benötigt es effektiven Klimaschutz. Dieser erfordert veränderte Rahmenbedingungen auf nationaler und EU-Ebene.


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Um dem Klimawandel zu begegnen benötigt es effektiven Klimaschutz.
Effektiver Klimaschutz der Kommunen erfordert veränderte Rahmenbedingungen auf nationaler und EU-Ebene.
Deshalb benötigt es veränderter Rahmenbedingungen auf nationaler und EU-Ebene um dem Klimawandel zu begegnen.

Regenwaldschutz ist Klimaschutz.
Die Sicherung von Territorien von indigenen Vögern der Regenwälder ist Regenwaldschutz.
Deshalb ist die Sicherung von Territorien von indigenen Vögern der Regenwälder Klimaschutz.

Die Sicherung von Territorien von indigenen Vögern der Regenwälder ist Regenwaldschutz.
Das Klimabündnis unterstützt indigene Völker der Regenwälder bei der Sicherung ihrer Territorien.
Das Klimabündnis unterstützt Regenwaldschutz.

Das Klimabündnis unterstützt Regenwaldschutz.
Regenwaldschutz ist Klimaschutz.
Deshalb unterstützt das Klimabündnis Klimaschutz.

Das Klimabündnis macht Bewusstseinsbildung zu Ölförderung oder Ressourcenförderung.
Ölförderung oder Ressourcenförderung hat Folgen für die indigenen Völker/ zerstört deren Gebiete bzw. ihre Lebensgrundlagen.
Deshalb macht das Klimabündnis Bewusstseinsbildung zu den Folgen für die indigenen Völker/ die Zerstörung deren Gebiete bzw. ihrer Lebensgrundlagen.

Story 5: »den Klimawandel lösen bedeutet die Wirtschaft zu sichern«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 108 bis 136 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Der Klimawandel hat vielfältige Auswirkungen.
Die Zerstörung von sehr vielem (bspw. Lebensräumen von Menschen) in einem extrem kurzen Zeitraum gehört zu den vielfältigen Auswirkungen.
Deshalb hat der Klimawandel zu Zerstörung von sehr vielem (bspw. Lebensräumen von Menschen) in einem extrem kurzen Zeitraum geführt.

**DER KLIWANDEL BRINGT VERSCHIEDENE HERAUSFORDERUNGEN HERVOR.**
Zu den Herausforderungen zählt die Änderung des Wirtschaftens.
Deshalb erfordert der Klimawandel die Änderung des Wirtschaftens.

Die größte Herausforderung des Klimawandels ist die Änderung des Wirtschaftens.
Das Wirtschaften zu verändern bedeutet, eine Art globale Wirtschaft zu schaffen.
Deshalb ist es die größte Herausforderung des Klimawandels, eine Art globale Wirtschaft zu schaffen.

**AUFGRUND DES KLIWANDELS DROHT EINE ERHÖHUNG DER DURCHSCHNITTSTEMPERATUR UM ZWEI GRAD CELSIUS.**
Eine Erhöhung der Durchschnittstemperaturen um zwei Grad ist nichts Positives (Anbau von Wein, etc.).
Deshalb führt der Klimawandel zu nichts Positivem.

**AUFGRUND DES KLIWANDELS DROHT EINE ERHÖHUNG DER DURCHSCHNITTSTEMPERATUR UM ZWEI GRAD CELSIUS.**
Eine Erhöhung der Durchschnittstemperaturen um zwei Grad führt zu dramatischen Änderungen der Lebensumstände für viele Menschen und damit auch Schädigung der Wirtschaft (durch Stürme, Überflutungen, Dürren).
Deshalb führt der Klimawandel zu dramatischen Änderungen der Lebensumstände für viele Menschen und damit auch Schädigung der Wirtschaft (durch Stürme, Überflutungen, Dürren).

**DIE SCHÄDIGUNG DER WIRTSCHAFT MUSS AUFGEHALTEN WERDEN.**
Der Klimawandel führt zur Schädigung der Wirtschaft.
Deshalb muss der Klimawandel aufgehalten werden.

Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien und in Energieunabhängigkeit von fossilen Energiequellen bedeutet die Wirtschaft zu sichern (lokal bis global).
Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien und in Energieunabhängigkeit von fossilen Energiequellen bedeutet den Klimawandel zu stoppen.
Deshalb bedeutet die Wirtschaft zu sichern auch den Klimawandel zu stoppen.

**Story 6: »Mainstreaming des Klimaschutzes«**
[= im Transkrip Zeile 137 bis 149]
**Storyline:** Eine Lösung des Klimawandels ist sofortiges Energiesparen. Sofortiges Energiesparen bedeutet, 'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutz, d.h. Klimaschutz steht an erster Stelle der politischen Agenda wird nicht wegen Finanzmangel wegdiskutiert.
Eine Lösung des Klimawandels ist sofortiges Energiesparen.
Sofortiges Energiesparen bedeutet, 'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutzes.
Deshalb ist es eine Lösung des Klimawandels, 'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutzes.

Eine Lösung des Klimawandels ist ein 'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutzes.
'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutzes bedeutet, Klimaschutz steht an erster Stelle der politischen Agenda wird nichtwegen Finanzmangel wegdiskutiert.
Deshalb ist es eine Lösung des Klimawandels, Klimaschutz an erste Stelle der politischen Agenda zu stellen.

Story 7: »Einbindung des privaten Sektors erforderlich«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 149 bis 159 ]

Storyline: Kommunen und Staaten setzen Maßnahmen um, die sich rechnen. Die ersten Klimaschutzmaßnahmen rechnen sich. Die Umsetzung Klimaschutzmaßnahmen im Anschluss an die ersten Maßnahmen kosten zusätzliches Geld, das erschlossen werden, wenn der private Sektor von Kommunen und Staaten eingebunden wird.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Kommunen und Staaten setzen Maßnahmen um, die sich rechnen.
Die ersten Klimaschutzmaßnahmen rechnen sich.
Kommunen und Staaten setzen erste Klimaschutzmaßnahmen um.

Klimaschutzmaßnahmen im Anschluss an die ersten Maßnahmen kosten zusätzliches Geld.
Kommunen bzw. Staaten haben kein zusätzliches Geld.
Deshalb können Kommunen bzw. Staaten keine Klimaschutzmaßnahmen im Anschluss an die ersten Maßnahmen finanzieren.

Deshalb können Klimaschutzmaßnahmen im Anschluss an die ersten Maßnahmen umgesetzt werden, wenn der private Sektor von Kommunen und Staaten eingebunden wird.

Story 8: »radikaler Wandel erforderlich«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 160 bis 172 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Story 9: »Kompensationsansätze als falsche Lösungsansätze«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 173 bis 186 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Story 10: »verfügbares Geld sinnvoll eingesetzt«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 187 bis 194 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Das verfügbare Geld ist begrenzt. Begrenztes Geld sollte nicht in die falschen Lösungsansätze gesteckt werden. Deshalb sollte das verfügbare Geld nicht in die falschen Lösungsansätze gesteckt werden.

Story 11: »Verständnis von Climate Justice«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 195 bis 208 ]

**Storyline:** Climate Justice bedeutet eine gerechte Regelung des Ressourcenverbrauchs.
Das heißt, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer die zu viel verbrauchen muss begrenzt werden, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer, die noch unter dem Niveau Industrieländer liegen darf sich entwickeln, die Emissionen müssen sich auf lange Sicht auf einem bestimmten klimapolitisch sinnvollen Niveau einpendeln und achtzig Prozent der gegenwärtigen Emissionen müssen reduziert werden.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**CLIMATE JUSTICE BEDEUTET EINE GERECHTE REGELUNG DES RESSOURCENVERBRAUCHS.**
Den Ressourcenverbrauch gerecht regeln heißt, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer die zu viel verbrauchen muss begrenzt werden.
Deshalb heißt Climate Justice, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer die zu viel verbrauchen muss begrenzt werden.

**CLIMATE JUSTICE BEDEUTET EINE GERECHTE REGELUNG DES RESSOURCENVERBRAUCHS.**
Den Ressourcenverbrauch gerecht regeln heißt, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer, die noch unter dem Niveau Industrieländer liegen darf sich entwickeln.
Deshalb heißt Climate Justice, der Ressourcenverbrauch derer die zu viel verbrauchen muss begrenzt werden.

**CLIMATE JUSTICE BEDEUTET EINE GERECHTE REGELUNG DES RESSOURCENVERBRAUCHS.**
Den Ressourcenverbrauch gerecht regeln heißt, die Emissionen müssen sich auf lange Sicht auf einem bestimmten klimapolitisch sinnvollen Niveau einpendeln.
Deshalb heißt Climate Justice, die Emissionen müssen sich auf lange Sicht auf einem bestimmten klimapolitisch sinnvollen Niveau einpendeln.

**CLIMATE JUSTICE BEDEUTET EINE GERECHTE REGELUNG DES RESSOURCENVERBRAUCHS.**
Den Ressourcenverbrauch gerecht regeln heißt, achtzig Prozent der gegenwärtigen Emissionen müssen reduziert werden.
Deshalb heißt Climate Justice, achtzig Prozent der gegenwärtigen Emissionen müssen reduziert werden.

Story 12: »Climate Justice thematisiert negative Auswirkungen des Energiebedarfs«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 209 bis 215 ]

**Storyline:** Der Begriff Climate Justice thematisiert thematisiert die negativen Auswirkungen des Energiebedarfs (die Erdölförderung) (für indigen Völkern). Das Klimabündnis zeigt diese Auswirkungen auf und verwendet deshalb den Begriff.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Der Energiehunger (die Erdölförderung) hat negative Auswirkungen (für indigen Völkern).
Der Begriff Climate Justice thematisiert die negative Auswirkungen (für indigen Völkern).
Deshalb thematisiert der Begriff Climate Justice den Energiehunger.
Das Klimabündnis zeigt die negative Auswirkungen des Energiehungers auf. Der Begriff Climate Justice thematisiert die negative Auswirkungen des Energiehungers. Deshalb verwendet das Klimabündnis den Begriff Climate Justice.

Story 13: »Druck von Außerhalb kann zu Erfolg führen«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 216 bis 230 ]

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Druck von Außerhalb auf die Verhandlungen kann zu einem erfolgreichen Ergebnis der Verhandlungen führen.
In Copenhagen gibt es Druck von Außerhalb auf die Verhandlungen.
Deshalb kann es in Copenhagen zu einem erfolgreichen Ergebnis der Verhandlungen kommen.

Story 14: »Anerkennung der Bedeutung der lokalen Ebene für den Klimaschutz«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 231 bis 262 ]
Storyline: Anspruchsvolle Klimaschutzziele können in den Verhandlungen in Copenhagen vereinbart werden, wenn die lokale Ebene einbezogen wird. Das Klimabündnis macht hierzu Lobbyarbeit, dazu gehört einerseits, dass darauf hingewirkt wird, dass in wichtigen Dokumenten der EU die Bedeutung der lokalen Ebene hervorgehoben wird. Andererseits gehört dazu die Finanzierung und andere Rahmenbedingungen zu klären.
Die internationale Politik muss diese Rahmenbedingungen schaffen. Die Chancen in Copenhagen die lokale Ebene einzubeziehen sind gering, da die Verhandlungen nicht darum gehen, Klimaschutz auf die lokale Ebene herunterzubrechen, obwohl das viele Leute wollen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Anspruchsvolle Klimaschutzziele können in den Verhandlungen in Copenhagen vereinbart werden, wenn die lokale Ebene einbezogen wird.
Die Chancen in Copenhagen die lokale Ebene einzubeziehen sind gering.
Deshalb sind die Chancen anspruchsvolle Klimaschutzziele in den Verhandlungen in Copenhagen zu vereinbaren gering.

Das Klimabündnis macht Lobbyarbeit.
Die Lobbyarbeit weist daraufhin, was Kommunen zu anspruchsvollen Klimaschutzzieilen beitragen können. Deshalb weist das Klimabündnis daraufhin, was Kommunen zu anspruchsvollen Klimaschutzzieilen beitragen können.

Kommunen können Klimaschutzziele umsetzen, wenn die richtigen Rahmenbedingungen herrschen.
Die internationale Politik kann die richtigen Rahmenbedingungen schaffen.
Deshalb kann die internationale Politik dafür sorgen, dass Kommunen Klimaschutzziele umsetzen können.
KLIMASCHUTZ MUSS AUF DIE LOKALE EbENE RUNTERGEBROCHEN WERDEN.
Auf lokaler Ebene besteht die Chance anspruchsvolle Ziele umzusetzen.

DESHALB MUSS KLIMASCHUTZ DIE CHANCE NUTZEN ANSPRUCHVOLLE ZIELE UMZUSETZEN.

Die Verhandlungen gehen nicht darum, Klimaschutz auf die lokale Ebene herunterzubrechen.
Viele Leute wollen, dass Klimaschutz auf die lokale Ebene heruntergebrochen wird.
Deshalb gehen die Verhandlungen nicht um das, was viele Leute wollen.

Ein erster Schritt ist es, dass in wichtigen Dokumenten der EU die Bedeutung der lokalen Ebene hervorgehoben wird.
Die Lobbyarbeit des Klimabündnisses im Vorfeld der Verhandlungen hat dazu geführt, in wichtigen Dokumenten der EU die Bedeutung der lokalen Ebene hervorgehoben wird.
Deshalb war die Lobbyarbeit des Klimabündnisses im Vorfeld der Verhandlungen einen ersten Schritt dargestellt.

Der zweite Schritt ist es die Finanzierung und anderen Rahmenbedingungen zu klären.
Die internationale Politik kann die Finanzierung und anderen Rahmenbedingungen klären.

DESHALB KANN ZIELT DER ZWEITE SCHRITT AUF DIE INTERNATIONALE POLITIK.

Story 15: »Scheitern von Kopenhagen absehbar«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 263 bis 273 ]


Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:


Die Bali Road Map hat festgelegt, dass es in Kopenhagen zu einer Lösung kommen soll. In Kopenhagen ist keine Lösung absehbar. Deshalb ist keine Erfüllung dessen absehbar, was in der Bali Road Map festgelegt wurde.
Story 16: »NGOs vs. Geschäftsinteressen«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 274 bis 298 ]

**Storyline:** Die traditionellen NGOs führen Aktionen durch und erzeugen so Druck, der die Verhandlungen u.U. in die richtige Richtung lenkt. **Andere Gruppen, die private Geschäftsinteressen zu Emissionshandel und CDM verfolgen, sollten nicht in der aktuellen Intensität auf den Klimaverhandlungen präsent sein.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Die traditionellen NGOs führen Aktionen durch.
Aktionen erzeugen Druck.
Deshalb erzeugen traditionelle NGOs Druck.

Traditionelle NGOs erzeugen Druck.
Druck können u.U. die Verhandlungen in die richtige Richtung lenken.
Traditionelle NGOs können u.U. die Verhandlungen in die richtige Richtung lenken.

**PRIVATE GESCHÄFTSINTERESSEN ZU EMISSIONSHANDEL UND CDM SOLLTEN NICHT IN DER AKTUELLEN INTENSITÄT AUF DEN KLINMAVERHANDLUNGEN PRÄSENT SEIN.**

Verschieden Gruppen verfolgen private Geschäftsinteressen zu Emissionshandel und CDM.
Deshalb sollten verschiedene Gruppen nicht in der aktuellen Intensität auf den Klimaverhandlungen präsent sein.

---

Story 17: »es fehlt keiner bei den Verhandlungen«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 299 bis 302 ]

**Storyline:** Auf den Klimaverhandlungen ist eine bunte Mischung von Gruppen und Personen vertreten. Es fehlt keiner.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Auf den Klimaverhandlungen ist eine bunte Mischung von Gruppen und Personen vertreten.
Eine bunte Mischung von Gruppen und Personen heißt, es fehlt keiner.
Deshalb fehlt auf den Klimaverhandlungen keiner.

---

Story 18: »das Klimabündnis motiviert für Verhandlungen auf nationaler bzw. EU-Ebene«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 308 bis 319 ]

**Storyline:** Von einer kleinen Gruppe an Leuten die am Klimaschutz und an Kommunen interessiert sind wird das Klimabündnis als gut wahrgenommen. Dazu zählen einzelne Länderdelegationen, die nach Abschluss der Konferenz auf nationaler bzw. EU Ebene über die Verbesserung von Rahmenbedingungen verhandeln.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Von Leuten die am Klimaschutz und an Kommunen interessiert sind wird das Klimabündnis als gut wahrgenommen.
Die Leute die am Klimaschutz und an Kommunen interessiert sind, sind eine kleine Gruppe.
Deshalb wird das Klimabündnis nur von einer kleinen Gruppe als gut wahrgenommen.

Das Klimabündnis ist motivierend für die/ macht sich bekannt mit denen, die in dem Feld aktiv sind.
EINZELNE LÄNDERDELEGATION SIND IN DEM FELD AKTIV.
Deshalb ist/ macht sich das Klimabündnis für einzelne Länderdelegationen motivierend/ bekannt.

Einzelne Länderdelegationen verhandeln nach Abschluss der Konferenz auf nationaler bzw. EU Ebene über die Verbesserung von Rahmenbedingungen.
Deshalb ist das Klimabündnis für einzelne Länderdelegationen motivierend.
Deshalb macht sich das Klimabündnis für die Verhandlungen nach Abschluss der Konferenz auf nationaler bzw. EU Ebene über die Verbesserung von Rahmenbedingungen motivierend.

Das Klimabündnis ist ein Netzwerk von beigetretenen Kommunen.
Die beigetretenen Kommunen haben sich zu einem konkreten Reduktionsziel von Treibhausgasen verpflichtet.
Deshalb verpflichtet das Klimabündnis zu einem konkreten Reduktionsziel von Treibhausgasen.

Deshalb stellt das Klimabündnis Auskunft über das Erreichen des Reduktionsziels der Kommunen zur Verfügung.

Das Klimabündnis hat ein Benchmarksystem für den kommunalen Klimaschutz gestartet.
Anhand eines Benchmarksystems für den kommunalen Klimaschutz können sich Kommunen praktisch einordnen wie sie mit ihren Maßnahmen im Vergleich zu anderen Kommunen stehen.
Deshalb hat das Klimabündnis damit begonnen, dass sich Kommunen praktisch einordnen wie sie mit ihren Maßnahmen im Vergleich zu anderen Kommunen stehen.
Story 20: »das Klimabündnis bewertet kommunalen Klimaschutz«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 368 bis 373 ]
**Storyline:** Viele Länder suchen nach einer Möglichkeit der Bewertung von kommunalem Klimaschutz. Das Klimabündnis informiert in Kopenhagen über Ergebnisse seiner Arbeit dazu.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Viele Länder suchen nach einer Möglichkeit der Bewertung von kommunalem Klimaschutz.
Das Klimabündnis informiert in Kopenhagen über Ergebnisse der Arbeit zur Bewertung von kommunalem Klimaschutz (CO₂-Bilanzierung und Benchmarking).
Deshalb informiert das Klimabündnis in Kopenhagen über Ergebnisse der Arbeit zu dem, was viele Länder suchen.

Story 21: »das Klimabündnis vernetzt sich in Kopenhagen«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 374 bis 384 ]
**Storyline:** Das Klimabündnis ist hauptsächlich zur Vernetzung und einem Austausch in Kopenhagen und ist keinen Protestaktionen dort angeschlossen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Das Klimabündnis ist hauptsächlich zur Vernetzung und einem Austausch in Kopenhagen.
Vernetzung und Austausch bedeutet keinen Protestaktionen angeschlossen zu sein.
Deshalb ist das Klimabündnis keinen Protestaktionen in Kopenhagen angeschlossen.

Story 22: »friedlicher Protest vs. Repression«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 386 bis 403 ]
**Storyline:** Um effektiven Klimaschutz zu erreichen ist gesellschaftlicher Druck auf die Verhandlungen sinnvoll. Die Proteste in Kopenhagen außerhalb der Verhandlungen sind deshalb sinnvoll. Die starke Repression gegen die friedlichen Proteste hingegen ist skandalös.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Um effektiven Klimaschutz zu erreichen ist gesellschaftlicher Druck auf die Verhandlungen sinnvoll.
Die Proteste außerhalb der Verhandlungen machen zusätzlichen Druck (sie zeigen, dass den Menschen was daran gelegen ist).
Deshalb sind die Proteste außerhalb der Verhandlungen sinnvoll um effektiven Klimaschutz zu erreichen.

Starke Repression gegen friedlichen Protest ist skandalös.
Die Proteste (am Samstag, dem 12.12.) außerhalb der Verhandlungen waren friedlich.
Deshalb ist starke Repression gegen die Proteste (am Samstag, dem 12.12.) skandalös.
Story 23: »die kontraproduktiven Autonomen«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 404 bis 413 ]  
**Storyline:** Protest autonomer Gruppen ist gewalttätig. Er ist kontraproduktiv, da er schnell den Großteil der nach Klimaschutz verlangenden friedlichen klimapolitisch engagierten Personen in Misskredit bringt.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Protest autonomer Gruppen ist gewalttätig.  
- Gewalttätiger Protest ist kontraproduktiv.  
- Deshalb ist Protest autonomer Gruppen kontraproduktiv.

- Protest autonomer Gruppen ist gewalttätig.  
- Gewalttätiger Protest bringt schnell alle in Misskredit.  
- Deshalb bringt Protest autonomer Gruppen schnell alle in Misskredit.

**Gewalttätiger Protest bringt schnell den Großteil der nach Klimaschutz verlangenden Personen in Misskredit.**  
**Der Großteil der nach Klimaschutz verlangenden Personen sind friedliche klimapolitisch engagierte Personen.**  
**Deshalb bringt gewalttätiger Protest schnell friedliche klimapolitisch engagierte Personen in Misskredit.**

Story 24: »Kooperation des Klimabündnisses mit anderen Netzwerken«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 414 bis 427 ]  
**Storyline:** Das Klimabündnis ist in Kooperation mit anderen Städtenetzwerken die zum Thema kommunaler Klimaschutz aktiv sind. Das dient der Absprache und der Organisation konzertierter Aktionen.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Das Klimabündnis ist in Kooperation mit anderen Städtenetzwerken die zum Thema kommunaler Klimaschutz aktiv sind.  
- Die Kooperation mit anderen Städtenetzwerken die zum Thema kommunaler Klimaschutz aktiv sind dient der Absprache und der Organisation konzertierter Aktionen.  
- Deshalb spricht sich das Klimabündnis ab und organisiert Aktionen konzertiert.

Story 25: »NGOs und soziale Bewegungen fordern alle das Gleiche«  
[ = im Transkript Zeile 428 bis 438 ]  
**Storyline:**  
Alle NGOs oder sozialen Bewegungen fordern klimapolitisch ziemlich das Gleiche, deshalb gibt es keinen Grund fundamental zu widersprechen.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Wenn alle klimapolitisch ziemlich das Gleiche fordern gibt es keinen Grund fundamental zu widersprechen.
Alle NGOs oder sozialen Bewegungen fordern klimapolitisch ziemlich das Gleiche.
Deshalb gibt es keinen Grund NGOs oder sozialen Bewegungen fundamental zu widersprechen.

Story 26: »Klimagerechtigkeit als fundamentaler Ansatz des Klimabündnisses«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 472 bis 488 ]

Storyline: In der Arbeit des Klimabündnisses mit Indigenen ist Klimagerechtigkeit ein fundamentaler Ansatz.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

In der Arbeit mit Indigenen ist Klimagerechtigkeit ein fundamentaler Ansatz.
Das Klimabündnis arbeitet mit Indigenen.
Deshalb ist Klimagerechtigkeit ein fundamentaler Ansatz für das Klimabündnis.
To make a change (regarding the suffering in the world) one needs to change the policies, the practices and attitudes whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public. Work on ‘advocacy and campaigning’ is changing the policies, the practices and the attitudes whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public. Therefore to make a change one could work on ‘advocacy and campaigning’.

Reducing poverty and suffering is including work on humanitarian response. Humanitarian response means disaster response, emergency response (on natural disasters or conflict) and preparing communities to anticipate that they can react betters when disaster strikes. Therefore reducing poverty and suffering is including disaster response, emergency response (on natural disasters or conflict) and preparing communities to anticipate that they can react betters when disaster strikes.

Reducing poverty and suffering is including work on advocacy and campaigning. Advocacy and campaigning means changing the policies, the practices and the attitudes whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public. Therefore reducing poverty and suffering is including the change the policies, the practices and the attitudes whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public.

Reducing poverty and suffering is including work on development work. Development work means working with people in poverty to improve their lives whether it’s livelihood, health care, education. Therefore reducing poverty and suffering is including the work with people in poverty to improve their lives whether it’s livelihood, health care, education.
The mission of Oxfam in the Global South is to reduce poverty and suffering. Reducing poverty and suffering is threefold (areas of work: humanitarian response, development work, advocacy and campaigning). Therefore the mission of Oxfam in the Global South is threefold (areas of work: humanitarian response, development work, advocacy and campaigning).

To make a change regarding the suffering in the world one needs to change the policies, the practices and attitudes whether it’s from government, private sector or the general public. Humanitarian response and development work is realised in small initiatives and does not change the policies, the practices and attitudes. Therefore humanitarian response and development work does not make a change regarding the suffering in the world.

Story 2: »Climate change as a development crisis«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 34 bis 66 ]

**Storyline:** Climate change is constituting a development crisis. It is impacting the people in the South first who are least responsible for causing it as they historically had very little emissions. To deal with climate change as a development crisis sustainable solutions are needed. Such solutions will sustain the progress of the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction. Therefore an ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gas reduction isn't a sustainable solution as it won't stop climate change to happen. Work on adaption will be a part of a sustainable solution which is reducing poverty.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Climate change is impacting those who are least responsible actually for causing it first.
Those who are least responsible actually for causing it are the people in the South.
Therefore climate change is impacting the people in the South first.

**An ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gas reduction won’t stop climate change to happen.**
In Copenhagen there may be an ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gas reduction.
Therefore Copenhagen won’t stop climate change to happen.

A problem impacting those who are least responsible for causing it is constituting a development crisis.
Climate change impacting those who are least responsible for causing it.
Therefore climate change is constituting a development crisis.

One is responsible for causing climate change if one caused emissions historically.
The people in the South historically had very little emissions.
Therefore the people in the South are little responsible for causing climate change.
To overcome the impacts caused by climate change one is in need of a specific capability. The (poor) people in the South who are being impacted first and most do not have the capability. Therefore the (poor) people in the South who are being impacted first and most won’t overcome the impacts caused by climate change.

Sustainable solutions are needed to deal with climate change as a development crisis. Sustainable solutions will sustain the progress of the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction. Therefore when dealing with climate change as a development crisis it is needed to sustain the progress of the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction.

Sustainable solutions will reduce poverty. An ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gas reduction won’t reduce poverty. Therefore an ambitious solution to commit greenhouse gas reduction isn’t a sustainable solution.

Climate change is already visible and will happen in the coming 50 years. Communities need to be assisted to adapt to what is already visible and what will happen in the coming 50 years. Therefore communities need to be assisted to adapt to climate change.

Sustainable solution to climate change will reduce poverty. Work on adaption will reduce poverty. Therefore work on adaption is part of a sustainable solution to climate change.

**Story 3: xthe solution: low-carbon development«**

[= im Transskript Zeile 84 bis 123 ]

**Storyline:** Greenhouse gas emission is the fundamental cause of global warming. The development model of the industrialised world (or: the economic model) is based on a specific way of production that is causing greenhouse gas emission. To solve the crisis on the one hand mitigation is needed. The industrialised world needs to change its economic model to a low-carbon economy and thereby cut down dramatically its greenhouse gas emissions. As in the developing world poverty reduction, which has to be the main priority, has to be in a low-carbon way, i.e. using other strategies of development than those the industrialised countries did for the past two centuries. On the other hand adaptation, i.e. assisting those who will be impacted by it, is needed to solve the crisis.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To solve global warming we need to become carbon-neutral. To become carbon-neutral we need to change our development model or the economic model. Therefore to solve global warming we need to change our development model or the economic model.
The fundamental solution to the crisis is reducing poverty and cutting greenhouse gas emission dramatically. Reducing poverty and cutting greenhouse gas emission dramatically means using other strategies of development than those the industrialised countries did for the past two centuries. Therefore solving the crisis means using other strategies of development than those the industrialised countries did for the past two centuries.

To solve the crisis adaptation is needed. Adaption means assisting those who will be impacted by it (with finance, interventions from disaster risk reduction, improved agriculture strategies or new ways of building houses). Therefore to solve the crisis it is needed to assist those who will be impacted by it.

The developing world has to develop to reduce poverty. Poverty has to be reduced in a way that is low-carbon. Therefore the developing world has to develop in a way that is low-carbon.

The development model of the industrialised world is based on a specific way of production. The specific way of production is causing greenhouse gas emission. Therefore the development model of the industrialised world is based on greenhouse gas emission.

The greenhouse gas emissions is the fundamental cause of global warming. The development model of the industrialised world is based on greenhouse gas emission. Therefore the development model of the industrialised world is part of the fundamental cause of global warming.

Greenhouse gas emission is the fundamental cause of global warming. The current way of production is causing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore current way of production is part of the fundamental cause of global warming.

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions it is needed to mitigate carbon producing systems. Mitigating carbon producing systems is a challenge to the industrialised world as well as the developing world. Therefore reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a challenge to the industrialised world as well as the developing world.

The developed/ industrialised world needs to cut down dramatically its greenhouse gas emissions. Cutting down dramatically its greenhouse gas emissions means changing the economic model to a low-carbon economy. Therefore the developed/ industrialised world needs to change the economic model to a low-carbon economy.
In the developing world poverty reduction must be the main priority. 
Poverty reduction means increasing wealth and living standards. 
Therefore increasing wealth and living standards has to be the main priority in the developing world.

Story 4: »The false promotion of flexible mechanisms and carbon markets«
[= im Transkript Zeile 124 bis 173 ]

Storyline: In our economic system / society economic actors and consumers change their behaviour if the price of something increases or decreases. Giving greenhouse gas emission a price therefore could reduce this emission. I.e. in general the idea of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets is a good one. Its current promotion does not have an ambitious set of targets and commitments and an compliance regime which is very tight. It therefore allows to continue emitting in the industrialised countries by offsetting in the developing world. This is causing no reduction or even an increase of greenhouse gas emission.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
In our economic system / society economic actors and consumers change their behaviour if the price of something increases or decreases. 
Government has to initiate all sorts of policies to increase or decrease the price of something.
Therefore behavioural change of economic actors and consumers has to be initiated by all sorts of policies of government.

A false solution to global warming is one which is causing no reduction of greenhouse gas emission. 
The current promotion of carbon markets are causing no reduction or even an increase of greenhouse gas emission (it's a zero-sum or even not a zero-sum).
Therefore the current promotion of carbon markets is a false solution to global warming.

A false solution to global warming / a loop-hole is one which is causing no reduction of greenhouse gas emission. 
Continuing to do what we do in the North but offsetting it in the developing world / the South is no reduction or even an increase of greenhouse gas emission.
Therefore continuing to do what we do in the North but offsetting it in the developing world / the South is a false solution to global warming / loop-hole.

Economic actors and consumers will only make the necessary changes forced to price signals. 
Giving carbon a price is a kind of price signal. 
Therefore giving carbon a price could force economic actors and consumers to make the necessary changes.

In general the idea of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets is good. 
The current promotion of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets is problematic. 
Therefore the current promotion is contrary to the general idea.
A right promotion of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets needs an ambitious set of targets and commitments and an compliance regime (the rules und regulations that will govern these commitments) which is very tight.

The current promotion of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets does not have an ambitious set of targets and commitments and an compliance regime (the rules und regulations that will govern these commitments) which is very tight.

Therefore the current promotion of flexible mechanisms, carbon markets is not the right promotion.

Story 5: »Climate Justice: recognising the historic responsibility«

[ = im Transskript Zeile 174 bis 208 ]

Storyline: Solutions to global warming need to recognise the differences in the responsibility to act against global warming (one dimension of justice). Countries of the developed world which originated 76% of the historic emissions have the responsibility to act first and farthest. China and India are big countries which are rapidly increasing their emissions need to be part of the solution in the future.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Countries with the highest historical emissions have the responsibility to act first and farthest.
The industrialised countries of the developed world originated 76% of the historic emissions.
Therefore countries of the developed world have the responsibility to act first and farthest.

Big countries which are rapidly increasing their emissions need to be part of the solution to global warming in the future.
China and India are big countries which are rapidly increasing their emissions.
Therefore China and India need to be part of the solution in the future.

Solutions to global warming need to consider dimensions of climate justice.
Recognising the differences in the responsibility to act against global warming is one dimension of justice.
Therefore solutions to global warming need to recognise the differences in the responsibility to act against global warming.

Story 6: »the meaning of Climate Justice«

[ = im Transskript Zeile 209 bis 229 ]

Storyline: Climate Justice has different meaning to different people. For Oxfam it is about recognising historic responsibilities and resolving differences of vulnerability of people in an equitable manner. For many people it is about making the development model more equitable as the development model is causing climate change and the exploitation of natural resources at the expense of poor people in the south, just to service the economy of the elites.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The development model is causing climate change and the exploitation of natural resources at the expense of poor people in the south, just to service the economy of the elites. 

CAUSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE EXPLOITATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES AT THE EXPENSE OF POOR PEOPLE IN THE SOUTH, JUST TO SERVICE THE ECONOMY OF THE ELITES IS NOT EQUITABLE.

Therefore the development model is not equitable.

For Oxfam Climate Justice is about recognising historic responsibilities and resolving differences of vulnerability of people in an equitable manner.

For many people Climate Justice is about making the development model more equitable.

Therefore Climate Justice has different meaning to different people.

---

**Story 7: »the risk of green-washing COP15's outcome«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 230 bis 261]

_Storyline:_ To avoid catastrophic climate change we need an adequate outcome, i.e. an outcome that keeps us below to 2 degrees of global warming, that will promote a low-carbon development and that will assist countries to adapt climate change. Leaders may green-wash, i.e. present even failure as a success, catastrophic climate change and its causes may not be avoided. Therefore a very clear benchmark has to evaluate what is adequate.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS CAUSES WILL NOT BE AVOIDED IF EVEN FAILURE IS PRESENTED AS SUCCESS/ IF THERE IS GREEN-WASHING.

At COP15 Leaders may present even failure as success (the 'most important agreement on climate change') / may green-wash.

Therefore at COP15 catastrophic climate change and its causes may not be avoided.

To avoid catastrophic climate change we need an adequate outcome of COP15.

The outcome of COP15 will be adequate when it will keep us below to 2 degrees of global warming, it will promote a low-carbon development and will assist countries to adapt climate change.

Therefore to avoid catastrophic climate change we need to keep us below to 2 degrees of global warming, it will promote a low-carbon development and will assist countries to adapt climate change.

COP15 is a very good moment to commit to ambitious action.

Many leaders are coming to COP15.

Therefore for many leaders it is a very good moment to commit to ambitious action.

A very clear benchmark has to evaluate what is adequate.

The outcome has to be adequate.

Therefore a very clear benchmark has to evaluate the outcome.
Story 8: »the international negotiations as elite politics«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 262 bis 291 ]

Storyline: The international negotiations have to be just negotiations, which means to consider the impacts on people and ecosystems and to consider the voices of those who are and will be impacted first and hardest by climate change. Current international negotiations are elite politics, which are not considering those voices. Oxfam together with civil society is highlighting this elite politics.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

JUST NEGOTIATIONS WILL CONSIDER THE VOICES OF THOSE WHO ARE AND WILL BE IMPACTED FIRST AND HARDEST BY CLIMATE CHANGE.
INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS NEED TO BE JUST NEGOTIATIONS.
Therefore international negotiations need to consider the voices of those who are and will be impacted first and hardest by climate change.

JUST NEGOTIATIONS WILL CONSIDER THE IMPACTS ON PEOPLE, ECOSYSTEMS, ETC.
INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS NEED TO BE JUST NEGOTIATIONS.
Therefore international negotiations need to consider the impacts on people, ecosystems, etc.

Oxfam together with civil society is highlighting the lack of the voices of those who are and will be impacted first and hardest by climate change in international negotiations. The lack of the voices of those who are and will be impacted first and hardest by climate change in international negotiations is constituting elite politics. Oxfam together with civil society is highlighting elite politics.

Elite politics are lacking of the voices of the voiceless. International negotiations are lacking of the voices of the voiceless. Therefore international negotiations are elite politics.

Story 9: »the opponents of a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 292 bis 315 ]

Storyline: A fair, ambitious and binding climate deal is necessary to avoid catastrophic climate change. Everybody who is at the climate negotiations with a name should agree. But there are groups who are not necessarily participating for it. The climate sceptics create a media hype around emails put completely out of context and therefore they undermine the consensus view about the reality of climate change, which is necessary to solve climate change. Certain business lobbies with economic interests caution leaders to take the necessary action. They fail to realize climate change as an economic opportunity.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Climate change offers an economic opportunity.
Economic opportunity means creating green jobs or making green investments.
THEREFORE CLIMATE CHANGE OFFERS GREEN JOBS OR GREEN INVESTMENTS.

EVERYBODY WHO’S AT THE CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH A NAME SHOULD AVOID CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE.
A FAIR, AMBITIOUS AND BINDING CLIMATE DEAL IS NECESSARY TO AVOID CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE.
Therefore everybody who’s at the climate negotiations with a name should agree to a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal.

A FAIR, AMBITIOUS AND BINDING CLIMATE DEAL IS NECESSARY TO AVOID CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE.
At the climate negotiations there are interest groups who are not necessarily participating for a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal.
Therefore at the climate negotiations there are interest groups who are not necessarily participating for what is necessary to avoid catastrophic climate change.

The media hype around emails put completely out of context undermines the consensus view about the reality of climate change.
The consensus view about the reality of climate change is important to solve climate change
Therefore the media hype around emails put completely out of context undermines solving climate change.

Certain business lobbies have economic interests.
Economic interest make them caution leaders to take the necessary action.
Therefore certain business lobbies are cautioning leaders to take the necessary action.

Story 10: »the role of Oxfam«
[= im Transkript Zeile 316 bis 333 ]
Storyline: Oxfam works for the civil society organisations to highlight the human impact of climate change and based on that to lobby for specific elements in the climate regime.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Oxfam is lobbying for specific elements in the climate regime.
Specific elements in the climate regime are ambitious targets that are divided in an equitable way, adequate finance to assist those impacted by climate change, a binding agreement that locks in countries to deliver that with a strong compliant system without loop-holes, gender and agriculture issues.
Therefore Oxfam is lobbying for ambitious targets that are divided in an equitable way, adequate finance to assist those impacted by climate change, a binding agreement that locks in countries to deliver that with a strong compliant system without loop-holes, gender and agriculture issues.
The human impact of climate change needs to be highlighted when trying to solve climate change. Oxfam works for the civil society organisations to highlight the human impact of climate change. Therefore Oxfam is trying to solve climate change.

**Story 11: »mobilisation to put pressure on decision makers«**

*Storyline:* Public concern puts pressure on politicians and decision makers. The purpose of mobilisation is to highlight the public concern. It can only be realised if there will be protests that provide solutions and that are non-violent. Oxfam is providing solutions and remaining non-violent and therefore will realise the purpose of mobilisation. There are different/ more radical strategies regarding the mobilisation. Oxfam is not disagreeing with it.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The purpose of mobilisation is to highlight the public concern about an issue.
There will only be public concern about an issue if there will be protests that provide solutions and that are non-violent.
Therefore the purpose of mobilisation can only be realised if there will be protests that provide solutions and that are non-violent.

Public concern puts pressure on politicians and decision makers.
The purpose of mobilisation is highlighting the public concern.
Therefore the purpose of mobilisation is to put pressure on politicians and decision makers.

The will only be public concern about an issue if there will be protests that provide solutions and that are non-violent.
Oxfam is providing solutions and remaining non-violent.
Therefore Oxfam will realise the purpose of mobilisation.

Regarding the mobilisation there are different/ more radical strategies.
Oxfam is not disagreeing with different/ more radical strategies.
Therefore regarding the mobilisation Oxfam is not disagreeing.

**Story 12: »differences are less important than consensus«**

*Storyline:* As common agreements unites civil society, differences are less important than common agreements.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Within CAN differences (about the role of carbon markets, market based solutions) are less important than the consensus on ‘the building blocks’ (the need to stay as far below two degrees as possible, the demand for 200 billion dollars a year for climate finance, adaptation and mitigation, the role of carbon markets).

The consensus on ‘the building blocks’ unites CAN. Therefore what unites CAN is more important than the differences.

In civil society differences are less important than common agreements.
Common agreements unite civil society. Therefore what unites civil society is more important than differences.

**Story 13: »climate hearings are needed«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 439 bis 468 ]

*Storyline:* Interventions like 'climate hearings', where people in the developing world give testimonies of the impact of climate are needed at a national level and at the international climate regime. Oxfam organised hundreds of climate hearings in the past year.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Interventions like 'climate hearings' are needed at a national level and at the international climate regime. Climate hearings are interventions where people in the developing world give testimonies of the impact of climate. Therefore interventions where people in the developing world give testimonies of the impact of climate are needed at a national level and at the international climate regime.

Interventions like 'climate hearings' are needed at a national level and at the international climate regime. Oxfam organised hundreds of climate hearings in the past year. Therefore Oxfam organised what is needed at a national level and at the international climate regime.
A.4.15 Storylines und Syllogismen »People’s Movement on Climate Change«

**Story 1: »Social transformation not social change«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 48 bis 60 ]

*Storyline:* IBON is working for social transformation but not for social change.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The vision, mission and focus of IBON is to work with movements organising and mobilising people for social transformation.
The vision, mission and focus of IBON is not to work with movements organising and mobilising people for social change.

*Therefore social transformation is not equal to social change.*

**Story 2: »The sovereignty of the people«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 68 bis 113 ]

*Storyline:* This is a story about the utopia of the sovereignty of the people. The representation of people in states' decision-making is excluding the majority of the people. To serve the interest and concerns of the people the political framework and therefore society has to be reconstructed. Doing so the sovereignty of the people could be achieved. That is the sovereignty of the people is contradicting the sovereignty of the state. The sovereignty of the people is necessary as they have capacities to redress climate change within their knowledge, which is ignored by the markets.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

*Klimaforum is connecting discussions.*

Discussions are focussing on proclaiming and reclaiming the basis of the sovereignty of the people.

*Therefore Klimaforum is focussing on proclaiming and reclaiming the basis of the sovereignty of the people.*

People are in need of a political framework that is guided by the wishes, concerns and interests of the people.

*A political framework that is guided by the wishes, concerns and interests of the people could be achieved by reconstructing societies.*

*Therefore people are in need of a reconstruction of societies.*

People don't want carbon trading.

*Carbon trading is accepted by leaders.*

*Therefore the leaders are contradicting the people.*

Sovereignty of the people means the decision-making has to be with the people.

*The majority of the people has been excluded from decision-making processes because of the sovereignty of the state.*

*Therefore the sovereignty of the state is contradicting the sovereignty of the people.*
Sovereignty of the people means the decision-making has to be with the people.
The people have solutions to climate change and to climate issues.
THEREFORE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE MEANS THE DECISION-MAKING HAS TO BE WITH THOSE WHO HAVE SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND TO CLIMATE ISSUES.

The people have capacities to redress climate change within their knowledge.
The market has ignored and wants to delay and distort the people's knowledge.
THEREFORE TO REDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE WITH THE PEOPLE’S CAPACITIES ONE HAS TO STOP THE MARKETS IGNORANCE.

THE CURRENT VALUE OF STATES’ DECISION-MAKING OR THE POLITICS THAT STATES MUST ENGAGE IN IS NOT WHAT PEOPLE WANT.
For what people want, states have to reconstruct themselves.
Therefore states have to reconstruct themselves regarding the value of states' decision-making or the politics that states must engage.

People do not want to be represented but want states to serve them.
THE VALUE OF STATES’S DECISION-MAKING SHOULD BE WHAT PEOPLE WANT.
Therefore the value of the states' decision-making should be to serve people not to represent them.

**Story 3: »Climate Justice«**
[ = im Transkript Zeile 116 bis 126 ]
**Storyline:** As climate change is touching economics it is a question of justice.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Climate change is about economics.
ECONOMICS IS A QUESTION OF JUSTICE.
THEREFORE CLIMATE CHANGE IS A QUESTION OF JUSTICE.

**Story 4: »Climate Justice as a holistic perspective«**
[ = im Transkript Zeile 129 bis 156 ]
**Storyline:** Issues of justice must be seen from a holistic perspective where the politics, the economics and the social dynamics are a one and the same thing.
Governance is driven by economics. Within the international economic arrangement an unequal access and distribution of resources is prevailing which is causing marginalisation of people. The control of access and distribution of resources is a question of power relations. Therefore power relations are a matter of justice.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:
Governance is driven by politics.
Politics is driven by economics.
THEREFORE GOVERNANCE IS DRIVEN BY ECONOMICS
Within the international economic arrangement there is access and distribution of resources. Access and distribution of resources is based on very unequal domain. Therefore the international economic arrangement is very unequal.

Matters of justice are matters of power relations. It is a question of power relations who controls the resources on how we access and how we distribute. 

Therefore who controls the resources on how we access and how we distribute are matters of justice.

Power controls or determines how wealth is created and how wealth is distributed. The way how wealth is created and how wealth is distributed determines marginalisation (as a women, an african, a person coming from the so-called developing country).

Therefore power determines marginalisation.

Issues of justice must be seen from a holistic perspective. The politics, the economics, and the social dynamics are a one and the same thing.

Therefore the politics, the economics, and the social dynamics are issues of justice.

Story 5: »Climate Justice: Overcoming the system in a concerted effort«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 158 bis 181 ]

Storyline: The reason of injustices is how the world is organised economically, politically, and socially. To achieve Climate Justice which means working out a system that can work or continue, a concerted effort of the people of the world is necessary.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To achieve Climate Justice we have to overcome the reason of injustices.
The reason of injustices is how the world is organised economically, politically, and socially.

Therefore to achieve Climate Justice we have to overcome how the world is organised.

Climate Justice means the people of the world take a concerted effort to find the cause of global warming and who suffers most.

Just a single effort of the developed or the developing world are not equal to a concerted effort of the people of the world.

Therefore Climate Justice does not mean the developed or the developing world take a single effort to find the cause of global warming and who suffers most.

Climate is changing because the factors that affect climate are changing.

We are causing the change of the factors that affect the climate.

Therefore we are changing climate.
Story 6: »UN as a framework of the powerful«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 184 bis 194 ]
*Storyline*: In the United Nations it's the powerful who decide, that is not everyone is involved and decisions are not the outcome of discussions.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

In the United Nations it’s the powerful who decide.  
The powerful making the decisions means that not everyone is involved and decisions are not the outcome of discussions.  
Therefore in the United Nations not everyone is involved and decisions are not the outcome of discussions.

Story 7: »Negotiations do not question economic models«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 197 bis 210 ]
*Storyline*: The current economic models are not working. Nonetheless the big powers have decided to continue this models. As these decisions have already been made before the climate negotiations they are illegitim.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

*DECISIONS ALREADY MADE BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS ARE ILLEGITIM.*
Decisions on how to deal with the climate change questions in climate negotiations have already been made before by the big powers.  
Therefore decisions on how to deal with the climate change questions in the climate negotiations are illegitim.

*IF DECISIONS ARE ALREADY MADE BEFORE IN NEGOTIATIONS THE OTHER PARTIES HAVE TO BE FORCED TO LEGITIMISE THEM.*  
In climate negotiations the big powers are trying to force the others of the world to legitimise their decisions.  
Therefore in climate negotiations decisions are already made before.

The current economic models are not working.  
*Not working economic models are not justified.*  
Therefore the current economic models are not justified.

*SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT WORKING SHOULD NOT BE JUSTIFIED TO BE CONTINUED.*  
The current economic models are not working.  
Therefore the current economic models should not be justified to be continued.

*IN CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS DECISIONS ON HOW TO DEAL WITH THE CLIMATE CHANGE QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT THE CONTINUATION OF THE ECONOMIC MODELS.*  
In climate negotiations decisions on how to deal with the climate change questions have already been made before by the big powers.  
Therefore in the climate negotiations the continuation of the economic models has already been decided by the big powers before.
Story 8: »People want a change of the system, states are holding on«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 214 bis 242 ]

**Storyline:** In the UN framework states not people are discussing. The negotiations do not want to change the system as many vibrant people's movements want it. Vibrant movements which are not prescribing to the negotiations are causing a lot of police. This is happening at Copenhagen where the dynamic people's movements are in general conflict to the pipeline-organised framework of the UNFCCC. As the movements are building momentum with their argument that the only way to rethink alternative energy is to let the fossils remain on the ground, the negotiators must respond.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Vibrant movements not prescribing to the negotiations cause a lot of police.
In Seattle, in Cancun and in Genoa there have been vibrant movements not prescribing to the negotiations.
**Therefore in Seattle, in Cancun and in Genoa there has been a lot of police.**

The UN framework is a state framework.
In a state framework states not people are discussing.
**Therefore in the UN framework states not people are discussing.**

Regarding the climate question many movements of people see no answer than change of the system.
The negotiations do not want to change the system.
**Therefore regarding the climate question many movements are standing in conflict with the negotiations.**

Movements, as they are dynamic and emerge according to what is driving them, are in conflict with pipeline organised frameworks.
The UNFCCC framework is a pipeline organised framework.
**Therefore movements are in conflict with the UNFCCC.**

Negotiators must respond if there is momentum built.
Movements are building momentum with their argument that the only way to rethink alternative energy is to let the fossils remain on the ground.
**Therefore the negotiators must respond to the momentum build by movements.**

Story 9: »The people have alternatives / strengthening the alternatives, movements«
[ = im Transskript Zeile 249 bis 278 ]

**Storyline:** Different issues (of education, food crisis, shelter for all, environment, gender equality) are issues of injustice, which several movements are dealing with. To redress the pertinent issues of our time alternatives to the current economic political framework are needed. The people have alternatives which have to be strengthened. Linking movements with each other or highlighting their alternatives are some ways of strengthening. Kenya Debt Relief Network is making linkages. The People's Protocol on Climate Change is highlighting alternatives.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Alternatives (to the current economic political framework) are needed to redress the pertinent issues (climate change, poverty, marginalisation, tensions in society from race and gender).
The people have alternatives. Therefore to redress the pertinent issues the people are needed.

To redress pertinent issues existing alternatives have to be highlighted. The People's Protocol on Climate Change is highlighting existing alternatives. Therefore the People's Protocol on Climate Change is supporting to redress pertinent issues.

Tension of fear, anxiety, helplessness and hopelessness is caused by a few people who control the world and keep their wealth to themselves.
To overcome tension of fear, anxiety, helplessness and hopelessness we need to rethink the world we live into. Therefore rethinking the world we live into means changing the control of the world by a few people who keep their wealth to themselves.

That movements could seek and find one another, linkages have to be made. Kenya Debt Relief Network is making linkages. Therefore Kenya Debt Relief Network makes that movements could seek and find one another.

Movements dealing with the same issue should make linkages.
Several movements are dealing with injustices. Therefore several movements should make linkages.

Different issues (of education, food crisis, shelter for all, environment, gender equality) are issues of injustice.
Several movements are dealing with different issues (of education, food crisis, shelter for all, environment, gender equality). Therefore several movements are dealing with injustices.

The current economic political framework is violent and keeps us at war.
People (especially the young people) are tired of violence and war. Therefore people are tired of the current economic political framework.

Story 10: »Autonomous groups: An expression of a burden«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 279 bis 323 ]

Storyline: Movements in their action are an expression of a necessity and a need. There are opportunities required to redress necessities and needs. If not people will take their burden somewhere (they will act what some call 'violent').
People who have a need are requiring opportunities to redress their issues/need to take their burden somewhere. No opportunities to redress one's issues/take one's burden somewhere may result in what some people call violence. **Therefore people who have a need may act in a way some people are calling violent.**

People having no opportunity to redress their issues need to take their burden somewhere (become what some would call violent).

Autonomous groups have no opportunity to redress their issues. **Therefore autonomous groups need to take their burden somewhere (become what some would call violent).**

Movements are born out of necessity and out of need. **Therefore autonomous groups are an expression of movements.**

---

**Story 11: »Struggling for justice for all«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 325 bis 338 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about who the narrator would cooperate with. The narrator will cooperate with people struggling for justice for all. That is struggling for the right to participate in live to a fullness in making a contribution to human prosperity and the right to make that contribution the in own way.

---

**Story 12: »Movements struggling for social transformation/ NGOs coopting«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 346 bis 365 ]

**Storyline:** Social transformation is a struggle of social actors. That is NGOs should not coopt or get coopted but support movements in their values for social transformation. A social transformation will be guaranteed when economics works for live and politics determines governance.

---

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

I am cooperating with people who stand for justice for all. Justice for all means the right to participate in live to a fullness in making a contribution to human prosperity and the right to make that contribution the in own way. **Therefore I am cooperating with people who stand for the right to participate in live to a fullness in making a contribution to human prosperity and the right to make that contribution in the own way.**

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Societies of peace will be guaranteed when economics works for live and politics determines governance.

Economics working for live and politics determining governance means serving people and allowing people to live in harmony. **Therefore societies of peace will be guaranteed when serving people and allowing people to live in harmony.**

---

Societies of peace will be guaranteed when economics works for live and politics determines governance. Economics working for live and politics determining governance means serving people and allowing people to live in harmony.
Social transformation is a struggle of social actors. In a struggle for social actors NGOs should support movements. Therefore NGOs should support movements to build on social transformation.

Some NGOs are coopting or get coopted. Coopting or to get coopted means to derail the motion of the movements that are moving towards constructing social transformation. Therefore some NGOs are derailing the motion of the movements that are moving towards constructing social transformation.

Social transformation means building societies of peace. Societies of peace will be guaranteed when economics works for live and politics determines governance. Therefore social transformation will be guaranteed when economics works for live and politics determines governance.

**Story 13: »An official demand can not be criminal«**

[ im Transkript Zeile 374 bis 402 ]

**Storyline:** The movements' claim for human prosperity is a claim put in by the official UNFCCC process. Therefore it can not be criminal. With the People's Movement Process, the Klimaforum and the accreditation at UNFCCC people who work for justice are given opportunities to put their case on the table.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A process which is only affirming to achieve justice for all but does not, has to be judged harsh.
The UNFCCC process has not delivered justice to all but affirmed to do so.
Therefore the UNFCCC process has to be judged harsh.

People who are not given opportunity to put their case on the table will become violent.
With the People's Movement Process, the Klimaforum and the accreditation at UNFCCC people who work for justice are given opportunities.
Therefore those people who work for justice are not becoming violent.

A claim put in by the official UNFCCC process can not be criminal.
The movements' claim for human prosperity is a claim put in by the official UNFCCC process.
Therefore the movements' claim for human prosperity can not be criminal.

**Story 14: »Carbon trading as a neo-colonial approach«**

[ im Transkript Zeile 407 bis 421 ]

**Storyline:** Carbon trading is a neo-colonial approach which therefore needs to be criticised.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Scrumping Africa in 1878 needs to be criticised.
Carbon trading is like scrumping Africa in 1878.
Therefore carbon trading needs to be criticised.
Story 1: »WCC focussed on the lacking issues in the UNFCCC«

Storyline: WCC's working group on climate change focussed attention to issues that were lacking in the negotiations. After WCC raised those issues the UNFCCC started discussions about it. Because WCC focussed on the interest of the people of the south, related to climate change, it raised the issues of moral acceptability of emission trading or adaption. As an observer organisation is observing the main trend in the negotiations, what is lacking and is trying to motivate and influence the negotiations from a moral point of view mostly, it does not really engage in technical and political lobby work.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

WCC's working group on climate change focussed attention to issues that were lacking in the negotiations.
The issues of moral acceptability of emission trading or adaption were lacking in the negotiations.
Therefore WCC's working group on climate change focussed attention to the issues of moral acceptability of emission trading.

The UNFCCC started discussions on specific issues after WCC's working group on climate change raised those issues.
WCC's working group on climate change raised the issues of moral acceptability of emission trading or adaption.
Therefore the UNFCCC started discussions on the issues moral acceptability of emission trading or adaption.

The UNFCCC-process has been focussed very much on an issue of the north than an issue of the south.
The mitigation issue is much more an issue of the north than an issue of the south.
Therefore the UNFCCC-process has been focussed very much on mitigation.

WCC has focussed on the interest of the people of the south, related to climate change.
Adaptation is an interest of the people of the south, related to climate change.
Therefore WCC has focussed on adaption.

An observer organisation is observing the main trend in the negotiations, what is lacking and is trying to motivate and influence the negotiations from a moral point of view mostly. Observing the main trend in the negotiations, what is lacking in the negotiations and trying to motivate and influence the negotiations from a moral point of view mostly does not really engage in technical and political lobby work.
Therefore an observer organisation does not really engage in technical and political lobby work.
Story 2: »the role of WCC«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 50 bis 85 ]

Storyline: WCC tabled issues, which have been lacking in the climate negotiations like adaptation, a substantial funding, mitigation in the south and justice.
WCC played a crucial role at the signing of the Kyoto Protocol. Because WCC had good contacts to the russian delegation the russian delegation played a substantial role and the Kyoto Protocol could be signed.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

For the signing of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 the russian delegation played a substantial role.
Because WCC had good contacts to the russian delegation the russian delegation played a substantial role.
Therefore because WCC had good contacts to the russian delegation the Kyoto Protocol has been signed in 1997.

Issues like adaptation, substantial funding, mitigation in the south and justice have been lacking in the climate negotiations.
WCC tabled issues, which have been lacking in the climate negotiations.
Therefore WCC tabled issues like adaptation, a substantial funding, mitigation in the south and justice.

Story 3: »the north responsible, the south affected«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 86 bis 120 ]

Storyline: Climate change is a broad problem, which is affecting people but also nature itself. The most important impact of climate change is the impact on the poor people mainly located in the south, the island states, the coastal areas or the arid areas in africa and asia. Climate change is caused by a specific lifestyle, wealth and the economic development, which is much more widespread in the north than in the south. The ground of the economic development is a material-based and energy-based economy. The main responsibility of climate change is in the Global North (including the middle class in developing countries). The historical responsibility of climate change is much larger in the north than in the south. There is a lot of work to be done to change lifestyle, wealth and the economic development. WCC should play a role in this change.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Climate change is a broad problem.
A broad problem is affecting people but also nature itself.
Therefore climate change is affecting people but also nature itself.
The most important impact of climate change is the impact on the poor people. The impact on the poor people is mainly located in the south, the island states, the coastal areas or the arid areas in Africa and Asia. Therefore the most important impact of climate change is mainly located in the south, the island states, the coastal areas or the arid areas in Africa and Asia.

**Historical responsibility of climate change is rooted in its causation in history.** The causation of climate change in history is much larger in the North than in the South. Therefore historical responsibility of climate change is much larger in the North than in the South.

Climate change is a problem of the economic development. A material-based and energy-based economy is the ground of economic development. Therefore climate change is grounded in a material-based and energy-based economy.

Lifestyle, wealth and the economic development are wrong. There is a lot of work to be done to change what is wrong. Therefore there is a lot of work to be done to change lifestyle, wealth and the economic development.

There is a lot of work to be done to change lifestyle, wealth and the economic development. WCC should play a role in working off what has to be done. Therefore WCC should play a role in working off a change lifestyle, wealth and the economic development.

The responsibility of climate change is rooted in its causation. The main causation of climate change is in the Global North. Therefore the main responsibility of climate change is in the Global North (including the middle class in developing countries).

Climate change is caused by a specific lifestyle, wealth and the economic development. A specific lifestyle, wealth and the economic development is much more widespread in the north than in the south. Therefore climate change is caused more more by the north than the south.
Story 4: »right solutions to climate change«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 121 bis 139 ]
Storyline: Solutions to climate change have to be sought in the fields of personal lifestyle, technology and institutions. A solution to climate change is a change in the mindset, i.e. the higher valueing of material products compared to immaterial issues. Another solution is the enhancement of new technology, renewable energy or more nature-conform production. Finally a solution to climate change is the setting up of new institutions (for example for the regulation of production or the use of energy or material).

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A solution to climate change is a change in the higher valueing of material products compared to immaterial issues.
The higher valueing of material products compared to immaterial issues is a change in the mindset.
Therefore a solution to climate change is a change in the mindset.

Solutions to climate change have to be sought in different fields.
Different fields are personal lifestyle, the technology, the institutions.
Solutions to climate change have to be sought in personal lifestyle, the technology, the institutions.

Solutions to climate change have to be sought in different fields.
One of the different fields is a change in the higher valueing of material products compared to immaterial issues.
Therefore a solution to climate change is a change in the higher valueing of material products compared to immaterial issues.

Solutions to climate change have to be sought in different fields.
One of the different fields is the enhancement of new technology, renewable energy or more nature-conform production.
Therefore a solution to climate change is the enhancement of new technology, renewable energy or more nature-conform production.

Solutions to climate change have to be sought in different fields.
One of the different fields is the setting up of new institutions (for example for the regulation of production or the use of energy or material).

Therefore a solution to climate change is the setting up of new institutions (for example for the regulation of production or the use of energy or material).
Story 5: »false solutions to climate change«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 140 bis 154 ]

**Storyline:** There are false solutions to climate change. On the one hand focusing primarily on market mechanisms is a false solution to climate change as it gives them free space to flourish. On the other hand giving in to every energy need that rises is a false solution to climate change as it will end up in building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants. Therefore building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants would be a false solution to climate change.

To focus primarily on market mechanisms is a false solution to climate change.
To focus primarily on market mechanisms means giving them free space to flourish.
Giving market mechanisms a free space to flourish is a false solution to climate change.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To give in to every energy need that rises is a false solution to climate change.
To give in to every energy need that rises will end up in building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants. Therefore building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants would be a false solution to climate change.

Story 6: »definition of Climate Justice«

[ = im Transkript Zeile 155 bis 177 ]

**Storyline:** Climate Justice is concerning the mitigation-side of climate change, the adaptation dimension and the process of negotiations. People that are most vulnerable to impacts of climate change should be supported in a good way. The use of the atmosphere as a sink for ghg emission and the costs of adapting and mitigating should be divided in a fair way. The amount of influence in the negotiations that different parts of the world/ different countries have should be balanced.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

There should be Climate Justice regarding the use of the atmosphere as a sink for ghg emission and the costs of adapting and mitigating.
The idea of Climate Justice is about dividing in a fair way. Therefore the use of the atmosphere as a sink for ghg emission and the costs of adapting and mitigating should be divided in a fair way.

**There should be Climate Justice to people that are most vulnerable to impacts of climate change.**
Climate Justice is about support in a good way.
Therefore people that are most vulnerable to impacts of climate change should be supported in a good way.
Climate Justice is concerning many dimensions. The mitigation-side of climate change, the adaptation dimension and the process of negotiations are among the many dimensions. Therefore Climate Justice is concerning the mitigation-side of climate change, the adaptation dimension and the process of negotiations.

The amount of influence in the negotiations that different parts of the world/ different countries have should be just. A balance would be just. Therefore the amount of influence in the negotiations that different parts of the world/ different countries have should be balanced.

**Story 7: »no full attention to the justice component in the negotiations«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 178 bis 189 ]

**Storyline:** There has not been full attention for the justice component in the negotiations, which would result in a politics of what would be scientifically and morally necessary.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

The climate negotiations have been a process of defending interests.
A process of defending interests isn't a process of bringing just and adequate solutions to climate change.
Therefore the climate negotiations haven't been a process of bringing just and adequate solutions to climate change.

The climate negotiations should have been a process of bringing just and adequate solutions to climate change.
The climate negotiations have been a process of defending interests.
Therefore what should have been is not equal to what has been.

Full attention for the justice component in the negotiations would result in a politics of what would be scientifically and morally necessary.
There is not yet a politics of what would be scientifically and morally necessary.
Therefore there is not yet full attention for the justice component in the negotiations.

**Story 8: »WCC promoting a fair, binding and ambitious deal«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 190 bis 203 ]

**Storyline:** WCC like most of the NGOs wants to achieve a fair and binding and adequate ambitious deal. This means staying well below 2-degrees-warming, heading for a 350ppm-CO2-concentration level and addressing Climate Justice.
Most of the NGOs want to achieve a fair and binding and adequate ambitious deal.
WCC is part of everybody.
Therefore WCC wants to achieve a fair and binding and adequate ambitious deal.

WCC wants to achieve a fair, binding and ambitious deal. A deal being fair, binding and ambitious means staying well below 2-degrees-warming, heading for a 350ppm-CO2-concentration level and addressing Climate Justice.
Therefore WCC wants to achieve a deal, which is staying well below 2-degrees-warming, which is heading for a 350ppm-CO2-concentration level and which is addressing Climate Justice.

In the last couple of years development NGOs entered the negotiation process. Development NGOs have a focus on the international justice component (more than environmental NGOs).
Therefore in the last couple of years a focus on the international justice component entered the negotiation process.

WCC becomes less visible if other NGOs are working on a similar issue with more capacity to follow and to influence the processes.
Development NGOs are working on a similar issue (international justice) with more capacity to follow and to influence the processes.
Therefore WCC becomes less visible because of development NGOs.
A paradigm shift has to be realised to create the ground for really effective climate policy. WCC should play a visible role in addressing a paradigm shift. Therefore WCC should play a visible role in creating the ground for really effective climate policy.

Effective climate policy that affects economic developments in the north and south needs support of the people. For support of the people one has to make clear to them that a paradigm-shift is realisable/ that there is a way of economic development that can be both climate-friendly and attractive for people’s well-being. Therefore for effective climate policy that affects economic developments in the north and south one has to make clear to people that a paradigm-shift is realisable/ that there is a way of economic development that can be both climate-friendly and attractive for people’s well-being.

To create people’s support of effective climate policy one has to show that a paradigm-shift is realisable/ that there is a way of economic development that can be both climate-friendly and attractive for people’s well-being. WCC’s role is to show that a paradigm-shift is realisable/ that there is a way of economic development that can be both climate-friendly and attractive for people’s well-being. Therefore WCC’s role is to create people’s support of effective climate policy.

Story 11: »types of protest«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 295 bis 316 ]

Storyline: Some protests at Copenhagen are reminding about specific issues or people negotiators should work for. Some other protests are not clear in their message and therefore are marginal. The big manifestation on Saturday will show that civil society worldwide is waiting for a fair ambitious and binding deal. It has a global support base, which is facilitated by the cooperation with the 'Countdown to Copenhagen' campaign.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Protest, which are not clear in their message are marginal. Some protest at Copenhagen are not clear in their message. Therefore some protests at Copenhagen are marginal.

The big manifestations at Copenhagen (12th of Dec.) have a global support base. The cooperation with the 'Countdown to Copenhagen' campaign is facilitating the support base. Therefore the big manifestations at Copenhagen (12th of Dec.) are facilitated by the cooperation with the 'Countdown to Copenhagen' campaign.
It needs to be shown that civil society worldwide is waiting for a fair ambitious and binding deal.
The big manifestation (12th of Dec.) will show that civil society worldwide is waiting for a fair ambitious and binding deal.

Therefore the big manifestation (12th of Dec.) will show what needs to be shown.

Negotiators should work for specific issues or people. Some protests are reminding about specific issues or people. Therefore some protests are reminding about what negotiators should work for.

**Story 12: »the strategy of WCC«**

[= *Transcript Zeile 341 bis 370*]

*Storyline:* Some of the organisations within GCCA are focused on an effective, adequate deal from an environmental point of view, which results in neglecting the justice component of climate change. They are putting pressure on Indian Civil Society to pressure their government to come with ambitious steps in order to facilitate the whole negotiation process. WCC and the organisations participating the 'Coutdown to Copenhagen' campaign are not following this strategy. The northern countries are responsible for climate change in the first place and therefore have to fulfill their commitments and promises in the first place. China and India will their move afterwards.

Some of the organisations within GCCA are following a strategy, which is neglecting the justice component of climate change. WCC and the organisations participating the 'Coutdown to Copenhagen' campaign are not following a strategy, which is neglecting the justice component of climate change. Therefore some of the organisations within GCCA are following a different strategy than WCC and the organisations participating the 'Coutdown to Copenhagen' campaign.

Putting pressure on Indian Civil Society to pressure their government to come with ambitious steps in order to facilitate the whole negotiation process is a wrong strategy. Some organisations within GCCA put pressure on Indian Civil Society to pressure their government to come with ambitious steps in order to facilitate the whole negotiation process. Therefore some organisations within GCCA are following a wrong strategy.

China and India will their move after the rich world showed its responsibility. The rich world is not showing its responsibility. Therefore China and India will not make their move.

Some of the organisations within GCCA are focused on an effective, adequate deal from an environmental point of view. Being focussed on an effective, adequate deal from an environmental point of view results in neglecting the justice component of climate change. Therefore some of the organisations within GCCA are neglecting the justice component of climate change.
Responsibility means fullfilling one's commitments and promises.
The northern countries are responsible for climate change in the first place.
Therefore the northern countries have to fullfill their commitments and promises in the first place.
A.4.17 Storylines und Syllogismen »Wetlands International«

Story 1: »Working on the interface 'people-ecosystems' to be successful«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 3 bis 19 ]

**Storyline:** People have impact on ecosystems as well as the otherway round. That's why conservation has to consider the interaction between people and ecosystems to be successful. Wetlands international is considering the interaction and therefore could be successful in conservation.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

To be successful in conservation it is necessary to consider the interaction between ecosystems and people. Wetlands international work on the interface between people and nature.

**Therefore Wetlands International could be successful in conservation.**

The role of wetlands international is the promotion of the importance of wetlands ecosystems for people and for nature. Promoting the importance of wetlands ecosystems for people and for nature happens with field work as well as work in the policy arena.

**Therefore wetlands international is dealing with field work as well as work in the policy arena.**

Story 2: »Fighting for an utopia«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 30 bis 40 ]

**Storyline:** Wetlands international is working for a sustainable use of wetland ecosystems worldwide. The narrator is believing that this goal will never be achieved. Therefore there will always be a need of wetlands international.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Wetlands worldwide will always not be used in a sustainable way/ are not well protected/ biodiversity is not conserved/ people and nature could not yet live alongside each other. Wetlands international is advocating all that.

**Therefore there will always be need of wetlands international.**

Story 3: »Global warming as a symptom of too high GHG emissions«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 61 bis 64 ]

**Storyline:** A too high concentration of GHG emissions is causing global warming. Therefore global warming is the symptom of this problem.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Too much greenhouse gas emissions caused by human activities are the real problem.

**The real problem is the reason for global warming.**

**Therefore global warming is a symptom of the real problem.**
Story 4: »Production and consumption patterns as solution«
[ in Transkript Zeile 67 bis 81 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the solutions to climate change. As the cause of climate change and therefore the degradation of ecosystems is the emission of carbon it is necessary to hold those emissions. Holding the emissions means changing the way of production and consumption. An alternative, capturing carbon from the atmosphere, presupposes the need of large scale capacity which is not yet existing. Therefore capturing carbon would be a future scenario.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

SOLVING CLIMATE CHANGE MEANS HOLDING THE CARBON EMISSIONS.
Holding the carbon emissions is about changing the way of production and consumption patterns.
Therefore solving climate change is about changing the way of production and consumption patterns.

FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ECOSYSTEMS THERE MUSTN’T BE A DEGRADATION.
Carbon emissions are reasonable for the degradation of ecosystems.
For a conservation of ecosystems it is therefore necessary to hold carbon emissions.

To capture carbon from the atmosphere for solving climate change, one is in need of large scale capacity.
Currently there is no large scale capacity.
Therefore capturing carbon from the atmosphere could possibly be done in the future.

Story 5: »False solutions to global warming«
[ in Transkript Zeile 86 bis 101 ]

Storyline: This is a story about false solutions to climate change. Approaches which lead to a growth of greenhouse gas emissions, possibly the degradation of ecosystems or a risk are no solutions to global warming. In this sense palm oil policies, second generation biofuels or nuclear power is no solution.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A SOLUTION TO GLOBAL WARMING WOULD REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES.
Palm oil policies in many cases cause significant emissions of greenhouse gases.
Therefore palm oil policies are no solution to global warming.

A SOLUTION TO GLOBAL WARMING WOULD NOT LEAD TO A DEGRADATION OF ECOSYSTEMS.
Second generation biofuels are risking the degradation of ecosystems (the introduction of exotic species or the disruption of the nutrient regimes of systems).
Therefore second generation biofuels are no solution to global warming.

A SOLUTION TO GLOBAL WARMING WOULD NOT BE A RISK.
Nuclear power is a risk.
Therefore nuclear power is no solution to global warming.
Story 6: »Climate Justice«
[= im Transkript Zeile 102 bis 116]

Storyline: The narrator describes Climate justice as the countries taking their taking the share of climate change, especially the responsibility for the harm they caused, and compensating and supporting the people who are affected by climate change. Climate justice is dealing with broad discussion around justice and rights. That's why Wetlands International is not using this term for their more specific work.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

(Climate justice means) All countries are partly causing the climate problem.
(CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS) THE CLIMATE PROBLEM IS SOLVED BY EVERYONE TAKING HIS SHARE.
Therefore (climate justice means) all countries have to take their share.

USING THE TERM 'CLIMATE JUSTICE' MAKES SENSE, IF ONE'S WORK IS DEALING WITH BROAD DISCUSSIONS.
Wetlands international's work on climate change is specific.
Therefore Wetlands International won't use the term so much.

(CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS) FOR THE HARM ONE HAS CAUSED ONE TAKES HIS RESPONSIBILITY.
(Climate justice means) Developed countries have caused harm.
Therefore (climate justice means) developed countries take their responsibility.

(CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS) CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT AFFORDS COMPENSATION AND SUPPORT.
(Climate justice realises) People are affected by climate change.
Therefore (climate justice means) people have to be compensated and well supported.

Story 7: »Incorporating points into official texts needs time«
[= im Transkript Zeile 129 bis 139]

Storyline: This is a story about how to set one's organisations points into the official texts. Incorporating many points in the official texts makes it necessary to influence the process for a long time. But there's has to be a stage for putting new issues on the agenda. If there is no such stage it is about putting its efforts in guarding that no changes are made to the points which have been incorporated into the texts before.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

IF IT'S NOT ABOUT PUTTING NEW ISSUES ON THE AGENDA IT IS ABOUT PUTTING ITS EFFORTS IN GUARDING THAT NO CHANGES ARE MADE TO THE POINTS WHICH HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THE TEXTS BEFORE.
Putting new issues on the agenda will be virtually impossible at the stage of COP15.
Therefore at the stage of COP15 it is about putting its efforts in guarding that no changes are made to the points which have been incorporated into the texts before.
COP15 is only a stage to put its efforts in guarding that no changes are made to the points which have been incorporated into the texts before. Wetlands International is present at COP15. Therefore Wetlands International is putting its efforts in guarding that no changes are made to the points which have been incorporated into the texts before.

To incorporate many of its points in the official texts one needs a long time trying to influence the process. Wetlands International is working for a long time trying to influence the process. Therefore Wetlands International managed to incorporate many of its points in official texts.

Story 8: »The insufficient impact of NGOs at the negotiations«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 142 bis 157 ]

Storyline: In principle the negotiation process is open to everyone interested to engage in. But access to the negotiation process is not equal to sufficient impact. Especially the NGO representatives should have more impact.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Everyone interested in the negotiation process does have access to it.
Access is not equal to impact.
Therefore it is not clear if everyone has sufficient impact at the negotiations.

People who do not have sufficient impact at the negotiation process should get more impact.
NGO representatives do not have sufficient impact.
Therefore NGO representatives should have more impact.

Story 9: »Economic interests are blocking the process«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 158 bis 164 ]

Storyline: People with economic interest are just reaching for their own good and thereby block the process of negotiation. Therefore those people should not be at negotiations.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

People with economic interests that are just reaching for their own good/try to block the process should not be at the negotiations.
Representatives of coal burning factories or other private sector people are people with economic interest.
Therefore representatives of coal burning factories or other private sector people should not be at the negotiations.
Story 10: »WI a organisation which is perceived quite positively«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 167 bis 190 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the perception of organisations. An organisation which is only screaming is perceived negatively whereas an organisation providing useful material is perceived positively. Wetlands International is providing useful materials and is therefore perceived quite positively.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- Approaches which provide incentive for deforestation are no solution for climate change.
- Agrofuels are providing incentive for deforestation.
- Therefore agrofuels are no solution to climate change.

Organisations who are not only screaming a lot but providing useful materials are perceived quite positively. Wetlands International are not only screaming a lot but providing useful materials. Therefore Wetlands International is perceived quite positively.

Story 11: »There are more diverse emission sources and sinks«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 214 bis 226 ]

**Storyline:** The narrator is highlighting the necessity to broaden one's view of emission sources and sinks. It's not only forest ecosystems which are important carbon sinks but also soils. Emissions are not only originating from forestry or agriculture but also other landusers.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- REDD is an approach which should incorporate relevant carbon sinks.
- Beside forest ecosystems soils are are relevant carbon sinks. Therefore REDD should not only consider forest ecosystems but soils.

Annex one countries should keep account of all kinds of different emissions. 
- All kinds of different emissions could not be keepen account of if mandatory accounting is limited on forestry and agriculture. Therefore mandatory accounting for annex one countries should not be limited on forestry and agriculture.

Story 12: »The impact of adaption measures on people«
[ = im Transkript Zeile 226 bis 231 ]

**Storyline:** Ecosystems have a protecting role for people. Adaption measures as infrastructure or development on wetlands have adverse impact on ecosystems and therefore on people. That’s why those measures should be avoided.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Ecosystems are protecting people.  
Adaption measures have an adverse impact on ecosystems.  
Therefore adaption measures have an adverse impact on people.

Adverse impacts on people should be avoided.  
Adaptation measures such as infrastructure or development on wetlands have adverse impact on people.  
Therefore to adaptation measures such as infrastructure or development on wetlands should be avoided.

Story 13: »Protest opens opportunities«  
[ = im Transskript Zeile 232 bis 254 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the value of protest. Organisations like Wetlands International want to be listened to by delegations and the private sector. Protest is pushing those actors and thereby opening opportunities for organisations attending the process to be listened to. Whereas protest is useful for the process, smashing windows is not. In this sense the narrator is distinguishing smashing windows from protest.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Wetlands Internationals wants to be listened to.  
Protest is opening opportunities for organisation working in the process to be listened to.  
Therefore protest is useful for Wetlands International.

Not knowing what’s going on but smashing windows means you’re an idiot.  
The black block does not know what’s going on at the climate negotiations but is smashing windows.  
Therefore the black block is a bunch of idiots.

Protest is useful for the process.  
Smashing windows is not useful for the process.  
Therefore smashing windows is not protest.

Violence is not useful for the process.  
Smashing windows is violence.  
Therefore violence is not useful for the process.

Smashing windows is not useful for the whole of the process.  
The black block just wants to smash windows  
Therefore the black block is not useful for the whole of the process.

Story 14: »The common responsibility for harmful climate scepticism«  
[ = im Transskript Zeile 272 bis 287 ]

Storyline: This is a story about climate scepticism its harmful potential and its reasons. Climate scepticism is an effect of not incorporating the views of others. Therefore many of the organisations present at COP15 have to implement a more integrated approach on climate change. As climate sceptics are believing in the false but have an impact on public opinion they are very harmful.
Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Believing in the false and having an impact on public opinion is very harmful.
Climate sceptics are believing in the false and have an impact on public opinion.
Therefore climate sceptics are very harmful.

Climate change needs to align peoples' views to each other.
Many organisations at COP15 are not trying to align peoples' views to each other.
Therefore many organisations are not dealing with climate change adequately.

**Story 1: »WWF’s participation in the negotiations: A constructive dialogue«**

* [ = im Transskript Zeile 19 bis 30 ]

**Storyline:** WWF is communicating its supporter's beliefs in the negotiations. Engaging in the negotiation process means trying to have a constructive dialogue with other parties like governments or business.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

WWF engage in the negotiation
Engaging in the negotiation means trying to have a constructive dialogue with other parties like governments and business. Therefore WWF is trying to have a constructive dialogue with other parties.

In the negotiation WWF is communicating views of its supporters.
Specific beliefs are underlying the supporters' views. Therefore in the negotiation WWF is communicating specific believes.

**Story 2: »The utopia of a one planet future«**

* [ = im Transskript Zeile 31 bis 50 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the utopia of a one planet future. The current predominant lifestyle is managing resources in an unsustainable way. If everybody in the world would live that lifestyle, three planets would be needed. Therefore resources have to be managed better to reach a one planet world. In such a sustainable world there wouldn't be a need of WWF anymore, cause its goal is reached.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

It is not possible for everybody to live a three planet lifestyle/ an unsustainable lifestyle. People in the UK are living a three planet lifestyle/ an unsustainable lifestyle. Therefore it is not possible to live like the people in the UK.

WWF'S GOAL IS A CHANGE OF THE UNSUSTAINABLE/ THREE PLANET LIFESTYLE. AN UNSUSTAINABLE/ THREE PLANET LIFESTYLE WOULD NO LONGER EXIST, IF A ONE PLANET FUTURE IS ACHIEVED. Therefore WWF would no longer need to exist if there's a one planet future.

A lifestyle for everyone has to be a sustainable lifestyle. To reach a sustainable lifestyle means managing the resource use better. Therefore to reach a lifestyle for everybody we have to manage the resource use better.
**Story 3: »Global warming as result of lifestyle«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 81 bis 94 ]

*Storyline:* This is a story about the cause of global warming. Global warming is caused by a combination of problems, which could be distilled to a specific way we live our lifes. This lifestyle which is promoted in particular by one part of the people, is causing a greater amount of climate change gases in the atmosphere - more than the natural systems can take out again. Global warming is the result this process.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Global warming is caused by a combination of problems.  
The combination of problems could be distilled to the way we live our lifes.  
Therefore global warming is caused by the way we live our lifes.

Global warming is caused by the way we live our lifes.  
The way we live our lifes is differing.  
Therefore how we cause global warming is differing.

A greater amount of climate changing gases put into the atmosphere than the natural systems of the earth can take out again will cause global warming.  
We are causing a greater amount of climate changing gases to be put into the atmosphere than the natural systems can take out again.  
Therefore we are causing global warming.

**Story 4: »Advancing energy use and efficiency as a solution«**

[= im Transkript Zeile 94 bis 103 ]

*Storyline:* Climate changing gases are mainly resulting from energy use and industry. As alternatives can be established and efficiency can be increased reducing climate changing gases does not imply stopping the use of energy and being industrialised. WWF will work to achieve such an advancement in energy use and efficiency.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Climate changing gases could be reduce with establishing alternatives and increasing efficiency.  
The impossibility to establish alternatives and increase efficiency would imply stopping the use of energy and industrialisation.  
Therefore reducing climate changing gases does not imply stopping the use of energy and being industrialised.

**WWF will work to achieve an alternative to a stop in using energy and being industrialised.**  
**Advancing energy use and efficiency is an alternative to a stop in using energy and being industrialised.**  
Therefore WWF will work to achieve an advancement in energy use and efficiency.
Climate changing gases are put into the atmosphere through energy use and industry. Energy use and industry can be advanced by establishing alternatives and increasing efficiency. **Therefore establishing alternatives and increasing efficiency will reduce climate changing gases.**

**Story 5: »A bind solution of individual action and action of business and government«**

*Storyline:* This is a story about the solutions to climate change. A real solution to climate change is a kind of collective action on different levels. Individuals as well as business and governments have to bear responsibility in equal parts. Individuals have to change the way they live. Business and governments have to make the infrastructure and energy supply more efficient and have to implement legislation that regulates the way of living essentially.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

A real solution to climate change is a kind of collective action on different levels.
Collective action on different levels comprises the responsibility of individuals as well as business and governments.
A real solution to climate change comprises the responsibility of individuals as well as business and governments.

A bind solution to climate change is comprehending a stake of individual action.
The stake of individual action is a change in the way we live our lifes (the way that you shop, where you live and the way that you commute to work for example).
Therefore a bind solution is comprehending a change in the way we live our lifes.

A bind solution to climate change is comprehending a stake of action of business and government.
The stake of action of business and government is to make infrastructure and energy supply more efficient and having legislation that regulates the way that we live our lives essentially.
Therefore a bind solution is comprehending to make infrastructure and energy supply more efficient and having legislation that regulates the way that we live our lives essentially.

To solve climate change the three planet lifestyle has to be reduced to a one planet lifestyle.
Reducing the three plane lifestyle to a one planet lifestyle means in equal parts to take individual actions as well as action of business and government.
Therefore to solve climate change means in equal parts to take individual actions as well as action of business and government.
Story 6: »A 'silver bullet' is masking the root causes of Climate Change«
[= im Transkript Zeile 130 bis 161]

**Storyline:** This is a story about false solutions to climate change. As the root cause of the problem of climate change is the way of living based on fossil fuels, 'silver bullet' solutions which mean carrying on the way of living, are masking the problem. A fundamental solution in contrast is tackling the root cause.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- The fundamental problem is the way of living based on fossil fuels.
- The problem of the way of living based on fossil fuels is masked not tackled by a 'silver bullet', something that would mean that we can carry on living the way that we do and not have to change.
- Therefore the fundamental problem is masked by a 'silver bullet'.

- Climate change is increasing when an agreement is delayed.
- If an agreement is delayed one has to look for alternatives.
- Therefore to prevent an increasing climate change one has to look for alternatives.

Story 7: »Legally binding solution not just promises needed«
[= im Transkript Zeile 162 bis 178]

**Storyline:** To tackle climate change a fundamental solution is needed which is legally binding one. Therefore just an political agreement which is not binding is a false solution as it is just promises that might not ever be filled.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

- To tackle climate change a fundamental solution is needed.
- Just a political agreement which is not legally binding (agreeing that there's a problem, recognising the scale, putting in place some ambition bag which tells what to do) is not a fundamental solution.
- Therefore just a political agreement which is not legally binding will not tackle climate change.

Story 8: »The meaning of Climate Justice«
[= im Transkript Zeile 179 bis 199]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the meaning of the term Climate Justice. Climate Justice is about those who suffer the most and who at the same time have the least responsibility for the causes of climate change. Industrial countries are those who have the greatest historical responsibility, as they developed first. Climate Justice is demanding for reparations and compensations.
Climate Justice is about those who suffer most. Those who suffer most are those who have least responsibility for the causes of climate change. Therefore Climate Justice is about those who have least responsibility for the causes of climate change.

Climate Justice is demanding for a balancing between those who are responsible and those who are suffering or who will suffer. Reparations of anything or compensations are such a balancing. Therefore Climate Justice is demanding for reparations of anything and compensations.

The historical responsibility for causing the problem is dependent on the start of development. The industrialised countries developed first. Therefore industrialised countries have the greatest historical responsibility.

One would not open up a huge set of issues and problems intentionally. States starting to say that they recognise the responsibility for compensation would open up a huge set of issues and problems. Therefore states would not start saying that they recognise the responsibility for compensation intentionally.

Climate Justice is a violent term. WWF is not using violent terms for phrasing in many cases. WWF is not using the term Climate Justice in many cases.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Sylogismen:

**Story 9: »State’s rationality: not setting problems intentionally«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 199 bis 213 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the rationality of states’ climate politics. As no one would open up a huge set of problems intentionally, states would not start to say that they recognise the responsibility for compensation.

**Story 10: »Climate Justice as violent term«**

[ = im Transkript Zeile 214 bis 220 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the use of the term Climate Justice. Climate Justice is understood as a violent term. That’s why WWF is not refering to it in many cases. But as WWF does not have a problem with the term, a lot of partner organisations are using it.
Solving climate change is characterised by problems and difficulties. Problems and difficulties will only be solved by countries talking together like the way they are doing at Copenhagen. Therefore climate change will only be solved by countries talking together.

For observer organisations and non-governmental organisations the UNFCCC makes space to participate, observe and contribute to the process. WWF is an observer organisation. Therefore for WWF the UNFCCC makes space to participate, observe and contribute to the process.

The parties and the other groups that are involved do allow good access to lobbying from NGOs and business. Lobbying from NGOs and business is including vested interests as well as interests of maintaining the status quo for short-time gain more than looking at the long-term gain. Therefore the parties and the other groups that are involved do allow good access to vested interests as well as interests of maintaining the status quo for short-time gain.
Story 13: »A fair, ambitious and binding deal«

[= im Transkript Zeile 266 vis 197]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the necessary outcome of the Copenhagen negotiations. One needs a deal which is fair, ambitious and binding. Fair means recognising the common and differentiated responsibilities for the problem as well as the differentiated ability to deal with it. Ambitious means addressing the problem based on the recent science. Legally binding means committing countries to deliver and implementing a compliance regime. WWF’s is campaigning on a fair, ambitious and binding deal like most of the NGOs are doing as well.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Fundamental to the campaigning of most NGOs is the demand for fairness, ambitiousness and bindingness of a deal. WWF is demanding for fairness, ambitiousness and bindingness of a deal. Therefore WWF’s is campaigning on a demand most of the NGOs are campaigning on. (part of a big coalition)

We need to base the targets at the negotiations in Copenhagen on the up to date peer reviewed science. The IPCC science review is no up to date peer reviewed science (cause a lot changed in four years after the editorial deadlines about measurements). Therefore we can not base the targets at the negotiations in Copenhagen on the IPCC science review.

A deal needs to be ambitious. Ambitious means addressing the problem based on the recent science. Therefore a deal needs to address the problem based on the recent science.

A deal needs to be legally binding. Legally binding means committing countries to deliver and implementing a compliance regime. Therefore a deal needs to commit countries to deliver and to implement a compliance regime.

A deal needs to be fair. Fair means recognising the common and differentiated responsibilities for the problem as well as the differentiated ability to deal with it. Therefore a deal needs to recognise the common and differentiated responsibilities for the problem as well as the differentiated ability to deal with it.
Story 14: »Underrepresentation in the climate negotiations«

[ = im Transskript Zeile 298 bis 332 ]

Storyline: This is a story about the representativeness of the climate negotiations. At the climate negotiations some groups are underrepresented: The people who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives, the women and the youth. Their voices should be louder and stronger. WWF is bringing people who are in the front-line of climate change to the negotiations and therefore is trying to make the negotiations more representative.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

At the climate negotiations voices of the underrepresented groups could be louder and stronger.
People who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives, women and youth are underrepresented groups.
Therefore at the climate negotiations voices of People who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives, women and youth could be louder and stronger.

People who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives are underrepresented at the climate negotiations.
WWF tried to bring some people who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives.
Therefore WWF tried to make the climate negotiations more representative.

Story 15: »The climate negotiations as a democratic process«

[ = im Transskript Zeile 333 bis 350 ]

Storyline: The climate negotiations are a democratic process. In democratic process the weight of argument and credibility decides whether a view should be heard or not and everybody has the right to make his/her case heard.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

In democratic process the weight of argument and credibility should decide whether a view should be heard or not.
The climate negotiations are a democratic process.
Therefore at the climate negotiations it should be the weight of argument and credibility that decides whether a view should be heard or not.

In a democratic process everybody has the right to make his/her case heard.
The climate negotiations are a democratic process.
Therefore at the climate negotiations everybody has the right to make his/her case heard.
**Story 16: »WWF's respected position in the negotiations«**

* [ = im Transskript Zeile 351 bis 368 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the role of WWF at the negotiations. WWF credibly scientifically based organisation with a large international membership and a policy team that represents a lot of countries from north and south. This provides WWF a respected position with its partner organisations and respect for its interventions and contributions to the negotiation process.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**BEING A CREDIBLY SCIENTIFICLY BASED ORGANISATION WITH A LARGE INTERNATIONAL MEMBERSHIP AND A POLICY TEAM THAT REPRESENTS A LOT OF COUNTRIES FROM NORTH AND SOUTH PROVIDES A RESPECTED POSITION WITH ITS PARTNER ORGANISATIONS AND RESPECT FOR ITS INTERVENTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS.**

WWF is a credibly scientifically based organisation with a large international membership and a policy team that represents a lot of countries from north and south. Therefore WWF has a respected position with its partner organisations and respect for its interventions and contributions to the negotiation process.

**Story 17: »WWF's means of climate politics«**

* [ = im Transskript Zeile 369 bis 390 ]

**Storyline:** This is a story about the means of WWF's climate politics at the negotiations. WWF engaging in policy issues that the negotiations break down into/ is doing lobbying work by means of a policy team, is engaging media and trying to make the climate negotiations accessible to public audience by means of communications and campaign sub-units and is attracting media and giving policy speakers a platform by means of stands.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

**In WWF's climate politics it is necessary to attract media attention and to give the policy speakers a platform.**

Stands are means for attracting media and giving policy speakers a platform. Therefore stands are means for WWF's climate politics.

**In WWF's climate politics it is necessary to engage in policy issues that the negotiations break down into/ to do lobbying work.**

A policy team is a means for engaging in policy issues that the negotiations break down into/ is doing lobbying work. Therefore a policy team is a means for WWF's climate politics.

**In WWF's climate politics it is necessary to engage media and try to make the climate negotiations accessible to public audience.**

Communications and campaign sub-units are means for engaging media and trying to make the climate negotiations accessible to public audience. Therefore communications and campaign sub-units are means for WWF's climate politics.
Story 18: »The right to protest peaceful within the law«

[= im Transskript Zeile 392 bis 407 ]

Storyline: All have a right to protest peaceful and do non-violent direct action within the law. WWF got the right to protest as its protest remains peaceful. There are different tactics which are peaceful and non-violent. Therefore all have the right to use those different tactics. In a democratic process one group should not comment on other groups tactics. That’s why WWF doesn’t tend to comment on what other groups’ tactics are.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Because of reasons of (In a democratic process) one group should not comment on other groups tactics.
WWF doesn’t tend to comment on what other groups’ tactics are.
Therefore WWF is part of (A democratic process)?.

Peaceful and constructive protest is within the law.
WWF’s protest is peaceful and constructive.
Therefore WWF is acting within the law.

All have a right to protest peaceful.
WWF’s protest remains peaceful.
Therefore WWF got the right to protest.

All have a right to protest peaceful and do non-violent direct action within the law.
There are different tactics which are peaceful protest and non-violent direct action within the law.
Therefore all have a right to use different tactics.

Story 19: »Different opinions (of NGOs) but different for reasons«

[= im Transskript Zeile 415 bis 432 ]

Storyline: Disagreement between NGOs is existing for reason. Both parties know about the reasons for the differences and accept and manage them.

Reproduktion der Story in Form von Syllogismen:

Different positions/opinions are different for reasons.
Parties know and accept the reasons for differences.
Therefore know and accept different positions/opinions.
A.5 Fallexzerpte zur hegemonialen Struktur der Interviews

A.5.1 Vorbemerkung

Die hegemoniale Struktur bezeichnet die aufgrund der Differenzierung bzw. Äquivalenzierung von Forderungen in einem Text vorherrschende Struktur von Artikulationen (vgl. hierzu im Weiteren Kap. II.2.5 der Dissertation). Im Text implizit bleibende Forderungen werden im Fallexzerpt durch KAPITÄLCHEN hervorgehoben.
A CO2 concentration of 350 ppm as the bottom line for CO2 in the atmosphere means

- a safe and stable climate (i.e. the prevention of bad things happening – like the melting of the arctic or people dying as a direct or indirect result of climate change).
- an ‘entire system change’.

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:**

A CO2 concentration of 350 ppm

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):**

350 ppm as the bottom line for CO2 in the atmosphere means

- a safe and stable climate (i.e. the prevention of bad things happening – like the melting of the arctic or people dying as a direct or indirect result of climate change).
- an ‘entire system change’.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):**

- Considering science (science says that for a safe, stable climate 350 ppm has to be the bottom line for CO2);
- Shifting the debate in the negotiations (the demand for maximum 450 ppm CO2 and 2 degrees warming to the demand for maximum 350 ppm CO2 and 1.5 degrees warming);
- A critical limit in climate politics based on a well-defined prognosis of the amount of degrees warming;
- A huge amount of reduction of CO2 emissions (drastic mitigation efforts);
- THE IDEA OF OFF-SETTING (CARBON TRADING OR CDM PROJECTS) DONE WELL;
- Behavioural change as an important but additional solution;
- Setting limits and standards by which the entire society can change rapidly;
- Government action (setting limits and standards; initiating an entire system change);
- Initiating an entire system change means governments remove all subsidies from fossil fuels or invest in the technologies that will reduce carbon;
- Smart government action protecting the people’s rights and biodiversity (healing the planet at the same time when carbon is reduced);
- Addressing the concerns of oppressed peoples around the world;
- Making reparations for damage already done by historic carbon emissions (Climate debt);
- Financing (by countries like the US that have caused most of the problem) and adaptation fundings;
- Technology transfer;
- Fair, bold and ambitious ways of getting back to 350;
- The cooperation of all countries within the UN climate negotiations as the best forum for problem-solving in a comprehensive way;
- Added components of civil society organizing (changing difficult global processes);
Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

- (PEACEFUL) PROTESTS;
- Pressure of civil society on anyone who has decision-making authority in the negotiation process (heads of state, environmental ministers and the delegates) (creating an air of heightened tension to the negotiations);
- Movement building and growing the social movement around climate change regarding breadth, diversity and power (the international day of climate action on October 24th as a tool for that aim);
- Representing the voices of all the people who have been organized with october 24th into the negotiations
- Reporting out what is going on at Copenhagen back to the global movement;
- Bringing as much of society with one as possible;
- Drawing the world’s eyes to Copenhagen;
- Focussing on the science and being open to partnering makes an organization able to get a widespread of organizations and social movements to participate together;

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
A CO2 concentration above 350 ppm

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
A concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere above the science-based critical limit of 350 parts-per-million is

- the cause of bad things happening around the world (i.e. the melting of the arctic or 300.000 people dying each year as a direct or indirect result of climate change).
- the cause of climate impacts imposed on especially poor people

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

- US, PUTTING TOO MUCH CARBON IN THE ATMOSPHERE;
- A specific definition of critical limits in climate politics: 450 ppm gives a 50%-chance of 2 degrees warming, stabilising at two degrees of temperature raise sustains a concentration above 350 ppm;
- The current flaws in the implementation of the idea of off-setting (carbon trading or cdm projects) by governments;
- The flaw of representativeness of the UN (not every state having enough delegates to fill all the roles that need to be filled at the negotiations);
- THE NOT-FAIR DECISION-MAKING IN THE ACTUAL DEBATE OF THE TREATY TEXT (indigenous voices and young people are underrepresented, governments are making all the decisions);
- The discouraging and silencing of action-oriented and confrontational tactics by institutionalising the respective groups (esp. the allocation of a constituency status at the UNFCCC to those groups);
- Comprehending behavioural change (changing light bulbs, buying ecological, turning down the thermostat, unplugging computers) as primary solution;
- Massive tree plantations in Brazil after cutting down the rain forest and loosing all the
biodiversity and kicking indigenous people off the land;
- The US burning fossil fuels for 200 years and contributing the vast amount of carbon into the atmosphere;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):**

- Groups getting institutionalized by means of receiving constituency status at the UNFCCC (and therefore getting less room to speak up);
- Protest which may turn violent (will not bring as much of society with one as possible; will bring the wrong kind of attention to Copenhagen; will destroy the opportunity to realize radical demands);
A.5.3 Fallexzerpt »CAN – Climate Action Network International«

**Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews**

**Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)**

*Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:*
An ecological modernization

*Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):*
An ecological modernization

- is equal to an internalization of greener technologies and healthier lifestyles into patterns of government policies.
- is heightening green technologies up to a level of economic feasibility and attractiveness to investors.
- is making green technologies the way for the future.
- is creating jobs.
- is making cleaner air.
- is doing all sorts of things in addition to helping to address global warming emission.
- is a shift to renewable electricity and renewable power resources such as wind and solar.
- IS ALLOWING THE DEVELOPING WORLD TO BECOME PROSPEROUS (TO LIFT THEIR CITIZENS OUT OF (AN EXTREME) POVERTY) while moving away from dirty technologies/ using cleaner technologies.

*Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):*

- Businesses trying to be a part of the solution and taking advantage of a new area for investment and innovation;
- Effort to facilitate and encourage progress at the UNFCCC;
- The UNFCCC being the most appropriate place for negotiations to take place (being the most transparent and open process, allowing for the most the widest variety of voices to be heard, being agreed by over 180 countries);
- Strong action being agreed at the negotiations;
- The voices of those, who are most affected by climate change being heard (bringing them to negotiations or finding other ways to lift their voices in the dialogue);
- Hearing the voices of indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change well enough;
- Stopping/ Shifting problematic patterns of government policies, i.e. internalising greener technologies and healthier lifestyles in government policies (being more important than focussing on personal action);
- Saving energy (the cheapest solution), i.e. heightening efficiency;
- Shifting to renewable electricity and renewable power resources (such as wind and solar);
- Developed countries helping developing countries to move away from dirty technologies/ use cleaner technologies (because of their responsibility);
Coordination and a unified voice of civil society to be most effective (to tackle businesses' investments of a immense amount of money and resources to maintain the status quo);
• Taking principles of equity, justice and fairness into account and into all of one's positions (the key part of the (Climate) Justice frame is the equity issue);
• Activist oriented organizations (participating at the negotiations) making the public awareness about the issue;
• Not saying that the whole UNFCCC process is a shame is useful;
• Changing government policy beforehand the negotiations in the capitals (to reach drastic changes);
• Affecting political discussions in the capital during the negotiations to change the government policy (to reach drastic changes);
• Campaigning or lobbying around various events (the UN climate negotiations or the G20 or other regional events);
• Coordinating, information sharing, lobbying, cooperation, focus on media attention, publishing a newsletter every day
• Building on story lines/ messages;
• Building the capacity of the people in developing countries of the south;
• Protests or activities that are raising the level of awareness of the public;
• Encouraging/ pressuring governments to take stronger action (with raised public awareness);
• Protests or activities that are an effort to facilitate and encourage progress;
• Focussing on the capacity building effort to help developing countries participation and capacity building;
• Cooperation as a means to compensate limited resources of NGOs;

Excessive ghg emissions

Excessive ghg emissions (TO A HIGH DEGREE IN THE US OR EUROPE; TO A LOW DEGREE IN AFRICA) are
• causing a pollution of the atmosphere.
• causing climate change.
• making those, who are the least responsible for causing them being the most affected.
• causing effects like desertification in countries in Africa.
• are not making effects evident in countries that have the biggest responsibility for climate change (the US or Europe).

The business models of the fossil fuel industry (especially oil companies, but also coal companies and others);
• Using very dirty technologies;
• The developed world developing/becoming prosperous on very dirty technologies;
• Problematic patterns of government policies driving emissions to continue to rise;
• Government policies allowing the fossil fuel industry to continue its business models;
• Fossil fuel subsidies;
• Businesses looking to maintain the status quo, i.e. their dominance in the market and their ability to make money of the dirty energy (investing a immense amount of money and resources);
• Immense amounts of resources used by the fossil fuel industry to avoid a change of its business models;
• Geopolitical issues being incorporated into the discussions at the international climate negotiations (MAKING THINGS INCREDIBLY COMPLICATED AND INCREDIBLY CHALLENGING);
• Issues with limited relevance to climate (like geopolitical issues) being incorporated into the discussions at the international climate negotiations;
• The government not achieving lofty goals at Copenhagen;
• The governmental negotiators being hands tight or having only some wiggle room at the negotiations;
• The voices of indigenous people, the voices of those, who are most affected by climate change not being heard well enough at the negotiations;
• No strong action being agreed at the negotiations;
• COUNTRIES THAT HAVE THE BIGGEST RESPONSIBILITY (THE US OR EUROPE) FOR CLIMATE CHANGE (not seeing the effects of climate change first hand) BEING ABLE TO PUSH IT ASIDE/ NOT FOCUS ON IT AS MUCH;
• Investing in technologies, where one has to worry about the waste (like nuclear power and so-called clean coal);
• Investing in costly solutions to climate change (like nuclear power);
• So-called clean coal;
• Carbon sequestration;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):**

• Trying to change government policy at the negotiations itself and not beforehand;
• NGOs or businesses are having a disruption or stop of the negotiations as the only objective;
• Activists saying that the whole process within the UN is a shame;
• NGOs having limited resources;
A paradigm-shift, i.e. a fundamental shift in the way of thinking about development, growth, gain, happiness and well-being, means

- a dramatic cut of greenhouse gas emissions.
- changed lifestyles (therefore a changed source of energy);
- POSITIVE IMPACTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT OR ON POOR COUNTRIES AND COMMUNITIES;
- Climate Justice, i.e. a stop of future climate change (esp. a stop of further damage to communities that have not contributed to climate change) and adaptation and sustainable development of developing countries (esp. of communities that have not contributed to climate change);
- Tackling the real causes of climate change;
- Political change occurring;
- The UN negotiation giving room for political change;
- Everybody having the right to see, to watch and comment at the climate negotiations;
- Impacting the UN negotiations;
- A fair, effective and binding outcome: i.e. ensuring binding emission reductions and ensuring sufficient secure financing for developing countries to help them to adapt and to develop sustainably;
- Everyone having the right to see, to watch and comment at the climate negotiations (nobody should be excluded);
- Decision-making following the principle of subsidiarity (decisions have to be made as close to the people as possible);
- GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOLLOWING THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBSIDIARITY;
- A change of the source of energy;
- Adaptation of affected countries;
- Disaster resolution tackling the effects of climate change;
- Specific market-mechanisms (having positive impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities);
- Adaptation measures avoiding negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities;
- Small-field adaptation technologies being part of the technology and adaptation negotiations;
- HOLISTICALLY PLANNING OF ADAPTATION MEASURES (WITH REGIONAL COOPERATION);
- Giving affected people resources to be able to adapt;
- A deal comprising commitments about stopping what is happening and ensuring that
people are able to develop;
• Implementing the figures that are on the table showing what is necessary to stop what is happening and to ensure that people are able to develop;
• Specific mitigation and financing commitments;
• Advocacy work (TO TACKLE THE REAL CAUSES, CAUSING POLITICAL CHANGE);
• Power;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):
• Being in partnership with developing countries;
• Supporting local organizations to do the work in the country;
• Changing international policies that are impacting on the communities in the South;
• Organizations coming together at a network level heightening influence;
• Civil society action (many people acting together);
• Protest (people showing that they care, letting negotiators know that they have to act);
• Doing advocacy work;
• Campaigning/ impacting the UN negotiations with an international campaign;
• Programme cooperation (the enhancement of aid-effectiveness, i.e. ensuring what is coordinated)
• Doing side events and briefings;
• Lobbying governments;
• The call for climate justice;
• A very broad alliance calling for climate justice;

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
The paradigm of development and well-being

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
The paradigm of development and well-being is a specific way of thinking about development, growth, gain, happiness and well-being, which is causing
• too many greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.
• negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities, i.e.
• DAMAGE TO COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE NOT CONTRIBUTED TO CLIMATE CHANGE.
• MALADAPTATION AND UNSUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (ESP. OF COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE NOT CONTRIBUTED TO CLIMATE CHANGE).

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):
• ‘False solutions’ to climate change, which have negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities;
• Specific market-mechanisms (having negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities);
• CDM having negative impacts on the environment or on poor countries and communities;
• IMPLEMENTING ADAPTATION MEASURES WITH MARKETS;
• Adaptation technologies not getting enough attention in the negotiations about technologies;
• No shift of things occurring (at Copenhagen);
• Specific mitigation and financing commitments not being existent yet;

_Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):_

• NGOs just doing service delivery;
A.5.5 Fallexzerpt »Focus/ CJN! – Focus on the Global South/ Climate Justice Now!«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:
A social transformation/ a systemic change

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
A social transformation/ a systemic change means

- something opposed to the capitalist framework is realized.
- THE SOCIAL AND THE ECOLOGICAL IS INTERRELATED, i.e. social justice being combined with ecological justice.
- consumption and production systems are transformed.
- the rate of resource consumption, particularly of fossil fuels, does not exceed the earth's capacity to absorb and regenerate and replenish itself.
- energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, people's participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights and a just transition for workers.
- reduced transport, more diverse agricultural production and the protection and regeneration of biodiversity and soils, because of a transformed agricultural system.
- improved social conditions for the majority of people.
- the benefits of the economic production are redistributed to a much larger group of people.
- the possibility to live without cars or to reduce the dependency on cars is realized.

- Articulating a very transformative agenda, i.e. to say that the ecological crisis of the planet can not be dealt with in a capitalist framework;
- INTERRELATING THE SOCIAL AND THE ECOLOGICAL;
- ADDRESSING THE SOCIAL QUESTIONS, THE QUESTIONS OF FOOD AND ACCESS TO FOOD, BIODIVERSITY, DEPENDENCY ON FOSSIL FUEL, CO2 EMISSIONS;
- Highlighting that the technical debates are not abstracted of the social reality and the social impacts;
- Highlighting the linkage of decisions and how they are made with questions of social justice;
- Reducing consumption on every level/ in general (consumption of energy, consumption of material goods, consumption of meat, etc.);
- OVERCOMING THE CURRENT RATE OF CONSUMPTION COMPLETELY WHICH IS EXCEEDING THE RATE OF REPRODUCTION;
- A resource consumption, particularly of fossil fuels, at a rate, which does not exceed the earth's capacity to absorb and regenerate and replenish itself
- Smart solutions addressing a lot of different issues/ CAN SOLVE THE CRISIS;
- PROTECTING THE ECONOMIC INTERESTS WITH A LONG TERM VIEW;
- ALL OF THE MAJOR ECONOMIES USING A LONG TERM VIEW AT THE NEGOTIATIONS;
- Reorganizing cities, i.e. a shift to accessible low-cost public transport;
- The agricultural system being transformed, i.e. reducing transport and the inputs to have
more diverse agricultural production and therefore to protect and regenerate biodiversity and soils;
• **CHANGING THE LIFESTYLE OF THE ELITE THAT MAKES THE DECISIONS;**
• Governments putting in place (even unilateral) policies;
• Achieving no legally binding agreement (as this would be a paralysis for the next five or ten years);
• No legally binding agreement means that there will be potential to continue to build a climate justice movement;
• A specific minimum outcome at the climate negotiation (COP15);
• Making the climate debate more transformative (reframing/ rethinking about or reconstructing the climate debate);
• (Climate Justice) Rejecting the carbon markets;
• (Climate Justice) Considering the Kyoto Protocol as a complete sell out;
• Reasserting agendas and demands that have been there for a long time by means of the issue of climate;
• (Climate Justice) Reframing the alternatives, i.e. talking about alternatives in the framework of the ecosystem or mother earth or redefining what it means to live well (buen vivir) (like indigenous people's movements are demanding for);
• (Climate Justice) Being very conscious (in the classic left) of the ecological questions;
• (CJN!’s principles) Building responses to climate change based on energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, people's participation, human rights, indigenous people's rights, women's rights, a just transition for workers;
• Rebuilding and replenishing ecosystems in a sustainable way;
• Shifting the energy systems, i.e. using renewable energy sources, down-scaling and localising energy production and therefore making energy-production more democratic, more efficient and more on the actual needs;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**

• Talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or articulating a very transformative agenda;
• A GLOBAL DEMAND FOR SOMETHING TO BE DONE ABOUT THE CRISIS (encouraged for example by demonstrations);
• Building a climate justice movement;
• Expanding the movement for transformation, i.e. building new alliances;
• Articulating linkages between the real struggles and the sort of more official elements of the climate debate (like CJN! is doing);
• Opening up the politics of climate change for people, who've been involved in other campaigns, in other struggles/ for demands that have been there for a long time (Climate Justice is resonating with movements and organizations from the south, which have been involved in resource-based struggles or struggles against large-scale development and sort of neoliberal economic policies – on the trade campaigns and the world bank campaigns, the privatization campaigns);
• A radical movement that has a purpose, commitment and courage of convictions (like the Reclaim Power! action showed);
• A non-violent direct action like the Reclaim Power! action;
• The Reclaim Power! action and the people's assembly giving the participating people the believe that they can achieve things, when they work together and stay together;
• Bolivia is articulating a very transformative agenda, which has a lot of supporters outside the negotiations;
• Creating ideas and spaces both inside and outside the negotiations (like CJN! does);
(Climate Justice) Talking about the people's voices and alternatives and justice-based responses to climate change (like in the Klimaforum);
• Connecting the outside with the inside in both ways;
• Creating a climate justice space inside the UNFCCC frame (i.e. pushing a justice framework and supporting the position of the south governments, trying to have a more systemic critique, a more system-critical approach to the climate negotiations, more critical of the market solutions and so on);
• Interventions in some of the plenaries in the negotiations;
• Mobilising for the Reclaim Power! action, particularly the inside part, the walk-out;
• Organizing a full day of activities on the outside (at the Klimaforum at Sunday the 13th);
• Participating as a block in the system change not climate change block at the demonstration;
• Doing press conferences;
• Organizing evening briefings (at the Klimaforum) to talk about what's happening inside and on the outside and sharing information about what's happening the next day;
• An alternative to CAN;
• Doing damage control (like CJN! is doing), if one has not much chance to influence the negotiations;

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
Capitalism

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
The capitalist framework is
• characterized by short-term economic interests.
• dependent on fossil fuel.
• characterized by a rate of consumption completely exceeding the rate of reproduction.
• causing CO2 emissions.
• causing a crisis of the planetary ecosystems/ an ecological kind of chaos affecting everything, i.e. (most visible and potentially irreversible) climate change, biodiversity depletion and the depletion of soils, which are all interrelated to each other (regarding consequences and responses).
• furthering an industrial model of agricultural, which is water-intensive, mono-growing, export-oriented, depending a lot on transportation, has terrible impacts on local markets and small-scale farmers and very devastating environmental impacts.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):
• Large scale, inefficient energy systems (based on massive infrastructure which is heavily dependent up on coal and other non-renewable resources; having a lot of waste);
• An UN agreement;
• A legally binding agreement (being a paralysis for the next five or ten years; provoking the vast majority of people to think that the problem is solved and there is no need to worry anymore);
• The northern countries having forced the developing countries into a position of accepting the terms of the deal;
• The terms of the deal allowing the developed countries not to change;
• The terms of the deal being put on the table by the rich countries;
• The most powerful countries (the G8) are dominating a lot of the discussions at the negotiations;
• The major economies protecting their short-term economic interests at the negotiations;
• The corporations being an active force in the negotiations (supporting a shift to a green capitalism or the maintenance of the status quo);
• Market-based solutions (like global carbon markets or CDMs);
• Geo-engineering;
• High-tech solutions;
• Nuclear;
• The privatization of the forests;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

• Some NGOs, who are part of the climate negotiations, promoting false solutions (like market-based solutions (like global carbon markets or CDMs) or geo-engineering or the privatization of the forests);
• CJN! not having much chance to influence the negotiations;
• Some social forces talking about systemic change, a kind of anti-capitalist or system-critical approach or are articulating a very transformative agenda, being nearly absent from the negotiations;
• An invisible and silent movement;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):**

- Der Stopp des Wachstums;
- Eine Diskussion darüber, wie wir leben wollen;
- MIT WENIGER RESSOURCEN UND MIT EINER WELTWEITEN GERECHTIGKEIT LEBEN;
- Verzicht auf bestimmte Dinge;
- Sich dafür einsetzen, dass alle Menschen auf der Welt dieselben Möglichkeiten haben, die wir mal gehabt haben;
- Die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung und damit zu Emissionen für die Südländer (die in Armut leben);
- Das Verhindern von Auswirkungen des Klimawandels;
- Der Verhandlungsprozess als Möglichkeit eine Vereinbarung zu erreichen (Alternativlosigkeit des Verhandlungsprozesses);
- Alternativlosigkeit dessen, was keine Lösung bringen wird (Alternativlosigkeit des Verhandlungsprozess bei konstitutivem Mangel einer (Problem)Lösung);
- Veränderung von Organisation bzw. Wertigkeit und Teilnehmer_innengröße des Verhandlungsprozesses;
- Regeln zur Reduktion der zu hohen Teilnehmer_innenzahl auf den Konferenzen (bspw. jede Delegation/ Organisation darf eine bestimmte Anzahl an Teilnehmer_innen mitbringen bzw. muss zum Ausgleich jeweils auch Teilnehmer_innen anderer finanziell schlechter ausgestatteter Länder fördern);
- TEILNAHME DER BETROFFENEN DES KLIMAWANDELS AM ENTSCHEIDUNGSPROZESS IN DEN KLIMAVERHANDLUNGEN;
- Finanzierung der Konferenzteilnahme von Frauen aus dem Süden (von GenderCC);
- Berechtigung zur Anwesenheit aller Personen und Gruppen auf den Klimaverhandlungen;
- Offenheit gegenüber Genderaspekten (d.h. ein gewisser Frauenanteil in der Gruppe);
- Einführung eines Paragraphen zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der
UNFCCC;
- Mitenken von Genderaspekten auf allen Ebenen (genderorientiertes Handeln auf nationaler und lokaler Ebene neben der internationalen);
- Integration von Genderaspekten in die Diskussions-Schwerpunkte (bspw. Financing, Technologie-Transfer, Mitigation) der Verhandlungen;
- Lösungen trotz Schwierigkeiten nicht erzwingen oder die Verhandlungen bzw. ein Ergebnis verhindern;
- EMISSIONSREDUKTION IN DEN INDUSTRIELÄNDERN;
- Handlung der entwickelten Industrieländer vor den Entwicklungsländern;
- Denjenigen, die in Armut leben die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung geben;
- Durchführung von Mitigations-Maßnahmen von den entwickelten Industrieländern und anschließend von Entwicklungsländern;
- Berücksichtigung der Ebene der Geschlechterverhältnisse, der Machtverhältnisse und der dahinterliegenden Rationalitäten bei Emissionsreduktion in den Industrieländern;

**Bekränzende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**
- Die Forderung nach einer Transformation der Gesellschaft;
- Die Anerkennung als Constituency, d.h. erhöhte Einflussmöglichkeiten (wie die Möglichkeit Statements geben zu können, Einladungen) [jedoch: der Anpassungsbedarf an den Prozess (ständige Anfragen zu Interventionen, etc.)];
- Aktionen von CJN! und das Einbringen von Grassroots-Organisationen in den Prozess vor der Konferenz in Bali;
- Verbesserungen des Wordings der (Verhandlungs-)Texte;
- Die Abstimmung mit Constituencies im UNFCCC-Prozess (um nicht gegeneinander zu arbeiten);
- Projekte zu Gender-Kommunikation und Capacity Building in Südafrika und auf der Ebene des internationalen Prozesses statt;
- Die Thematisierung von Gender auf den Klimaverhandlungen;
- Die Einführung eines Paragraphen zu Gender equality unter dem Punkt Prinzipien der UNFCCC;
- Protest außerhalb der Konferenz der Druck erzeugt;

**Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)**

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:**
Der Androzentrismus

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):**
Die androzentrische Planung und Denkweise,
- stellt bestimmte Männlichkeitsrollen oder -rezeptionen in den Mittelpunkt.
- orientiert sich an einigen wenigen Menschen (nicht allen Männern) und Männlichkeitskonzepten die auf grenzenloses Wachstum fokussieren.
- macht die traditionelle Ökonomie prioritär.
- schließt den Bereich der Versorgungökonome aus.
- führt zu erhöhten Emissionen.
- gibt denjenigen, die in Armut leben nicht die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung.
- lässt keine Diskussion darüber zu, wie wir leben wollen.
führt zu Ansätzen zur Lösung des Klimawandels die sich am Markt orientieren (marktbasierten Lösungsansätzen).

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):**

- Verständnis des Klimawandels als einem Umweltproblem;
- Die Priorität der traditionellen Ökonomie;
- Ausschluss des Bereichs der Versorgungsökonomie durch die Priorität der traditionellen Ökonomie;
- Der Markt;
- Das Unvermögen der Meisten sich keine Gesellschaft ohne Wachstum mit eigener Lebensqualität vorstellen zu können;
- Ungerechte Strukturierung des Verhandlungsprozesses, d.h. Länderdelegationen sind zahlenmäßig sehr ungleich besetzt (mehr Vertreter der Industrieländer als der Südländer) und haben unterschiedliche Entscheidungsmacht, die Teilnehmer_innen bei der UNFCCC, die über viel Geld verfügen haben eine zahlenmäßige und in der Selbstdarstellung höhere Präsenz und höheren Einfluss;
- Geringere Ressourcen der Südländer um an den Klimaverhandlungen teilzunehmen;
- Ungerechtigkeit=Ungleichwertigkeit der Stimmen/ Länder im UN-System;
- Ausschließliche Beteiligung der Verursacher des Klimawandels am Entscheidungsprozess in den Klimaverhandlungen (Abwesenheit der Betroffenen);
- Der Verhandlungsprozess als ein Schlagabtausch von Argumenten = nicht miteinander reden bzw. sich zuhören;
- Zu hohe Teilnehmer_innenzahl bei den Konferenzen;
- Alternativlosigkeit dessen, was keine Lösung bringen wird (Alternativlosigkeit des Verhandlungsprozess bei konstitutivem Mangel einer (Problem)Lösung);
- Zahlenmäßige aber nicht inhaltliche Dominanz von Observer-Organisationen;
- **PRAKTISCHE FESTSCHREIBUNG VON MARKTINSTRUMENTE (VOM EMISSIONSHANDEL BIS CDM) DURCH DEN OFFIZIELLEN PROZESS;**
- Das Gender auf den Klimaverhandlungen lange Zeit kein Thema war;
- Schwierigkeit in die Diskussions-Schwerpunkte (bspw. Financing, Technologie-Transfer, insb. Mitigation) der Verhandlungen Genderaspekte zu integrieren;
- Unverständnis der Beziehung von Geschlechterverhältnissen zur Klimakrise durch die Verhandelnden in der UNFCCC;
- Entwicklung von Krisenlösungsplänen/ "real solutions" am Schreibtisch (Reißbrett) (vs. eine Diskussion darüber, wie wir leben wollen);
- Ansätze, die glauben schnell etwas technologisch verändern zu können (wie bspw. CCS, Atomennergie oder marktbasierte Mechanismen);
- REDD oder CDM-Projekte;
- Die Idee eines unbegrenzten grünen Wachstums (in der Idee des Green New Deal);
- Gleiche pro-Kopf-Emissionen (sind ungerecht, da sie denen, die in Armut leben nicht die Möglichkeit zur Entwicklung geben);
Die Forderung (des Climate Justice Action Networks) Kopenhagen abzufackeln;
(Aufgrund einer Schwierigkeit) Lösungen erzwingen oder die Verhandlungen bzw. ein Ergebnis verhindern;
Ausschließlich Gender-Mainstreaming als Forderung;
Limitierung der Offenheit der Positionen aufgrund der ausschließlichen Organisation der Gender-Abteilungen von UN-Organisationen (wie es in der Global Gender and Climate Alliance ursprünglich der Fall war);
Keine Mitwirkung von Observer-Organisationen an Entscheidungen bei den Klimaverhandlungen;
IMMER STÄRKERE ANPASSUNG VON (INSB. DEN) UMWELTORGANISATIONEN (BSPW. DES WWF) SEIT DER KONFERENZ IN DEN HAAG AN DAS, WAS DURCH DEN OFFIZIELLEN PROZESS PRAKTISCH FESTGESCHRIEBEN WURDE (Marktinstrumente – vom Emissionshandel bis CDM);
Die Anerkennung als Constituency, d.h. der Anpassungsbedarf an den Prozess (ständige Anfragen zu Interventions, etc.) [jedoch: erhöhte Einflussmöglichkeiten (wie die Möglichkeit Statements geben zu können, Einladungen)];
Die Rede von dem Zeitmangel der Diskussion, was eine weltweite Gerechtigkeit bedeutet, WIE DIE KRISE ZU LÖSEN IST;
A.5.7 Fallexzerpt »GFN – Global Footprint Network«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden;
A world with a sustainable ecological footprint

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
A world with a sustainable ecological footprint means
- a balance between the production and the consumption of bio-capacity (ending ‘overshoot’) / the ability of the natural world to support the demand of bio-capacity being made by humans.
- the cause of environmental impacts or climate change and with it related social injustices does not exist anymore.
- just adaptation measures set in place to deal with the specific climate change, which is occurring nevertheless.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):
- AVOIDING A CONTINUED DEPENDENCY ON FOSSIL FUELS;
- Improving energy efficiency;
- Work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy, which is including all kinds of natural capital (no limitation to carbon);
- IMPROVING ENERGY EFFICIENCY WITH THE ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT APPROACH;
- Examining the current bio-capacity demand and its environmental impacts with the ecological footprint approach;
- Adopting the ecological footprint and building it into its political structure as a first step on the way to change people’s thinking about the production and consumption of natural capital;
- Revealing patterns of bio-capacity flows and asking questions about optimising the energy and environmental component of trade with the Ecology of Trade approach;
- Maintaining a surplus bio-capacity production in nations;
- Working on the supply side of energy means shifting the demand away from fossil fuels (which contains using more other sources of energy like renewables, especially ‘pink power’ or the nuclear option) or reducing the carbon content of the human emissions (which contains CONTINUED IMPROVEMENTS IN POLLUTION CONTROL OR POLLUTION PREVENTION DEVICES);
- Investing in alternative energy;
- Working on the demand side means optimising people's consumption (changing people's behaviours and way to think about the demand for products and for services);
- A slow process of trying to change the behavioural habits of hundreds of millions (if not billions) of people (a long-term shift);
- Governments, many corporations and non-profit groups encouraging people to optimize their consumption;
- Acting effectively before 2020 or 2030;
- An agreement for world leaders being able to move forward together;
• An agreement on the part of all nations;
• A voluntary agreement to report greenhouse gas emissions and the trend associated to those emissions;
• An outcome, which is visible and which people are paying attention to and are reporting about;
• Implementing the ecological asset management idea, i.e. rewarding nations for restoring of natural capital (like the REDD agreement does);
• Events like the climate conference at Copenhagen as a chance to cope with challenges like climate change/ as an opportunity to talk about good ideas;
• Anybody having the opportunity to be around the climate conferences, making it possible to hear as many different points of view as possible;
• Representing extraordinary ideas from the experience of indigenous peoples that more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration at the climate meetings;
• Avoiding that everybody is attending large meetings/ sessions

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**

• People having an opportunity to voice their frustrations with the negotiation process;
• People having an opportunity to make climate change as an urgent situation known to decision-makers and leaders;
• NGOs bringing the opportunity to talk about many good ideas forward by providing a wide-ranging set of materials;

**Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)**

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:**
An ‘overshoot’ / imbalance between bio-capacity production and consumption

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):**
An imbalance of bio-capacity production and consumption (i.e. the current demand of natural capital or bio-capacity extending its annual production → ‘overshoot’) is the cause of

• environmental impacts.
• dramatic climate change (a jeopardizing of the balance between oxygen and CO2 on the planet; a global phenomenon all people will feel the effects of).
• social injustices (climate injustices), i.e. a localized impact, an inequality or an unequally shared burden, which is related back to emissions or pollution of some kind: It could be the shifting patterns of rainfall and temperature, dramatic changes across the planet in terms of the ability of the land base to provide of food and other basic needs for people. The poor communities, the developing economies, the ones that are currently stressed or unstable are the ones affected by climate change first and perhaps worst.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):**

• Continuing to debate climate change, which’s science is very clear;
• Using fossil fuels;
• Humans continuously demanding for fossil fuels;
• The on-going demand for energy based on the western consumption patterns;
• Transfering the western consumption patterns to developing economies;
• Work on the issues of energy efficiency and the embodied energy, which is limited to the
carbon component and therefore excluding other natural capital and other bio-capacity production issues;
• The flow of bio-capacity from one continent to another (contradicting the idea of climate justice);
• Nations (like China, for example) accessing the surplus bio-capacity of other nations (like for example in Africa) and appropriating it for their own needs;
• Specific trade relationships taking shape between the nations in Africa and nations like China constituting the flow of bio-capacity from one continent to another;
• Everybody attending the large meetings/ sessions would be difficult to work with/ become chaotic;
• Not representing extraordinary ideas from the experience of indigenous peoples that more conventional solutions haven’t taken into consideration at the climate meetings;
• Not representing underprivileged nations or communities, developing economies, the indigenous peoples at the climate meetings;
• Making statements that aren’t relevant to the discussions;

_Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):_

• Protest activities, which are not focussed on the issue at hand;
A whole new system/ social structure in place/ A new society

- not dependent on capitalist economics.
- not going to be (ecologically) destructive.
- the transformation away from the system of infinite growth.
- socially just

Getting rid of the current process of negotiation and trying something else;
Groups inside the negotiation process and groups mobilising on the outside working together (coordination of activities inside and outside);
Realising the most extreme looking but legitimate demands of developing countries;
Figuring out, how to live in a way that's not ecologically destructive;
The knowledge (millennia of experience) of many indigenous groups about living in a not destructive way;

NGOs being more radical in their demands makes the until then most extreme demands of developing countries look more reasonable/ moderat;
Alliances strengthening the work of similar organizations;
An alliance between organizations critical of the UN climate process strengthening their work;
Participating in the current process of negotiation to expose it and abolish it;
The mobilization of social movements;
The mobilization of social movements mobilising on the inside and on the outside of the UNFCCC talks at Copenhagen against the UNFCCC process;
Sharing peoples' voices from the outside;
Having a solid coalition of groups which is an alternative to CAN;
(Some people think it is necessary) CJN! putting a little more pressure on, being a little bit more vocal and militant in what they are demanding;
Broadcast what's going on inside the negotiations out to the rest of the world;
Big very militant angry protest outside the convention centre being a critical part of trying to put things forward (the only way that governments potentially even think about listening);
The access to NGO resources being not exclusive;
Manifestation of the NGOs (CJN’s) policies within UNFCCC;
• Making the voices and messages of people who are outside of the talks heard inside the talks;
• Working on alliance building and building the climate justice movement;
• Drawing from the experience of many indigenous groups.

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
The (economic/ capitalist) system

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
The (economic/ capitalist) system is
• dependent on capitalist economics/ capitalism.
• leading to a overuse of the ecosystem and its collapse (eventually the end of human population).
• causing/ intensifying ecological consequence like climate change.
• violating human rights/ engendering injustice.
• empowering corporations to continue business as usual.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):
• The continuation of the imperialist, colonialist model (the collaboration and conspiration of the big powers (the developed countries) to figure out how to control everything and use the developing countries for their own means).
• Keeping hold of the current economic system;
• Infinite economic growth (increasing resource exploitation);
• The UN climate convention making a decision allowing the use of genetically engineered trees and carbon plantations;
• The process of negotiation;
• The UNFCCC process being extremely hierarchically and patriarchically (EXCLUDING DEVELOPING COUNTRY DELEGATIONS, NON-GOVERNMENTAL AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ORGANIZATIONS);
• The dealmaking of the developed country delegations behind closed doors (the 'danish text' at COP15) as a continuation of the imperialist, colonialist model;
• Very conservative, very pro-corporate policies in the climate process;
• Carbon offsets (and voluntary emission targets);
• The use of genetically engineered trees and carbon plantations;
• An extreme amount of repression against the movements to be expected at the UNFCCC process at Copenhagen;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):
• The really large NGOs in CAN (like WWF, Conservation International and Nature Conservancy) having very conservative, very pro-corporate policies.
• CAN's exclusive monopoly of access to NGO ressources.
• (SOME PEOPLE SAY) CJN’S INVOLVEMENT IN THE INTERNAL PROCESS AND BEING NOT VERY RADICAL IN ITS POSITIONS WON’T LEAD TO SUCCESS.
Eine CO2-neutrale Gesellschaft

- ist technisch möglich und laut Wissenschaft klimapolitisch notwendig.
- ist klimaverträglich.
- ist ein erreichbares Ziel.
- ist ein Teilziel auf dem Weg zur Rettung der Umwelt.
- ist bis zum Jahr 2050 notwendig.
- löst nicht alle Probleme der Welt bzw. das Gesellschaftssystem.
- ist klimagerecht, d.h. jeder Mensch das gleiche Recht auf Zugang hat zu Ressourcen, zu Energieversorgung und zu den Dienstleistungen über erneuerbare Energien; jeder Mensch die gleichen Pflichten zur Begrenzung von Emissionen hat, dass jeder Mensch eine begrenzte CO2 Menge emittieren darf (etwa eine Tonne pro Person).

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):**

- Angehen der Art der Energienutzung und der Ressourcenverschwendung, d.h. Nutzung erneuerbarer Energien, die möglichst dezentrale Nutzung von Windenergie und Sonnenenergie und Stopp der Ressourcenverschwendung;
- Die Einigung der Staatschefs auf ein Kopenhagenprotokoll;
- Ein faires, ambitioniertes und rechtlich verbindliches Klimaabkommen;
- Die Einbezug der Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandels auf den Klimaverhandlungen;
- Alle reden miteinander (das Grundprinzip der UN);
- Verhandlungen unter dem Dach der UN, wo jeder Staat Rederecht hat und die Ärmsten der Armen ihre Stimme erheben können;
- Verhandlungen um den notwendigen Reduktionspfad von CO2;
- Gesetzesmaßnahmen oder die Schaffung gesellschaftlicher Rahmenbedingungen;
- Die Beschränkung der Klimaverhandlungen auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen;
- Die UN als legitimer Ort von Verhandlungen über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen (da alle 192 Staaten der Welt vertreten sind);
- Eine sachlich fundierter Basis (auf der Grundlage des IPCC) für die Debatte über die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen;
- Zielen der Verhandlungen auf Klimagerechtigkeit;
- Die Reduktion der Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null;
- Das Anbieten drastischer Treibhausgasreduktionen von Seiten der Industriestaaten;
- **DER POLITISCHE WILLE FÜR VERABSCHEIDUNG EINES ABKOMMENS**;
- Der Einbezug von Staatschefs in die Verhandlungen um politischen Willen zu schaffen und ein Abkommen möglich zu machen;
Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

- Die Teilnahme der Klimabewegung an Verhandlungen (Lobbyarbeit in der Konferenz);
- Die Durchführung von Aktivitäten außerhalb der Verhandlungen (Proteste bei den Hauptemittenten, z.B. Kohlekraftwerken);
- Auf gewaltfreie Aktionen fokussierter Protest gegen die herrschenden Bedingungen;
- Internationale Abstimmung um bestimmte Aktionen machen zu können bzw. schnell reagieren zu können;
- Der Anspruch auf Gerechtigkeit (wie von der Climate Justice Now Bewegung (CJN!, CJA, FoE) erhoben);
- Keine Annahme von Geld aus Politik oder Industrie;

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:

Die überhöhte CO2-Konzentration in der Atmosphäre

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):

Die überhöhte CO2-Konzentration in der Atmosphäre

- resultiert im Treibhauseffekt und schussendlich im Klimawandel.
- erzeugt ein Gerechtigkeitsproblem insofern, dass sie zu enormen Klimaauswirkungen sowie zu sozialen Verwerfungen von Gesellschaftssystemen führt, bis hin zu Klimakriegen und Millionen von Klimaflüchtlingen.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

- Ein ressourcen-verschwenderischer Lebensstil;
- (Wirtschafts-)Wachstum;
- Die Forderung vieler Industriegesellschaften nach Wachstum;
- (Zu) geringe Einbezug der Stimmen der armen Menschen und der Menschen die am meisten betroffen sind vom Klimawandel auf den internationalen Verhandlungen
- Die (diskussionswürdigen) Eigeninteressen der Industrilobby;
- Die dominierende Rolle bestimmter Staaten (die großen Emittenten wie bspw. die USA) unter dem Dach der UN (erschweren faire Verhandlungen);
- Der fehlende politische Wille, die Treibhausgas-Emissionen bis zur Mitte des Jahrhunderts auf Null zu reduzieren;
- Die Weigerung der Industriestaaten in Kopenhagen drastische Treibhausgasreduktionen anzubieten (lassen Verhandlungsprozess stocken);
- Greenwashing der Verhandlungen;
- CCS Technologie;
- Nukleartechnologie (ein Risiko mit einem anderen Risiko aufwiegen);
- Geotechnologien, die versuchen Wetter über Geo-engineering zu beeinflussen (ein Risiko mit einem anderen Risiko aufwiegen);

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

- Eine Klimabewegung, die ausschließlich auf die Teilnahme an Konferenzen (Lobbying) setzt;
- Eine Klimabewegung, die Aktivitäten außerhalb der Konferenz (Proteste gegen
Hauptemittenten wie bspw. Kohlekraftwerke) außer acht lässt;
• Die Fokussierung auf technische Konzepte, d.h. die Vernachlässigung des Gerechtigkeitsthemas;
• Das Annehmen von Geld aus Politik oder Industrie;
• Die umfassende Forderung an die Klimaverhandlungen nach einem "ganz anderen Klima" (die Forderung nach einem anderen Gesellschaftssystem);
A.5.10 Fallexzerpt »GROOTS – Grassroots Organisations Operating Together in Sisterhood«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:

A changed paradigm of development

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):

A changed paradigm of development

- is effective for poor peoples' groups.
- is resulting in effective programming on the ground.
- means seeing poor people as serious stakeholders in the process.
- means empowering poor people.
- means environmental resources will be used sustainably, people live in harmony and are not overproducing.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):

- A PROCESS WHERE (AFFECTED) LOCAL PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN;
- A PROCESS WHERE LARGE POOR PEOPLES’ CONSTITUENCIES (AND THEIR SOLUTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS) HAVE A VISIBILITY;
- No absence of grassroots women representing themselves and their own interest in decision-making processes anymore;
- Coming to an agreement at COP15;
- Policies and programs at the national, global or regional level;
- NOT MARGINALISING VICTIMS OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND VICTIMS OF DISASTER (BASICALLY WOMEN) FROM DECISION-MAKING;
- Work on resilience or adaption, i.e. giving constituency-based groups the opportunity to impact what happens in terms of policy formulations;
- SEEING PEOPLE AS SERIOUS STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PROCESS;
- Work on mitigation, i.e. taking into consideration carbon neutral processes and reduce emissions;
- Collaboration and engaging with institutional actors and governments

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

- Opening up space and opportunities for grassroots women to represent themselves and their own interests in decision-making processes;
- Bringing people who are victims of disaster or climate change into the decision-making process (i.e. basically women and poor people);
- Protest activity getting the attention of common people;
- SMART PROTESTS BEING VISUALLY STIMULATING and getting media attention;
- CHANGE BY MEANS OF COLLABORATION OF POOR PEOPLES GROUPS/ GRASSROOTS GROUPS OR BY MEANS OF ADVERSIAL POLITICS OF PROFESSIONAL GROUPS;
Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
The old paradigm of development

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
The old paradigm of development

• entails lots of injustices.
• means that victims of climate change and victims of disaster (especially grassroots women) are marginalized from decision-making.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

• General wording on the macro level/uneffective programming on the ground;
• Marginalising victims of climate change and victims of disaster (basically women) from decision-making;
• The offsetting process;
• Technology transfer;
• Rich countries are selling something to poor countries;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

• Adversial politics aiming at taking on the power/government;
• Protests as a kind of adversial politics;
• Poor peoples' groups/grassroots pursuing an adversial politics;
• Violent protest (being a kind of boomerang on civil society; causing more security loads at the conferences/policing/an adverse response);
A.5.11 Fallexzerpt »Hopenhagen«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:
The Green Economy/ the low-carbon economy

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
The Green Economy

- is the tide that lifts all boats.
- is the solution to climate change and the economic crisis (i.e. will limit greenhouse gas emission without hurting productivity).
- is rewarding companies to innovate and therefore solve climate change.
- leads to a 'space race' for the best and quickest solutions of climate change.
- is the free competition and the capitalising on the growth opportunities.
- is based on renewable resources, low-carbon production and new technologies.
- is achieving prosperity on as broad a scale as possible.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):

- AWARENESS OF THE WORLD’S CITIZENS FOR CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE UN’S ROLE IN CREATING THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND FRAMEWORKS FOR COMBATING IT;
- DEMAND FOR A RENEWED CLIMATE POLITICS;
- Linking climate change and solutions to climate change to economy and therefore making it relevant and inspiring to the people of the world.
- A GROUP EFFORT REALIZED WITH A NEXUS OF SEVERAL GROUPS;
- People coming to the table as equal partners in dialogue and as contributors to solutions;
- Capitalising on the growth opportunities;
- Companies creating the solutions that will drive the green economy (like a transition to renewable based industry);
- Shifting away from using non-renewable resources.
- Investments in technologies and innovations (the highest innovative potential);

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

- BUILDING AWARENESS FOR CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE UN’S ROLE IN CREATING THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND FRAMEWORKS FOR COMBATING IT;
- Making successful climate politics relevant to the people of the world/ generating a demand for successful climate politics;
Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
Intergovernmental Regulation and Mandating

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
Intergovernmental regulation and mandating of the market is

• not stopping the rise of ghg emissions caused by INDUSTRIALIZATION AND PERVASIVE MATERIALISM IN THE DEVELOPED WORLD AND ITS CLIMATIC CONSEQUENCES LIKE RISING SEA LEVELS OR OTHER GEOGRAPHIC NATURAL ISSUES.
• not questioning the dependence on finite fossil resources and therefore endangering the foundation of the economic growth.
• INTERVENING IN THE MARKET’S ABILITY TO INNOVATE AND CONTINUE TO FUNCTION IN AN OPTIMAL LEVEL.
• RESULTING IN MAKING REPARATIONS OR SHIFTING AROUND OF RESOURCES AND THEREFORE BY MORE CHARITY THAN PROBLEM-SOLVING.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

• The absence of the world’s citizens’ awareness and demand for an agreement for a new economic model;
• The absence of any leadership for change in the UN organization;
• The current dealing with climate change and its solutions is not inspiring hope;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

• ACTIVISTS PROTESTING AND NOT USING THE INCLUSIVE SPACE FOR COMMON DISCUSSIONS ABOUT CHANGE (RESP. TOWARDS A GREEN ECONOMY) THE UN SET IN PLACE AT COP15;
• Activists being competitive in their demands, i.e. not pursuing the common goal of a change (towards a green economy);
• ACTIVISTS CALLING FOR CLIMATE JUSTICE AS A BACKWARD ORIENTED IDEA;
A.5.12 Fallexzerpt »International Youth Climate Movement«

**Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews**

**Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)**

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:**

Climate Justice

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):**

Climate Justice means

- resolving the clash of responsibility opposite to vulnerability.
- making climate change and climate change politics happening in a just way.
- treating biodiversity with respecting care.
- policies that are equitable and in-line with what science says.
- is equitable and just.
- is keeping trees and the natural carbon sinks standing.
- is respecting the basic rights/ the sovereignty of indigenous people.
- creating a lot of new jobs and revitalizing neighbourhoods and communities and the economy.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):**

- Policies that are equitable and in-line with what science says;
- Equitable and just mechanisms (keeping trees and the natural carbon sinks standing, treating biodiversity with respecting care);
- Getting off fossil fuels/ moving towards renewable energy sources, I.E. COUNTRIES COMMITING TO SERIOUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY (NATIONAL AND GLOBAL) AND MASSIVE INVESTMENTS IN CLEAN AND RENEWABLE ENERGIES (LIKE SOLAR AND WIND);
- Subsidies towards the renewable energy sector;
- Respecting the basic rights/ the sovereignty of indigenous people;
- Taking the issues of climate change seriously;
- CHANGING THE HIGHEST IMPACTS CAUSED BY THE COUNTRIES THAT ARE RESPONSIBLE THE MOST TO CLIMATE CHANGE;
- The people that are impacted by climate change being at the climate negotiations and being a vital part of the conversations and decision-making;
- The corporations and the fossil fuel industry not having the current influence;
- ACTIVITIES INSIDE AND DEMONSTRATIONS OUTSIDE THE NEGOTIATIONS;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**

- A movement having a real impact with direct action (for example shutting down coal plants);
- A global and visible power and movement demanding real action from governments (realized with activities inside and (equally important) demonstrations outside the negotiations);
- ACTIVITIES OF GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY;
- Direct action, i.e. a strong civil disobedience and non-violent action;
Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
The system

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
The system is causing

• a clash of responsibility opposite to vulnerability.
• affected people.
• that people who did least to create climate change are suffering the most because of it.
• the violation of basic rights/ the sovereignty of indigenous people.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

• The greenhouse gas emissions coming from burning the fossil fuels;
• Holding on the way of exploiting natural resources;
• The power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government;
• Subsidies being made towards coal, oil and nuclear energy;
• Subsidies being made towards coal, oil and nuclear energy because of the power and influence of the fossil fuel industry on the government;
• A collusion of governments and corporations and fossil fuel industry;
• Carbon offset;
• REDD schemes and carbon trading schemes (not respecting the basic rights of indigenous people in their sovereignty);
• Poor mostly minority people being impacted the most;
• Exclusion of the people that are the most impacted from talks and decisions about climate change;
• Not respecting the basic rights/ the sovereignty of indigenous people;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

• – / –
A.5.13 Fallexzerpt »Klima-Bündnis«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:
Ein radikaler Wandel auf kommunaler/ lokaler Ebene

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
Ein radikaler Wandel auf kommunaler/ lokaler Ebene

- bedeutet eine Senkung von Energieverbrauch und Energiebedarf in Kommunen.
- bedeutet um achtzig Prozent reduzierte Emissionen.
- sichert die Wirtschaft auf lokaler Ebene.
- führt zu einer Art global gedachten Wirtschaft.
- führt auf lange Sicht zu einem Einpendeln der Emissionen auf einem klimapolitisch sinnvollen Niveau.
- etabliert eine gerechte Regelung des Ressourcenverbrauchs.
- begrenzt den Ressourcenverbrauch derer die auf dem gegenwärtigen Niveau der Industrieländer liegen.
- ermöglicht eine Entwicklung des Ressourcenverbrauchs derer, die noch unter dem gegenwärtigen Niveau Industrieländer liegen.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):

- (Climate Justice) Reduktion von achtzig Prozent der gegenwärtigen Emissionen;
- (Climate Justice) Entwicklung des Ressourcenverbrauch derer, die noch unter dem gegenwärtigen Niveau Industrieländer liegen;
- (Climate Justice) Begrenzung des Ressourcenverbrauch derer die auf dem gegenwärtigen Niveau der Industrieländer liegen;
- Die Änderung des Wirtschaftens;
- Sofortiges Energiesparen;
- 'Mainstreaming' des Klimaschutzes/ Klimaschutz steht an erster Stelle der politischen Agenda;
- Ein breiter Wille zum Klimaschutz/ die Nachfrage nach praktischen Lösungen;
- Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene;
- Einbezug der lokalen Ebene in den internationalen Verhandlungen;
- Die Senkung von Energieverbrauch und Energiebedarf in Kommunen;
- KLIMAPOLITISCHE WEICHENSTELLUNGEN DER KOMMUNEN AUF LOKALER EBENE;
- Bewusstseinsbildung für Klimaschutz auf lokaler Ebene;
- Bereitstellen von Rahmenbedingungen für Kommunen auf nationaler und die EU-Ebene;
- Klimaschutz als Pflichtaufgabe für Kommunen;
- Einbindung des privaten Sektors in den Klimaschutz durch Kommunen und Staaten;
- Reduktion von Treibhausgasen durch Maßnahmen in Kommunen (bspw. der Verbot des Baus bestimmter Gebäude bzw. die Pflicht zur Gebäudesanierung);
- Sanierung von Häuser bzw. der Umstieg auf öffentliche Mobilität;
- Schaffung der richtigen Rahmenbedingungen bzw. Finanzierung für kommunalen
Klimaschutz durch die internationale Politik;
• Verbindliche Festlegung nächster Schritte in Kopenhagen;
• Unterstützung von Initiativen zur Sicherung von Territorien indigener Völkern der Regenwälder, d.h. REGENWALDSCHUTZ;
• Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien und in Energieunabhängigkeit von fossilen Energiequellen (ist die Sicherung der Wirtschaft);

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):
• Vorantreiben von Änderungen auf lokaler Ebene;
• Lobbyarbeit für kommunalen Klimaschutz;
• Lobbyarbeit im Vorfeld der Verhandlungen;
• Verbesserung von Rahmenbedingungen für kommunalen Klimaschutz in Verhandlungen nach Abschluss der Konferenz (auf nationaler bzw. EU Ebene);
• Erzeugen von Druck (auf Verhandlungen) durch Aktionen von NGOs;
• Druck von Außerhalb auf die Verhandlungen für ein erfolgreiches Ergebnis;
• Unterstützung indigener Völker der Regenwälder bei der Sicherung ihrer Territorien;
• Bewusstseinsbildung zu den Auswirkungen von Ölförderung oder Ressourcenförderung;
• Arbeit zu kommunalem Klimaschutz, d.h. der Unterstützung von Kommunen;

Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:
Die etablierten Rahmenbedingungen in nationaler und internationaler Politik

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
Etablierte Rahmenbedingungen in nationaler und internationaler Politik
• verhindern, dass die Politik auf die lokale Ebene heruntergebrochen wird.
• reproduzieren eine Wirtschaftsweise, die gekennzeichnet ist von einem immensen Energiehunger und damit verbunden einer immensen Ressourcenförderung (insb. von Erdöl), die die Territorien und Lebensgrundlagen indigener Völker zerstört und die zum Klimawandel führt (eine Erhöhung der Durchschnittstemperatur um zwei Grad Celsius führt zu dramatischen Änderungen der Lebensumstände für viele Menschen und damit auch einer Schädigung der Wirtschaft – durch Stürme, Überflutungen, Dürren).

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):
• Verhandlungen in denen Klimaschutz nicht auf die lokale Ebene heruntergebrochen wird;
• Verhandlungen, die nicht um das gehen, was viele Leute wollen;
• Ein zu hoher Ressourcenverbrauch von einigen;
• Das erreichen keiner Lösung auf den Kopenhagener Klimaverhandlungen;
• PRÄSENZ PRIVATER GESCHÄFTSINTERESSEN ZU EMISSIONSHANDEL UND CDM IN DER AKTUELLEN INTENSITÄT AUF DEN KLIMAVERHANDLUNGEN;
• Starke Repression gegen friedlichen Protest (insb. außerhalb der Verhandlungen am Samstag, dem 12.12.);
• Ausschließlich Häuser sanieren bzw. auf öffentliche Mobilität umsteigen;
• Ansätze der Kompensation (insb. CCS);
• Schlupflocher die es ermöglichen, sich aus der Verantwortung zu stehlen (insb. Ansätze
der Kompensation);
• Laufzeitverlängerung von Atomkraftwerken, CCS, der Bau von Großkraftwerken oder Kohlekraftwerken;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):**

• Gewalttätiger Protest (der den Großteil der nach Klimageschutz verlangenden friedlichen klimapolitisch engagierten Personen in Misskredit bringt);
• Protest autonomer Gruppen;
A.5.14 Fallexzerpt »Oxfam International«

Die hegemomiale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:
A change of the development model/ economic model

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
A change of the development model/ economic model

• is resulting in a dramatically cut down of greenhouse gas emissions.
• is establishing carbon-neutrality.
• is a change of the economic model to a low-carbon economy.
• is reducing poverty and suffering.
• is a reduction of poverty in a way that is low-carbon (the developing world is developing in a way that is low-carbon).
• means communities can react better when disaster strikes.
• is improving the livelihood, health care and education of people in poverty.
• means poverty reduction, i.e. increasing wealth and living standards.
• is sustaining the progress of the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):

• Changing the policies, the practices and attitudes whether it's from government, private sector or the general public;
• USING OTHER STRATEGIES OF DEVELOPMENT THAN THOSE THE INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES USED FOR THE PAST TWO CENTURIES;
• HIGHLIGHTING THE HUMAN IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE;
• Working on humanitarian response, i.e. disaster response, emergency response (on natural disasters or conflict) and preparing communities to anticipate that they can react betters when disaster strikes;
• Working on development issues, i.e. working with people in poverty to improve their lives whether it's livelihood, health care, education.
• Advocacy and campaigning, i.e. changing the policies, the practices and the attitudes whether it's from government, private sector or the general public;
• A consensus view about the reality of climate change;
• EVERYBODY BEING AT THE CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH A NAME PUSHING FOR AVOIDING CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CHANGE;
• Everybody being at the climate negotiations with a name agreeing to a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal;
• An adequate outcome of COP15 (keeping us below to 2 degrees of global warming, promoting a low-carbon development, assisting countries to adapt climate change);
• A VERY CLEAR BENCHMARK EVALUATING THE OUTCOME;
• The international negotiations considering the impacts on people (especially those, who are and will be impacted first and hardest by climate change) and ecosystems, etc.;
• A binding agreement that locks in countries to deliver that with a strong compliant system;
• GIVING CARBON A PRICE TO FORCE ECONOMIC ACTORS AND CONSUMERS TO MAKE THE NECESSARY CHANGES;
• Ambitious targets that are divided in an equitable way;
• Adequate finance to assist those impacted by climate change;
• Making use of the economic opportunities: Creating green jobs or making green investments;
• Sustainable solutions, that sustain the progress of the past 10, 15 years in terms of poverty reduction;
• A specific capability of the affected people to overcome the impacts caused by climate change;
• WORKING ON ADAPTATION;
• Assisting those who will be impacted by climate change (with finance, interventions from disaster risk reduction, improved agriculture strategies or new ways of building houses);
• Assisting communities to adapt to current and future climate change;
• Reducing greenhouse gas emissions by mitigating carbon producing systems in the industrialized world as well as the developing world;
• The developed/industrialized world cutting down dramatically its greenhouse gas emissions;
• Poverty reduction being the main priority in the developing world;
• THE DEVELOPING WORLD DEVELOPING;
• Governments initiating behavioral change of economic actors and consumers by increasing the price of carbon;
• A right promotion of flexible mechanisms or carbon markets (having an ambitious set of targets and commitments and an compliance regime, which is very tight);
• The industrialized countries/ The developed taking their responsibility to act first and farthest (because the originated 76% of the historic emissions);
• China and India, which are rapidly increasing their emissions acting secondly (after the developed world);
• Considering dimensions of climate justice, i.e. recognising the differences in the responsibility to act against global warming;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

• Working on humanitarian response, development work, advocacy and campaigning;
• Highlighting the public concern/putting pressure on politicians and decision makers with mobilization;
• CREATING PUBLIC CONCERN WITH PROTESTS THAT PROVIDE SOLUTIONS AND THAT ARE NON-VIOLENT.
• Common agreements uniting civil society (especially CAN);
• The consensus within CAN regarding the 'building blocks' (i.e. the need to stay as far below two degrees as possible, the demand for 200 billion dollars a year for climate finance, adaptation and mitigation, the role of carbon markets);
• Interventions like 'climate hearings' (where people in the developing world give testimonies of the impact of climate) at a national and international level;
A development crisis

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):
A development crisis/development model is

- not equitable.
- causing greenhouse gas emission.
- causing climate change and the exploitation of natural resources at the expense of poor people in the south, just to service the economy of the elites.
- impacting those who are least responsible actually for causing it first (especially the people in the South).
- causing poverty.
- constituting elite politics.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):

- A specific way of production in the industrialized world.
- Interest groups at the climate negotiations, not necessarily participating for a fair, ambitious and binding climate deal;
- The media hype around emails put completely out of context undermining the consensus view about the reality of climate change;
- Certain business lobbies with economic interests cautioning leaders to take the necessary action;
- A solution to commit greenhouse gas, which won't reduce poverty (i.e. an unsustainable solution);
- Solutions to global warming, which are not causing reduction of greenhouse gas emission;
- The current promotion of carbon markets (causing no reduction or even an increase of greenhouse gas emission – it's a zero-sum or even not a zero-sum);
- Loopholes: Continuing to do what we do in the North but offsetting it in the developing world/ the South (causing no reduction or even an increase of greenhouse gas emission);
- THE CURRENT PROMOTION OF FLEXIBLE MECHANISMS AND CARBON MARKETS NOT HAVING AN AMBITIOUS SET OF TARGETS AND COMMITMENTS AND AN COMPLIANCE REGIME (THE RULES UND REGULATIONS THAT WILL GOVERN THESE COMMITMENTS) WHICH IS VERY TIGHT;
- GREEN-WASHING: EVEN FAILURE PRESENTED AS SUCCESS;
- THE PEOPLE IN THE NORTH HAVING CAUSED EMISSIONS HISTORICALLY;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):

- PROTESTS BEING VIOLENT AND RESULTING IN NO PUBLIC CONCERN ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE;
A.5.15 Fallexzerpt »People’s Movement on Climate Change«

Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:
The social transformation/ reconstruction of society

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):
The social transformed society is

- a society of peace (where economics and governance work for people and people live in harmony).
- justice for all.
- Climate Justice.
- a political framework guided by the wishes, concerns and interests of the people.
- the sovereignty of the people (i.e. decision-making of the people for the people).
- solving climate change with the people’s solutions.
- leaving fossil resources in the ground.

Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):

- Changing the way of accessing and distributing resources as well as creating and distributing wealth;
- A STRUGGLE OF SOCIAL ACTORS;
- Changing the control of the world by a few people keeping their wealth to themselves;
- STOPPING THE MARKETS IGNORANCE AND REDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE WITH THE PEOPLE’S CAPACITIES;
- States reconstructing themselves;
- Changing the economical, political and social organization of the world;
- HIGHLIGHTING EXISTING ALTERNATIVES OF THE PEOPLE;

Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):

- NGOS SUPPORTING MOVEMENTS TO BUILD ON SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION;
- Discussions focussing on proclaiming and reclaiming the basis of the sovereignty of the people (LIKE AT KLIMAFORUM09);
- Movements proclaiming a change of the system;
- Making linkages between movements;
- Marginalized people with no opportunities to redress their issues take their burden somewhere (may act in a way some people are calling violent);
The system, the international economic arrangement

• inoperable, as it is causing injustices and unequalities (i.e. climate change, an unequal access and distribution of resources, an unequal distribution of wealth, poverty, marginalization, destruction of nature, war and tensions in society from race and gender).
• ignorant, as it is delaying and distorting the people's capacities and knowledge (to redress climate change).
• suppressing people’s sovereignty as it causes the predominance of the state’s sovereignty.

• The power’s control over resources and wealth;
• The way of accessing and distributing of resources as well as creating and distributing wealth;
• A governance which is driven by economics;
• An exclusory process of decision-making within the UNFCCC (states are discussing, big powers making the decisions, excluding the majority of the people) pretending to deliver justice to all;
• Justifying and continuing the world’s economical, political, and social organization (especially in the climate negotiations);
• The leaders accepting carbon trading;

• NGOs getting co-opted;
A paradigm-shift

- is an economic development that can be both climate-friendly and attractive for people’s well-being.
- is a change in the personal lifestyle/ the mindset.
- is the higher valuing of immaterial issues compared to material products.
- is resulting in the support of the people.
- means the world mean temperature stays well below 2-degrees-warming.
- means holding a 350ppm-CO2-concentration level.
- means addressing Climate Justice.

Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:

A paradigm-shift

Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):

A paradigm-shift

- A process of bringing just and adequate solutions;
- Changing the higher valuing of material products compared to immaterial issues;
- Enhancing new technology, renewable energy or more nature-conform production;
- Setting up new institutions (for example for the regulation of production or the use of energy or material);
- Dividing the use of the atmosphere as a sink for ghg emission and the costs of adapting and mitigating in a fair way;
- Supporting the people that are most vulnerable to impacts of climate change in a good way;
- Balancing the amount of influence of different parts of the world/ different countries in the negotiations;
- Full attention for the justice component in the negotiations, i.e. a politics of what would be scientifically and morally necessary;
- Overcoming Injustices in the Negotiation Process;
- Developing countries having a big impact in the negotiation process;
- Achieving a fair and binding and adequate ambitious deal;
- The people's acceptance for a paradigm-shift;
- Responsibility, i.e. fulfilling commitments and promises;
- The northern countries fulfilling their commitments and promises in the first place;
- China and India moving after the rich world showed its responsibility;
**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**

- Protests reminding about specific issues or people negotiators should work for;
- The big manifestations at Copenhagen (12th of Dec.) having a global support base (like the cooperation with the 'Countdown to Copenhagen' campaign) SHOWING THAT CIVIL SOCIETY WORLDWIDE IS WAITING FOR A FAIR AMBITIOUS AND BINDING DEAL;

**Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)**

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:**

The current paradigm of development and well-being

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):**

The current paradigm of development and well-being is

- constituting a specific lifestyle, idea of wealth and economic development.
- affecting people but also nature itself.
- impacting on the poor people mainly located in the South, the island states, the coastal areas or the arid areas in Africa and Asia.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):**

- An economic development grounded in material and energy;
- A SPECIFIC LIFESTYLE, IDEA OF WEALTH AND THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MUCH MORE WIDESPREAD IN THE NORTH THAN IN THE SOUTH;
- The Global North (including the middle class in developing countries) being responsible for climate change in the first place;
- The climate negotiations being a process of defending interests (of UNJUST AND INADEQUATE SOLUTIONS);
- Developing countries not having a big impact in the negotiation process;
- Taking an solely environmental point of view on the quality of a deal and therewith neglecting the justice component of climate change;
- The lack of discussions about the moral acceptability of emission trading or adaption in the climate negotiations;
- The lack of the issues of adaptation, substantial funding, mitigation in the South and justice in the climate negotiations;
- Giving in to every energy need that rises (ending up in building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants);
- Building new coal power plants or new nuclear power plants;
- Focussing primarily on market mechanisms, i.e. giving them free space to flourish;
- The rich world not showing its responsibility;

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):**

- Protest, which is not clear in its message;
- Focussing on an effective, adequate deal from an environmental point of view and therewith neglecting the justice component of climate change;
  (for example: putting pressure on Indian Civil Society to pressure their government to come with ambitious steps in order to facilitate the whole negotiation process (although climate change is not the responsibility of Indian in the first place);
Die hegemoniale Struktur des Interviews

Äquivalenzkette B: Das Glückseligmachende (the beatific)

*Symbolischer Repräsentant des Glückseligmachenden:*
Conserved ecosystems worldwide

*Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie B1):*
Conserved ecosystems worldwide would mean
- there is no degradation.
- wetlands worldwide are used in a sustainable way/ are well protected.
- biodiversity is conserved.
- ecosystems are protecting people.
- people and nature are living alongside each other.
- the interaction between ecosystems and people are considered.

*Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie B2.1):*
- Considering the interaction between ecosystems and people;
- Not limiting mandatory accounting for annex one countries on forestry and agriculture;
- REDD as an approach which incorporates relevant carbon sinks;
- Soils implemented as relevant carbon sinks (besides forests in REDD);
- Annex one countries keeping account of all kinds of different emissions;
- Holding carbon emissions;
- Large-scale capacity to capture carbon from the atmosphere;
- REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASES;
- (CLIMATE JUSTICE MEANS) EVERYONE TAKING HIS SHARE;
- (Climate Justice means) All countries taking their share;
- (Climate Justice means) Developed countries taking their responsibility;
- (Climate Justice means) People being compensated and well supported;

*Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):*
- Protest opening opportunities for organization working in the process to be listened to;
- Aligning peoples' views to each other;
- Advocating a sustainable way of using wetlands worldwide, a protection of wetlands, biodiversity being conserved, that people and nature are living alongside each other;
- NGO representatives having more impact;
- Organizations not only screaming;
Degraded ecosystems worldwide (especially wetlands)

Degraded ecosystems (especially wetlands) worldwide means

- biodiversity is not conserved.
- there is the risk of an introduction of exotic species or the disruption of the nutrient regimes.
- there are adverse impacts on people.
- people and nature could not yet live alongside each other.
- wetlands/ecosystems worldwide are not well protected.

Adaptation measures such as infrastructure or development on wetlands;
BELIEVING IN THE FALSE AND HAVING AN IMPACT ON PUBLIC OPINION (like climate sceptics);
Too much greenhouse gas emissions induced by humans;
Carbon emissions;
The way of production;
Consumption patterns;
Currently no large-scale capacity to capture carbon from the atmosphere;
Palm oil policies (causing significant emissions of greenhouse gases);
Second-generation biofuels (risking the degradation of ecosystems, especially the introduction of exotic species or the disruption of the nutrient regimes of systems);
Nuclear power;
People with economic interests (like representatives of coal burning factories or other private sectors) just reaching for their own good/trying to block the process;
Approaches which provide incentive (like agrofuels) for deforestation;
Not keeping of all kinds of different emissions (IF MANDATORY ACCOUNTING IS LIMITED ON FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE);
Limiting mandatory accounting for annex one countries on forestry and agriculture;
All countries in several parts;

Not knowing what’s going on but smashing windows (like the black block);
Smashing windows (is not useful for the process; IS NOT PROTEST; IS VIOLENCE);
NGO REPRESENTATIVES NOT HAVING SUFFICIENT IMPACT;
Many organizations at COP15 not trying to align peoples’ views to each other;
A one-planet lifestyle/ a sustainable lifestyle

- Countries talking together like the way they are doing at Copenhagen;
- Basing the targets at the negotiations in Copenhagen on the up to date peer reviewed science;
- A deal being fair, which means recognising the common and differentiated responsibilities for the problem as well as the differentiated ability to deal with it;
- A deal being ambitious, which means addressing the problem based on the recent science.
- A deal being legally binding, which means committing countries to deliver and implementing a compliance regime;
- The weight of an argument and credibility that decides whether a view should be heard at the climate negotiations or not;
- Everybody having the right to make his/her case heard at the climate negotiations;
- Managing the resource use better;
- Advancing energy use and industry by establishing alternatives and increasing efficiency;
- Advancing energy use and efficiency is an alternative to a stop in using energy and being industrialized; The impossibility to establish alternatives and increase efficiency would imply stopping the use of energy and industrialization;
- Collective action on different levels: the responsibility of individuals as well as business and governments;
- Individual action: a change in the way we live our lives (the way that you shop, where you live and the way that you commute to work for example);
- Business and government action: making infrastructure and energy supply more efficient and having legislation that regulates the way that we live our lives essentially;
- Reducing the three-planet lifestyle to a one-planet lifestyle;
- Looking for alternatives if an agreement is delayed;
- A fundamental solution;
- Climate Justice: A balancing between those who are responsible (The historical responsibility for causing the problem is dependent on the start of development. Therefore industrialized countries have the greatest historical responsibility.) and those who are suffering or who will suffer. Reparations.
OF ANYTHING OR COMPENSATIONS ARE SUCH A BALANCING.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie B2.2):**

- Engaging in the negotiation, i.e. trying to have a constructive dialogue with other parties like governments and business;
- Being a credibly scientifically based organization with a large international membership and a policy team that represents a lot of countries from North and South provides a respected position with its partner organizations and respect for its interventions and contributions to the negotiation process;
- Making the climate negotiations accessible to public audience.
- Attracting media (by means of campaigning or stands);
- Giving policy speakers a platform (for example with stands at the negotiations);
- Doing lobby work;
- Peaceful and constructive protest is within the law;
- All having a right to protest peaceful and doing non-violent direct action within the law;
- Using different tactics of peaceful protest and non-violent direct action within the law;

**Äquivalenzkette H: Das Grauen (the horrific)**

**Symbolischer Repräsentant des Grauens:**

A three-planet lifestyle/ an unsustainable lifestyle

**Eigenschaften und Folgen (Kategorie H1):**

A three-planet lifestyle is

- an unsustainable lifestyle.
- the consumption of too many resources.
- a unsustainable way of shopping, living, commuting to work or insulating houses.
- causing a fundamental problem.
- causing a greater amount of climate changing gases to be put into the atmosphere than the natural systems of the earth can take out of the atmosphere again, which is causing global warming.

**Bekräftigende Faktoren allgemein (Kategorie H2.1):**

- Certain areas of business lobbying for maintaining the status quo (i.e. for their short-time gain more than looking at the long-term gain);
- People who are in the front-line of climate change and experience it in their day-to-day lives being underrepresented at the climate negotiations;
- Energy use and industry putting greenhouse gases into the atmosphere;
- Using fossil fuels;
- Humankind putting a greater amount of climate changing gases into the atmosphere than the natural systems of the earth can take out again;
- Delaying an agreement;
- A 'silver bullet' (something that would mean that we can carry on living the way that we do and not have to change) masking not tackling the problem of the way of living based on fossil fuels;
- A political agreement which is not legally binding (agreeing that there's a problem, recognising the scale, putting in place some ambition bag which tells what to do);
• **THE BEHAVIOUR OF A PART OF THE WORLD’S POPULATION;**

_Bekräftigende Faktoren: Agency von NGOs und sozialen Bewegungen (Kategorie H2.2):_

• Lobbying certain areas of business for maintaining the status quo (i.e. for their short-time gain more than looking at the long-term gain);
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