

RAWSEP Talk Show Part 4. Larry the Litigator is the anchor of the RAWSEP talk show today. Larry the Litigator here, taking the microphone to Switzerland, where, when singing "I am, I said" by Neil Diamond, the Swiss pronounce it, Das bin "Eesh" zahg-teh "Eesh"! Emma, a Swiss woman over 64 years of age, behind the counter of a Swiss shop which looks like a Swiss chalet: You sound like a native Swiss person over 64, Larry the Litigator! Would you like to buy that Swiss watch you are holding? Larry the Litigator: Lets get back to why I am here. Yesterday, this news story broke: European Court Faults Switzerland. the European Court of Human Rights held the Swiss government accountable. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/04/09/world/europe/climate-human-rights.html> Excerpts edited by RAWSEP for brevity and clarity and relationship to Residents Against Wood Smoke Emission Particulates, a 501c3 nonprofit organization. Emma, a Swiss woman over 64: Yes, we brought this case to court when I was a young woman, barely over 64. Now I'm a little older, pushing 74, but elated as a young girl over yesterday's verdict! Larry the Litigator: Why the emphasis on age, if I may ask? Emma, a Swiss woman over 64: I'm part of a data set. I don't mind. This ruling eventually may apply to anyone in Switzerland, and then go on to apply to everyone in this polluted, polluted world. Larry the Litigator: What exactly was the legal ruling in the Swiss court? Emma, a Swiss woman over 64, taking the microphone from Larry the litigator: it was the first time an international court determined that governments were legally obligated to meet their climate targets under human rights law. You may have seen that photograph of me in a group with other white haired women, Europe's top human rights court said on Tuesday that the [Swiss government had violated its citizens' human rights](#) by not doing enough to stop climate change. A group called KlimaSeniorinnen, or Senior Women for Climate Protection at the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, France, said that Switzerland had failed to meet its target in reducing carbon emissions and asked the court to ask the Swiss government to address that shortcoming. Larry the Litigator: It is the latest decision in a broader wave of [climate-related lawsuits](#) that aim to [push governments to act against global warming](#), and [countries' domestic courts](#) have handled similar cases. Olivia, a Finnish Woman buying a watch: I expect Switzerland to heed the court's ruling simply because Switzerland is a rule-of-law state, it's not a rogue state. Larry the Litigator: the ruling could also encourage more members of the public to sue! (An aside here from Residents Against Wood Smoke Emission Particulates: If the European Union had stopped using the lie of Carbon Neutrality of Wood Burning to ignore wood burning emissions and if the European Union had stopped not counting emissions from wood burning in their climate goals, then maybe Switzerland would have slowed climate change, in reality, in a timely manner!) Larry the Litigator continues: This may affect) upcoming opinions by [international courts](#), including the [International Court of Justice](#). In the United States [young people are filing lawsuits](#) over state and federal governments failure to protect them from global warming. See the photo of a young man holding a Climate Justice banner in the United States! Emma, a Swiss woman over 64: Switzerland violated our human rights! The court's ruling on Tuesday said Switzerland was, by not mitigating climate change, violating the European Convention on Human Rights. The litigants, women over 64, worked on the lawsuit for nearly a decade with Greenpeace and a team of lawyers, and pointed to research showing that older women are particularly [vulnerable to heat-related illnesses](#). Four of the women said they had heart and respiratory diseases that put them at risk of death on very hot days. Many others in the group, who live across Switzerland, said they struggled with fatigue, and lightheadedness because of the extreme heat. Larry the Litigator: 20 percent promised, only 11 percent delivered by Switzerland! Switzerland had vowed to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 20 percent by 2020 compared with 1990 levels. But between 2013 and 2020, Switzerland had reduced its emissions levels only 11 percent. In addition, Switzerland failed to quantify its efforts to limit emissions, by using a carbon budget. By not acting "in good time" the Swiss government had failed to protect its citizens' rights. The court ordered Switzerland to address those shortcomings. (An aside from Residents Against Wood Smoke Emission Particulates: address these shortcomings by counting wood burning emissions and shutting down wood burning power plants and shutting down indoor residential wood burning. The CO2 and PM2.5 emitted by wood burning are 2.8 times the CO2 and PM2.5 emitted by the fossil fuel coal burning. Both PM2.5 and CO2 hasten climate change. In addition, Wood burning emissions are 90% PM2.5, particulate matter of 2.5 micrometer size, the perfect size to infiltrate the human lung, setting off a cascade of human health problems and early deaths. Coal burning power plants should be replaced by Wind and Solar power plants, not by wood burning power plants). Emma, a Swiss woman over 64: Members of the KlimaSeniorinnen group celebrated as they left the court on Tuesday! The Swiss government had argued that human rights law does not apply to climate change, and that addressing it should be a political process. But now, after the ruling, Switzerland's federal office of justice said that the Swiss authorities would analyze the judgment and act to make changes. A co-president of the KlimaSeniorinnen, called the decision "a victory for all generations"! Larry the Litigator. In closing, in other news, United States news, Berkeley, California, will end its natural gas ban. The decision could have widespread ripple effects in the cities and local governments [that followed Berkeley's lead in seeking to end the use of natural gas](#) in new buildings. As a member of Residents Against Wood Smoke Emission Particulates I must point out that indoor residential wood burning emits 450 times the PM2.5 particulates as the fossil fuel natural gas burning. For this reason, RAWSEP believes that Berkeley California should have passed laws and enforced a permanent indoor residential wood burning ban on all residential buildings before Berkeley attempted to ban natural gas in new buildings. A new Berkeley law could be a complaint based system using hyperlocalized resident owned PurpleAir PM2.5 monitor data showing PM2.5 pollution above Environmental Protection Agency National Ambient Air Quality Standards (EPA NAAQS) as justification for shutting down indoor residential wood burning, one wood burning appliance by one wood burning appliance at a time, if necessary. Also, Berkeley, roll out those up to \$8,000 Heat Pump rebates, based on a sliding income scale! Get your priorities straight Berkeley! This natural gas ban in new builds should have been number 3 on your list! And so it goes. Good luck to you and your clean air compatriots, Emma, a Swiss woman over 64 whose name I cannot properly pronounce! Adieu for now from Switzerland, where history has been made, with possible ripple effects around the world beginning!

