

TIK TAK

TIK TAK

TIK TAK

TIK TAK

TIK TAK

Sezona 2021/2022

Uprizoritev 2

VROČI

2	Kazalo Contents	
3	Zasedba Cast and crew	
	Andreas Malm:	
5	<i>Vprašanje, ki bi nas moralo najbolj težiti</i>	
6	<i>The Question That Should Weigh Most Heavily on Our Minds</i>	
	Medvladni odbor za podnebne spremembe (IPCC) odgovarja na nekaj pogosto zastavljenih vprašanj	
9	<i>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Answers Some Frequently Asked Questions</i>	
10		
	Zoper podnebne spremembe po pravični poti	16 A Fair Way to Fight Climate Change
	Daniel Gaio:	Daniel Gaio:
12	<i>Oblikovanje delavskih gibanj zoper zavajajoče rešitve</i>	16 <i>Building workers' movements against false solutions</i>
	Nathan Thanki:	Nathan Thanki:
12	<i>Pravične alternative trajnostnemu razvojnemu mehanizmu Pariškega sporazuma</i>	16 <i>Justice alternatives to the Sustainable Development Mechanism of the Paris Agreement</i>
	María Faciolince, Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik:	María Faciolince, Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik:
12	<i>Pravična vizija za podnebne migracije</i>	16 <i>A just vision for climate migration</i>
	Roxana Baldrich:	Roxana Baldrich:
15	<i>Luciano Lliuya proti RWE AG: pravni spor za podnebno pravičnost</i>	18 <i>Luciano Lliuya v. RWE AG: litigating for climate justice</i>

Avtorski projekt / Devised project

INA / FEVER

Režija / Director:
Žiga Divjak

Igrajo / Cast:

Damir Avdić k. g. / as guest
Mina Palada k. g. / as guest
Draga Potočnjak
Maya Sara Unger k. g. / as guest
Vito Weis
Gregor Zorc k. g. / as guest

Dramaturgija / Dramaturg:
Goran Injac

Besedilo / Text:
Žiga Divjak in igralci / and the cast

Scenografija / Set designer:
Igor Vasiljev

Kostumografija / Costume designer:
Tina Pavlovič

Glasba in oblikovanje zvoka / Composer and
sound designer:
Blaž Gracar

Strokovni sodelavec / Expert from the field:
Andreas Malm

Pomoč pri raziskavi / Research assistant:
Maja Ava Žiberna

Oblikovanje svetlobe / Lighting designer:
David Orešič

Režiser videoprenosa / Livestream director:
Vid Hajnšek

Prevod v nemščino / Translator into German:
Martin Thomas Pesl

Prevod slovenskih in bosanskih odlomkov v angleščino /
Translator of Slovenian and Bosnian parts into English:
Barbara Skubic

Prevod v slovenščino / Translator into Slovenian:
Tina Malič

Lektorici / Language consultants:
Aleksandra Žerjav (angleščina / English),
Mateja Dermelj (slovenščina / Slovenian)

Vodja predstave / Stage manager:
Gašper Tesner

Izvršna producentka / Executive producer:
Tina Dobnik

Premieri / Premières:

24. 9. 2021, Orpheum, Gradec / Graz (steirischer herbst '21)
12. 10. 2021, Slovensko mladinsko gledališče, Ljubljana

Predstava je pretežno v angleščini, z nadnapisi. /
Performed mostly in English, with surtitles.

Naročilo: steirischer herbst '21 in Slovensko mladinsko
gledališče / Commissioned by steirischer herbst '21
and Mladinsko Theatre

Produkcija: Slovensko mladinsko gledališče
v koprodukciji s steirischer herbst '21 in
Masko Ljubljana / Produced by Mladinsko Theatre in
coproduction with steirischer herbst '21 and Maska
Ljubljana

S prijazno podporo Ministrstva za kulturo Republike
Slovenije, Avstrijskega kulturnega foruma Ljubljana,
Slovenskega kulturno-informacijskega centra v Avstriji
SKICA in Mestne občine Ljubljana / With the kind
support of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of
Slovenia, Austrian Cultural Forum Ljubljana, Slovenian
Culture and Information Centre in Austria SKICA, and
the Municipality of Ljubljana

Nekaj motivov in fragmentov smo povzeli po knjigah
Manj je več: Kako bo odrast rešila svet Jasona
Hickla, *Kako razstreliti naftovod* Andreasa Malma,
Ministrstvo za prihodnost Kima Stanleyja Robinsona
in *Neprijazna Zemlja: Življenje po segrevanju* Davida
Wallacea-Wellsa / We have used some motives and
fragments from the books *Less is More: How Degrowth
Will Save the World* by Jason Hickel, *How to Blow Up a
Pipeline* by Andreas Malm, *Ministry for the Future* by
Kim Stanley Robinson and *The Uninhabitable Earth:
Life After Warming* by David Wallace-Wells

Hvala / Thanks to: Marjana Dermelj, Ana Loriger,
Katarina Morano, Urša Regvar

Tehnično vodenje / Technical operator: Sven Horvat
Šepetalki / Prompters: Jera Krečič, Nina Strmole
Lučna mojstra / Lighting engineers: Matjaž Brišar, David Cvelbar
Tonski mojster / Sound engineer: Silvo Zupančič
Asistent tonskega mojstra / Sound technician: Marijan Sajovic
Video tehnik / Video technician: Dušan Ojdanič
Garderoberki / Wardrobe mistresses: Andreja Kovač,
Slavica Janošević
Izdelava pletenin / Knitwear maker: Martina Šušteršič
Maskerka in frizerka / Make-up artist and hair stylist: Nathalie
Horvat
Rekviziter / Property master: Dare Kragelj
Izdelava kostuma-rekvizita / Prop-costume maker:
Helena Žnidaršič
Odrski mojster / Chief theatrical technician: Boris Prevec
Odrski tehniki / Stage technicians: Tadej Čaušević, Valerij Jeraj,
Tine Mazalovič, Mitja Strašek
Ključavničar / Master welder: Sandi Mikluž
Mizar / Master carpenter: Boštjan Kljakič Kim
Izdelava scenografije / Set construction: delavnice Slovenskega
mladinskega gledališča / Mladinsko Theatre workshops
Ekonom / Production services: Ivan Šikora
Čistilki / Facilities maintenance: Naila Jamaković,
Zdenka Žigman



Vito Weis

Andreas Malm

VPRAŠANJE, KI BI NAS MORALO NAJBOLJ TEŽITI

Poletje 2021 je bilo letni čas globalnega pekla. Lososi v rekah Britanske Kolumbije so se dobesedno cvrli, okoli šeststo ljudi pa je nenadoma izgubilo življenje v vročinskem valu brez primere: znak, da je nastopilo poletje zgodnjega enaindvajsetega stoletja. Sledil je nov niz rekordnih požarov na tihooceanskem severozahodu ZDA, niz, ki ga, ko pišem te vrstice, še ni konec. Od gozdov v Sredozemlju so ostale samo saje. Viralni filmski klip je kazal trajekt, nabito poln ljudi, ki so jih evakuirali z grškega otoka Evia: vse naokrog so strmi bregovi žareli v plamenih. Ognjeni zublji so rohnili po Alžiriji, Tuniziji, Albaniji, Franciji; Turčija se je komaj začela dobro spopadati z vrtoglavo uničujočimi požari, ko so jo že zalile hudourniške poplave, ki so odnašale cele vasi in na severu države povzročile smrt skoraj sto ljudi, podobni prizori pa so se odvijali tudi na zahodu Nemčije, na Kitajskem, v južnem Sudanu, Mjanmaru, v indijski zvezni državi Maharaštra, v ameriški zvezni državi Tennessee. Planet izmenično v ognju in pod vodo. Poletje 2021 so ti dogodki zajeli celo nekatera od najbogatejših območij na svetu.

Pa se še kar nadaljuje. In nadaljuje. V Beli hiši se Joe Biden od avgusta 2021 v tempu, ki ga nismo videli vse od predsedovanja Georgea W. Busha, ukvarja z izdajanjem dovoljenj za črpanje nafte in plina na javnih zemljiščih. Na OPEC pritiska, naj proizvede več nafte. ConocoPhillips ima njegov blagoslov za gradnjo naftovoda na severnih pobočjih Aljaske. Toda ker se permafrost topi, mora družba, da bi objekt sploh obstal na mestu in bi lahko na svetovno tržišče pripeljala še več nafte za gorivo, umetno zamrzovati tla. V sosednji Kanadi si podjetje Enbridge z

razstrelivom in buldožerji utira pot prek ozemelj staroselcev, da bi zgradilo naftovod za nafto iz katranskega peska, v Britaniji pa vlada načrtuje odprtje novega naftnega polja, Cambo, pri Shetlandskih otokih in novega podzemnega premogovnika v Cumbrii (da ne omenjamo tretje vzletno-pristajalne steze na Heathrowu). Angela Merkel je znova zavrnila pozive, da bi lignit nehali uporabljati pred letom 2038; vsaj dotlej bodo nemški rudniki rasli in v peči pošiljali še več tega najbolj umazanega fosilnega goriva. Daleč največja zasebna družba s sedežem v Franciji je Total. Trenutno v vzhodni Afriki gradi ogrevani naftovod, ki bo najdaljši na svetu in bo nafto s polj okoli Albertovega jezera dovajal na obalo, od koder jo bodo lahko za gorivo razpošiljali po svetu; Total k temu hujska predsednik Emmanuel Macron, tako v Afriki kot na Arktiki, kjer družba vrta, da bi načrpala še več zemeljskega plina, ki ga bo prodala za čeden dobiček.

Skrajni vremenski pojavi v segrevajočem se svetu so posledica skupne količine izpustov CO₂ v ozračje. Več kot jih je, slabše bo; še nekaj let »vsega po starem«, pa bo poletje 2021 v retrospektivi videti prav blago, kot prvi krog brezdanjega pekla.

Pa se še kar nadaljuje. In nadaljuje, in potem gre še kar naprej.

Še celo tako buržoazna ustanova, kot je Mednarodna agencija za energijo, je izjavila, da je edina možnost, da se planet ne bo segrel več kot za 1,5 stopinje, da človeštvo ne zgradi nobenih *novih* objektov, povezanih s fosilnimi gorivi, več. Niti enega novega naftovoda ali rudnika ali letališča. Ampak seveda vladajoči razredi počnejo ravno nasprotno: hitijo prilivat olja na ogenj. Proizvodnjo

fosilnih goriv bi morali, da bi ničlo dosegli tako hitro, kolikor je v človeški moči, zmanjšati vsaj za šest odstotkov na leto; namesto tega v prihodnjih desetletjih načrtujejo povečanje proizvodnje povprečno za dva odstotka na leto. To je dva odstotka več fosilnih goriv, iztrganih iz zemlje, leto za letom; dva odstotka več kot leto prej, potem še dva odstotka več in tako naprej. Pa že zdaj pobočja hribov žarijo v ognju.

Toda prava skrivnost ni norost tega sistema. Ta je znana že nekaj časa (čeprav se njena razsežnost z vsakim letom jasneje kaže). Prava skrivnost je prej naša lastna nedejavnost. Kako dolgo bomo zgolj opazovalci dogajanja, ki se v najboljšem primeru vljudno pritožujejo, pogosteje pa samo molče opazujejo? Bomo pustili, da nas ta sistem vse pobije? Se bomo vdali brez pravega boja? Doslej je že kristalno jasno, da lahko vladajoče razrede iz njihove kompulzivne navade, da razpihujejo ogenj, iztrgajo samo večji nemiri od spodaj. Če jih ne bodo, se bo to dogajalo do zadnje kaplje goriva. Ljudje, ki jih zanima lastno preživetje in preživetje drugih, bi prav zlahka uničili imetje, ki uničuje Zemljo. Pa vendar se nič od tega ne zgodi. Zakaj? Kdaj se bomo začeli braniti? Zakaj čakamo in se zadržujemo? Po poletju 2021 je to vprašanje, ki bi nas moralo najbolj težiti.

Prevedla Tina Malič

Andreas Malm

THE QUESTION THAT SHOULD WEIGH MOST HEAVILY ON OUR MINDS

The summer of 2021 was a season in global hell. Salmon roasted in the rivers of British Columbia, while some six hundred people suddenly expired in the unprecedented heatwave: the sign of the onset of an early twenty-first-century summer. There followed another round of record-breaking wildfires in the US Pacific Northwest, still not over as these words are written. Forests in the Mediterranean basin were reduced to soot. A viral film clip showed a ferry packed with people being evacuated from the Greek island of Evia: all around them, steep mountainsides glowing with fire. Flames roared through Algeria, Tunisia, Albania, France; barely had Turkey come to grips with the dizzyingly destructive wildfires before flash floods struck, sweeping away villages and killing nearly a hundred in the northern parts of the country. Similar scenes unfolded in western Germany, China, South Sudan, Myanmar, the Indian state of Maharashtra, the US state of Tennessee. A planet alternately on fire and under water. In the summer of 2021, this even encompassed some of the most affluent places on Earth.

And still, it goes on. It goes on. From the White House, as of August 2021, Joe Biden is busy handing out approvals for oil and gas drilling on public land at a speed not seen since George W. Bush was president. He is putting pressure on OPEC to produce *more* oil. On the northern slopes of Alaska, ConocoPhillips has his blessing to construct pipelines. Still, because the permafrost is melting, the company has to artificially freeze the ground to hold the pipelines in place so more oil can be conveyed to the world market for burning. Over in Canada, Enbridge is

blasting and bulldozing its way through indigenous lands to build pipelines for tar-sands oil, while in Britain, the government is planning to open the new Cambo oilfield near the Shetland Islands and a new deep coal mine in Cumbria (not to mention the third runway at Heathrow). Angela Merkel has again rejected calls for phasing out lignite coal any earlier than in 2038; at least until then, the mines of Germany will continue to grow and send more of the dirtiest of fossil fuels to the furnaces. The single largest private company based in France is Total. It is currently constructing what will be the world's longest heated oil pipeline in eastern Africa, sending oil from the fields around Lake Albert through Uganda and Tanzania to the coast, whence the oil can be shipped around the world for combustion; president Emmanuel Macron is egging Total on, in Africa as in the Arctic, where the company is drilling for yet more fossil gas to sell at a handsome profit.

Extreme weather events in a warming world result from the total amount of CO₂ emitted into the atmosphere. The more there is, the worse it will be; a few more years of business-as-usual and the summer of 2021 will look benevolent in hindsight, the first circle in a bottomless hell.

And still, it continues. It continues, and then it goes on some more.

Even as bourgeois an institution as the International Energy Agency has declared that the only chance to stay below 1.5 degrees of global warming is for humanity to build no *new* fossil fuel installations. Not a single new pipeline or coal mine or airport. But, of course, the ruling classes are doing precisely the opposite: rushing to pour fuel on the fires. The production of fossil

fuels should be cut by at least six per cent per year to hit zero as soon as humanely possible; instead, producers are planning to increase production by an average of two per cent per year in the coming decades. That's two per cent *more* fossil fuels taken out of the ground, year after year; two per cent more than in the previous year, then two per cent more, and so on. And already now, mountainsides are glowing with fire.

But the real mystery is not the insanity of this system. It has been known for quite some time (although the magnitude of the insanity is further clarified with every passing year). Instead, the real mystery is our own lack of action. For how long are we going to stand by – complaining politely at most, silently watching more often – as this goes on? Are we going to let this system kill us all? Shall we go down without a proper fight? By now, it is abundantly clear that only significant unrest from below has a chance to shake the ruling classes out of their compulsive habit to fan the flames. In the absence of unrest, this habit will go on until the last drop of fuel. People interested in their own and others' survival could very well destroy the property that is destroying the Earth. And yet, none of this is happening, still. Why? When do we start fighting back? Why are we waiting and holding back? After the summer of 2021, this is the question that should weigh most heavily on our minds.

7 VROČINA – FEVER – VROČINA – FEVER 7



Maya Sara Unger



Mina Palada

Medvladni odbor za podnebne spremembe (IPCC) odgovarja na nekaj pogosto zastavljenih vprašanj

Kako vemo, da so za podnebne spremembe odgovorni ljudje?

Da pri podnebnih spremembah zadnjega obdobja poglavito vlogo igrajo ljudje, je jasno. Ta sklep temelji na sintezi informacij, pridobljenih iz več sklopov dokazov, med njimi neposrednega opazovanja nedavnih sprememb v Zemljinem podnebnju, analiz drevesnih letnic, ledenih vrtn in drugih virov dolgoročnih podatkov, ki izpričujejo, kako se je podnebje spreminjalo v preteklosti, ter računalniških simulacij, utemeljenih na osnovah fizike, ki določa podnebni sistem.

Na podnebje vpliva vrsta dejavnikov. Obstajata dve poglaviti naravni gibalni spreminjanja podnebja, ki delujeta v časovnem razponu od desetletij do stoletij. Prvo gibalno so spremembe v dejavnosti Sonca, saj vplivajo na količino energije, ki jo prejemo od njega. Drugo so veliki vulkanski izbruhi, ki povečujejo število drobnih delcev (aerosolov) v višjih plasteh ozračja, ti pa odbijajo sončno svetlobo in tako ohlajajo površje – ta učinek lahko traja več let. Glavni gibalni podnebnih sprememb, za kateri je odgovoren človek, pa sta povečevanje koncentracije toplogrednih plinov in aerosolov v ozračju, do česar prihaja zaradi izgorevanja fosilnih goriv, rabe zemljišč in drugih virov. Toplogredni plini infrardeče sevanje zadržijo blizu površja in tako povzročajo segrevanje podnebja. Zaradi aerosolov, podobno kot velja za tiste, ki jih po naravni poti proizvedejo vulkani, pa se podnebje praviloma ohlaja, saj povečujejo odboj sončnih žarkov. Več sklopov dokazov kaže, da je poglaviti vzrok za nedavne spremembe podnebja človekov vpliv.

Trenutni stopnji povečevanja koncentracije najpomembnejših toplogrednih plinov (ogljikov dioksid, metan in dušikov oksid) najmanj v zadnjih 800.000 letih ni mogoče najti primerjave. Več sklopov dokazov jasno kaže na to, da je ta rast posledica človekovega delovanja. Osnove fizike, na kateri temelji ogrevalni učinek toplogrednih plinov na ozračje, razumemo že več kot stoletje in s pomočjo trenutnega znanja smo razvili podnebne modele zadnje generacije. Tako kot modeli za napovedovanje vremena tudi ti predstavljajo stanje ozračja na podlagi tridimenzionalne mreže celic in glede na fizikalna načela simulirajo njegovo spreminjanje v času. Vključujejo tudi prikaz oceana, morskega ledu in poglavitnih procesov, ki delujejo kot gibalna podnebja in podnebnih sprememb.

Rezultati dosledno izpričujejo, da lahko takšni podnebni modeli segrevanje, kot ga opazamo, reproducirajo le, če upoštevamo učinke človekovega delovanja, zlasti vse večjo koncentracijo toplogrednih plinov. Ti podnebni modeli kažejo prevladujoč ogrevalni učinek zaradi povečane koncentracije toplogrednih plinov, ki ga deloma izravnavata ohlajevalni učinek aerosolov. V nasprotju s tem simulacije, ki upoštevajo samo naravne procese – z notranjo variabilnostjo, povezano z El Niñem in drugimi podobnimi variacijami vred –, opaženega segrevanja ne morejo reproducirati. Dejstvo, da simulacije, ki upoštevajo samo naravne procese, kažejo veliko manjši dvig temperature, govori o tem, da opažene visoke stopnje segrevanja ne moremo pojasniti zgolj z naravnimi procesi. Reproduciramo jo lahko samo, če pri simulacijah upoštevamo vpliv človeka.

Poleg tega prevladujoči učinek človekovih dejavnosti ni očitno le iz dviga temperature na površju Zemlje, temveč tudi iz vzorca segrevanja v spodnjem delu ozračja in ohlajanja stratosfere,

segrevanja morij, taljenja morskega ledu in številnih drugih zaznanih sprememb. Dodaten sklop dokazov v zvezi s tem, da je gonilna sila podnebnih sprememb človek, izhaja iz primerjave med stopnjo segrevanja, opaženo v zadnjih desetletjih, in tisto iz časa, ko človek na podnebje ni vplival. Dokazi iz drevesnih letnic in drugih paleoklimatskih virov podatkov kažejo, da je naraščanje temperature površja, ki smo jo opazili v zadnjih petdesetih letih, preseglo vsako stopnjo v kateremkoli petdesetletnem obdobju v zadnjih 2000 letih. Gledano v celoti ti dokazi kažejo, da so vodilni vzrok za segrevanje, ki smo ga zaznali v zadnjih desetletjih, ljudje.

Bi lahko podnebne spremembe preusmerili nazaj, če bi ogljikov dioksid odstranili iz ozračja?

Namerna odstranitev ogljikovega dioksida (CO₂) iz ozračja bi nekatere vidike podnebnih sprememb lahko preusmerila nazaj. Toda to bi se zgodilo samo, če bi pripeljala do neto zmanjšanja celotne količine CO₂ v ozračju, torej če bi bile te namerne odstranitve večje od izpustov. Nekateri trendi podnebnih sprememb, na primer dviga temperature na površju Zemlje, bi se začeli v nekaj letih obračati. Da bi se nazaj preusmerili nekateri drugi vidiki, bi trajalo desetletja (na primer taljenje permafrosta) ali stoletja (na primer zakisanost globokega morja), za tretje, kakršen je dvig morske gladine, pa bi bila potrebna stoletja ali tisočletja.

Besedna zveza negativni izpusti ogljikovega dioksida (CO₂) se nanaša na odstranitev CO₂ iz ozračja s pomočjo namernega človekovega prizadevanja obenem z odstranitvami, do katerih pride po naravni poti, in jo pogosto uporabljamo kot sinonim za termin odstranitev ogljikovega dioksida. Negativni izpusti CO₂ lahko pomenijo kompenzacijo za izpuste CO₂ v ozračje, ki jih povzročajo človekove dejavnosti. Dosegli bi jih lahko, če bi okreplili proces naravnega vsrkavanja CO₂ na kopnem (na primer s sajenjem dreves ali s pomočjo kmetijskih praks, ki povečujejo vsebnost ogljika v prsti) in/ali v morjih (na primer z obnovitvijo obalnih ekosistemov) ali pa z odstranjevanjem CO₂ neposredno iz ozračja. Če je količina odstranjenega CO₂ iz ozračja večja od izpustov, ki jih na globalni ravni povzročijo človek, pravimo, da so izpusti neto negativni. Omeniti pa moramo, da tehnologije za odstranjevanje CO₂ iz ozračja še niso pripravljene oziroma da še ne morejo odstraniti toliko CO₂, kolikor bi ga bilo treba, da bi prišlo do kompenzacije za trenutno raven izpustov, poleg tega pa ima večina od njih neželene stranske učinke.

[...]

Skupina scenarijev za prihodnost, ki je deležna vedno večje pozornosti, še zlasti v kontekstu ambicioznih podnebnih ciljev, kakršen je omejitev zvišanja globalne temperature na 1,5 ali 2 °C, vključenih v Pariški sporazum, so tako imenovani »prekoračitveni« scenariji. Po njih bi počasno kratkoročno zmanjševanje izpustov kompenzirali z neto negativnimi izpusti pozneje v tem stoletju, zaradi česar bi začasno presegli ali »prekoračili« določene ravni segrevanja. Zaradi zamaknjenega odziva več delov podnebnega sistema bi v primerjavi s scenariji, ki bi cilj dosegli brez te začasne prekoračitve, nastale dodatne podnebne spremembe. Da bi se te preusmerile nazaj, bi potrebovale desetletja ali več stoletij, in po tistih scenarijih, ki predvidevajo večjo prekoračitev, bi obrat nastopil pozneje.

[...]

Temperatura je na Zemlji nihala že prej. Kako se trenutno segrevanje od teh nihanj razlikuje?

Zemljino podnebje se je vedno spreminjalo po naravni poti, toda oboje, tako razširjenost po vsem planetu kakor stopnja nedavnega segrevanja, je nenavadno. Segrevanje zadnjega obdobja je v nasprotno smer obrnilo počasen dolgoročen trend ohlajanja, raziskave pa kažejo, da je globalna temperatura površja zdaj višja, kot je bila več tisočletij prej.

Podnebje sicer določa več spremenljivk, vendar je ključni kazalec splošnega podnebnega stanja temperatura, globalna temperatura površja pa je bistvena za opis in razumevanje globalnih podnebnih sprememb, vključno z Zemljinim energetskim proračunom. Bogat nabor geološkega dokaznega gradiva kaže, da se je temperatura v zgodovini Zemlje spreminjala. Različni naravni arhivi po vsem planetu, kakršni so morski in jezerski sedimenti, ledeniški led in drevesne letnice, pričajo o tem, da je bil planet v preteklosti v določenih obdobjih hladnejši, v določenih pa tudi toplejši. Čeprav naša gotovost pri natančnejšem določanju obsežnih temperaturnih sprememb na splošno upada, kolikor dlje v preteklost se zaziramo, lahko znanstveniki med sedanjim in preteklimi segrevanji še vedno prepoznajo vsaj štiri pomembne razlike.

Topleje postaja skorajda povsod. V desetletjih in stoletjih zadnjih dveh tisočletij so se nekatere regije segrele bolj od globalnega povprečja, druge pa so se v istem času ohladile. Med 10. in 13. stoletjem se je na primer severnoatlantsko območje segrelo bolj kot številna druga. V nasprotju s tem je vzorec nedavnega segrevanja površja na planetarni ravni bolj poenoten, kot velja za druga deset- ali stoletna podnebna nihanja v zadnjih dva tisoč letih.

Segrevanje je hitro. V zadnjih dveh milijonih let je Zemljino podnebje nihalo med razmeroma toplimi medledenimi in hladnejšimi ledenimi dobami, ko se je ledeni pokrov razširil prek obširnih območij severnih celin. Intervali hitrega segrevanja so sovpadli z razpadanjem največjih ledenih pokrovov in oznanjali medledene dobe, kakršna je sedanji holocen, ki se je začel pred približno 12.000 leti. Med prehodom iz zadnje ledene dobe v trenutno medledeno se je temperatura v celoti povišala za 5 °C. Do te spremembe je prišlo v približno 5000 letih, največja stopnja segrevanja pa je bila 1,5 °C na tisoč let, čeprav prehod ni bil enakomeren. V nasprotju s tem se je Zemljino površje od obdobja med letoma 1850 in 1900 segrelo za približno 1,1 °C. Toda celo najboljša rekonstrukcija globalne temperature površja v zadnji medledeni dobi je preveč grobo razdelana, da bi jo lahko neposredno primerjali s tako kratko dobo, kot je zadnjih 150 let. Vendar imamo za zadnjih 2000 let zapise višje ločljivosti in ti kažejo na to, da je stopnja segrevanja v zadnjih petdesetih letih presegla stopnjo v kateremkoli drugem petdesetletnem obdobju.

Nedavno segrevanje je v nasprotno smer obrnilo dolgoročni globalni trend ohlajanja. Po zadnji veliki ledeni dobi je temperatura površja približno pred 6500 leti dosegla vrhunec, potem pa se je začelo počasno ohlajanje. Dolgoročni trend ohlajanja so prekinjala toplejša desetletja in stoletja. Ta nihanja pa so bila v primerjavi z vztrajnim in izrazitim segrevanjem, ki se je začelo sredi 19. stoletja, ko se je v tisočletjih merjeni trend ohlajanja obrnil v nasprotno smer, manjša.

Že dolgo ni bilo tako vroče. Če vzamemo povprečje celotnega planeta, so bile temperature površja v zadnjem desetletju verjetno višje kot takrat, ko se je pred približno 6500 leti začel dolgi trend ohlajanja. Če je to res, se moramo, da bi našli dokaze za večstoletne globalne temperature površja, ki bi bile višje kot trenutne, ozreti še vsaj do prejšnje medledene dobe pred približno 125.000 leti.

Prejšnja temperaturna nihanja so povzročili obsežni naravni procesi, trenutno segrevanje pa je nastalo predvsem zaradi človeka. Toda to, da razumemo, kako in zakaj so se temperature spreminjale v preteklosti, je odločilno tudi za razumevanje trenutnega segrevanja in vzajemnega delovanja človeka in naravnih vplivov, in to nam bo pomagalo ugotoviti, kaj se bo zgodilo v prihodnje. Iz preučevanja preteklih podnebnih sprememb je jasno še, da se, za razliko od njih, učinki segrevanja v zadnjem obdobju nalagajo na druge pretese, zaradi katerih so ljudje in narava za spremembe ranljivi, kakor niso bili še nikoli poprej.

Iz šestega ocenjevalnega poročila Medvladnega odbora za podnebne spremembe AR6 Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis (OP6 Podnebne spremembe 2021: Fizikalni temelji) <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wgl/#FullReport>

Prevedla Tina Malič

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Answers Some Frequently Asked Questions

How do we know humans are responsible for climate change?

The dominant role of humans in driving recent climate change is clear. This conclusion is based on a synthesis of information from multiple lines of evidence, including direct observations of recent changes in Earth's climate; analyses of tree rings, ice cores, and other long-term records documenting how the climate has changed in the past; and computer simulations based on the fundamental physics that govern the climate system.

Climate is influenced by a range of factors. There are two main natural drivers of variations in climate on timescales of decades to centuries. The first is variations in the sun's activity, which alter the amount of incoming energy from the sun. The second is large volcanic eruptions, which increase the number of small particles (aerosols) in the upper atmosphere that reflect sunlight and cool the surface—an effect that can last for several years. The main human drivers of climate change are increases in the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases and of aerosols from burning fossil fuels, land use and other sources. The greenhouse gases trap infrared radiation near the surface, warming the climate. Aerosols, like those produced naturally by volcanoes, on average cool the climate by increasing the reflection of sunlight. Multiple lines of evidence demonstrate that human drivers are the main cause of recent climate change.

The current rates of increase of the concentration of the major greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide) are unprecedented over at least the last 800,000 years. Several lines of evidence clearly show that these increases are the results of human activities. The basic physics underlying the warming effect of greenhouse gases on the climate has been understood for more than a century, and our current understanding has been used to develop the latest generation climate models. Like weather forecasting models, climate models represent the state of the atmosphere on a grid and simulate its evolution over time based on physical principles. They include a representation of the ocean, sea ice and the main processes important in driving climate and climate change.

Results consistently show that such climate models can only reproduce the observed warming when including the effects of human activities, in particular the increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases. These climate models show a dominant warming effect of greenhouse gas increases (red band, which shows the warming effects of greenhouse gases by themselves), which has been partly offset by the cooling effect of increases in atmospheric aerosols. By contrast, simulations that include only natural processes, including internal variability related to El Niño and other similar variations, as well as variations in the activity of the sun and emissions from large volcanoes, are not able to reproduce the observed warming. The fact that simulations including only natural processes show much smaller temperature increases indicates that natural processes alone cannot explain the strong rate of warming observed. The observed rates can only be reproduced when human influence is added to the simulations.

Moreover, the dominant effect of human activities is apparent not only in the warming of global surface temperature, but also in the pattern of warming in the lower atmosphere and cooling in the stratosphere, warming of the ocean, melting of sea ice, and many other observed changes. An additional line of evidence for the role of humans in driving climate change comes from comparing the rate of warming observed over recent decades

with that which occurred prior to human influence on climate. Evidence from tree rings and other paleoclimate records shows that the rate of increase of global surface temperature observed over the past fifty years exceeded that which occurred in any previous 50-year period over the past 2000 years. Taken together, this evidence shows that humans are the dominant cause of observed global warming over recent decades.

Could climate change be reversed by removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere?

Deliberate removal of carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the atmosphere could reverse (i.e. change the direction of) some aspects of climate change. However, this will only happen if it results in a net reduction in the total amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere, that is, if deliberate removals are larger than emissions. Some climate change trends, such as the increase in global surface temperature, would start to reverse within a few years. Other aspects of climate change would take decades (e.g., permafrost thawing) or centuries (e.g., acidification of the deep ocean) to reverse, and some, such as sea level rise, would take centuries to millennia to change direction.

The term *negative carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions* refers to the removal of CO₂ from the atmosphere by deliberate human activities, in addition to the removals that occur naturally, and is often used as synonymous with *carbon dioxide removal*. Negative CO₂ emissions can compensate for the release of CO₂ into the atmosphere by human activities. They could be achieved by strengthening natural CO₂ sequestration processes on land (e.g., by planting trees or through agricultural practices that increase the carbon content of soils) and/or in the ocean (e.g., by restoration of coastal ecosystems) or by removing CO₂ directly from the atmosphere. If CO₂ removals are greater than human-caused CO₂ emissions globally, emissions are said to be *net negative*. It should be noted that CO₂ removal technologies are not yet ready or unable to achieve the scale of removal that would be required to compensate for current levels of emissions, and most have undesired side effects.

[...]

A class of future scenarios that is receiving increasing attention, particularly in the context of ambitious climate goals such as the global warming limits of 1.5°C or 2°C included in the Paris Agreement, are so-called 'overshoot' scenarios. In these scenarios, a slow rate of reductions in emissions in the near term is compensated by net negative CO₂ emissions in the later part of this century, which results in a temporary breach or 'overshoot' of a given warming level. Due to the delayed reaction of several climate system components, it follows that the temporary overshoot would result in additional climate changes compared to a scenario that reaches the goal without overshoot. These changes would take decades to many centuries to reverse, with the reversal taking longer for scenarios with larger overshoot.

[...]

The Earth's temperature has varied before. How is the current warming any different?

Earth's climate has always changed naturally, but both the global extent and rate of recent warming are unusual. The recent warming has reversed a slow, long-term cooling trend, and research indicates that global surface temperature is higher now than it has been for millennia.

While climate can be characterised by many variables, temperature is a key indicator of the overall climate state, and global surface temperature is fundamental to characterising and understanding global climate change, including Earth's energy budget. A rich variety of geological evidence shows that temperature has changed

throughout Earth's history. A variety of natural archives from around the planet, such as ocean and lake sediments, glacier ice and tree rings, shows that there were times in the past when the planet was cooler, and times when it was warmer. While our confidence in quantifying large-scale temperature changes generally decreases the farther back in time we look, scientists can still identify at least four major differences between the recent warming and those of the past.

It's warming almost everywhere. During decades and centuries of the past 2000 years, some regions warmed more than the global average while, at the same time, other regions cooled. For example, between the 10th and 13th centuries, the North Atlantic region warmed more than many other regions. In contrast, the pattern of recent surface warming is globally more uniform than for other decadal to centennial climate fluctuations over at least the past two millennia.

It's warming rapidly. Over the past 2 million years, Earth's climate has fluctuated between relatively warm interglacial periods and cooler glacial periods, when ice sheets grew over vast areas of the northern continents. Intervals of rapid warming coincided with the collapse of major ice sheets, heralding interglacial periods such as the present Holocene Epoch, which began about 12,000 years ago. During the shift from the last glacial period to the current interglacial, the total temperature increase was about 5°C. That change took about 5000 years, with a maximum warming rate of about 1.5°C per thousand years, although the transition was not smooth. In contrast, Earth's surface has warmed approximately 1.1°C since 1850–1900. However, even the best reconstruction of global surface temperature during the last deglacial period is too coarsely resolved for direct comparison with a period as short as the past 150 years. But for the past 2000 years, we have higher-resolution records that show that the rate of global warming during the last 50 years has exceeded the rate of any other 50-year period.

Recent warming reversed a long-term global cooling trend. Following the last major glacial period, global surface temperature peaked by around 6500 years ago, then slowly cooled. The long-term cooling trend was punctuated by warmer decades and centuries. These fluctuations were minor compared with the persistent and prominent warming that began in the mid-19th century when the millennial-scale cooling trend was reversed.

It's been a long time since it's been this warm. Averaged over the globe, surface temperatures of the past decade were probably warmer than when the long cooling trend began around 6500 years ago. If so, we need to look back to at least the previous interglacial period, around 125,000 years ago, to find evidence for multi-centennial global surface temperatures that were warmer than now.

Previous temperature fluctuations were caused by large-scale natural processes, while the current warming is largely due to human causes. But understanding how and why temperatures have changed in the past is critical for understanding the current warming and how human and natural influences will interact to determine what happens in the future. Studying past climate changes also makes it clear that, unlike previous climate changes, the effects of recent warming are occurring on top of stresses that make humans and nature vulnerable to changes in ways that they have never before experienced.

From the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change AR6 Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/#FullReport>

**CLIMATE
DANGEROUS
SYSTEM
PRODUCTION
WITH NO
REDUCTION
CLIMATE
DANGEROUS
SYSTEM
PRODUCTION
WITH NO
REDUCTION**

ZOPER PODNEBNE SPREMEMBE PO PRAVIČNI POTI

Iz knjige *Pogledi na globalni zeleni New Deal*

Podnebna kriza zadeva celoten planet, a že zdaj, pri otoplitvi 1,1 °C, nosijo nesorazmerni delež bremena tisti, ki so najmanj krivi, medtem ko se elita najbogatejših z globalnega Severa, ki je k podnebnim spremembam prispeval levji delež, pod leporečjem o zelenih prehodih in dogovorih še vedno pogosto sprenevedavo zavzema za *status quo* in ohranjanje nevzdržnega neoliberalnega sistema za vsako ceno. Vendar alternative obstajajo. Podnebni aktivisti z vsega sveta se borijo za pravične globalne ukrepe, ki bi problem reševali pri koreninah in se ne bi bali preseči okvirov sistema, kakršnega poznamo, za ukrepe, ki bi gradili na temeljih demokratičnega lastništva, spolne in razredne pravičnosti, protirasizma in protikolonializma. Tu je nekaj njihovih razmišljanj.

Oblikovanje delavskih gibanj zoper zavajajoče rešitve

Daniel Gaio

Daniel Machado Gaio je nacionalni sekretar za okolje pri sindikatu Central Única Dos Trabalhadores (Enotna delavska centrala – CUT), s sedežem v São Paulu v Braziliji. Iz portugalsčine prevedel Michael Fox.

Človeštvo se je zaradi pandemije covid-19 znašlo še pred težjimi izzivi kot prej. V zadnjih desetletjih smo delavci skupaj z drugimi družbenimi gibanji in okoljskimi organizacijami javno obsodili netrajnost neoliberalnega modela, ki je povzročil zdravstveno, družbeno, ekološko in podnebno krizo. Poudarjali smo pomen alternativnih poti, ki so zdaj še toliko bolj nujne.

Smo v vrtincu systemskega spora, v katerem bodo stare odgovore v trajnostni preobliki prikazovali kot poti iz krize oziroma za rešitev iz nje. V času, ko svet zahteva drugačen izhod, se bodo pod pretvezo »zelenega gospodarstva« zelo verjetno pojavile zavajajoče rešitve, ki si jih bodo zelo prizadevali uveljaviti.

Eden od sektorjev, ki je veliko vložil v zavajajoče rešitve, je rudarstvo. Rudarska podjetja kot odgovor na neodgovorno in

ubijalsko resničnost, ko gre za njihov vpliv na prizadete skupnosti, delavce in biološko raznolikost, delničarjem predstavljajo avtomatizacijo, informacijsko tehnologijo in delo s podizvajalci. Ko sta jezova v Bentu Rodriguesu¹ (2015) in Brumadinhui² (2019) popustila, je voda za seboj pustila 75 milijonov litrov strupenega odpadnega blata, uničila celotne skupnosti in povzročila nepopravljivo okoljsko škodo. Ob tem je življenje izgubilo 278 ljudi, za dvanajstimi pa se je izgubila vsaka sled. Večina od njih je bila delavcev. Še danes si družine prizadevajo za pravico in odškodnino za ta zločin. Medtem pa podjetje samo sebe oglašuje z besedami, da bo »do leta 2030 v zmanjšanje izpustov ogljikovega dioksida za 33 % vložilo vsaj dve milijardi dolarjev. To bo največja investicija rudarske industrije v boju proti podnebnim spremembam.«³ Gre za tranzicijo, ki je vse prej kot pravična.

To je tudi sektor, ki je poleg kmetijstva in živinoreje odgovoren za krčenje gozda, za spore in onesnaženje v Amazoniji, kar vse se je v zadnjem času še stopnjevalo. Rešitev iz krize naj bi bili enaki kmetijski in rudarski sistemi, le brez delavcev. Tako bi se proizvodnja povečala, število delovnih mest pa zmanjšalo, s čimer bi ogrozili številne skupnosti in otežili njihovo življenje.

Ravno zato poskušajo sindikati in družbena gibanja sprejeti obvezujoči sporazum, s katerim bi podjetja prevzela odgovornost za prizadete v okoljskih zločinih in zaradi kršitev človekovih pravic. Učinkovita tranzicija ne sme dopuščati dogovorov, v katerih se podjetja sama predstavljajo kot trajnostna, medtem ko uničujejo okolje, izkoriščajo delavce in jim jemljejo življenja.

Zaradi razsežnosti tega izziva si tako na uradnih mestih za podnebna pogajanja pri OZN kakor v naših mednarodnih zavezništvih intenzivno prizadevamo, da bi do sprememb prišlo na globalni ravni. Do njih mora priti z zblizevanjem protihegemonskih skupin, ki upoštevajo predloge delavcev, žensk, temnopoltih in staroselskih ljudstev in skupnosti.

Poleg tega, da se delavsko gibanje spopada s starimi in novimi oblikami dela in prekarnostjo, mora v boj za takšen model napredka vključiti feministični in protirasistični ekosocializem. Skupaj se lahko otresemo tega propadlega modela in začnemo vzpostavljati sistem, ki se osredotoča na življenje, zaposlovanje in demokracijo.

Pravične alternative trajnostnemu razvojnemu mehanizmu Pariškega sporazuma

Nathan Thanki

Nathan Thanki je sokoordinator pri platformi Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice (Svetovna kampanja Zahtevajmo podnebno pravičnost) s sedežem v Londonu (Združeno kraljestvo).

Pariški sporazum se v več pogledih razlikuje od Kjotskega protokola. Zmanjšuje razlikovanje med razvitimi državami in državami v razvoju, obenem pa opušča skupno določanje ciljev in časovnic za zmanjšanje izpustov in daje prednost precej

- 1 Phillips, Dom (2015). »Brazil's mining tragedy: was it a preventable disaster?«. The Guardian.
- 2 Phillips, Dom (2019). »Brazilian mining company to pay out £86m for disaster that killed almost 300 people«. The Guardian.
- 3 WBCSD Communications (2020). »Yale advances on the climate agenda and unveils USD\$2 billion to reduce carbon emissions within the next ten years«. WBCSD.

bolj ohlapnemu pristopu »nacionalno določenih prispevkov«. Rezultat je, kot je znano, tak, da smo vsi na krovu, ladja pa tone. Tudi če bodo nacionalno določeni prispevki doseženi, se bodo temperature še to stoletje zvišale za 3–4 °C.

Področje, na katerem Pariški sporazum posnema Kjotski protokol, je uporaba tržnih pristopov za ublažitev podnebnih sprememb. Tako imenovani »mehanizem čistega razvoja« iz Kjotskega protokola so omadeževala vprašanja o njegovi učinkovitosti ter številni primeri kršenja človekovih pravic in prilaščanja zemljišč, ki so še posebno prizadeli staroselska ljudstva in gozdne skupnosti. Sistemu za trgovanje z izpusti teh več kot očitno ni uspelo zmanjšati. Kljub temu se Pariški sporazum (natančneje 6. člen) še naprej zanaša na tovrstne, dokazano neuspešne pristope.

Šesti člen je zavil v jezik »prstovoljnega sodelovanja«, kar pa je le šifra za enako logiko, kakršna je bila temelj za odpustke Katoliške cerkve v srednjem veku; kdor lahko plača, temu so grehi odpušteni, revni pa morajo nositi breme. Temeljno izhodišče za takšno »sodelovanje« je možnost, da države v kvoti nacionalno določenih prispevkov izkoristijo »mednarodne prenose rezultatov blaženja«. Če bi torej razvita država hotela, bi lahko svoje ogljično intenzivne dejavnosti povečala in preprosto kupila pravico do izravnave onesnaženja prek zmanjšanja v drugi državi. Ena od tehnologij, ki naj bi poskrbele za tovrstne izravnave, je bioenergija z zajemanjem in skladiščenjem ogljika (BECCS). V teoriji to pomeni sajenje dreves, ki bi vsrkavala ogljik iz ozračja, sečnjo teh dreves, potem sežig biomase za rabo energije, nato pa zajemanje ogljika in njegovo podzemno skladiščenje. Pri tem pa se pojavlja kup težav. Bioenergija ni zares ogljično nevtralna. Tako zmogljiva tehnologija še ne obstaja, če pa bi njene zmogljivosti hoteli povečati, bi potrebovali ogromno zemlje. Čigave? Z lahkoto boste uganili.

Namesto vztrajanja pri skoraj fanatični zavezi k zavajajočim tržno naravnanim rešitvam podnebna pravičnost zahteva resnične rešitve, ki se osredotočajo na ljudi, so nepristranske ter spoštujejo inherentno vrednost narave in je ne enačijo s potrošno dobrino. Nekatere rešitve – čeprav niso omejene zgolj na naštetu – vključujejo: drastično omejevanje korporacij in bogatih elit pri prekomerni porabi, zlasti energije; odstranjevanje ovir, kakršna je pravica do intelektualne lastnine, na poti do cenovno dostopnih in dosegljivih okoljsko ustreznih tehnologij; prenehanje podeljevanja subvencij proizvajalcem, kadar bi to promoviralo fosilna goriva in druge ogljično intenzivne industrije; ohranjanje biološke raznolikosti s preprečevanjem škode na ekološki integriteti naravnih ekosistemov in povečanje ekološke obnove; preoblikovanje industrijskega kmetijstva v ekološko kmetovanje; in vlaganje v elektrificiran, brezplačen ali subvencioniran množični javni prevoz. Na voljo je več pravih kot napačnih rešitev.

Pravična vizija za podnebne migracije

María Faciolince in Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik

María Faciolince je vodja projekta Power Shifts (Spreminjanje razmerij moči) pri Oxfamu. Deluje v Barceloni, Španija. Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik je soustanovitelj komunikacijske iniciative The World At 1C (Svet pri 1 stopinji) s sedežem v Barceloni, Španija, in njen sourednik.

Svet, opustošen zaradi podnebnega nasilja, je razseljena krajina. Vse višja morja goltajo obale. Obdelovalne površine so zaradi slane vode in ekstremne vročine izrabljene.



Damir Avdić



Draga Potočnjak

Puščave se širijo. Orkani pretresajo obalne skupnosti. Ozemlja prednikov so zaradi ekstremnih temperatur neprimerna za življenje.

V vzhodni Afriki od Džibutija⁴ do Mozambika⁵ so morali milijoni zapustiti domove zaradi silovitega deževja, suš in orkanov. Na Tihem oceanu, kjer so nizko ležeče otoške države zaradi dvigovanja morske gladine še posebno ranljive, preliminarno raziskave kažejo,⁶ da skoraj dve tretjini gospodinjstev na Tuvaluju in Kiribatih razmišlja o selitvi kot odgovoru na okoljske udarce. V Srednji Aziji⁷ pa so okoljske spremembe dokazano eden od dejavnikov, ki so prispevali k selitvam milijonov ljudi.

Leta 2017 je bilo skoraj 68,5 milijona ljudi po svetu razseljenih – tretjina zaradi ekstremnih vremenskih razmer. Številne institucije, od Svetovne banke do Združenih narodov, napovedujejo, da utegne v naslednjih treh desetletjih domove zapustiti od več deset milijonov pa do milijarda ljudi.⁸ A glede na zapleteno sovplivanje podnebnih in drugih dejavnikov so tudi te ocene verjetno prenizke. Poleg tega, da je počasno nasilje podnebnih sprememb zaradi vse večje intenzivnosti ekstremnih vremenskih pojavov (tajfuni, poplave, gozdni požari) neposredno gonilo migracij, tudi povečuje nepravilnost, saj spodbuja druga pomanjkanja in motive za selitve.

Kakšni pa sploh so pravično usmerjeni pristopi do razseljevanja v resničnosti, ko so migracije, ki jih povzročajo podnebje, vse pogostejše? Ena od možnosti je skoraj paradoksalna dvojna pravica: pravica ostati in pravica preseliti se.

Pravica ostati

Nasprotje od razseljevanja je naseljenost: zakoreninjenost na enem kraju, za kar pa so nujne razmere, v katerih se lahko življenje reproducira. Vendar pa je vse večja krhkost zaradi podnebnega nasilja pripeljala do razseljenosti številnih skupnosti *in situ*.⁹ Izguba prostora in okolja, ki omogoča življenje, namreč povzroči, da skupnosti ostanejo na svojih ozemljih, vendar nimajo več možnosti za preživetje.

Preseljevanje in migracije pogosto navajajo kot blažilno strategijo, toda kakšna družbena, gospodarska in politična zaščita je potrebna, da bi skupnosti lahko še naprej živele človeka vredno življenje na svojih lastnih domovih? K ohranjanju pravice ostati sodi vse, kar varuje pravice prebivalstva: od drznih ukrepov, ki bi zagotovili varno podnebje, do večjih zemljiških pravic za staroselske skupnosti in male kmete, dejavnih politik, ki podpirajo ruralne skupnosti, ukrepov za odpis dolga državam globalnega Juga in spolno občutljivih strategij za zaščito žensk in deklet.

Pravica preseliti se

Toda prizadevanja za naseljenost se morajo soočiti s kruto resničnostjo, in sicer da je obsežno razseljevanje nekaj neizogibnega in da že poteka. Že pri trenutni stopnji globalnega segrevanja so številna območja na poti k temu, da postanejo neprimerna za življenje, če to že niso. Pravica do selitve je pravica do poti v varnost in do mehanizmov, ki omogočajo vnovično vzpostavitev človeka vrednega življenja v novem okolju. Ovir za uresničenje »pravice do selitve« je veliko. Imperialistične mejne ureditve, namenjene nadzoru in kaznovanju tistih, ki skušajo v upanju na boljše življenje meje prečkati, so vsako leto strožje. Razseljene skupnosti se danes srečujejo z resničnostjo, ki pomeni zapave, deportacijo in smrt, naj bo to na pomorskih pokopališčih v Sredozemskem morju ali ob nevarnem prečkanju Panamske zemeljske

ožine. Že če izhajamo iz današnjega stanja na področju varovanja pravic migrantov, si zlahka predstavljamo prihodnost »podnebnega apartheida«.¹⁰

Poleg tega pa je zaščita za podnebne migrante neznatna, čeprav se pojavljajo prvi temeljni znanja.¹¹ A tudi dostop do tistega, kar je pravno mogoče, je lahko finančno neizvedljiv. Raziskava ruralnih skupnosti v Malaviju¹² je pokazala, da »podnebne spremembe migracije verjetneje bolj zavirajo, kot pa krepijo migracijske tokove«. V omenjeni raziskavi o migracijah na Tihem oceanu so ugotovili, da si večina ljudi sploh ne bi mogla privoščiti selitve, čeprav bi menili, da je nujna.

Odprta vprašanja

Razselitve zaradi podnebnja bodo obrise migracij razširile tako, kakor se to ni zgodilo še nikoli doslej, ostaja pa še veliko neznank. Kateri pravni ukrepi lahko zaščitijo pravice tistih, ki so prisiljeni zapustiti domove zaradi sistemske okoljske krize? Kako lahko zaščitimo »nove« pravice, ko pa že vzpostavljeni načini zaščite za migrante in begunce tako hitro erodirajo? Kako se lahko soočimo s kulturno-duhovnim izzivom pripadnosti pokrajini, ki nenehno razpada in se spreminja? Kako lahko uredimo demografske in družbene razmere v lokalnih skupnostih, ki sprejemajo podnebne begunce, hkrati pa so pogosto tudi same že pod hudim podnebnim pritiskom?¹³

Luciano Lliuya proti RWE AG: pravni spor za podnebno pravičnost

Roxana Baldrich

Roxana Baldrich je bila še nedavno svetovalka za podnebno krizno upravljanje pri organizaciji Germanwatch s sedežem v Bonnu, Nemčija.

Perujski mali kmet in gorski vodnik se neustrašno bori za podnebno pravičnost

Saúl Luciano Lliuya proti podjetju RWE AG je prva podnebna tožba, pri kateri je sodišče (novembra 2017) ugotovilo, da je zasebno podjetje nemara odgovorno za podnebno škodo zaradi izpustov,¹⁴ in je dopustilo začetek dokaznega postopka. S podporo nevladne okoljske organizacije Germanwatch in fundacije Stiftung Zukunftsfähigkeit se je perujski mali kmet in gorski vodnik Saúl Luciano Lliuya odločil, da bo vzel usodo v svoje roke in ukrepal proti podnebnim nevarnostim, ki prežijo nanj in na njegovo skupnost. Leta 2015 je tožil nemškega energetska giganta RWE, ki je v Evropi odgovoren za največ izpustov CO₂. Želi si, da bi podjetje prevzelo svoj del odgovornosti za škodljive vplive podnebnih sprememb. V konkretnem primeru »škodljivi vplivi« pomenijo, da se zaradi umikanja ledenikov, ki ga povzročajo podnebne spremembe, ledeniško jezero nad mestom Huaraz v Andih širi, tveganje, da bo poplavilo ali celo prebilo jez, pa je vse večje. Tožnikovemu posestvu in številnim delom mesta grozi uničujoča poplava, ki bi prizadela okoli 50.000 ljudi. Saúl Luciano sodišče poziva, naj presodi, ali

je podjetje RWE dolžno pokriti stroške za ustrezne varnostne ukrepe – sorazmerno z deležem toplogrednih plinov, ki jih je v preteklosti spustilo v ozračje. To bi v praksi lahko pomenilo, da bi na ledeniškem jezeru sofinanciralo gradnjo veliko večjega jezusa in/ali črpalnega sistema.

Tožnik je svoje razloge za tožbo strnil takole:

Vsak dan vidim, kako se ledeniki talijo, jezera v gorah pa postajajo vse večja. Za nas v dolini je grožnja velikanska. Ne moremo preprosto čakati in gledati, kaj se bo zgodilo. Menim, da je podjetje RWE delno odgovorno za nevarnost, ki nam preti v Huarazu. Znanstvene raziskave so pokazale, da jezero nad mojim domačim krajem raste zaradi taljenja ledenikov. RWE je eno od podjetij, ki proizvedejo največ izpustov na svetu. A tovrstna podjetja za posledice svojih izpustov doslej niso prevzela nikakršne odgovornosti. Ni nam treba biti pravni strokovnjaki, da bi videli, kako narobe je to. Zato zahtevamo, da na našem ledeniškem jezeru namestijo vsaj protipoplavno zaščito. Še bolje pa bi bilo, če bi v prihodnje prenehali onesnaževati ozračje, da bodo lahko preživeli vsi ljudje. V preteklosti smo bili nemočni, vendar ni več tako. Gre za našo varnost in pravico.

Saúl Luciano se zaveda, da v svoji tiski ni osamljen. Upa, da bo njegova tožba postala precedenčna in bo pomagala drugim, ki jim grozijo podnebne spremembe. Končni cilj podnebnih tožb je, da bi svetovne korporacije in politika prevzele odgovornost za podnebne spremembe. Da bi prispevala k temu cilju, sta Saúl Luciano in njegov odvetnik ustvarila »testni primer«, ki bi ga lahko ponovili tudi v drugih državah. Njun odškodninski zahtevki zato temelji na splošni določbi glede motenja posesti po nemškem civilnem zakoniku (§ 1004 BGB). Gre za eno najstarejših in najpogostejše uporabljenih podlag za tožbo, podobne določbe pa obstajajo tudi v številnih drugih sodnih območjih. Še več, v poštev pride tako v primerih, ki predstavljajo tveganje za motenje posesti, kot ob dejanskem motenju. Če bi jo v praksi uporabili v podnebnih tožbah, bi to pomenilo, da bi tožniki lahko zahtevali finančno pomoč za prilagoditvene ukrepe ali nadomestilo za podnebno škodo. Dejstva v primeru Huaraz v tekočem dokaznem postopku še preverjajo,¹⁵ a že to, da bi bilo zasebno podjetje lahko odgovorno za škodo, ki so jo povzročile podnebne spremembe zaradi njegovih izpustov, je pravno gledano velik korak naprej. Morda bo to druge tožnike navdihnilo za podobne zahtevke ali sodnike za podobne odločitve.

Iz knjige *Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal*, kuratorja Harpreet Kaur Paul in Dalia Gebrial, izdajatelj Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung, 2021.

Prevedel Vid Ropoša

4 Fagan, Laureen (2019). »Africa's 'climate refugees' are already here – and there«. *Africa Times*.
5 Wachiaya, Catherine (2020). »One year on, people displaced by Cyclone Idai struggle to rebuild«. UNHCR UK.
6 UNU-EHS in UNESCAP (brez datuma). »Climate change and migration in the Pacific: Links, attitudes, and future scenarios in Nauru, Tuvalu, and Kiribati«. Univerza Združenih narodov.
7 Blondin, Suzy (2018). »Environmental migrations in Central Asia: a multifaceted approach to the issue«. *Central Asian Survey* 38 (2), str. 275–292.
8 Nature Climate Change (2019). »From migration to mobility«. *Nature Climate Change*, 9 (895).
9 Feldman, Shelley, in Charles Geisler (2011). »Land grabbing in Bangladesh: In-situ displacement of peasant holdings«. *Future Agricultures*.

10 UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights (2019). »UN expert condemns failure to address impact of climate change on poverty«. UN OHCHR.
11 Mahečić, Andrej (2020). »UN Human Rights Committee decision on climate change is a wake-up call, according to UNHCR«. UNHCR.
12 Suckall, N., idr. (2017). »Reduced migration under climate change: Evidence from Malawi using an aspirations and capabilities framework«. *Climate and Development* 9 (4), str. 298–312.
13 McDonnell, Tim (2019). »Climate change creates a new migration crisis for Bangladesh«. *National Geographic*.
14 Toussaint, Patrick (2020). »Loss and damage and climate litigation: The case for greater interlinkage«. *Reciel: Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*.

15 Climate Case Chart (Seznam podnebnih tožb, 2015). »Luciano Lliuya v. RWE AG«. Sabin Center for Climate Change Law (Sabinovo središče za pravo podnebnih sprememb).

A FAIR WAY TO FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE

From the book *Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal*

The climate crisis is affecting the entire planet, but even now, with the 1.1°C rise in global temperature, those who are the least to blame have to shoulder a disproportionate amount of the burden. Meanwhile, the Global North's wealthiest elite, who have contributed the lion's share to global warming, continue to advocate for the status quo and preserving the unsustainable neoliberal system under the guise of green deals and agreements. But alternatives do exist. Climate activists worldwide are fighting for fair global measures that would tackle the problem at its roots, measures that would not be afraid to cross the boundaries of the system as we know it, measures that would build upon the foundation of democratic ownership, gender and social equality, anti-racism and anti-colonialism. Below is a short selection of their thoughts.

Building workers' movements against false solutions

Daniel Gaio

Daniel Machado Gaio is National Secretary Of Environment at Central Única Dos Trabalhadores (Cut), based in São Paulo, Brazil. Translated by Michael Fox.

Humanity's challenges have become more urgent since the beginning of Covid-19. In recent decades, the labor movement together with social movements and environmental organizations have denounced the unsustainability of the neoliberal model that created a health, social, ecological and climate crisis. We have been pointing out alternative paths to this model – and now, they are even more urgent.

We find ourselves in a moment of a systematic dispute in which old answers disguised as sustainable will be highlighted as ways out of the crisis. False solutions masquerading as a 'green economy' will likely appear with substantial strength

at a time when the world is demanding a different way out.

One sector that has invested heavily in false solutions is mining. Automation, IT and labor subcontracting are being presented to shareholders as the answer to the irresponsible and murderous reality of these companies' performance in the face of impacted communities, workers and biodiversity. Together, the ruptures of Vale dams in Bento Rodrigues¹ (2015) and Brumadinho² (2019) dumped 75 million liters of toxic tailings mud, devastating entire communities, generating irrecoverable environmental losses, and claiming the lives of 278 people and 12 missing, mostly workers. To this day, families seek justice and reparations for the crime. Meanwhile, in its institutional marketing, the company says that "it will invest at least USD\$2 billion to reduce the company's carbon emissions by 33% by 2030. The biggest investment ever committed by the mining industry to fight climate change."³ It's a transition that's not at all just.

This sector, together with agriculture and cattle ranching, has been responsible for deforestation, conflicts and contamination in the Amazon that have recently intensified. Retaining the same agricultural and mining systems, but without workers, is being presented as the answer to this crisis. This way, while production increases, jobs decrease and communities are threatened and harassed.

That's why unions and social movements are working towards the approval of a binding treaty that holds companies accountable and responds to those impacted in cases of environmental crimes and human rights violations. An effective transition cannot allow arrangements where companies self-present as sustainable while destroying the environment, exploiting and costing workers their lives.

In light of the scale of this challenge, we have been working intensively for these transformations to be made through global pacts, both in official spaces for climate negotiations at the UN and in our international alliances. These transformations must occur through the convergence between counterhegemonic groups that bring proposals from workers, women, Blacks, Indigenous peoples and communities.

Beyond the challenges that deal with the old and new forms of work and precariousness, it is up to the labor movement to incorporate feminist and anti-racist eco-socialism as an aid in the fight over the model of development. Together, we can break away from this failed model, and build towards a system that focuses on life, employment and democracy.

Justice alternatives to the Sustainable Development Mechanism of the Paris Agreement

Nathan Thanki

Nathan Thanki is a Co-Coordinator for Global Campaign To Demand Climate Justice, based in London, UK.

- ¹ Phillips, Dom (2015). 'Brazil's mining tragedy: was it a preventable disaster?'. The Guardian.
- ² Phillips, Dom (2019). 'Brazilian mining company to pay out £86m for disaster that killed almost 300 people'. The Guardian.
- ³ WBCSD Communications (2020). 'Vale advances on the climate agenda and unveils USD\$2 billion to reduce carbon emissions within the next ten years'. WBCSD.

The Paris Agreement differs from the Kyoto Protocol in several regards. It both weakens the differentiation between developed and developing countries and abandons the collective setting of targets and timetables for emissions reductions in favour of the far more flexible approach of "nationally determined contributions" (NDCs). The result, famously, is that everyone is on board but the ship is sinking: even if the NDCs are implemented, temperatures are on track to rise by 3–4°C this century.

One area in which the Paris Agreement does mimic the Kyoto Protocol is in the use of market-based approaches to climate change mitigation. The Kyoto Protocol's so-called "Clean Development Mechanism" was tainted by questions over its efficacy and many instances of human rights abuses and land grabs particularly impacting indigenous peoples and forest communities. Emissions trading schemes demonstrably failed to reduce emissions. Yet the Paris Agreement (specifically, Article 6) persists in relying on these policy approaches that are proven failures.

Article 6 is couched in the language of "voluntary cooperation" but this is code for the same kind of logic that underpinned the indulgences of the Middle Ages' Catholic Church; those who can afford to pay are absolved of their sins. The poor pick up the burden. The basic premise of this kind of 'cooperation' is that countries are able to use "internationally transferred mitigation outcomes" to count towards their NDC. So, if a developed country wanted to, it could increase its own carbon-intensive activities and simply purchase the right to offset this pollution through mitigation carried out in another country. One of the technologies touted to deliver these offsets is Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS). In theory, BECCS would involve planting trees to absorb atmospheric carbon, cutting those trees down and burning the biomass to use the energy, then somehow capturing and storing the carbon in the ground. There are a plethora of problems. Bioenergy is not actually carbon neutral. The technology doesn't exist at scale yet, and to scale it up would require vast amounts of land. Whose land? You can easily guess.

Rather than persist in a near-fanatical commitment to market-based false solutions, climate justice demands real solutions which are people-centred and equitable, and which appreciate the inherent value of nature rather than reduce it to a commodity. Some solutions include, but are not limited to: drastically limiting corporations and wealthy elites excessive consumption, particularly of energy; removing barriers to affordable and accessible environmentally sound technologies such as intellectual property rights; ending producer subsidies promoting fossil fuels and other carbon intensive industries; conserving biodiversity by leaving the ecological integrity of natural ecosystems unharmed and scaling up ecological restoration; transforming industrial agriculture towards agroecological practices; and investing in electrified, free or subsidized mass public transit. There are more real solutions than false ones.

A just vision for climate migration

María Faciolince & Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik

María Faciolince is the Power Shifts Project Lead at Oxfam, based in Barcelona, Spain; and Daniel Macmillen Voskoboynik is Co-Founder And Co-Editor at The World At IC, based in Barcelona, Spain.

A world wracked by climate violence is a landscape of displacement. Rising seas



V ospredju / In the foreground Gregor Zorc

shaving coastlines. Farmlands depleted by saltwater and extreme heat. Encroaching deserts. Coastal communities pummeled by cyclones. Ancestral territories deemed unlivable by extreme temperatures.

In eastern Africa, from Djibouti⁴ to Mozambique,⁵ millions have been displaced by torrential rains, droughts, and cyclones. In the Pacific, where low-lying island nations are particularly vulnerable to sea level rise, preliminary research suggests⁶ that people in over two thirds of households in Tuvalu and Kiribati would consider migration as a response to environmental shocks. In Central Asia,⁷ environmental transformations have been documented as strong contributory factors in the movement of millions.

In 2017, nearly 68.5 million people around the world were displaced – a third by extreme weather. From the World Bank to the United Nations, various institutions predict that between tens of millions to up to a billion people could be displaced by climate change within the next three decades.⁸ But even these estimated figures are likely to be undercounts, given the often intricate ways in which climatic factors intertwine with others. In addition to being a direct driver of movement through intensified extreme weather events (typhoons, floods, forest fires), the slow violence of climate change is an injustice multiplier, accelerating other deprivations and drivers of movement.

So in a reality of escalating climate-induced migration, what do justice-centred approaches to displacement look like? One possible approach calls for an almost paradoxical double-right: the right to stay, and the right to move.

The right to stay

The opposite of displacement is emplacement: rooted connection within a territory, which requires the conditions necessary to reproduce life in it. Yet, increasing fragility driven by climate violence has led to many communities being displaced in situ.⁹ Loss of place, and its life-giving environment, leaves communities stranded in their own territories without the ability to sustain their livelihoods.

Resettlement and migration are often forwarded as a mitigation strategy, but what social, economic and political protections are needed for communities to live with dignity in their own homes? Enshrining the right to stay involves everything to protect the rights of populations: from bold climate mitigation measures to ensure a safe climate, to strengthened land rights for indigenous communities and smallholder farmers, to active policies to support rural communities, to debt relief measures for the Global South, and gender-sensitive strategies to protect women and girls.

The right to move

But efforts to secure emplacement must live with the reality that significant displacement is underway and inevitable. Even with current levels of global heating, many territories are destined to be unlivable, if not already unlivable. The right to move is the right to have a pathway to safety, and mechanisms to rebuild a dignified life in a new territory. The obstacles to 'the right to move' are numerous. Regimes of border imperialism, policing frontiers and criminalising those seeking to cross them in the hope of a better life, are being strengthened by the year. Displaced communities today meet the reality of detention, deportation and death, whether in the marine graveyards of the Mediterranean, or the dangerous crossings

of the Darien Strait. Simply by extrapolating from the state of migrant rights protection today, we can easily envision a future of 'climate apartheid'.¹⁰

In addition, the architecture of protection for climate refugees is minimal, although some early cornerstones are emerging.¹¹ But even access to what is legally possible can be economically unrealistic. One study of rural communities in Malawi¹² found that 'climate change is likely to increase barriers to migration rather than increasing migration flows.' The aforementioned studies on attitudes towards migration across the Pacific found that the majority of people would not be able to afford the movement they deemed necessary.

The questions that remain

Climate displacement will stretch the contours of migration in unprecedented ways, and many questions remain. What kind of legal measures can protect the rights of those forced to uproot their lives by a systemic ecological crisis? How can [we] protect 'new' rights in a context where existing protections for migrants and refugees are being so swiftly eroded? How can we address the cultural-spiritual challenge of belonging in a landscape that is continuously degrading and changing? What is needed to face the challenge of changing demographic and social conditions in local communities receiving climate refugees, which in many cases are already facing significant climatic stress?¹³

Luciano Lliuya v. RWE AG: litigating for climate justice

Roxana Baldrich

Roxana Baldrich was, until recently, Policy Advisor For Climate Risk Management at Germanwatch, based in Bonn, Germany.

A Peruvian small-scale farmer and mountain guide is taking bold steps for climate justice

Saúl Luciano Lliuya v. RWE AG is the first climate change lawsuit in which a court found (in November 2017) that a private company could potentially be held liable for climate damages from its emissions,¹⁴ allowing the case to progress to the evidentiary stage. With support of the environmental NGO Germanwatch and the foundation Stiftung Zukunftsfähigkeit, Peruvian small-scale farmer and mountain guide Saúl Luciano Lliuya decided to take his fate into his own hands and do something about the climate risks that he and his community are facing. In 2015, he sued the German energy giant RWE, the biggest single emitter of CO₂ in Europe. He wants the company to assume its share of responsibility for the adverse impacts of climate change. In this concrete case, "adverse impacts" means that, due to climate-induced glacial retreat, a glacial lake above the Andean city of Huaraz has grown in size and threatens to overflow or even break its dam. The plaintiff's property along with large parts of the city are at risk of a devastating flood that would affect

around 50,000 people. Saúl Luciano requests the court to determine that RWE is liable, proportionate to its historical GHG emissions, to cover the expenses for appropriate safety precautions. This could mean, for example, paying part of the cost of a much bigger dam and/or a pumping system at the glacial lake.

The plaintiff himself explains his motivation for the lawsuit as follows:

Every day, I see the glaciers melting and the lakes in the mountains growing. For us in the valley, the threat is immense. We cannot simply wait and see what happens. For me, RWE is partly responsible for the risks that threaten us in Huaraz. According to scientific studies, the lake above my hometown is growing because of accelerated glacier melting. RWE is one of the world's biggest emitters. But so far, these companies have not assumed any responsibility for the consequences of their emissions. You don't have to be a legal scholar to see that this is wrong. That is why we demand that they now at least install flood protection at our glacier lake. And even better, that they should stop contaminating the climate in the future so that all people can survive. We used to be powerless, but we aren't anymore. This is about our protection and about justice.

Saúl Luciano is aware that his plight is not an isolated one. He hopes that his lawsuit will set a precedent and benefit others who are threatened or impacted by climate change. The final goal of climate change lawsuits is the establishment of global corporate legal accountability as well as global political responsibility for climate change. In order to contribute to that goal, Saúl Luciano and his lawyer wanted to create a 'test case' that would be replicable in many other countries. Therefore, their claim is based on the general nuisance provision under German civil law (§1004 BGB). Nuisance is one of the oldest and most widely used causes of action, and provisions similar to §1004 exist in many other jurisdictions. What is more, it can be used both, when there is a risk of nuisance or actual nuisance. Applied to climate change lawsuits, this means that it can be used to ask for the financing of adaptation measures, or for compensation for climate harms.

While the facts of the "Huaraz Case" are still being evaluated in the ongoing evidentiary phase,¹⁵ the court's recognition that a private company could potentially be held liable for the climate change related damages of its emissions marks a significant development in law. This might inspire other plaintiffs to make similar claims, or other judges to take similar decisions.

From the book Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal, curated by Harpreet Kaur Paul & Dalia Gebrial, published by Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung, 2021.

4 Fagan, Lauren (2019). 'Africa's 'climate refugees' are already here – and there'. Africa Times.
5 Wachiyaya, Catherine (2020). 'One year on, people displaced by Cyclone Idai struggle to rebuild'. UNHCR UK.
6 UNU-EHS and UNESCAP (n.d.). 'Climate change and migration in the Pacific: Links, attitudes, and future scenarios in Nauru, Tuvalu, and Kiribati'. United Nations University.
7 Blondin, Suzy (2018). 'Environmental migrations in Central Asia: a multifaceted approach to the issue'. Central Asian Survey 38(2), p. 275–292.
8 Nature Climate Change (2019). 'From migration to mobility'. Nature Climate Change 9 (895).
9 Feldman, Shelley and Charles Geisler (2011). 'Land grabbing in Bangladesh: In-situ displacement of peasant holdings'. Future Agricultures.

10 UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights (2019). 'UN expert condemns failure to address impact of climate change on poverty'. UN OHCHR.
11 Mahecic, Andrej (2020). 'UN Human Rights Committee decision on climate change is a wake-up call, according to UNHCR'. UNHCR.
12 Suckall, N. et al., (2017). 'Reduced migration under climate change: Evidence from Malawi using an aspirations and capabilities framework'. Climate and Development 9(4), p. 298–312.
13 McDonnell, Tim (2019). 'Climate change creates a new migration crisis for Bangladesh'. National Geographic.
14 Toussaint, Patrick (2020). 'Loss and damage and climate litigation: The case for greater interlinkage'. Reviel: Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law.

15 Climate Case Chart (2015). 'Luciano Lliuya v. RWE AG'. Sabin Center for Climate Change Law.



Slovensko mladinsko gledališče
Vilharjeva 11, SI-1000 Ljubljana
T: + 386 (0)1 3004 900
F: + 386 (0)1 3004 901
E: info@mladinsko-gl.si
www.mladinsko.com

Svet SMG / Mladinsko Theatre Council:
Semira Osmanagić – predsednica / president, Zvone Čadež,
Katarina Stegnar, Asta Vrečko, Martina Vuk

Strokovni svet SMG / Mladinsko Theatre Expert Council:
Tatjana Ažman – predsednica / president, Blaž Lukan,
Janez Pipan, Matjaž Pograjc, Dario Varga

Direktor / Managing director: Tibor Mihelič Syed
Umetniški vodja / Artistic director: Goran Injac
Režiserja / Directors: Matjaž Pograjc, Vito Taufer
Dramaturginja / Dramaturg: Urška Brodar
Vodja trženja in odnosov z javnostmi / Head of marketing
and public relations: Helena Grahek
Lektorica / Language consultant: Mateja Dermelj
Strokovni sodelavki / Consultants: Tina Malič, Katarina Saje
Tehnični vodja / Technical manager: Dušan Kohek
Vodja koordinacije programa / Head of programme coordination: Vitomir Obal
Kordinator programa / Programme coordinator: Gašper Tesner
Tajnica gledališča / Secretary: Lidija Čeferin
Računovodkinja / Accountant: Mateja Turk
Knjigovodkinja / Bookkeeper: Tina Matajč
Prodaja vstopnic / Box office: Gabrijela Bernot, Sanja Spahić

Delovanje Slovenskega mladinskega gledališča sofinancira Ministrstvo
za kulturo RS. / The programme of the Mladinsko Theatre is co-financed
by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia.

Ustanoviteljica Slovenskega mladinskega gledališča je Mestna občina
Ljubljana. / The founder of the Mladinsko Theatre is the City of Ljubljana.



REPUBLIKA SLOVENIJA
MINISTRSTVO ZA KULTURO



Mestna občina
Ljubljana



Prodaja vstopnic / Ticket Sales

- v Prodajni galeriji / Sales Gallery
Trg francoske revolucije 5, 1000 Ljubljana
ob delavnikih / Weekdays 12.00–17.30
ob sobotah / Saturdays 10.00–13.00
+386 (0)1 425 33 12
- pri gledališki blagajni / theatre box office
Vilharjeva 11, 1000 Ljubljana
+386 (0)1 3004 902
uro pred začetkom predstave / one hour before the performance
- na spletu / online
www.mladinsko.com
nakup vstopnic s popusti prek spleta ni mogoč /
reduced-price tickets not available online

Gledališki list Slovenskega mladinskega gledališča in Maske
Ljubljana – sezona 2021/2022 / Mladinsko Theatre and Maska
Ljubljana programme booklet – season 2021/2022

Številka / No. 2 (Mladinsko)
September 2021

Izide ob vsaki premieri / Issued at every première
Izdalo / Published by Slovensko mladinsko gledališče

Za izdajatelja / Represented by Tibor Mihelič Syed

© Vse pravice pridržane / All rights reserved

Uredništvo / Editorial board: Urška Brodar, Mateja Dermelj, Helena
Grahek, Goran Injac, Tina Malič, Katarina Saje, Tibor Mihelič Syed

To številko uredila / Editor: Tina Malič

Lektorici / Language editing: Mateja Dermelj (slovenščina /
Slovenian), Jana Renée Wilcoxon (angleščina / English)

Redaktorica / Redactor: Urška Brodar

Oblikovanje / Design: Mina Fina, Damjan Ilič, Ivian K. Mujezinović – Grupa Ee

Fotografije z vaj / Rehearsal photos: Matej Povše

Tisk / Printed by: Fotoprospekt, d. o. o.

Naklada / Copies: 300

ISSN: 2232-2019

steirischerherbst

steirischerherbst festival gmbh
Sackstraße 17, AT-8010 Graz
T: +43 (0)316 823 007
F: +43 (0)316 823 007 77
E: info@steirischerherbst.at
www.steirischerherbst.at

Direktorica in glavna kuratorica / Director and chief curator: Ekaterina Degot
Namestnica direktorice / Deputy director: Henriette Gallus
Vodja kuratorskega oddelka / Head of curatorial affairs: Christoph Platz
Višji kurator / Senior curator: David Riff
Kuratorja / Curators: Mirela Baciak, Dominik Müller
Višji producent / Senior producer: Jakob Schweighofer

..maska

Maska, zavod za založništvo, kulturno in producentsko dejavnost / Maska,
Institute for Publishing, Production and Education
Metelkova 6/II, SI-1000 Ljubljana
T: +386 (0)1 431 31 22
E: info@maska.si
www.maska.si

Direktorica / Director: Alja Lobnik
Vodja produkcije / Head of production: Tina Dobnik
Strokovna administrativna sodelavka / Administration: Nataša Božič

**PROFIT IS
PROFIT
IS PROFIT
PROFIT IS
PROFIT
IS PROFIT
PROFIT IS
PROFIT
IS PROFIT**

PROFIT JE PROFIT JE PROFIT