

Diplomacy Failed: Good!

November 23, 2026

"The U.N. climate summit in Turkey broke down Sunday," explained *The Washington Post*, "after stark disagreements over the future of fossil fuels kept countries from reaching consensus on a proposed agreement for tackling global warming."

Just as prophecies foretold.

But don't reach for your Nostradamus.

The prophet was economist Thomas Schelling, and he didn't foresee this exact agreement breakdown at this precise time. What he did, as far back as 1992, was explain why any workable international "climate agreement" would be highly unlikely.

While the U.N. Secretary General blames "powerful fossil fuel interests," Schelling's point (no pun intended) was that it's not in the shared interest of enough nation-states to agree to curb CO2 emissions. The idea is probably familiar enough: poor countries struggling to progress need fossil fuels to advance, and they would much prefer a "free ride," while only rich countries can afford to hobble themselves by increasing the price of energy by reducing the most efficient forms, which happen to be fossil fuels.

Schelling has suggested that the best thing to do is wait for progress to alleviate the problem. There has been a general trend to shift from more polluting to less polluting fuels for the past several centuries. In time, it'll likely all balance out.

Now, many of you may be in my position, skeptical of the "findings" of contemporary (subsidized) "climate science." The Secretary General doesn't agree: "There may be no consensus in the negotiating room, but there is no ambiguity in the science."

That's hardly true. The "scientific consensus" for man-made global warming has been puffed up, dishonestly, for too long.

So breathe in the air; rest easy. Atmospheric carbon is good for life on the planet (it being what green plants breathe in) and it was dangerously low during the Little Ice Age not too long ago. Which climate alarmists seem never to mention.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.