

<p>TEXTE ORIGINAL ETATSUNIEN David Wallace WELLS New-York Magazine</p>	<p>RESUME FRANCAIS Vincent LUCCHESI Uzbek & Rica</p>	<p>TRADUCTION FRANCAISE Jocelyne LE BOULICAUT Association Initiatives Dionysiennes</p>
<p>The Uninhabitable Earth</p> <p>Famine, economic collapse, a sun that cooks us: What climate change could wreak — sooner than you think.</p> <p>By David Wallace-Wells</p> <p>(http://nymag.com/author/David%20Wallace-Wells/)</p>		<p>La Terre Inhabitable</p> <p>Famine, effondrement économique, un soleil qui nous cuit : Ce que le changement climatique pourrait dévaster ----- plus tôt que vous ne le pensez.</p> <p>Par David Wallace-Wells traduction de Jocelyne Le Boulicaut</p>
<p><i>To read an annotated version of this article, complete with interviews with scientists and links to further reading, click here.</i> (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans-annotated.html)</p>		
<p>I. ‘Doomsday’</p> <p><i>Peering beyond scientific reticence.</i></p> <p>It is, I promise, worse than you think. If your anxiety about global warming is dominated</p>	<p>Changement climatique : les 8 apocalypses à venir</p> <p>Vincent Lucchese</p> <p>C’est pire que vous ne le pensez. Et plus</p>	<p>I. ‘Apocalypse’</p> <p><i>Regarder au-delà des réticences scientifiques</i></p> <p>Je vous le promet, les choses sont pires que</p>

<p>by fears of sea-level rise, you are barely scratching the surface of what terrors are possible, even within the lifetime of a teenager today. And yet the swelling seas — and the cities they will drown — have so dominated the picture of global warming, and so overwhelmed our capacity for climate panic, that they have occluded our perception of other threats, many much closer at hand. Rising oceans are bad, in fact very bad; but fleeing the coastline will not be enough.</p>	<p>urgent que vous ne le croyez. Le réchauffement climatique menace l'humanité par une série de cataclysmes en cascade, d'une diversité surprenante. Telle est en tout cas la conclusion de la très riche enquête (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans.html) de David Wallace-Wells, du <i>New York Magazine</i>. (http://nymag.com/) Dans cet article, le journaliste égrène froidement les faits et les menaces, répertoriés en huit catégories d'apocalypses potentielles.</p>	<p>vous ne le pensez. Si votre angoisse quand au réchauffement climatique est dominée par votre crainte de la hausse des océans, vous ne faites qu'effleurer la surface des catastrophes possibles, et qui peuvent se produire dans un laps de temps qui équivaut à la durée de vie d'un adolescent d'aujourd'hui. Et pourtant, la montée des océans – et les villes qui seront englouties – a tellement dominé l'image que nous nous faisons du changement climatique, et cette crainte a tellement excédé notre capacité à paniquer pour le climat, qu'elle a empêché notre capacité à percevoir les autres menaces, pourtant bien plus proches de nous. La montée des océans est un évènement négatif, très négatif même, mais fuir les zones littorales ne sera pas suffisant.</p>
<p>Indeed, absent a significant adjustment to how billions of humans conduct their lives, parts of the Earth will likely become close to uninhabitable, and other parts horrifically inhospitable, as soon as the end of this century.</p> <p>Even when we train our eyes on climate change, we are unable to comprehend its scope. This past winter, a string of days 6</p>		<p>En effet, en l'absence d'un ajustement significatif dans le mode de vie de milliards d'êtres humains, des zones de notre planète seront rendues inhabitables, et d'autres seront devenues terriblement inhospitalières, d'ici la fin de notre siècle.</p> <p>Même si nous nous crevons les yeux pour fixer le changement climatique, nous n'arrivons pas à en saisir l'étendue. L'hiver</p>

and 7 degrees warmer than normal baked the North Pole, melting the permafrost that encased Norway's Svalbard seed vault — a global food bank nicknamed "Doomsday," designed to ensure that our agriculture survives any catastrophe, and which appeared to have been flooded by climate change less than ten years after being built.

Maybe you know that already — there are alarming stories in the news every day, like those, last month, that seemed to suggest satellite data showed (<https://www.carbonbrief.org/major-correction-to-satellite-data-shows-140-faster-warming-since-1998>) the globe warming since 1998 more than twice as fast as scientists had thought (in fact, the underlying story was considerably less alarming than the headlines). Or the news from Antarctica this past May, when a crack (<http://www.newsweek.com/antarctica-ice-shelf-larsen-c-crack-grown-618676>) in an ice shelf grew 11 miles in six days, then kept going; the break now has just three miles to

dernier, des successions de journées à 6 et 7 degrés plus élevés que normalement ont baigné le Pôle Nord, faisant fondre le permafrost qui abritait le centre Norvégien au Svalbard de protection des graines – une banque alimentaire surnommée « Apocalypse » et destinée à assurer que notre agriculture survivra quelque catastrophe que ce soit, et qui s'est retrouvée noyée à cause du changement climatique, moins de 10 ans après sa construction.

Peut-être savez-vous déjà tout cela ... les histoires alarmistes sont diffusées aux informations quotidiennement, telles celles entendue le mois dernier laissant à penser que les données des satellites montraient que depuis 1998, le réchauffement climatique se produisait deux fois plus vite que ce que les scientifiques avaient prévu. En fait l'histoire réelle était bien moins alarmante que les titres ne le laissaient penser. Ou alors vous avez entendu au mois de Mai dernier qu'une fissure dans le pack glaciaire s'est accrue de 11 miles en 6 jours, puis se poursuivit ; la crevasse n'a plus que 3 miles à parcourir. - au moment où vous lisez cela elle a peut être atteint

<p>go — by the time you read this, it may already have met the open water (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/trillion-ton-iceberg-breaks-off-antarctic-ice-shelf.html) where it will drop into the sea one of the biggest icebergs ever, a process known poetically as “calving.”</p>		<p>l'océan libre ; là où s'effondrera dans la mer, un des icebergs les plus gigantesques, un processus connu sous le nom de « vêlage ».</p>
<p>But no matter how well-informed you are, you are surely not alarmed enough. Over the past decades, our culture has gone apocalyptic with zombie movies and <i>Mad Max</i> dystopias, (http://www.vulture.com/2016/07/the-present-worse-than-fictional-dystopias.html) perhaps the collective result of displaced climate anxiety, and yet when it comes to contemplating real-world warming dangers, we suffer from an incredible failure of imagination.</p>	<p>« <i>Peu importe à quel point vous êtes bien renseignés, vous n'êtes sûrement pas assez inquiets.</i> » Dans l'article qu'il a publié le 10 juillet 2017 dans le <i>New York Magazine</i>, le journaliste David Wallace-Wells y va franco sur la corde anxiogène. Mais son cri d'alarme est plus que pertinent. Arguant de « <i>douzaines d'interviews et d'échanges avec des climatologues et chercheurs et de certaines d'articles scientifiques sur le changement climatique</i> », il dresse un inventaire complet des réactions en chaîne catastrophiques que subira l'humanité si nous ne changeons pas radicalement de cap pour contenir le réchauffement de la planète.</p>	<p>Mais peu importe votre niveau de connaissance, vous n'êtes pas assez inquiets. Au cours des précédentes décennies, notre culture a été baignée dans un climat apocalyptique empli de films de zombies et des dystopies à la <i>Mad Max</i>, peut être simplement la conséquence collective d'un déplacement de l'angoisse provenant du changement climatique, et cependant, quand nous devons regarder en face les dangers réalistes de ce réchauffement, nous souffrons d'une incroyable incapacité d'imagination.</p>
<p>The reasons for that are many: * the timid language of scientific probabilities, which the climatologist James</p>		<p>Il y a de nombreuses raisons à cela : * le langage timoré des probabilités scientifiques, ce que le climatologue James</p>

Hansen once called “scientific reticence” in a paper chastising scientists for editing their own observations so conscientiously that they failed to communicate how dire the threat really was;

- * the fact that the country is dominated by a group of technocrats who believe any problem can be solved and an opposing culture that doesn't even see warming as a problem worth addressing;

- *the way that climate denialism has made scientists even more cautious in offering speculative warnings;

- * the simple speed of change and, also, its slowness, such that we are only seeing effects now of warming from decades past;

- * our uncertainty about uncertainty, which the climate writer Naomi Oreskes in particular has suggested stops us from preparing as though anything worse than a median outcome were even possible;

- * the way we assume climate change will hit

Hansen a appelé « la réticence scientifique » dans une publication destinée à remettre en cause les scientifiques pour leur propension à élaborer leur propres observations si consciencieusement qu'ils en étaient incapables de communiquer quel était le degré sinistre de la menace.

- * Le fait que le pays soit contrôlé par un groupe de technocrates qui sont convaincus que tout problème peut être résolu et une contre-culture qui ne considère même pas que le réchauffement climatique vaille la peine de s'en soucier ;

- *le fait que le climato-scepticisme a rendu les scientifiques encore plus précautionneux lorsqu'ils expriment des avertissements ;

- * la simple vitesse du processus et surtout sa lenteur, ce qui fait que nous n'observons qu'aujourd'hui les conséquences du réchauffement des décennies passées ;

- * nos doutes quant à notre incertitude, ce qui a été suggéré par l'écrivaine climatique Naomi Oreskes, nous empêche d'anticiper, comme si quoi que ce soit de pire qu'une occurrence médiane était possible ;

- * la façon que nous avons de considérer

hardest elsewhere, not everywhere;

- * the smallness (two degrees) and largeness (1.8 trillion tons) and abstractness (400 parts per million) of the numbers;
- * the discomfort of considering a problem that is very difficult, if not impossible, to solve;
- *the altogether incomprehensible scale of that problem, which amounts to the prospect of our own annihilation;
- * simple fear. But aversion arising from fear is a form of denial, too.

que le changement climatique frappera le plus durement ailleurs, mais pas partout ;

- * la petitesse (2°) comme l'énormité (1,8 trillion de tonnes) et l'abstraction (400 parties par million) des nombres;
- * le malaise dans lequel nous plonge un problème très difficile, sinon impossible à résoudre ;
- * l'échelle totalement incompréhensible de ce problème, qui annonce la perspective de notre propre destruction ;
- * la peur tout simplement. Mais l'aversion née de la crainte est aussi une forme de déni.

In between scientific reticence and science fiction is science itself. This article is the result of dozens of interviews and exchanges with climatologists and researchers in related fields and reflects hundreds of scientific papers on the subject of climate change.

Entre la réticence scientifique et la science-fiction est la science lui-même. Cet article est le résultat de douzaines d'entretiens et d'échanges avec les climatologues et les chercheurs dans des champs liés et reflète des centaines de papiers scientifiques sur le sujet de changement climatique.

What follows is not a series of predictions of what will happen — that will be determined in large part by the much-less-certain science of human response. Instead, it is a

Ce qui suit n'est pas une série des prédictions de ce qui arrivera - qui sera déterminé en grande partie par la beaucoup moins certaine science de réponse

<p>portrait of our best understanding of where the planet is heading absent aggressive action.</p>		<p>humaine. Au lieu de cela, c'est un portrait de notre meilleure compréhension d'où la planète se dirige l'action agressive absente.</p>
<p>It is unlikely that all of these warming scenarios will be fully realized, largely because the devastation along the way will shake our complacency. But those scenarios, and not the present climate, are the baseline. In fact, they are our schedule.</p>		<p>Il est peu vraisemblable que tous ces scénarii de réchauffement climatique se réalisent, une des raisons majeures en étant que la destruction qui accompagnera le processus nous secouera de notre torpeur. Mais ce sont bien ces scénarii, et non le climat actuel qui vont nous servir de point de départ. De fait ils sont notre feuille de route.</p>
	<p>Les projections s'emballent</p> <p>Un peu plus d'un mois après la décision de Donald Trump de sortir des Etats-Unis de l'accord de Paris sur le climat, le journaliste américain tente la thérapie de choc. Sa démonstration ne s'adresse pour autant pas aux climatosceptiques, mais plutôt aux acteurs de bonne volonté qui, selon lui, sont encore bien loin de réaliser à quel point la situation est critique.</p> <p>Son inquiétude est alimentée par deux constats. Premièrement, les trajectoires actuelles sont très loin des engagements pris lors de l'accord de Paris. Le monde entier s'est accordé sur un objectif de limitation à 2°C du réchauffement planétaire par rapport à l'ère préindustrielle pour limiter</p>	

	<p>l'ampleur des catastrophes climatiques. Or, la tendance actuelle nous mène déjà vers un réchauffement de 4°C. Et cela n'est que la projection médiane, prévient l'auteur. Les hypothèses les plus sombres font monter le thermomètre de plus de 8°C...</p>	
<p>Related Stories</p> <p>The Uninhabitable Earth, Annotated Edition (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans-annotated.html)</p> <p>The Doomsday vault is fine, for now: The structure has been secured and the seeds are safe. But treating the episode as a parable of impending flooding missed the more important news. Until recently, permafrost was not a major concern of climate scientists, because, as the name suggests, it was soil that stayed permanently frozen. But Arctic permafrost contains 1.8 trillion tons of carbon, more than twice as much as is currently suspended in the Earth's atmosphere.</p>	<p>Bombe à retardement sous la glace</p> <p>Deuxième constat : ces prévisions, déjà pas bien joyeuses, omettent plusieurs facteurs qui pourraient considérablement aggraver les choses. Plus grosse source d'inquiétude : le permafrost. Ces immenses étendues de terre gelée, situées notamment en Alaska et en Sibérie, sont menacées de fonte par le réchauffement climatique. Or, ce permafrost renfermerait quelques 1 800 000 000 000 de tonnes de carbone. « <i>Plus du double du carbone présent actuellement dans l'atmosphère. S'il dégèle, il peut relâcher ce carbone sous forme de méthane, 34 fois plus puissant que le CO2 lorsqu'on l'évalue à l'échelle du siècle, et 86 fois plus puissant à l'échelle d'une vingtaine d'années</i> », prévient David Wallace-Wells.</p>	<p>Pour le moment la chambre forte Apocalypse est sûre : la structure a été sécurisée et les graines ne risquent rien. Mais considérer cet épisode comme une simple parabole d'inondation manquée ne ferait qu'occulter le fond du problème. Jusqu'à très récemment, le permafrost ne faisait pas partie des préoccupations principales des scientifiques climatiques, parce que comme son nom l'indique, il s'agissait d'un sol qui reste gelé de façon permanente. Mais le permafrost Arctique contient 1,8 trillions de tonnes de carbone, plus que deux fois la quantité totale qui est</p>

		en suspension dans l'atmosphère terrestre.
<p>When it thaws and is released, that carbon may evaporate as methane, which is 34 times as powerful a greenhouse-gas warming blanket as carbon dioxide when judged on the timescale of a century; when judged on the timescale of two decades, it is 86 times as powerful. In other words, we have, trapped in Arctic permafrost, twice as much carbon as is currently wrecking the atmosphere of the planet, all of it scheduled to be released at a date that keeps getting moved up, partially in the form of a gas that multiplies its warming power 86 times over</p>		<p>Quand il y a fonte du permafrost et que ce carbone est libéré, il s'évapore de la même façon que le méthane, ce qui veut dire avec des conséquences aussi puissantes que 34 fois l'effet de couverture chauffante des dioxyde de carbone pendant un siècle ; si on rapporte cela à deux décades, cela représente un effet de multiplication par un facteur 86. En d'autres termes le permafrost Arctique a emmagasiné 2 fois plus de carbone que la quantité qui est en train actuellement de détruire l'atmosphère de la planète, tout cela étant destiné à être libéré à une date qui se rapproche de plus en plus, partiellement sous la forme d'un gaz qui multiplie 86 fois sa puissance de réchauffement.</p>
	<p>En résumé, le réchauffement climatique risque de déclencher une réaction qui va elle-même décupler le réchauffement climatique. Une véritable bombe à retardement, qui n'est pas prise en compte dans les modélisations du GIEC, s'alarme encore l'auteur.</p> <p>De même, les projections ne tiendraient pas</p>	

non plus entièrement compte de l'effet albédo (la glace reflète une grande partie des rayons du soleil et évite ainsi qu'ils ne réchauffent la Terre. La glace fondant, ce rafraîchissement naturel s'estompe) ni de l'augmentation de la couverture nuageuse qui accentuerait le réchauffement. Bref, nous sous-estimons le réchauffement à venir. « *Des données satellitaires ont montré le mois dernier que le réchauffement du globe était deux fois plus rapide que les scientifiques ne le pensaient depuis 1998* », appuie le journaliste.

Une fois le constat posé, il égraine les 8 principales calamités qui ne manqueront pas de nous tomber sur le râble si nous ne réagissons pas. Il s'agit en quelque sorte du scénario du pire, puisque David Wallace-Wells ne retient que les études les plus pessimistes. Il écrit aussi parfois avec excès, comme le relève cet autre article américain de The Atlantic, par exemple lorsqu'il estime que l'ensemble du permafrost pourrait dégeler dans le courant du siècle. Certains scientifiques pensent que la fonte sera plus diluée dans le temps. Voici quoi qu'il en soit une synthèse fidèle à

	l'esprit apocalyptique de l'auteur.	
<p>Related Stories</p> <p>The Man Who Coined 'Global Warming' on the Worst-Case Scenario for Earth (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/man-who-coined-global-warming-on-worst-case-scenarios.html)</p> <p>'The Models Are Too Conservative': A Paleontologist on Climate Change Today (http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/what-mass-extinctions-teach-us-about-climate-change-today.html)</p>		
<p>The present tense of climate change — the destruction we've already baked into our future — is horrifying enough. Most people talk as if Miami and Bangladesh still have a chance of surviving; most of the scientists I spoke with assume we'll lose them within the century, even if we stop burning fossil fuel in the next decade.</p> <p>Two degrees of warming used to be considered the threshold of catastrophe:</p>	<p>1. La grande submersion, la grande extinction</p> <p><i>« La plupart des gens parlent de Miami ou du Bangladesh comme s'ils avaient encore une chance de survivre mais la plupart des scientifiques avec lesquels j'ai échangé assurent que nous perdrons ces régions dans le courant du siècle. Même si on arrête de brûler des combustibles fossiles dans les dix ans à venir. »</i> Première conséquence du réchauffement climatique, la montée des eaux (fonte des glaciers et dilatation</p>	<p>L'état actuel du changement climatique – la destruction que nous avons déjà intégrée à notre avenir – est suffisamment terrifiante. La majorité des gens parlent de Miami et du Bangladesh comme si ces deux endroits avaient encore une chance de survie ; la majorité des scientifiques auxquels j'ai parlé affirment que nous les perdrons au cours de ce siècle ; même si nous arrêtons toute combustion d'énergies fossiles lors de la prochaine décennie.</p> <p>On a pris l'habitude de considérer que 2° de réchauffement est le seuil limite avant</p>

tens of millions of climate refugees unleashed upon an unprepared world. Now two degrees is our goal, per the Paris climate accords, and experts give us only slim odds of hitting it. The U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issues serial reports, often called the “gold standard” of climate research; the most recent one projects us to hit four degrees of warming by the beginning of the next century, should we stay the present course . But that’s just a median projection. The upper end of the probability curve runs as high as eight degrees — and the authors still haven’t figured out how to deal with that permafrost melt. The IPCC reports also don’t fully account for the albedo effect (less ice means less reflected and more absorbed sunlight, hence more warming); more cloud cover (which traps heat); or the dieback of forests and other flora (which extract carbon from the atmosphere).

Each of these promises to accelerate warming, and the history of the planet shows that temperature can shift as much as five degrees Celsius within thirteen years. The last time the planet was even

thermique des océans), est le premier cataclysme que nous devons surmonter.

Fort de sa démonstration d’un réchauffement pouvant atteindre 8°C, voire 10°C, à la fin du siècle, le journaliste rappelle que la dernière fois que la Terre a pris 4°C, le niveau des océans est monté de plusieurs dizaines de mètres. Cette fois, la mer pourrait monter de plus de 3 mètres avant la fin du siècle. « *Un tiers des plus grandes villes du monde sont situées sur la côte et au moins 600 millions de personnes vivent sous ce niveau aujourd’hui* », note David Wallace-Wells.

Alors que beaucoup de scientifiques affirment que nous sommes déjà entrés dans la 6^{ème} grande extinction massive d’espèces, David Wallace-Wells souligne que le changement climatique a souvent joué un rôle majeur au cours des cinq premières grandes crises d’extinction. « *Celle d’il y a 252 millions d’années a commencé par un réchauffement de 5°C, accélérée par le relâchement de méthane en Arctique et s’est finie par l’extinction de 97% de la vie sur Terre* ». Petit plus de notre temps : on augmente aujourd’hui le taux de

catastrophe : des dizaines de millions de réfugiés climatiques déferlant sur un monde qui n’y est pas prêt. Donc, 2° reste notre objectif, celui de l’accord de Paris, et les experts ne nous laissent que peu de chances de le respecter. Le GIEC (Groupe intergouvernemental d’experts sur l’évolution du climat) a publié plusieurs rapports, sous le nom d’« étalon or » du climat ; le plus récent d’entre eux estime que si nous ne changeons rien au cours actuel, nous atteindrons une augmentation de 4° d’ici le début du siècle prochain.

Il s’agit là d’une projection médiane. La limite supérieure de la courbe des probabilités atteint 8 ° - et les auteurs n’ont pas encore trouvé comment gérer la fonte du permafrost. Ces rapports ne tiennent pas complètement compte de l’effet albédo (moins de glace, cela veut dire moins d’effet de réflexion de la lumière du soleil, et donc plus d’absorption et plus de réchauffement) ; plus de couverture nuageuse (qui piège la chaleur) ; ou dépérissement des forêts et autres flore (qui piègent le carbone de l’atmosphère).

Chacune de ces prédictions d’accélération du réchauffement, et l’histoire de la planète montrent que la température peut connaître des variations de 5° dans les 13 ans. Dans « La Fin du Monde », son nouveau récit des événements d’extinction majeurs

four degrees warmer, Peter Brannen points out in *The Ends of the World*, (<https://www.amazon.com/Ends-World-Apocalypses-Understand-Extinctions/dp/0062364804>) his new history of the planet's major extinction events, the oceans were hundreds of feet higher.

The Earth has experienced five mass extinctions before the one we are living through now, each so complete a slate-wiping of the evolutionary record it functioned as a resetting of the planetary clock, and many climate scientists will tell you they are the best analog for the ecological future we are diving headlong into. Unless you are a teenager, you probably read in your high-school textbooks that these extinctions were the result of asteroids.

In fact, all but the one that killed the dinosaurs were caused by climate change produced by greenhouse gas. The most notorious was 252 million years ago; it began when carbon warmed the planet by five degrees, accelerated when that warming triggered the release of methane in

carbone dans l'atmosphère dix fois plus rapidement qu'il ne le faisait à l'époque.

de la planète, Peter Brannen indique que la dernière fois que la planète a connu une température de 4° de plus, les océans avaient un niveau de plusieurs centaines de pieds de plus.

La Terre a connu 5 extinctions de masse avant celle que nous connaissons aujourd'hui, chacune a résulté dans une ardoise de l'évolution complètement effacée et une ré-initialisation de l'horloge planétaire, et plusieurs experts climatiques vous diront que c'est là ce qui décrit le mieux l'avenir écologique vers lequel nous plongeons tête première. Et à moins que vous ne soyez un adolescent, vous avez probablement lu dans vos manuels scolaires que ces extinctions étaient les conséquences de chutes d'astéroïdes.

En fait, si on excepte celle qui a vu l'extinction des dinosaures, elles ont toutes été les conséquences de changements climatiques dus aux gaz à effet de serre. La plus connue s'est produite il y a 252 millions d'années ; elle démarra quand le carbone a augmenté la température de la planète de 5°, a connu une accélération quand ce

the Arctic, and ended with 97 percent of all life on Earth dead. We are currently adding carbon to the atmosphere at a considerably faster rate; by most estimates, at least ten times faster. The rate is accelerating.

This is what Stephen Hawking had in mind when he said (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/2017/05/02/tomorrows-world-returns-bbc-startling-warning-stephen-hawking/>) , this spring, that the species needs to colonize other planets in the next century to survive, and what drove Elon Musk, last month, to unveil (<http://www.newsweek.com/elon-musk-mars-spacex-martian-city-625994>) his plans to build a Mars habitat in 40 to 100 years. These are nonspecialists, of course, and probably as inclined to irrational panic as you or I. But the many sober-minded scientists I interviewed over the past several months — the most credentialed and tenured in the field, few of them inclined to alarmism and many advisers to the IPCC who nevertheless criticize its conservatism — have quietly reached an apocalyptic

réchauffement déclencha la libération du méthane de l'Arctique, et s'est conclue par la mort de 97 % de toute vie sur terre. Actuellement, nous sommes en train de rajouter du carbone à l'atmosphère à un rythme encore plus rapide ; la majorité des estimations fixe ce taux à 10 fois plus rapide. Le taux est en augmentation continue.

C'est cela que Stephen Hawkins avait à l'esprit quand, au printemps dernier, il a dit que les espèces devaient coloniser d'autres planètes au cours du prochain siècle pour assurer leur survie, et c'est cela aussi qui, le mois dernier, a conduit Elon Musk à dévoiler son projet d'habitat pour Mars d'ici 40 à 100 ans. Ce ne sont pas des spécialistes, il est vrai, et ils sont probablement tout aussi enclins à paniquer de façon irrationnelle que vous et moi. Mais les nombreux scientifiques, à l'esprit posé, que j'ai interrogés tous ces derniers mois — parmi les plus diplômés et experts dans ce domaine, peu sujets à l'alarmisme, ainsi que de nombreux conseillers auprès du GIEC qui cependant critiquent son conservatisme — sont aussi tranquillement arrivés à cette même conclusion apocalyptique : Il n'existe aucun plan crédible de réduction d'émissions qui seul puisse empêcher le désastre climatique.

conclusion, too: No plausible program of emissions reductions alone can prevent climate disaster.

Related Stories

Scientist Michael Mann on 'Low-Probability But Catastrophic' Climate Scenarios
(<http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/scientist-michael-mann-on-climate-scenarios.html>)

When Did Humans Doom the Earth for Good?
(<http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2015/06/anthropocene-debate.html>)

Over the past few decades, the term “Anthropocene” has climbed out of academic discourse and into the popular imagination
(<http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2015/06/anthropocene-debate.html>)— a name given to the geologic era we live in now, and a way to signal that it is a new era, defined on the wall chart of deep history by human intervention. One problem with the term is that it implies a conquest of nature (and even echoes the biblical “dominion”). And however sanguine you might be about the

<p>proposition that we have already ravaged the natural world, which we surely have, it is another thing entirely to consider the possibility that we have only provoked it, engineering first in ignorance and then in denial a climate system that will now go to war with us for many centuries, perhaps until it destroys us. That is what Wallace Smith Broecker, the avuncular oceanographer who coined the term “global warming,” means when he calls the planet an “angry beast.” You could also go with “war machine.” Each day we arm it more.</p>		
<p>II. Heat Death</p> <p><i>The bahraining of New York.</i></p> <p>In the sugarcane region of El Salvador, as much as one-fifth of the population has chronic kidney disease, the presumed result of dehydration from working the fields they were able to comfortably harvest as recently as two decades ago. <i>Photo: Heartless Machine</i></p> <p>Humans, like all mammals, are heat engines; surviving means having to continually cool off, like panting dogs. For</p>	<p>2. Une chaleur mortelle</p> <p>« Vous avez peur de la montée des eaux mais cela occulte les autres menaces. Fuir les côtes ne suffira pas. » Plein de sollicitude pour ceux de ses lecteurs qui auraient l’optimisme un peu trop facile, l’auteur explique que la chaleur de l’air sera elle-même extrêmement délétère pour l’être humain.</p> <p>« Pour survivre, la température de l’air doit être assez fraîche pour que la régulation thermique par la peau soit efficace », décrit-il. Or, à 7°C de réchauffement, cela deviendrait impossible pour une large bande</p>	

that, the temperature needs to be low enough for the air to act as a kind of refrigerant, drawing heat off the skin so the engine can keep pumping. At seven degrees of warming, that would become impossible for large portions of the planet's equatorial band, and especially the tropics, where humidity adds to the problem; in the jungles of Costa Rica, for instance, where humidity routinely tops 90 percent, simply moving around outside when it's over 105 degrees Fahrenheit would be lethal. And the effect would be fast: Within a few hours, a human body would be cooked to death from both inside and out.

Climate-change skeptics point out that the planet has warmed and cooled many times before, but the climate window that has allowed for human life is very narrow, even by the standards of planetary history. At 11 or 12 degrees of warming, more than half the world's population, as distributed today, would die of direct heat. Things almost certainly won't get that hot this century, though models of unabated emissions do bring us that far eventually. This century, and especially in the tropics, the pain points will pinch much more quickly even than an

équatoriale de la planète, particulièrement sous les tropiques. « *Au Costa Rica, où l'humidité est de 90%, se promener dehors par plus de 40°C pourrait déjà être mortel. En quelques heures à peine, le corps humain serait mortellement cuit.* »

Si les pires scénarios se confirment, à 11 ou 12°C de réchauffement, la moitié de la population telle qu'elle est actuellement répartie sur la planète mourrait directement de chaud. Mais même à 4°C de réchauffement, « *la canicule de 2003, qui a tué 2 000 personnes par jour, deviendra la norme en Europe* ».

increase of seven degrees. The key factor is something called wet-bulb temperature, which is a term of measurement as home-laboratory-kit as it sounds: the heat registered on a thermometer wrapped in a damp sock as it's swung around in the air (since the moisture evaporates from a sock more quickly in dry air, this single number reflects both heat and humidity). At present, most regions reach a wet-bulb maximum of 26 or 27 degrees Celsius; the true red line for habitability is 35 degrees. What is called heat stress comes much sooner.

Related Stories

Michael Oppenheimer: Only 10 Percent Chance We Meet Paris Targets
(<http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/michael-oppenheimer-10-percent-chance-we-meet-paris-targets.html>)

Actually, we're about there already. Since 1980, the planet has experienced a 50-fold increase in the number of places experiencing dangerous or extreme heat; a bigger increase is to come. The five warmest summers in Europe since 1500 have all occurred since 2002, and soon, the IPCC warns, simply being outdoors that time

of year will be unhealthy for much of the globe. Even if we meet the Paris goals of two degrees warming, cities like Karachi and Kolkata will become close to uninhabitable, annually encountering deadly heat waves like those that crippled them in 2015. At four degrees, the deadly European heat wave of 2003, which killed as many as 2,000 people a day, will be a normal summer. At six, according to an assessment focused only on effects within the U.S. from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, summer labor of any kind would become impossible in the lower Mississippi Valley, and everybody in the country east of the Rockies would be under more heat stress than anyone, anywhere, in the world today. As Joseph Romm has put it in his authoritative primer *Climate Change: What Everyone Needs to Know*, (<https://www.amazon.com/Climate-Change-Everyone-Needs-Know/dp/0190250178>) heat stress in New York City would exceed that of present-day Bahrain, one of the planet's hottest spots, and the temperature in Bahrain "would induce hyperthermia in even sleeping humans." The high-end IPCC estimate, remember, is two degrees warmer

still. By the end of the century, the World Bank has estimated, the coolest months in tropical South America, Africa, and the Pacific are likely to be warmer than the warmest months at the end of the 20th century. Air-conditioning can help but will ultimately only add to the carbon problem; plus, the climate-controlled malls of the Arab emirates aside, it is not remotely plausible to wholesale air-condition all the hottest parts of the world, many of them also the poorest. And indeed, the crisis will be most dramatic across the Middle East and Persian Gulf, where in 2015 the heat index registered temperatures as high as 163 degrees Fahrenheit. As soon as several decades from now, the hajj will become physically impossible for the 2 million Muslims who make the pilgrimage each year.

It is not just the hajj, and it is not just Mecca; heat is already killing us. In the sugarcane region of El Salvador, as much as one-fifth of the population has chronic kidney disease, including over a quarter of the men, the presumed result of dehydration from working the fields they were able to comfortably harvest as recently as two decades ago. With dialysis, which is

<p>expensive, those with kidney failure can expect to live five years; without it, life expectancy is in the weeks. Of course, heat stress promises to pummel us in places other than our kidneys, too. As I type that sentence, in the California desert in mid-June, it is 121 degrees outside my door. It is not a record high.</p>		
<p>III. The End of Food</p> <p><i>Praying for cornfields in the tundra.</i></p> <p>Climates differ and plants vary, but the basic rule for staple cereal crops grown at optimal temperature is that for every degree of warming, yields decline by 10 percent. Some estimates run as high as 15 or even 17 percent. Which means that if the planet is five degrees warmer at the end of the century, we may have as many as 50 percent more people to feed and 50 percent less grain to give them. And proteins are worse: It takes 16 calories of grain to produce just a single calorie of hamburger meat, butchered from a cow that spent its life polluting the climate with methane farts.</p> <p>Pollyannaish plant physiologists will point out that the cereal-crop math applies only to</p>	<p>3. La famine mondiale</p> <p>Il y a certes des variations suivant les cultures et les climats, mais la règle générale pour les céréales poussant actuellement à leur rendement optimal est que « <i>chaque degré de réchauffement supplémentaire diminue les rendements agricoles de 10 %.</i> Certaines estimations montent à 15 ou 17 % . » Avec un réchauffement de 5°C à la fin du siècle, l'équation cauchemardesque serait donc : comment nourrir une population 50 % plus nombreuse avec 50 % de céréales en moins ?</p> <p>L'auteur anticipe le contre-argument voulant que le réchauffement libérera a contrario des terres aujourd'hui trop froides pour être cultivées, comme le Groenland. Mais « <i>déplacer les cultures vers des régions plus</i></p>	

those regions already at peak growing temperature, and they are right — theoretically, a warmer climate will make it easier to grow corn in Greenland. But as the pathbreaking work by Rosamond Naylor and David Battisti has shown, the tropics are already too hot to efficiently grow grain, and those places where grain is produced today are already at optimal growing temperature — which means even a small warming will push them down the slope of declining productivity. And you can't easily move croplands north a few hundred miles, because yields in places like remote Canada and Russia are limited by the quality of soil there; it takes many centuries for the planet to produce optimally fertile dirt.

Drought might be an even bigger problem than heat, with some of the world's most arable land turning quickly to desert. Precipitation is notoriously hard to model, yet predictions for later this century are basically unanimous: unprecedented droughts nearly everywhere food is today produced. By 2080, without dramatic reductions in emissions, southern Europe will be in permanent extreme drought, much worse than the American dust bowl ever

froides sera compliqué car ces terres sont souvent peu fertiles, comme dans le nord du Canada ou de la Russie », affirme-t-il.

En plus de la chaleur, l'autre calamité agricole sera la sécheresse. « *Il y a unanimité sur le fait que des sécheresses sans précédent pourraient se multiplier à peu près partout où l'on produit de la nourriture aujourd'hui* », alerte le journaliste. À moins que l'on ne réduise drastiquement les émissions de gaz à effet de serre, l'Europe du Sud connaîtra constamment, d'ici 2080, des sécheresses extrêmes, « *bien pires que le Dust Bowl américain ne l'a jamais été* ».

David Wallace-Wells rappelle fort à propos que nous n'avons pas le luxe d'avoir une marge de manoeuvre en la matière, alors que 800 millions de personnes souffrent déjà de sous-nutrition dans le monde : « *Selon l'ONU, les famines en Somalie, au Soudan du Sud, au Nigéria et au Yémen pourraient tuer 20 millions de personnes rien que cette année.* »

was. The same will be true in Iraq and Syria and much of the rest of the Middle East; some of the most densely populated parts of Australia, Africa, and South America; and the breadbasket regions of China. None of these places, which today supply much of the world's food, will be reliable sources of any. As for the original dust bowl: The droughts in the American plains and Southwest would not just be worse than in the 1930s, a 2015 NASA study predicted (<https://www.nasa.gov/press/2015/february/nasa-study-finds-carbon-emissions-could-dramatically-increase-risk-of-us>), but worse than any droughts in a thousand years — and that includes those that struck between 1100 and 1300, which “dried up all the rivers East of the Sierra Nevada mountains” and may have been responsible for the death of the Anasazi civilization.

Remember, we do not live in a world without hunger as it is. Far from it: Most estimates put the number of undernourished at 800 million globally. In case you haven't heard, this spring has already brought an unprecedented quadruple famine to Africa and the Middle East; the U.N. has warned that separate starvation events in Somalia,

South Sudan, Nigeria, and Yemen could kill 20 million this year alone.

IV. Climate Plagues

What happens when the bubonic ice melts?

Rock, in the right spot, is a record of planetary history, eras as long as millions of years flattened by the forces of geological time into strata with amplitudes of just inches, or just an inch, or even less. Ice works that way, too, as a climate ledger, but it is also frozen history, some of which can be reanimated when unfrozen. There are now, trapped in Arctic ice, diseases that have not circulated in the air for millions of years — in some cases, since before humans were around to encounter them. Which means our immune systems would have no idea how to fight back when those prehistoric plagues emerge from the ice.

The Arctic also stores terrifying bugs from more recent times. In Alaska, already, researchers have discovered remnants of the 1918 flu that infected as many as 500 million and killed as many as 100 million —

4. Les pestes climatiques

« *Qu'arrivera-t-il quand la peste bubonique congelée sera libérée ?* » En fondant, les glaces ne libèrent pas que des gaz à effet de serre. Au nombre des joyusetés à venir, des maladies et bactéries de toutes sortes pourraient se réveiller. Certaines pourraient être congelées là-bas depuis des millions d'années, attendant leur heure. « *Notre système immunitaire, s'il venait à rencontrer ces pestes préhistoriques, n'aurait absolument aucune idée de comment réagir pour s'en protéger* », prévient le journaliste du *New York Magazine*.

Certains « *terrifiants microbes de temps moins anciens* » pourraient aussi faire leur come-back. « *En Alaska, des chercheurs ont déjà trouvé des traces de la grippe espagnole de 1918, qui avait infecté 500 millions de personnes et en avait tué 100 millions, soit 5 % de la population mondiale.* » Pour varier les plaisirs, la BBC rapportait, en mai dernier, que des scientifiques

about 5 percent of the world's population and almost six times as many as had died in the world war for which the pandemic served as a kind of gruesome capstone. As the BBC reported (<http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20170504-there-are-diseases-hidden-in-ice-and-they-are-waking-up>) in May, scientists suspect smallpox and the bubonic plague are trapped in Siberian ice, too — an abridged history of devastating human sickness, left out like egg salad in the Arctic sun.

Experts caution that many of these organisms won't actually survive the thaw and point to the fastidious lab conditions under which they have already reanimated several of them — the 32,000-year-old “extremophile” bacteria revived in 2005, an 8 million-year-old bug brought back to life in 2007, the 3.5 million-year-old one a Russian scientist self-injected (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lv0_Cu0FcPA) just out of curiosity — to suggest that those are necessary conditions for the return of such ancient plagues. But already last year, a boy was killed and 20 others infected by anthrax released when retreating permafrost exposed the frozen carcass of a

soupçonner aussi la peste bubonique et la petite variole d'attendre sagement le dégel en Sibérie.

Le journaliste modère pour une fois son propos en rappelant que la plupart de ces organismes ont très peu de chances de survivre au dégel et d'être réanimés. Mais le risque n'est pas nul pour autant : un enfant est mort l'an dernier, infecté par de l'anthrax contenu dans un renne contaminé 75 ans plus tôt et congelé dans le permafrost.

Peste bubonique, petite variole, grippe espagnole... Des menaces guère plus réjouissantes qu'une Apocalypse zombie... (smartcc365.com)

Pour compléter le tableau, l'auteur appelle aussi à se méfier des maladies actuelles, qui pourraient migrer et muter à cause du changement climatique. « *Vous ne vous inquiétez pas trop de la dengue ou de la malaria si vous vivez dans le Maine ou en France. Mais avec la migration des moustiques tropicaux vers le nord, vous devriez.* »

reindeer killed by the bacteria at least 75 years earlier; 2,000 present-day reindeer were infected, too, carrying and spreading the disease beyond the tundra.

What concerns epidemiologists more than ancient diseases are existing scourges relocated, rewired, or even re-evolved by warming. The first effect is geographical. Before the early-modern period, when adventuring sailboats accelerated the mixing of peoples and their bugs, human provinciality was a guard against pandemic. Today, even with globalization and the enormous intermingling of human populations, our ecosystems are mostly stable, and this functions as another limit, but global warming will scramble those ecosystems and help disease trespass those limits as surely as Cortés did. You don't worry much about dengue or malaria if you are living in Maine or France. But as the tropics creep northward and mosquitoes migrate with them, you will. You didn't much worry about Zika a couple of years ago, either.

As it happens, Zika may also be a good model

<p>(http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2016/02/zika-virus-gmo-mosquitoes.html) of the second worrying effect — disease mutation. One reason you hadn't heard about Zika until recently is that it had been trapped in Uganda; another is that it did not, until recently, appear to cause birth defects. Scientists still don't entirely understand what happened, or what they missed. But there are things we do know for sure about how climate affects some diseases: Malaria, for instance, thrives in hotter regions not just because the mosquitoes that carry it do, too, but because for every degree increase in temperature, the parasite reproduces ten times faster. Which is one reason that the World Bank estimates that by 2050, 5.2 billion people will be reckoning with it.</p>		
<p>V. Unbreathable Air</p> <p><i>A rolling death smog that suffocates millions.</i></p> <p>By the end of the century, the coolest months in tropical South America, Africa, and the Pacific are likely to be warmer than</p>	<p>5. L'air irrespirable</p> <p>Le CO2 ne se contente pas de réchauffer l'atmosphère, il en change aussi par définition la composition. Or, l'air que nous respirons a un impact sur notre santé, de façon parfois inattendue. Si la teneur en carbone monte à 1 000 ppm en 2100,</p>	

the warmest months at the end of the 20th century. *Photo: Heartless Machine*

Our lungs need oxygen, but that is only a fraction of what we breathe. The fraction of carbon dioxide is growing: It just crossed 400 parts per million, and high-end estimates extrapolating from current trends suggest it will hit 1,000 ppm by 2100. At that concentration, compared to the air we breathe now, human cognitive ability declines by 21 percent.

Other stuff in the hotter air is even scarier, with small increases in pollution capable of shortening life spans by ten years. The warmer the planet gets, the more ozone forms, and by mid-century, Americans will likely suffer a 70 percent increase in unhealthy ozone smog, the National Center for Atmospheric Research has projected. By 2090, as many as 2 billion people globally will be breathing air above the WHO “safe” level; one paper last month showed that, among other effects, a pregnant mother’s exposure to ozone raises the child’s risk of autism (as much as tenfold, combined with other environmental factors). Which does make you think again about the autism

l’auteur assure qu’« un tel air pourrait baisser les capacités cognitives humaines de 21 % ».

Quand il fait plus chaud, les réactions chimiques accentuent également la pollution à l’ozone, liée à de nombreuses maladies et qui augmente le risque d’autisme lorsque l’air en question est respiré par des femmes enceintes. Les feux de forêts pourraient aussi être deux fois plus destructeurs d’ici 2050, avec leurs lots de particules toxiques. Sans compter qu’ils alimenteraient d’autant plus le réchauffement climatique.

La Chine donne déjà aujourd’hui un bon aperçu des scénarios le plus noirs en matière d’extrême pollution des villes. David Wallace-Wells rappelle qu’en 2013, année du fameux « Airpocalyspe » chinois, « *le smog fut responsable du tiers de toutes les morts dans le pays* ».

epidemic in West Hollywood.

Already, more than 10,000 people die each day from the small particles emitted from fossil-fuel burning; each year, 339,000 people die from wildfire smoke, in part because climate change has extended forest-fire season (in the U.S., it's increased by 78 days since 1970). By 2050, according to the U.S. Forest Service (https://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/effects_2012/FS_Climate1114%20opt.pdf), wildfires will be twice as destructive as they are today; in some places, the area burned could grow fivefold. What worries people even more is the effect that would have on emissions, especially when the fires ravage forests arising out of peat. Peatland fires in Indonesia in 1997, for instance, added to the global CO₂ release by up to 40 percent, and more burning only means more warming only means more burning. There is also the terrifying possibility that rain forests like the Amazon, which in 2010 suffered its second “hundred-year drought” in the space of five years, could dry out enough to become vulnerable to these kinds of devastating, rolling forest fires — which would not only expel enormous amounts of carbon into the

atmosphere but also shrink the size of the forest. That is especially bad because the Amazon alone provides 20 percent of our oxygen.

Then there are the more familiar forms of pollution. In 2013, melting Arctic ice remodeled Asian weather patterns, depriving industrial China of the natural ventilation systems it had come to depend on, which blanketed much of the country's north in an unbreathable smog. Literally unbreathable. A metric called the Air Quality Index categorizes the risks and tops out at the 301-to-500 range, warning of "serious aggravation of heart or lung disease and premature mortality in persons with cardiopulmonary disease and the elderly" and, for all others, "serious risk of respiratory effects"; at that level, "everyone should avoid all outdoor exertion." The Chinese "airpocalypse" of 2013 peaked at what would have been an Air Quality Index of over 800. That year, smog was responsible for a third of all deaths in the country.

--	--	--

VI. Perpetual War

The violence baked into heat.

Climatologists are very careful when talking about Syria. They want you to know that while climate change did produce a drought that contributed to civil war, it is not exactly fair to say that the conflict is the result of warming; next door, for instance, Lebanon suffered the same crop failures. But researchers like Marshall Burke and Solomon Hsiang have managed to quantify some of the non-obvious relationships between temperature and violence: For every half-degree of warming, they say, societies will see between a 10 and 20 percent increase in the likelihood of armed conflict. In climate science, nothing is simple, but the arithmetic is harrowing: A planet five degrees warmer would have at least half again as many wars as we do today. Overall, social conflict could more than double this century.

This is one reason that, as nearly every climate scientist I spoke to pointed out, the U.S. military is obsessed with climate change: The drowning of all American Navy bases by sea-level rise is trouble enough,

6. La guerre perpétuelle

« Les climatologues sont très prudents quand ils parlent de la Syrie. » Prudents, mais formels : la sécheresse fait partie, entre autres nombreuses causes, des facteurs d'instabilité sociale ayant conduit à la guerre civile dans le pays. Emmanuel Macron ne disait pas autre chose lorsqu'il établissait un lien, le 8 juillet 2017, lors de la conférence du G20, entre terrorisme et réchauffement climatique.

Pour chaque demi-degré supplémentaire, les sociétés verraient augmenter de 10 à 20 % la probabilité d'un conflit armé

Le journaliste américain cite une vaste étude de Marshall Burke et Solomon Hsiang qui relève, au-delà des particularismes et conjonctures locaux, une corrélation entre violence et température : pour chaque demi-degré supplémentaire, les sociétés verraient augmenter de 10 à 20 % la probabilité d'un conflit armé.

À cela s'ajoutent les tensions liées aux vastes migrations climatiques à venir. Et David Wallace-Wells de souligner que ce n'est pas pour rien si l'armée américaine est obsédée par les études sur le réchauffement

but being the world's policeman is quite a bit harder when the crime rate doubles. Of course, it's not just Syria where climate has contributed to conflict. Some speculate that the elevated level of strife across the Middle East over the past generation reflects the pressures of global warming — a hypothesis all the more cruel considering that warming began accelerating when the industrialized world extracted and then burned the region's oil.

What accounts for the relationship between climate and conflict? Some of it comes down to agriculture and economics; a lot has to do with forced migration, already at a record high, with at least 65 million displaced people wandering the planet right now. But there is also the simple fact of individual irritability. Heat increases municipal crime rates, and swearing on social media, and the likelihood that a major-league pitcher, coming to the mound after his teammate has been hit by a pitch, will hit an opposing batter in retaliation. And the arrival of air-conditioning in the developed world, in the middle of the past century, did little to solve the problem of the summer crime wave.

climatique : « *Être le gendarme du monde est un peu plus compliqué quand le taux de criminalité vient à doubler.* »

VII. Permanent Economic Collapse

Dismal capitalism in a half-poorer world.

The murmuring mantra of global neoliberalism, which prevailed between the end of the Cold War and the onset of the Great Recession, is that economic growth would save us from anything and everything.

But in the aftermath of the 2008 crash, a growing number of historians studying what they call “fossil capitalism” have begun to suggest that the entire history of swift economic growth, which began somewhat suddenly in the 18th century, is not the result of innovation or trade or the dynamics of global capitalism but simply our discovery of fossil fuels and all their raw power — a onetime injection of new “value” into a system that had previously been characterized by global subsistence living. Before fossil fuels, nobody lived better than their parents or grandparents or ancestors from 500 years before, except in the immediate aftermath of a great plague like the Black Death, which allowed the lucky survivors to gobble up the resources

7. L’effondrement économique permanent

En s’appuyant toujours sur les travaux de Solomon Hsiang et de ses collègues, le journaliste signale que chaque degré de réchauffement pourrait coûter 1,2 point de PIB. Plus généralement, les chercheurs ont calculé comme projection médiane une perte de 23 % des revenus par personne à la fin du siècle, due aux différentes conséquences du changement climatique (agriculture, violences, tempêtes, énergie, mortalité, etc.).

David Wallace-Wells suggère que le principe même de croissance est intrinsèquement lié à l’exploitation des énergies fossiles, et voué à s’interrompre avec la fin de celles-ci. « *Avant les énergies fossiles, personne ne vivait jamais mieux que ses parents. (...) Peut-être que la fin des fossiles signifie le retour à un état de stabilité* », avance-t-il.

Dans un rapport de septembre 2016, l’OCDE tablait aussi sur une perte de 6 à 12 points de PIB à la fin du siècle selon les scénarios de réchauffement empruntés.

liberated by mass graves. After we've burned all the fossil fuels, these scholars suggest, perhaps we will return to a "steady state" global economy. Of course, that onetime injection has a devastating long-term cost: climate change.

The most exciting research on the economics of warming has also come from Hsiang and his colleagues, who are not historians of fossil capitalism but who offer some very bleak analysis of their own: Every degree Celsius of warming costs, on average, 1.2 percent of GDP (an enormous number, considering we count growth in the low single digits as "strong"). This is the sterling work in the field, and their median projection is for a 23 percent loss in per capita earning globally by the end of this century (resulting from changes in agriculture, crime, storms, energy, mortality, and labor).

Tracing the shape of the probability curve is even scarier: There is a 12 percent chance that climate change will reduce global output by more than 50 percent by 2100, they say, and a 51 percent chance that it lowers per capita GDP by 20 percent or more by then, unless emissions decline. By comparison,

Selon l'étude de Hsiang, il y aurait même « *12% de chances que le réchauffement climatique réduise la productivité globale de plus de 50 % d'ici 2100* ».

the Great Recession lowered global GDP by about 6 percent, in a onetime shock; Hsiang and his colleagues estimate a one-in-eight chance of an ongoing and irreversible effect by the end of the century that is eight times worse.

The scale of that economic devastation is hard to comprehend, but you can start by imagining what the world would look like today with an economy half as big, which would produce only half as much value, generating only half as much to offer the workers of the world. It makes the grounding of flights out of heat-stricken Phoenix last month seem like pathetically small economic potatoes. And, among other things, it makes the idea of postponing government action on reducing emissions and relying solely on growth and technology to solve the problem an absurd business calculation.

Every round-trip ticket on flights from New York to London, keep in mind, costs the Arctic three more square meters of ice.

--	--	--

VIII. Poisoned Oceans	8. Les océans empoisonnés Plus du tiers du carbone est absorbé par les	
------------------------------	---	--

Sulfide burps off the skeleton coast.

That the sea will become a killer is a given. Barring a radical reduction of emissions, we will see at least four feet of sea-level rise and possibly ten by the end of the century. A third of the world's major cities are on the coast, not to mention its power plants, ports, navy bases, farmlands, fisheries, river deltas, marshlands, and rice-paddy empires, and even those above ten feet will flood much more easily, and much more regularly, if the water gets that high. At least 600 million people live within ten meters of sea level today.

But the drowning of those homelands is just the start. At present, more than a third of the world's carbon is sucked up by the oceans — thank God, or else we'd have that much more warming already. But the result is what's called "ocean acidification," which, on its own, may add a half a degree to warming this century. It is also already burning through the planet's water basins — you may remember these as the place where life arose in the first place. You have probably heard of "coral bleaching" — that is, coral dying — which is very bad news, because

océans. Une chance pour éviter que le réchauffement ne soit encore pire. Mais les effets secondaires sont terribles : acidification des océans, blanchiment et mort des coraux, qui « *supportent le quart de la vie marine et nourrissent directement un demi milliard de personnes* », selon le journaliste.

L'absorption du carbone peut déclencher un cercle vicieux : la sous-oxygénation de l'eau entraîne le grand développement de bactéries qui diminuent encore le taux d'oxygène disponible, faisant grossir les « zones mortes » dans les eaux profondes, puis de plus en plus près de la surface. Les poissons meurent étouffés, nourrissant les bactéries et accélérant encore le processus. Ces zones mortes « *grossissent comme des cancers, dépeuplant des pans entiers de l'océan comme c'est déjà le cas dans certaines parties du Golfe du Mexique ou au large de la Namibie* ».

L'hydrogène sulfuré issu de ce processus est « *le gaz préféré de la planète pour commettre un holocauste naturel* ». Il a déjà tué la quasi totalité de la vie marine par le passé, qui a mis des millions d'années à

reefs support as much as a quarter of all marine life and supply food for half a billion people. Ocean acidification will fry fish populations directly, too, though scientists aren't yet sure how to predict the effects on the stuff we haul out of the ocean to eat; they do know that in acid waters, oysters and mussels will struggle to grow their shells, and that when the pH of human blood drops as much as the oceans' pH has over the past generation, it induces seizures, comas, and sudden death.

That isn't all that ocean acidification can do. Carbon absorption can initiate a feedback loop in which underoxygenated waters breed different kinds of microbes that turn the water still more "anoxic," first in deep ocean "dead zones," then gradually up toward the surface. There, the small fish die out, unable to breathe, which means oxygen-eating bacteria thrive, and the feedback loop doubles back. This process, in which dead zones grow like cancers, choking off marine life and wiping out fisheries, is already quite advanced in parts of the Gulf of Mexico and just off Namibia, where hydrogen sulfide is bubbling out of the sea along a thousand-mile stretch of

s'en remettre, conclut David Wallace-Wells.

land known as the “Skeleton Coast.” The name originally referred to the detritus of the whaling industry, but today it’s more apt than ever. Hydrogen sulfide is so toxic that evolution has trained us to recognize the tiniest, safest traces of it, which is why our noses are so exquisitely skilled at registering flatulence. Hydrogen sulfide is also the thing that finally did us in that time 97 percent of all life on Earth died, once all the feedback loops had been triggered and the circulating jet streams of a warmed ocean ground to a halt — it’s the planet’s preferred gas for a natural holocaust. Gradually, the ocean’s dead zones spread, killing off marine species that had dominated the oceans for hundreds of millions of years, and the gas the inert waters gave off into the atmosphere poisoned everything on land. Plants, too. It was millions of years before the oceans recovered.

IX. The Great Filter

Our present eeriness cannot last.

So why can’t we see it? In his recent book-length essay *The Great Derangement*, (<https://www.amazon.com/Great-Derangement-Climate-Unthinkable->

Lectures/dp/022632303X) the Indian novelist Amitav Ghosh wonders why global warming and natural disaster haven't become major subjects of contemporary fiction — why we don't seem able to imagine climate catastrophe, and why we haven't yet had a spate of novels in the genre he basically imagines into half-existence and names “the environmental uncanny.”

“Consider, for example, the stories that congeal around questions like, ‘Where were you when the Berlin Wall fell?’ or ‘Where were you on 9/11?’ ” he writes. “Will it ever be possible to ask, in the same vein, ‘Where were you at 400 ppm?’ or ‘Where were you when the Larsen B ice shelf broke up?’ ” His answer: Probably not, because the dilemmas and dramas of climate change are simply incompatible with the kinds of stories we tell ourselves about ourselves, especially in novels, which tend to emphasize the journey of an individual conscience rather than the poisonous miasma of social fate.

Surely this blindness will not last — the world we are about to inhabit will not permit it. In a six-degree-warmer world, the Earth's ecosystem will boil with so many natural disasters that we will just start calling them

“weather”: a constant swarm of out-of-control typhoons and tornadoes and floods and droughts, the planet assaulted regularly with climate events that not so long ago destroyed whole civilizations. The strongest hurricanes will come more often, and we’ll have to invent new categories with which to describe them; tornadoes will grow longer and wider and strike much more frequently, and hail rocks will quadruple in size. Humans used to watch the weather to prophesy the future; going forward, we will see in its wrath the vengeance of the past. Early naturalists talked often about “deep time” — the perception they had, contemplating the grandeur of this valley or that rock basin, of the profound slowness of nature. What lies in store for us is more like what the Victorian anthropologists identified as “dreamtime,” or “everywhen”: the semi-mythical experience, described by Aboriginal Australians, of encountering, in the present moment, an out-of-time past, when ancestors, heroes, and demigods crowded an epic stage. You can find it already watching footage of an iceberg collapsing into the sea — a feeling of history happening all at once.

It is. Many people perceive climate change as a sort of moral and economic debt, accumulated since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution and now come due after several centuries — a helpful perspective, in a way, since it is the carbon-burning processes that began in 18th-century England that lit the fuse of everything that followed. But more than half of the carbon humanity has exhaled into the atmosphere in its entire history has been emitted in just the past three decades; since the end of World War II, the figure is 85 percent. Which means that, in the length of a single generation, global warming has brought us to the brink of planetary catastrophe, and that the story of the industrial world's kamikaze mission is also the story of a single lifetime. My father's, for instance: born in 1938, among his first memories the news of Pearl Harbor and the mythic Air Force of the propaganda films that followed, films that doubled as advertisements for imperial-American industrial might; and among his last memories the coverage of the desperate signing of the Paris climate accords on cable news, ten weeks before he died of

lung cancer last July. Or my mother's: born in 1945, to German Jews fleeing the smokestacks through which their relatives were incinerated, now enjoying her 72nd year in an American commodity paradise, a paradise supported by the supply chains of an industrialized developing world. She has been smoking for 57 of those years, unfiltered.

Or the scientists'. Some of the men who first identified a changing climate (and given the generation, those who became famous were men) are still alive; a few are even still working. Wally Broecker is 84 years old and drives to work at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory across the Hudson every day from the Upper West Side. Like most of those who first raised the alarm, he believes that no amount of emissions reduction alone can meaningfully help avoid disaster. Instead, he puts his faith in carbon capture — untested technology to extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, which Broecker estimates will cost at least several trillion dollars — and various forms of “geoengineering,” the catchall name for a variety of moon-shot technologies far-fetched enough that many climate scientists

prefer to regard them as dreams, or nightmares, from science fiction. He is especially focused on what's called the aerosol approach — dispersing so much sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere that when it converts to sulfuric acid, it will cloud a fifth of the horizon and reflect back 2 percent of the sun's rays, buying the planet at least a little wiggle room, heat-wise. "Of course, that would make our sunsets very red, would bleach the sky, would make more acid rain," he says. "But you have to look at the magnitude of the problem. You got to watch that you don't say the giant problem shouldn't be solved because the solution causes some smaller problems." He won't be around to see that, he told me. "But in your lifetime ..."

Jim Hansen is another member of this godfather generation. Born in 1941, he became a climatologist at the University of Iowa, developed the groundbreaking "Zero Model" for projecting climate change, and later became the head of climate research at NASA, only to leave under pressure when, while still a federal employee, he filed a lawsuit against the federal government charging inaction on warming (along the

way he got arrested a few times for protesting, too). The lawsuit, which is brought by a collective called Our Children's Trust and is often described as "kids versus climate change," is built on an appeal to the equal-protection clause, namely, that in failing to take action on warming, the government is violating it by imposing massive costs on future generations; it is scheduled to be heard this winter in Oregon district court. Hansen has recently given up on solving the climate problem with a carbon tax alone, which had been his preferred approach, and has set about calculating the total cost of the additional measure of extracting carbon from the atmosphere.

Related Stories

Climate Scientist James Hansen: 'The Planet Could Become Ungovernable' (<http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/scientist-jim-hansen-the-planet-could-become-ungovernable.html>)

Hansen began his career studying Venus, which was once a very Earth-like planet with plenty of life-supporting water before runaway climate change rapidly transformed it into an arid and uninhabitable sphere

<p>enveloped in an unbreathable gas; he switched to studying our planet by 30, wondering why he should be squinting across the solar system to explore rapid environmental change when he could see it all around him on the planet he was standing on. “When we wrote our first paper on this, in 1981,” he told me, “I remember saying to one of my co-authors, ‘This is going to be very interesting. Sometime during our careers, we’re going to see these things beginning to happen.’ ”</p>		
	<p>Le changement climatique et le paradoxe de Fermi</p> <p>David Wallace-Wells conclut de façon inattendue... en parlant d’extra-terrestres. Etant donné le grand âge de l’univers, bien plus vieux que notre Terre, et son gigantisme, la vie a dû émerger ailleurs et elle a pu bénéficier des milliers, voire des millions, d’années de développement nécessaires à la mise au point de technologies avancées et à la maîtrise des voyages interstellaires. Mais si c’est le cas, pourquoi les extra-terrestres ne nous ont-ils jamais rendu visite ? C’est le fameux paradoxe de Fermi.</p>	

	<p>« Les civilisations se développent, mais un filtre environnemental les fait décliner et disparaître rapidement. Si vous regardez la planète Terre, ce filtre correspond aux grandes extinctions de masse. »</p> <p>Et si la réponse à ce paradoxe était contenue dans le réchauffement climatique ? Peut-être qu'aucune civilisation dans l'univers n'a jamais réussi à se développer sans dérégler son environnement au point de périliter avant de pouvoir s'envoler vers d'autres planètes.</p>	
<p>Several of the scientists I spoke with proposed global warming as the solution to Fermi's famous paradox, which asks, If the universe is so big, then why haven't we encountered any other intelligent life in it? The answer, they suggested, is that the natural life span of a civilization may be only several thousand years, and the life span of an industrial civilization perhaps only several hundred. In a universe that is many billions of years old, with star systems separated as much by time as by space, civilizations might emerge and develop and burn themselves up simply too fast to ever find one another. Peter Ward, a charismatic</p>	<p>Apocalypse et optimisme</p> <p>Étonnement, de nombreux scientifiques rencontrés par le journaliste lui auraient fait part de cette hypothèse. C'est le cas du paléontologue Peter Ward, qui parle de « <i>grand filtre</i> » : « <i>Les civilisations se développent, mais un filtre environnemental les fait décliner et disparaître rapidement. Si vous regardez la planète Terre, ce filtre correspond aux grandes extinctions de masse.</i> »</p> <p>« Nous avons trouvé une voie pour créer une Apocalypse technologique, nous trouverons une voie pour trouver notre salut</p>	

paleontologist among those responsible for discovering that the planet's mass extinctions were caused by greenhouse gas, calls this the "Great Filter": "Civilizations rise, but there's an environmental filter that causes them to die off again and disappear fairly quickly," he told me. "If you look at planet Earth, the filtering we've had in the past has been in these mass extinctions." The mass extinction we are now living through has only just begun; so much more dying is coming.

And yet, improbably, Ward is an optimist. So are Broecker and Hansen and many of the other scientists I spoke to. We have not developed much of a religion of meaning around climate change that might comfort us, or give us purpose, in the face of possible annihilation. But climate scientists have a strange kind of faith: We will find a way to forestall radical warming, they say, because we must.

technologique »

Contre toute attente, le ton final est pourtant à l'optimisme : « *Ward, Broecker, Hansen et beaucoup des scientifiques à qui j'ai parlé sont des optimistes. Ils sont persuadés que nous trouverons une solution pour prévenir le réchauffement radical à venir, tout simplement parce que nous n'avons pas le choix...* »

It is not easy to know how much to be reassured by that bleak certainty, and how much to wonder whether it is another form of delusion; for global warming to work as parable, of course, someone needs to survive to tell the story. The scientists know that to even meet the Paris goals, by 2050, carbon emissions from energy and industry, which are still rising, will have to fall by half each decade; emissions from land use (deforestation, cow farts, etc.) will have to zero out; and we will need to have invented technologies to extract, annually, twice as much carbon from the atmosphere as the entire planet's plants now do. Nevertheless, by and large, the scientists have an enormous confidence in the ingenuity of humans — a confidence perhaps bolstered by their appreciation for climate change, which is, after all, a human invention, too. They point to the Apollo project, the hole in the ozone we patched in the 1980s, the passing of the fear of mutually assured destruction. Now we've found a way to engineer our own doomsday, and surely we will find a way to engineer our way out of it, one way or another. The planet is not used to being provoked like this, and climate

Pour certains, ces solutions passeront nécessairement par la géo-ingénierie et la manipulation du climat. Pour d'autres, au contraire, ce serait une grave erreur, et il faut plutôt miser sur la captation du CO² et la contrainte économique. Quoi qu'il en soit, « *nous avons trouvé une voie pour créer une Apocalypse technologique, nous trouverons une voie pour trouver notre salut technologique* », assure David Wallace-Wells.

systems designed to give feedback over centuries or millennia prevent us — even those who may be watching closely — from fully imagining the damage done already to the planet. But when we do truly see the world we've made, they say, we will also find a way to make it livable. For them, the alternative is simply unimaginable.

**This article appears in the July 10, 2017, issue of New York Magazine.*

**This article has been updated to provide context for the recent news reports about revisions to a satellite data set, to more accurately reflect the rate of warming during the Paleocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum, to clarify a reference to Peter Brannen's The Ends of the World, and to make clear that James Hansen still supports a carbon-tax based approach to emissions.*

Related

The Uninhabitable Earth, Annotated Edition (<http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans-annotated.html>)

Faut-il une bonne dictature verte ?

Cela passe avant tout par une vraie prise de conscience de l'ampleur de l'urgence. Mais combien de temps peut-on encore se permettre le luxe d'attendre ? La démocratie peut-elle avoir la réactivité nécessaire, ou bien faut-il, pour sauver l'humanité, mettre en place une bonne dictature verte ? Question sensible, qui est justement au coeur du dossier du nouveau numéro d'*Usbek & Rica*. En kiosque et sur notre site depuis le 4 juillet !