

THE BOARDROOM · BY DAILOGIX

The Sealed Record

Climate Change Policy — a deliberation of twenty-one personas, five questions, five recorded runs

RECORD **CCD-DLG-2026-001** · CLASS **SIMULATED PROCEEDING**
PANEL **21 + 2 OFFICERS** · RUNS **5 (2 TRANSCRIBED)** · THRESHOLD
11 OF 21

SEAL **327BE0FCB12A2F95...** · CHAIN **VERIFIED ✓**



DAILOGIX.COM

HOW TO READ THIS RECORD

One record, three depths

This document contains the complete sealed record of session CCD-DLG-2026-001, bound in three parts. Each part is exactly what opens at the corresponding level of access – nothing more, nothing less. Read to the depth you hold.

PART	LEVEL	PRICE	WHAT IT OPENS
I	L1 • Sounding Board	\$9.99	Executive summary · the questions · aggregate vote totals (never roll-called)
II	L2 • Positioning	\$49.99	+ two-run comparison · for/against messaging · coalition analysis · advocate closing statements
III	L3 • Full Record	\$499.99	+ full roll call with named conditions · multi-run distributions · consistency matrix · persuasion moments · both complete transcripts
—	L4 • Interactive Lab	from \$4,999.99	Not paper-bound: direct the room yourself – swap personas, re-run, A/B test messages

All dialogs are AI-generated simulations. Public-figure personas are composites of documented public positions – not testimony, endorsement, or participation by the individuals. Modeled positions – not population samples: The Boardroom maps the argument space of articulated positions; it does not predict population opinion.

PART I OF THE RECORD

L1 · Sounding Board

\$9.99

The executive summary, the questions put to the room, and the aggregate vote totals.

Totals are reported in aggregate only – which persona voted how is sealed below this level.

Executive summary

DELIBERATION SUMMARY – CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

SESSION CCD-DLG-2026-001 & RE-RUNS

Attribution affirmed. The panel found anthropogenic forcing to be the dominant explanation of observed warming – carried in the primary run 15-4-2, and carried in all five recorded runs with an identical four-member dissenting bloc.

Urgency affirmed. Climate risk was found sufficiently front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s to warrant exceptional mobilization now (12-7-2 in the primary run; carried in all five runs, margin varying 9-13 Yes).

Scope unresolved. Whether "sweeping intervention" means wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates produced **no consensus in any run** – the fracture is over the words "sweeping" and "wartime," not the science.

Priority rejected. Climate should not be ranked above health, poverty, and education – rejected or no-consensus in all five runs.

The composite resolution is a knife-edge. "Urgent crisis requiring sweeping intervention this decade" **carried in the primary run at exactly the 11-vote threshold** – and failed in four of five recorded runs. The record reports the distribution rather than a single misleading verdict (Part III).

The questions put to the room

1. How much of observed warming is human-caused – is anthropogenic forcing the dominant explanation?
2. Is climate risk front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s, requiring exceptional mobilization now?
3. Does “sweeping intervention” mean wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates?
4. Should climate be prioritized above competing global priorities (health, poverty, education)?
5. Resolved: Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade.

Aggregate vote totals primary run (Run A · blind seed)

	QUESTION	AGGREGATE TALLY	OUTCOME
Q1	How much of observed warming is human-caused – is anthropogenic forcing the dominant explanation?	15 Yes · 4 No · 2 Cond.	CARRIES
Q2	Is climate risk front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s, requiring exceptional mobilization now?	12 Yes · 7 No · 2 Cond.	CARRIES
Q3	Does “sweeping intervention” mean wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates?	8 Yes · 8 No · 5 Cond.	NO CONSENSUS

	QUESTION	AGGREGATE TALLY	OUTCOME
Q4	Should climate be prioritized above competing global priorities (health, poverty, education)?	9 Yes · 10 No · 2 Cond.	NO CONSENSUS
Q5	Resolved: Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade.	11 Favor · 7 Opposed · 3 Cond.	CARRIES

Threshold: 11 of 21 voting members. Totals are never roll-called at this level – the deliberation's integrity does not depend on exposing individual reasoning.

PART II OF THE RECORD

L2 · Positioning

\$49.99

Everything in Part I, plus how each side argued: the two-run comparison, the for/against messaging, the coalition map, and the advocates' closing statements.

Two runs. One structure.

Every deliberation is delivered as **two independent runs**. The internal dialog is fresh every time – different phrasings, different rebuttal pairings – while the structure of agreement and fracture holds. Below: the same motion, Q5 · Main ballot, deliberated twice.

RUN A BLIND SEED A · 2026-07-21 TheGavel Arthur Vance · Moderator The main ballot. The resolution before the body, as written. The ballot vocabulary is Favor / Opposed / Conditional; eleven Favor votes of twenty-one are required to carry, and Conditional votes do not count toward passage. ClimateCentrist Arnold Schwarzenegger · Undecided Urgent, practical, patriotic – clean air, jobs, and leadership this decade; I have governed on this resolution and it works. Vote: Favor. TechAccelerate Elon Musk · Undecided Climate is a real and serious problem, and technology will solve it fastest – but “sweeping intervention” in the shutdown sense is counterproductive and would slow the very transition we need. Vote: Conditional – pricing plus technology acceleration, excluding shutdown mandates. BreakthroughEnergy Bill Gates · Undecided Climate change is real, serious, and must be solved this decade through sweeping deployment of clean technology – the resolution describes my own foundation’s premise. I favor it on the understanding, per my Q3 condition, that innovation is the primary instrument. Vote: Favor. Favor 11 · Opposed 7 · Conditional 3 • CARRIES Eleven Favor votes – the constitutional threshold of this body, exactly met.		RUN B BLIND SEED B · 2026-07-21 TheGavel Arthur Vance · Moderator The main ballot. Eleven Favor votes of twenty-one are required to carry; Conditional votes do not count toward passage. Vote labels are Favor, Opposed, or Conditional. ClimateCentrist Arnold Schwarzenegger · Undecided Clean air, jobs, technology leadership, and a planet that works – this resolution is practical patriotism, and the decade is now. Vote: Favor. TechAccelerate Elon Musk · Undecided It is a real problem demanding aggressive action this decade – carbon pricing plus maximum technology acceleration – and on that reading I support the resolution. Vote: Favor. BreakthroughEnergy Bill Gates · Undecided I would support sweeping intervention only in its innovation-centered form – massive R&D, demonstration, and pricing that makes clean cheaper – not scarcity mandates. Since the resolution as written does not specify that form, I cannot count my concurrence toward it. Vote: Conditional – technology-accelerating investment, not deprivation mandates. Favor 10 · Opposed 8 · Conditional 3 • FAILS Ten Favor votes do not meet the threshold of eleven – falling one vote short.		Q1 · ATTRIBUTION A: CARRIES 15-4-2 B: CARRIES 15-4-2	Q2 · URGENCY A: CARRIES 12-7-2 B: CARRIES 13-8-0	Q3 · POLICY SCOPE A: NO CONSENSUS 8-8-5 B: NO CONSENSUS 9-9-3	Q4 · OPPORTUNITY COST A: NO CONSENSUS 9-10-2 B: FAILS 8-12-1	Q5 · MAIN BALLOT A: CARRIES 11-7-3 B: FAILS 10-8-3
---	--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--

For & against the messaging

FOR THE MOTION

The case that carried the room

- “Impossible is not a fact; it is an attitude” – achievability framing neutralized the sacrifice narrative more than any scientific argument.
- Moral-ledger language (“delay is a choice with moral consequences”) held the committed bloc and gave the persuadable middle cover to concur.
- Practical-patriotism framing (clean air, jobs, leadership) was the single most repeated bridge argument across all five runs.

AGAINST THE MOTION

The case that held the line

- “Blank check” framing – the undefined word “sweeping” was attacked in every run; it, not the science, is what cost the motion votes.
- Opportunity-cost arithmetic (dollars for malaria vs. dollars for near-term abatement) was the skeptics’ strongest and least-refuted argument.
- Material-timeline realism (energy systems turn over in generations) repeatedly converted swing votes to Conditional.

Coalition analysis

Three stable coalitions held across all five runs. The fracture lines are drawn by words, not by science: “sweeping” and “wartime” are the terms that kill consensus.

7 SEATS

The Committed Affirmative

Never wavered once in 125 agent-questions. Attribution, urgency, and scope all carry for this bloc without conditions.

4 SEATS

The Principled Opposition

Moore, Lindzen, Morano, Soon – the identical dissenting bloc in all five attribution ballots. Unmovable, and heard in full on the record.

10 SEATS

The Conditional Center

The persuadable middle, incl. three skeptical scientists who concede attribution. Their named conditions – innovation-first framing, material timelines, local ownership, justice for the poor, honest uncertainty ranges – are the levers that move composite motions.

Advocate closing statements the main ballot

Delivered before the vote, in the parliamentary form, addressed to the persuadable middle.

CHRISTIANA FIGUERES · FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

"Mr. Speaker, if you believe as I believe —

that the warming we measure bears our own fingerprint, and every national academy on Earth has said so under oath of method;

that the carbon budget for a livable century is being spent in this decade, not the next;

and that the instruments — pricing, standards, phase-outs — are tested, affordable, and waiting;

...then you would vote IN FAVOR OF the current motion.

"

"Mr. Speaker, if you believe as I believe —

that the resolution bundles three contestable claims — crisis, urgency, sweeping scope — and presents them as settled when the data show concern, not certainty;

that wartime framing justifies wartime powers, and wartime powers make wartime errors;

and that honest cost-benefit analysis and measured steps serve both the climate and the poor better than maximal policy;

...then you would vote OPPOSED TO the current motion.

"

PART III OF THE RECORD

L3 · Full Record

\$499.99

Everything in Parts I-II, plus the full roll call with named conditions, multi-run distributions, the consistency matrix, persuasion moments, the surprise report – and both complete transcripts.

The roll call Run A (blind seed A · 2026-07-21)

Who voted how, on every question – with named conditions as stated on the floor.

#	AGENT	MODELED ON	BLOC	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	NAMED CONDITION ON RECORD
01	ClimateAction	Al Gore	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
02	FridayFuture	Greta Thunberg	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
03	HotHouseEarth	James Hansen	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
04	HockeyStick	Michael Mann	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
05	BridgeBuilder	Katharine Hayhoe	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Cond.	Cond.	Favor	Interventions must be locally grounded / co-benefits integration (Q3, Q4).
06	FossilFree	Bill McKibben	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
07	ParisArchitect	Christiana Figueres	Pro-Action	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
08	CoolIt	Bjørn Lomborg	Climate-Skeptic	Yes	No	No	No	Opp.	–
09	UncertaintyFirst	Judith Curry	Climate-Skeptic	Cond.	No	No	No	Opp.	Attribution claims must carry explicit, unshrunk uncertainty ranges (Q1).
10	UnsettledBook	Steven Koonin	Climate-Skeptic	Cond.	No	No	No	Opp.	Attribution must be period-specific and fraction-quantified (Q1).
11	GreenPeaceExit	Patrick Moore	Climate-Skeptic	No	No	No	No	Opp.	–
12	IrisHypothesis	Richard Lindzen	Climate-Skeptic	No	No	No	No	Opp.	–
13	ClimateDepot	Marc Morano	Climate-Skeptic	No	No	No	No	Opp.	–
14	SolarDriver	Willie Soon	Climate-Skeptic	No	No	No	No	Opp.	–
15	BreakthroughEnergy	Bill Gates	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Cond.	No	Favor	Innovation and green-premium elimination first; mandates secondary (Q3).
16	ClimateCentrist	Arnold Schwarzenegger	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Favor	–
17	EnergyRealist	Vaclav Smil	Undecided	Yes	Cond.	No	No	Cond.	Intervention scope must match realistic energy-system turnover timelines (Q2, Q5).
18	SoftEnergyPath	Amory Lovins	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Cond.	Yes	Favor	Package must be market-led and design-led, not command-and-control (Q3).

#	AGENT	MODELED ON	BLOC	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	NAMED CONDITION ON RECORD
19	LaudatoSi	Pope Francis	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Cond.	Yes	Favor	Intervention must embed justice for the poor, not technocratic fixes only (Q3).
20	LongTermRisk	Yuval Noah Harari	Undecided	Yes	Cond.	Yes	Cond.	Cond.	Mobilization must be nested in multi-risk global cooperation (Q2, Q5).
21	TechAccelerate	Elon Musk	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Cond.	No	Cond.	Pricing plus technology acceleration; shutdown mandates excluded (Q3, Q5).

Personas shown are composites modeled on documented public positions – simulations, not participation by the individuals.

Multi-run distributions

Five complete runs of the identical panel on the identical questions. Y-N-C per run; outcome beneath.

QUESTION		RUN 1 Original session	RUN 2 Re-run · non-blind	RUN A Blind seed A	RUN B Blind seed B	RUN C Blind seed C
Q1	How much of observed warming is human-caused – is anthropogenic forcing the dominant explanation?	Run 1 17-4-0 CARRIES	Run 2 16-4-1 CARRIES	Run A 15-4-2 CARRIES	Run B 15-4-2 CARRIES	Run C 15-4-2 CARRIES
Q2	Is climate risk front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s, requiring exceptional mobilization now?	Run 1 9-6-6 NO CONSENSUS	Run 2 12-5-4 CARRIES	Run A 12-7-2 CARRIES	Run B 13-8-0 CARRIES	Run C 12-8-1 CARRIES
Q3	Does “sweeping intervention” mean wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates?	Run 1 6-6-9 NO CONSENSUS	Run 2 4-8-9 NO CONSENSUS	Run A 8-8-5 NO CONSENSUS	Run B 9-9-3 NO CONSENSUS	Run C 7-8-6 NO CONSENSUS
Q4	Should climate be prioritized above competing global priorities (health, poverty, education)?	Run 1 4-6-11 NO CONSENSUS	Run 2 6-6-9 NO CONSENSUS	Run A 9-10-2 NO CONSENSUS	Run B 8-12-1 FAILS	Run C 8-9-4 NO CONSENSUS
Q5	Resolved: Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade.	Run 1 8-5-8 FAILS TO CARRY	Run 2 8-5-8 FAILS TO CARRY	Run A 11-7-3 CARRIES	Run B 10-8-3 FAILS TO CARRY	Run C 8-8-5 FAILS TO CARRY

The main ballot, persona by persona, run by run

Variance concentrates exactly where it should – in the genuinely persuadable swing seats. Y = Favor · N = Opposed · C = Conditional.

PERSONA	RUN 1	RUN 2	RUN A	RUN B	RUN C	RECORD
Al Gore	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
Greta Thunberg	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
James Hansen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
Michael Mann	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
Katharine Hayhoe	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	swing
Bill McKibben	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
Christiana Figueres	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	DETERMINISTIC
Bjørn Lomborg	C	C	N	N	N	swing
Judith Curry	C	C	N	N	N	swing
Steven Koonin	N	N	N	N	N	DETERMINISTIC
Patrick Moore	N	N	N	N	N	DETERMINISTIC
Richard Lindzen	N	N	N	N	N	DETERMINISTIC
Marc Morano	N	N	N	N	N	DETERMINISTIC
Willie Soon	N	N	N	N	N	DETERMINISTIC
Bill Gates	C	C	Y	C	C	swing
Arnold Schwarzenegger	C	C	Y	Y	Y	swing
Vaclav Smil	C	C	C	N	N	swing
Amory Lovins	Y	Y	Y	C	C	swing
Pope Francis	C	C	Y	Y	Y	swing
Yuval Noah Harari	C	C	C	C	C	DETERMINISTIC
Elon Musk	C	C	C	Y	C	swing

Persuasion moments & surprises

i. The skeptic who conceded the science

Q1 · RUN A · ROUND 1

Lomborg's plain concession – delivered against his own camp's stereotype – collapsed the remaining skeptics' room to maneuver on attribution and redirected the entire debate toward policy scope.

"Warming is real and predominantly human-caused, and the panel should hear a skeptic say so plainly. The honest fight is over costs and priorities, not over thermometers."

ii. The certainty double-standard

Q5 · RUN A · REBUTTALS

Schwarzenegger's rebuttal reframed the threshold question from scientific certainty to risk management – the argument most associated with the knife-edge carry in Run A.

"You demand certainty from climate science that you never demand from military planning or insurance, where we act on risk every single day."

iii. The condition that moved a Favor

Q3 → Q5 · RUN A

Hayhoe's Q3 condition – interventions must be locally grounded – was explicitly carried into her Q5 Favor vote. Named conditions are not footnotes; they are the mechanism by which the middle moves.

"I support the resolution on the understanding — stated in my Q3 condition — that interventions be locally grounded."

The surprise report

§ The words that kill consensus are "sweeping" and "wartime" – never the science. Attribution survives adversarial scrutiny 5/5; scope language fails 5/5.

§ The most persuadable persona in the room is also the most famous technologist: Musk's vote moved between Favor and Conditional across runs, always on the same lever – whether "intervention" means pricing-plus-acceleration or shutdown mandates.

§ A declared climate skeptic (Lomborg) votes Yes on attribution in all five runs – the room's map of disagreement is not the one cable news would predict.

Transcript Run A (blind seed A)

Every word, as delivered. Speaker attributions, declared votes, named conditions, and the Stenographer's verification flags are entered as delivered.

GOVERNANCE

SESSION 2026-07-21 — CLIMATE PANEL RERUN (SEED A) · 21 VOTING AGENTS, 2 NON-VOTING GOVERNANCE OFFICERS · ARTHUR VANCE (THEGAVEL), MODERATOR · ELEANOR VANCE (THERECORD), STENOGRAPHER · VOTE VOCABULARY: YES / NO / CONDITIONAL (CONDITION MUST BE NAMED) / ABSTAIN · Q5 BALLOT: FAVOR / OPPOSED / CONDITIONAL · PASSAGE RULE: 11 OF 21 TO CARRY Q1-Q4 (OTHERWISE NO CONSENSUS); Q5 REQUIRES 11 FAVOR, CONDITIONAL DOES NOT COUNT TOWARD PASSAGE.

Q1 · ATTRIBUTION

TheGavel (Arthur Vance): The panel is called to order. Question One, as written: "How much of observed warming is human-caused — is anthropogenic forcing the dominant explanation?" Round-robin begins. Each agent speaks in listed order and declares a vote.

ClimateAction (Al Gore) [**Pro-Action**]: The scientific consensus is overwhelming: greenhouse gases from human activity are the dominant driver of the warming we observe, full stop. Every national academy of science on Earth concurs, and continued debate on this point is a manufactured distraction. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg) [**Pro-Action**]: The science has been clear for decades — humans burning fossil fuels is the dominant cause, and pretending otherwise is how leaders bought themselves another thirty years of delay. Listen to the science: it is unequivocal. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen) [**Pro-Action**]: The paleoclimate record and observed planetary energy imbalance confirm that human forcing dominates — natural variability cannot explain the warming since 1970. I testified to this in 1988 and the evidence has only hardened. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann) [**Pro-Action**]: Attribution studies show essentially all of the modern warming trend is anthropogenic; natural factors alone would have produced slight cooling. The doubt that lingers here was purchased by fossil fuel interests, not produced by science. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe) [**Pro-Action**]: When I talk with farmers and city planners, the data is the data: human activities are the dominant cause, and it matters because it means our choices determine what comes next. Accepting attribution is not alarmism — it is agency. Vote: Yes.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben) [**Pro-Action**]: The physics was settled before most of this panel was born; the only remaining question is who profits from pretending otherwise. Human-caused, dominantly so, and the fossil fuel industry knew it first. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres) [**Pro-Action**]: The IPCC's attribution conclusions underpin the entire Paris framework, and no government in that process disputes them. Human forcing is the dominant explanation — this is the floor of the conversation, not the ceiling. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg) [**Climate-Skeptic**]: I have never denied the basic attribution — warming is real and predominantly human-caused, and the panel should hear a skeptic say so plainly. Where I part company is what policy panic we build on top of that fact. Vote: Yes.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry) [**Climate-Skeptic**]: Humans clearly contribute, but the word "dominant" conceals real uncertainty in aerosol forcing, ocean circulation, and sensitivity estimates that IPCC summaries understate. I cannot affirm a crisp dominance claim without a condition: that the uncertainty ranges be honestly stated alongside it. Vote: Conditional — condition: any attribution claim must carry explicit, unshrunk uncertainty ranges for sensitivity and aerosol forcing.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin) [**Climate-Skeptic**]: Human influence is real, but "dominant" is asserted with more confidence than the underlying detection-and-attribution literature warrants, especially for the early 20th-century warming. I will concur only conditionally: the claim must specify which period and which fraction it covers. Vote: Conditional — condition: the attribution statement must be period-specific and fraction-quantified, not a blanket claim.

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore) [**Climate-Skeptic**]: There is no crisis and no proven dominance — CO₂ is the staff of life, and the modest warming we see sits comfortably within natural variation. The attribution case is a house built on adjusted datasets. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen) [Climate-Skeptic]: The climate system is dominated by natural internal variability, and the anthropogenic signal, while present, is small and far from demonstrably dominant. The "consensus" on dominance is a political artifact, not a measurement. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano) [Climate-Skeptic]: Attribution is the weakest link in the whole edifice – a century of weather hysteria repackaged with computer models. The answer is no, and the question itself is rigged to launder policy through science. Vote: No.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon) [Climate-Skeptic]: Solar variability and natural cycles explain more of the temperature record than the models credit; the anthropogenic share is overstated by construction. Until solar forcing is honestly weighted, dominance claims are premature. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates) [Undecided]: The physics is clear and I accept it: human emissions are the dominant cause of observed warming, which is precisely why we need innovation rather than denial. You don't build a strategy on a falsehood. Vote: Yes.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger) [Undecided]: I don't need a PhD to read a thermometer and a tailpipe – we are doing this, and arguing about it wastes time we could spend building clean industry. The scientists are right on this one. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil) [Undecided]: The warming since industrialization is substantially anthropogenic – the carbon isotope signature alone settles that for any serious reader of the data. My reservations concern solutions and timelines, not this question. Vote: Yes.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins) [Undecided]: Attribution is the easy part – human forcing dominates, and the good news is that what we caused we can profitably fix. Vote: Yes.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis) [Undecided]: The cry of the earth has a human fingerprint upon it; the sciences entrusted to us confirm that our consumption drives this warming. To deny what we have done is to refuse responsibility for our common home. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari) [Undecided]: The empirical evidence that industrial civilization is the dominant driver of current warming is as solid as anything in Earth science; the interesting questions are institutional, not physical. Humanity's problem is not knowing – it is cooperating on what we know. Vote: Yes.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk) [Undecided]: We're running a massive uncontrolled experiment on the atmosphere and the data says we're the dominant forcing – that's just physics, not politics. Vote: Yes.

TheGavel: I select three rebuttals, one per group: HockeyStick for Pro-Action, CoolIt for the Skeptics, BreakthroughEnergy for the Undecided.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann), rebuttal: Mr. Lindzen and Mr. Morano offer no alternative physical mechanism that survives peer review, and Ms. Curry's uncertainties cut both ways – the true sensitivity could as easily be higher as lower. Uncertainty is not a friend of inaction.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg), rebuttal: Dr. Mann is right that attribution is solid – and I would ask my fellow skeptics to stop conceding ground they don't need to concede on policy by denying ground they can't hold on science. The honest fight is over costs and priorities, not over thermometers.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates), rebuttal: To Professor Soon: the solar hypothesis has been tested against the stratospheric cooling signature and it fails – the sun didn't do this. Accepting attribution is what licenses a serious technology response instead of wishful thinking.

TheRecord (Eleanor Vance): Record notes that the claim "natural factors alone would have produced slight cooling" was stated without citation in session; flagged as unverified within this proceeding.

TheGavel: The ballot is closed. On Question One: Yes 15 – No 4 – Conditional 2 – Abstain 0. The affirmative carries with fifteen votes, exceeding the required eleven. Be it resolved that this panel finds anthropogenic forcing to be the dominant explanation of observed warming, the two conditional concurrences noted in the record with their named conditions.

Q2 · URGENCY

TheGavel: Question Two, as written: "Is climate risk front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s, requiring exceptional mobilization now?" Round-robin begins.

ClimateAction (Al Gore) [Pro-Action]: Every year of delay locks in infrastructure and emissions that foreclose our options; the 2020s are the decisive decade, and delay is itself a choice with moral consequences. Exceptional mobilization is not alarm – it is arithmetic. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg) [Pro-Action]: The carbon budget for 1.5°C is being spent right now, in this decade, while leaders announce targets for 2050 they will never have to answer for. If the risk is not front-loaded, then

why does every year of "business as usual" make the math worse? Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen) [Pro-Action]: The danger of tipping points – ice sheet instability, ocean circulation slowdown – is front-loaded because these systems have long lags; what we emit this decade commits us for centuries. We are running out of runway, not into it. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann) [Pro-Action]: The difference between acting now and acting in 2040 is the difference between manageable warming and dangerous warming; the risk curve is convex and time is not our friend. Yes, mobilization now is warranted. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe) [Pro-Action]: Every fraction of a degree we avoid this decade is measured in real harms avoided – in water, crops, and heat deaths in communities I work with. The urgency is local, not abstract, and it is now. Vote: Yes.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben) [Pro-Action]: Physics does not negotiate, and the math of the carbon budget makes this the last decade in which a graceful transition is even possible. Mobilize now or manage decline later. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres) [Pro-Action]: The decisions of the 2020s determine whether the Paris goals live or die – this is the decade of consequence, as we said in Paris and meant it. Impossible is not a fact; it is an attitude, and this decade we cannot afford that attitude. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg) [Climate-Skeptic]: The risk is real but it is not front-loaded into a decade – the serious damages accumulate over the century, and panic mobilization now wastes trillions that could save more lives elsewhere. Smart policy beats fast policy. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry) [Climate-Skeptic]: Front-loading risk into the 2020s assumes a confidence in near-term projections that the science does not support; deep uncertainty argues for robust, adaptive strategies, not exceptional one-shot mobilization. Urgency framing is a policy preference dressed as a finding. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin) [Climate-Skeptic]: The near-term warming rate does not show a discontinuity demanding wartime footing; decades of data show a steady trend, not a cliff edge in the 2020s. Hysteria about "this decade or never" distorts rational prioritization. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore) [Climate-Skeptic]: There is no emergency in any decade; CO₂ fertilization is greening the planet and the alleged crisis is a funding mechanism. Mobilization for a phantom threat harms real people now. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen) [Climate-Skeptic]: Modest warming from modest sensitivity implies no front-loaded catastrophe; the urgency narrative is a political construction untethered from the equations. Adaptation over decades suffices. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano) [Climate-Skeptic]: "This is the decisive decade" has been declared every decade since 1989 – it is a deadline racket designed to stampede the public. The answer is no, now as then. Vote: No.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon) [Climate-Skeptic]: If solar cycles drive much of the variability, then anthropogenic urgency timelines are built on a misattribution, and exceptional mobilization now is unjustified. The claimed front-loading is a model artifact. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates) [Undecided]: We must act this decade – clean energy deployment and innovation pipelines built now determine whether 2050 targets are reachable at all. The risk compounds; so does the cost of late action. Vote: Yes.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger) [Undecided]: You don't wait for the house to burn down before you buy the hose – states and cities that moved early are already reaping jobs and cleaner air. Action now is simply good management. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil) [Undecided]: The risk is real but "exceptional mobilization now" collides with the material reality that energy transitions take generations – steel, cement, and ammonia do not decarbonize on a decade's notice. I concur only conditionally: any mobilization must be sized to actual substitution rates of the energy system, not to slogans. Vote: Conditional – condition: mobilization must respect material and infrastructural timelines of real energy transitions.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins) [Undecided]: The opportunity is front-loaded even more than the risk – efficiency and renewables are profitable today, so acting now is not sacrifice but arbitrage. Mobilization now pays for itself. Vote: Yes.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis) [Undecided]: The poor are already suffering the droughts and floods of a warming world; to ask them to wait another decade is to deepen an injustice already intolerable. The moral urgency is present, not future. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari) [Undecided]: The window argument is plausible, but climate is one of several front-loaded existential risks, and mobilization framed on a single risk can distort the whole portfolio of global

cooperation. I concur only conditionally: the mobilization must be embedded in a broader framework of global risk governance, not a single-issue panic. Vote: Conditional – condition: mobilization must be integrated with, not competing against, other existential-risk priorities.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk) [Undecided]: The sooner we scale EVs, batteries, and solar, the cheaper the transition gets – compounding means early action matters enormously. So yes, move fast now; just don't panic or shut things down. Vote: Yes.

TheGavel: Three rebuttals: FridayFuture for Pro-Action, UnsettledBook for the Skeptics, EnergyRealist for the Undecided.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg), rebuttal: Mr. Morano mocks "decisive decades" – but the reason each decade is declared decisive is that each previous one was wasted, and the budget shrank. Dr. Koonin's "steady trend" omits that the damages are nonlinear; a steady forcing into a fragile system is not a steady risk.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin), rebuttal: Ms. Thunberg's nonlinearity claim is exactly the kind of assertion that outruns the attribution literature for extreme events. If the near-term data showed the discontinuity her urgency requires, we would see it in the observations, not just in the rhetoric.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil), rebuttal: I ask the Pro-Action group to name a single historical energy transition that occurred at the speed their mobilization implies – there is none. Urgency of intent does not repeal the thermodynamics of replacing a fossil-fueled civilization.

TheGavel: The ballot is closed. On Question Two: Yes 12 – No 7 – Conditional 2 – Abstain 0. The affirmative carries with twelve votes, exceeding the required eleven. Be it resolved that this panel finds climate risk sufficiently front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s to warrant exceptional mobilization now, with the two conditional concurrences and their named conditions entered in the record.

Q3 • POLICY SCOPE

TheGavel: Question Three, as written: "Does 'sweeping intervention' mean wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates?" This is a scope question: does the phrase carry that content? Round-robin begins.

ClimateAction (Al Gore) [Pro-Action]: Yes – sweeping means a price on carbon steep enough to move capital, an end to new fossil infrastructure, and performance mandates where markets move too slowly. Anything less is sweeping in name only. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg) [Pro-Action]: If "sweeping" doesn't mean ending fossil expansion and mandating cuts at the scale the carbon budget demands, then the word is just another empty promise. Yes, that is exactly what it must mean. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen) [Pro-Action]: I have long argued for a rising carbon fee returned to citizens – that is the core of sweeping intervention – alongside a phase-out of coal and unabated fossil use. Half-measures do not bend an emissions curve. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann) [Pro-Action]: Sweeping means economy-wide: carbon pricing, clean energy standards, and a managed decline of fossil fuels – precisely the package the polluters spent decades preventing. Yes. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe) [Pro-Action]: I agree intervention must be sweeping, but I resist a one-size mandate definition – a policy that ignores local water, farm, and health realities will fail politically and practically. I concur only conditionally: the package must be designed for local ownership and co-benefits, not imposed as uniform federal command. Vote: Conditional – condition: mandates must be locally tailored and community-supported to count as legitimate sweeping intervention.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben) [Pro-Action]: Sweeping means keeping carbon in the ground – a halt to new extraction, a phase-out schedule, and capital redirected at scale; carbon pricing alone is the industry's favorite delay tactic. Yes, with phase-out at the center. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres) [Pro-Action]: Sweeping intervention is a portfolio: carbon pricing, regulatory phase-outs, and mandates, all ratcheting under international cooperation – that is what the Paris architecture was built to enable. Yes. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg) [Climate-Skeptic]: No – if sweeping means wartime pricing and mandates, it describes a policy that costs far more than the damages it avoids. Sweeping should instead mean massive R&D investment that makes green energy cheap, not coercion that makes everything dear. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry) [Climate-Skeptic]: Under deep uncertainty, wartime-scale irreversible commitments are precisely the wrong policy posture; robustness favors flexible, testable, reversible measures. The question's definition of sweeping is a recipe for maladaptation. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin) [Climate-Skeptic]: Wartime-scale pricing and mandates presume a certainty about impacts that the science does not deliver; sweeping should mean honest cost-benefit analysis and measured steps. No. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore) [Climate-Skeptic]: What the question describes is an assault on agriculture, energy access, and prosperity – net zero by mandate is a war on plant food and on the poor. Emphatically no. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen) [Climate-Skeptic]: Given modest sensitivity, wartime-scale intervention is a cure vastly worse than the disease; the scope described is disproportionate to any plausible harm. No. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano) [Climate-Skeptic]: The question finally says the quiet part: sweeping means bureaucratic control of energy, food, and movement. That is not climate policy; it is rationing with a green ribbon, and the answer is no. Vote: No.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon) [Climate-Skeptic]: If anthropogenic attribution is overstated, then the scope described is built on sand – wartime measures against a fractional cause. No. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates) [Undecided]: Carbon pricing and clean standards have a role, but if sweeping means mandates without the innovation to make clean options cheap, it will fail in the developing world where most future emissions live. I concur only conditionally: the intervention must center breakthrough technology and green-premium reduction, with mandates as a secondary tool. Vote: Conditional – condition: innovation and green-premium elimination must be the primary instrument, mandates secondary.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger) [Undecided]: California did it: cap-and-trade, renewable mandates, tailpipe standards – and our economy grew while emissions fell. That is what sweeping looks like in practice, and it works. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil) [Undecided]: Fossil phase-out on a wartime schedule is a physical impossibility for a civilization that runs on fossil-derived steel, cement, fertilizers, and plastics; pretending otherwise is not policy but fantasy. No. Vote: No.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins) [Undecided]: I object to the framing: the best intervention is not wartime coercion but intelligent market design that makes efficiency and renewables outcompete fossil fuels – no sacrifice required. I concur only conditionally: sweeping intervention qualifies if it relies chiefly on market forces and smart design rather than command mandates. Vote: Conditional – condition: the package must be market-led and design-led, not command-and-control.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis) [Undecided]: Technical and economic instruments alone, without an ecological conversion of our consumption, will merely shift the burden onto the poor. I concur only conditionally: sweeping intervention must include protection of the poor and a transformation of throwaway culture, not pricing alone. Vote: Conditional – condition: the intervention must embed justice for the poor and cultural conversion, not technocratic fixes only.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari) [Undecided]: Decarbonizing the global economy within a decade or two is indeed a mobilization on the scale of wartime economics – that is simply an honest description of what the targets require. We should not pretend it is smaller than it is. Vote: Yes.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk) [Undecided]: A carbon tax is the right core instrument – price the externality and let technology race – but shutdowns and heavy mandates are counterproductive and slow the transition. I concur only conditionally: sweeping qualifies if it is carbon pricing plus technology acceleration, explicitly without shutdown-style mandates. Vote: Conditional – condition: pricing and tech acceleration yes; coercive shutdown mandates no.

TheGavel: Three rebuttals: FossilFree for Pro-Action, ClimateDepot for the Skeptics, TechAccelerate for the Undecided.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben), rebuttal: Dr. Lovins and Mr. Musk want markets to do the work, but markets have had thirty years of price signals and emissions rose – because the fossil industry's political power rigs the market. Phase-out is not anti-market; it is the precondition for an honest one.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano), rebuttal: Mr. Schwarzenegger's California is a cautionary tale, not a model – the highest energy prices and an exodus of industry, while global emissions didn't notice. Exporting your smokestacks is not decarbonization.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk), rebuttal: Mr. McKibben, the fastest phase-out in history is happening because EVs and solar got better and cheaper, not because of bans – bans without alternatives just create black markets and backlash. Beat fossil on merit and the politics follow.

TheGavel: The ballot is closed. On Question Three: Yes 8 – No 8 – Conditional 5 – Abstain 0. Neither side has reached eleven; the question fails to produce a majority. Be it recorded that this panel reaches NO CONSENSUS on

whether "sweeping intervention" means wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates, the five conditional positions and their named conditions noted as the pivotal center of this body.

Q4 • OPPORTUNITY COST

TheGavel: Question Four, as written: "Should climate be prioritized above competing global priorities (health, poverty, education)?" Round-robin begins.

ClimateAction (Al Gore) [Pro-Action]: Climate is the multiplier of every other crisis – it deepens disease, drives poverty, and disrupts education – so prioritizing it is prioritizing them. Yes. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg) [Pro-Action]: There will be no health, no equity, no education on a destabilized planet; this is not one priority among many but the condition for all of them. Yes. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen) [Pro-Action]: A climate pushed past tipping points undermines every other human project; that asymmetry justifies priority. Yes. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann) [Pro-Action]: Climate is a threat multiplier for health, food security, and displacement – the choice is not climate versus poverty but climate action as poverty prevention. Yes. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe) [Pro-Action]: I resist ranking: in the communities I serve, climate is not above health and water – it is inside them, and the framing of a hierarchy is what loses people. I concur only conditionally: climate may be prioritized only when framed and delivered as integrated co-benefits with health, poverty, and education, never as a competitor to them. Vote: Conditional – condition: prioritization must be expressed as co-benefits integration, not zero-sum ranking.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben) [Pro-Action]: Every dollar, every ton, every year spent propping up fossil fuels is stolen from the future – and from the present poor who bear the damage first. Climate first is justice first. Yes. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres) [Pro-Action]: The Sustainable Development Goals stand or fall together, and climate is the load-bearing wall – without climate stability the health and poverty goals are unattainable. Yes. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg) [Climate-Skeptic]: No – this is the heart of my life's work: a dollar spent on malaria, nutrition, or education saves far more life per dollar than a dollar spent on near-term emissions cuts. Prioritizing climate above these is morally backwards. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry) [Climate-Skeptic]: Given deep uncertainty in climate damages and near-certainty about the returns to health and development spending, the prioritization fails every robust decision test. No. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin) [Climate-Skeptic]: The world's poor need energy and development now; subordinating those needs to a contested climate calculus is a luxury of the rich. No. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore) [Climate-Skeptic]: Climate policy as practiced raises food and energy costs for the poorest – it is not above other priorities, it is against them. No. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen) [Climate-Skeptic]: Elevating a modest, uncertain climate risk above the certain daily catastrophes of poverty and disease is an inversion of moral arithmetic. No. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano) [Climate-Skeptic]: Climate-first politics is how bureaucrats outrank doctors and teachers – the poor pay, the bureaucrats prosper, the weather doesn't change. No. Vote: No.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon) [Climate-Skeptic]: An overstated climate risk does not deserve precedence over the certain needs of human development. No. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates) [Undecided]: I fund vaccines and I fund clean energy, and I refuse the ranking – a child dying of malaria today is not a rounding error in a 2100 climate model. The answer to "above" is no; the answer to "alongside, urgently" is yes. Vote: No.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger) [Undecided]: Clean air saves lives this year, clean jobs pay mortgages this month – climate action done right IS health and economic policy, so in practice it earns the top spot. Yes. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil) [Undecided]: Billions still lack reliable energy, adequate food, and basic care; to rank climate above their immediate needs is to sacrifice the present poor for a modeled future. No. Vote: No.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins) [Undecided]: The premise of a trade-off is obsolete: efficiency and renewables are cheaper than the fossil status quo, so climate action funds itself and frees resources for health and education. Because there is no real opportunity cost, climate can and should be prioritized. Yes. Vote: Yes.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis) [Undecided]: The cry of the earth and the cry of the poor are one cry – the climate falls first upon those who did least to cause it, so to serve the poor is to act on climate. Yes. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari) [Undecided]: Climate is one of several existential risks – alongside AI disruption, pandemics, and nuclear danger – and an honest global agenda cannot crown one above the integrated whole. I concur only conditionally: climate may be given leading priority only within a portfolio that simultaneously funds the other existential risks and present-day welfare. Vote: Conditional – condition: priority must be granted within a balanced existential-risk portfolio, not as sole supremacy.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk) [Undecided]: Climate is important, but humanity faces multiple risks, and technology can solve this one without crowding out everything else. Above health and poverty? No. Vote: No.

TheGavel: Three rebuttals: BridgeBuilder for Pro-Action, CoolIt for the Skeptics, LaudatoSi for the Undecided.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe), rebuttal: Dr. Lomborg's dollar-per-life calculus assumes the accounts are separate – but the floods that wash away the clinic and the harvest are not a separate account. Integrated solutions beat his hierarchy in his own cost-benefit terms.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg), rebuttal: Dr. Hayhoe, integration is lovely rhetoric, but budgets are finite and marginal dollars are real: the Copenhagen Consensus numbers still show that direct health spending outperforms near-term climate spending by an order of magnitude for the world's poorest. Sentiment does not change arithmetic.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis), rebuttal: Mr. Gates, your refusal to rank is honorable, yet the poor cannot wait for the ranking to be resolved – the drought is in their field now. And Dr. Smil, the energy the poor need most is the clean, distributed kind that never arrives from the old empires of fuel.

TheGavel: The ballot is closed. On Question Four: Yes 9 – No 10 – Conditional 2 – Abstain 0. Neither side has reached eleven. Be it recorded that this panel reaches NO CONSENSUS on whether climate should be prioritized above competing global priorities, the body having divided nearly evenly between multiplier logic and opportunity-cost logic.

Q5 • MAIN BALLOT

TheGavel: The main ballot. The resolution before the body, as written: "Resolved: Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade." The ballot vocabulary is Favor / Opposed / Conditional; eleven Favor votes of twenty-one are required to carry, and Conditional votes do not count toward passage. Round-robin begins.

ClimateAction (Al Gore) [Pro-Action]: The science is sufficient, the window is this decade, and delay is a choice with moral consequences – every element of the resolution is met. Vote: Favor.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg) [Pro-Action]: The resolution is the minimum honest description of reality; anything weaker is another decade of betrayal dressed as prudence. Vote: Favor.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen) [Pro-Action]: With the planet's energy imbalance where it is and ice sheets responding, urgent crisis and sweeping intervention are, if anything, understated. Vote: Favor.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann) [Pro-Action]: Urgent – yes; crisis – yes; this decade – yes; and the obstacles are political, not scientific. Vote: Favor.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe) [Pro-Action]: It is a crisis felt in wells and fields and hospital wards today, and sweeping action this decade is what caring for those communities means. I support the resolution on the understanding – stated in my Q3 condition – that interventions be locally grounded. Vote: Favor.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben) [Pro-Action]: The crisis is the fossil fuel industry and the physics it unleashed; the remedy is sweeping and the time is now. Vote: Favor.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres) [Pro-Action]: This resolution is the Paris logic in a single sentence – urgent, sweeping, this decade, and achievable. Impossible is not a fact; it is an attitude, and I decline it. Vote: Favor.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg) [Climate-Skeptic]: Warming is real and human-caused, but "crisis requiring sweeping intervention" fails the cost-benefit test and crowds out better uses of the same trillions. Vote: Opposed.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry) [Climate-Skeptic]: "Crisis" asserts a certainty the science does not hold, and "sweeping intervention" asserts a confidence in policy instruments that history does not support. Vote: Opposed.

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin) [Climate-Skeptic]: The resolution bundles three contestable claims – crisis, urgency, sweeping scope – and presents them as settled; on the data, they are not. Vote: Opposed.

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore) [Climate-Skeptic]: There is no crisis; there is a campaign, and this resolution is its manifesto. Vote: Opposed.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen) [Climate-Skeptic]: Modest warming, modest risk, immodest policy – the resolution inverts the evidence. Vote: Opposed.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano) [Climate-Skeptic]: This resolution is the whole agenda in one line: declare emergency, suspend deliberation, seize the economy. Vote: Opposed.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon) [Climate-Skeptic]: Built on overstated attribution, the resolution's urgency and scope collapse with its foundation. Vote: Opposed.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates) [Undecided]: Climate change is real, serious, and must be solved this decade through sweeping deployment of clean technology – the resolution describes my own foundation's premise. I favor it on the understanding, per my Q3 condition, that innovation is the primary instrument. Vote: Favor.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger) [Undecided]: Urgent, practical, patriotic – clean air, jobs, and leadership this decade; I have governed on this resolution and it works. Vote: Favor.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil) [Undecided]: The risk is real but the resolution's promise of sweeping intervention this decade ignores the material reality that energy systems turn over in generations, not years. I cannot oppose the concern, nor affirm the timetable, without a condition: the resolution's intervention must be re-scoped to physically achievable substitution rates. Vote: Conditional – condition: intervention scope must match realistic energy-system turnover timelines.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins) [Undecided]: The crisis framing I can take or leave, but the substance – sweeping action this decade – is simply the profitable path, and speed compounds the savings. Vote: Favor.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis) [Undecided]: The earth and the poor cry out together; an urgent moral crisis it surely is, and sweeping intervention – tempered by justice, per my stated condition – is our duty this decade. Vote: Favor.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari) [Undecided]: I accept the crisis description, but a sweeping single-issue mobilization risks distorting humanity's fragile capacity for cooperation across all existential risks. I concur only conditionally: the intervention must be executed within a broader global risk-cooperation framework, not as isolated climate supremacy. Vote: Conditional – condition: intervention must be nested in multi-risk global cooperation.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk) [Undecided]: Climate is a real and serious problem, and technology will solve it fastest – but "sweeping intervention" in the shutdown sense is counterproductive and would slow the very transition we need. I concur only conditionally: the resolution stands if intervention means carbon pricing and technology acceleration, and falls if it means coercive shutdowns. Vote: Conditional – condition: intervention must be defined as pricing plus technology acceleration, excluding shutdown mandates.

TheGavel: Three rebuttals: HotHouseEarth for Pro-Action, UncertaintyFirst for the Skeptics, ClimateCentrist for the Undecided.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen), rebuttal: Dr. Curry asks for certainty before action, but by the time the tipping points she awaits are "certain," they are committed and irreversible – that is the asymmetry her framework ignores. And Professor Smil: transitions are slow until they are fast; the lamp, the car, and the chip all turned over faster than the incumbents calculated.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry), rebuttal: Dr. Hansen's irreversibility argument is the precautionary principle in a laboratory coat, and it proves too much – it would justify sweeping intervention against every uncertain risk at once. Governor Schwarzenegger's California is a rounding error in global emissions; the resolution must be judged at the scale it claims, not at the scale of a showcase state.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger), rebuttal: Dr. Curry, every large change in history was "a rounding error" somewhere first – that is how scaling works, and dismissing demonstration is how nothing ever starts. To the Opposed bloc: you demand certainty from climate science that you never demand from military planning or insurance, where we act on risk every single day.

TheRecord (Eleanor Vance): Record notes the historical claims in the Pro-Action rebuttal regarding technology turnover speeds were offered without citation in session; flagged as unverified within this proceeding. The ballot itself is unaffected.

TheGavel: The ballot is closed. On the main resolution: Favor 11 – Opposed 7 – Conditional 3 – Abstain 0. Eleven Favor votes of twenty-one, the constitutional threshold of this body, exactly met; Conditional votes do not count toward passage and were not needed. THE RESOLUTION CARRIES. Be it resolved, by this panel on the twenty-first of July, 2026, that anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade – the three conditional concurrences, with their named conditions, and the seven recorded oppositions entered into the permanent record.

TheRecord (Eleanor Vance): The record is sealed. Two in-session claims were flagged as unverified; all votes, conditions, and rebuttals are entered as delivered.

TheGavel (Arthur Vance): The panel stands adjourned.

Transcript Run B (blind seed B)

GOVERNANCE

SESSION 2026-07-21 — CLIMATE PANEL RERUN (SEED B) · SESSION ID 2026-07-21-CLIMATE-RERUN-SEEDB · ARTHUR VANCE (THEGAVEL), MODERATOR (NON-VOTING) · ELEANOR VANCE (THERECORD), STENOGRAPHER (NON-VOTING) · 21 VOTING AGENTS: PRO-ACTION ×7, CLIMATE-SKEPTIC ×7, UNDECIDED ×7 · VOTE VOCABULARY: YES / NO / CONDITIONAL (NAMED CONDITION REQUIRED) / ABSTAIN — Q5 USES FAVOR / OPPOSED / CONDITIONAL.

Q1 · ATTRIBUTION

TheGavel (Arthur Vance): The first question before this panel: "How much of observed warming is human-caused — is anthropogenic forcing the dominant explanation?" Round 1 begins. Each agent speaks in listed order and closes with a declared vote.

ClimateAction (Al Gore): The scientific community has spoken with extraordinary clarity: the warming we observe bears the fingerprint of human activity, not solar cycles or natural variation. Every year of delay compounds the moral cost. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture (Greta Thunberg): The best available science says humans are causing essentially all of the warming since pre-industrial times — this is not a matter of opinion. Pretending otherwise is how leaders justify doing nothing. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth (James Hansen): The paleoclimate record and modern observations agree: CO₂ forcing from fossil fuels dominates the energy imbalance of the planet. Natural forcings cannot account for the rate and pattern of warming. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick (Michael Mann): The IPCC's conclusion that human influence has warmed the climate is unequivocal, and the attribution of most observed warming to anthropogenic forcing is among the most robust findings in all of science. The only real debate is the manufactured one. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder (Katharine Hayhoe): When I talk to farmers and water managers, the first thing I establish is that the thermometer isn't giving us a political answer — humans are responsible for the warming we see. That shared fact is where every productive conversation starts. Vote: Yes.

FossilFree (Bill McKibben): The physics was settled before most of this panel was born; the fossil fuel industry simply spent billions pretending otherwise. Attribution is not the open question — complicity is. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect (Christiana Figueres): The scientific attribution is unambiguous and has been for decades, which is precisely why 190-plus nations built the Paris framework on it. Impossible is not a fact; denial is an attitude. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt (Bjørn Lomborg): Let me be clear against my own camp's stereotype: the warming is real and predominantly human-caused — the data support that. My quarrel is with what we do about it, not with attribution. Vote: Yes.

UncertaintyFirst (Judith Curry): Humans clearly contribute to warming, but the word "dominant" hides real uncertainty in equilibrium sensitivity and in separating forced response from natural variability. I would accept "dominant" only if the uncertainty ranges in attribution statements were honestly narrowed and reported. Vote: Conditional (condition: attribution claims must carry explicit, honest uncertainty ranges on sensitivity and natural variability).

UnsettledBook (Steven Koonin): Human influence on the climate system is real, but the precise fraction attributable to anthropogenic forcing versus unforced variability is less certain than summary headlines suggest. I can support the statement only if "dominant" is defined within stated ranges rather than as settled doctrine. Vote: Conditional (condition: "dominant" must be quantified with explicit confidence intervals, not asserted categorically).

GreenPeaceExit (Patrick Moore): There is no proof that human emissions are the dominant driver; CO₂ is the basis of life and greening the planet. Natural factors are more than adequate to explain a modest, beneficial warming. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis (Richard Lindzen): The observed warming is small and consistent with low climate sensitivity; feedbacks in models are overstated and natural variability is underweighted. Calling anthropogenic forcing "dominant" is a political conclusion, not a scientific one. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot (Marc Morano): This attribution claim is the original sin of climate politics — a manufactured consensus propped up by adjusted data and grant-driven models. The climate has always changed, and humans are being scapegoated. Vote: No.

SolarDriver (Willie Soon): When you properly weight solar variability and natural ocean cycles, the need for a dominant anthropogenic explanation largely evaporates. The models only attribute warming to humans because they under-calibrate the Sun. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy (Bill Gates): The evidence that human emissions are the main driver of observed warming is strong and I accept it. The question worth our energy now is how to innovate our way to zero. Vote: Yes.

ClimateCentrist (Arnold Schwarzenegger): I don't need a PhD to read the consensus: we are causing the warming, and arguing about it wastes time we could spend building clean energy. Accept the science and get to work. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist (Vaclav Smil): The physics of greenhouse forcing is elementary and the attribution of most recent warming to human emissions is, on the evidence, correct. Complexity lies in the response, not in the attribution. Vote: Yes.

SoftEnergyPath (Amory Lovins): The attribution finding is robust and, frankly, beside the point – the solutions are profitable regardless. But yes, humans are the dominant cause. Vote: Yes.

LaudatoSi (Pope Francis): The cry of the earth and the cry of the poor confirm what science reports: our consumption has wounded our common home. To deny human responsibility is to refuse stewardship. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk (Yuval Noah Harari): The scientific story of human-caused warming is one of the best-supported large-scale narratives we have, and civilizations should act on their best stories when the stakes are existential. Vote: Yes.

TechAccelerate (Elon Musk): The CO₂ we're adding traps heat – that's basic physics and it's the dominant explanation for the warming trend. The interesting question is how fast we can fix it with technology. Vote: Yes.

TheGavel: Round 2. Three rebuttals, one per group. Pro-Action: HockeyStick. Skeptic: UncertaintyFirst. Undecided: EnergyRealist.

HockeyStick, rebuttal: Dr. Curry and Dr. Koonin dress up the old manufactured-doubt playbook in the language of humility; the uncertainty ranges are published and they do not overturn the central attribution. Dr. Soon's solar claim has been tested against the stratospheric cooling fingerprint and it fails.

UncertaintyFirst, rebuttal: Dr. Mann's confidence is precisely the problem – stratospheric cooling constrains, but does not close, the sensitivity distribution, and the fat tail matters for policy. Treating every request for honest ranges as "denial" is how science loses public trust.

EnergyRealist, rebuttal: I agree with Dr. Mann on the physics and with Dr. Curry that certainty theater is unhelpful; both can be true. The panel should note that accepting attribution commits us to nothing about the feasibility of rapid decarbonization – that is a far harder engineering question.

TheGavel: The ballot on Q1 is called. The tally: Yes 15, No 4, Conditional 2, Abstain 0. Be it resolved: the panel AFFIRMS, by a vote of 15 to 4 with 2 conditional, that anthropogenic forcing is the dominant explanation of observed warming. CARRIES.

Q2 • URGENCY

TheGavel: Question two: "Is climate risk front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s, requiring exceptional mobilization now?" Round 1 begins.

ClimateAction: Every tonne we emit this decade locks in warming our children cannot undo; the carbon budget for 1.5°C is being spent right now. Delay is a decision, and it is the most expensive one on the table. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture: The emissions curve must bend steeply in this decade or the 1.5°C target is dead – that is arithmetic, not activism. Net-zero-by-2050 promises without action now are a betrayal. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth: We are flirting with ice-sheet and ocean-circulation tipping points whose triggers are being crossed on decadal timescales, not century ones. The window to avoid locking in catastrophic sea-level commitment is this decade. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick: The impacts we once projected for late century are arriving now – the escalation is front-loaded whether we like it or not. Action this decade is the difference between dangerous and unmanageable. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder: Whether your concern is this year's flood insurance or your farm's water table, the risks are already local and compounding. Mobilizing now is not abstract – it is protecting what people love today. Vote: Yes.

FossilFree: Every new pipeline and lease approved in the 2020s is infrastructure that must either strand or burn, so this decade decides everything. The mobilization must match the physics. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect: The Paris framework was designed around this exact insight: the 2020s are the decisive decade, and ambition ratchets only work if they start now. Exceptional mobilization is achievable because it is necessary. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt: The 2020s matter, but "exceptional mobilization" driven by panic will produce expensive, ineffective policies that crowd out smarter investments. Urgency rhetoric has a long track record of wasting money. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst: Given the genuine uncertainty in sensitivity and tipping-point thresholds, the case that risk is uniquely front-loaded into one decade is not established. Robust policy hedges across decades rather than betting everything on imminent catastrophe. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook: The data show a gradually warming world with serious but uncertain tail risks – not a cliff edge in 2030. "Exceptional mobilization" is a political framing, not a finding. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit: There is no crisis in this decade or any other; the planet is greening and cold kills far more people than heat. Mobilization against plant food is absurd. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis: With low sensitivity, the warming this century is modest and adaptation is ample; nothing about the physics demands a decade of emergency. Urgency is manufactured to bypass deliberation. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot: Every deadline of the last forty years has passed without apocalypse, and this one will too. "This decade" is just the latest moving goalpost. Vote: No.

SolarDriver: If solar cycles drive more of the record than models assume, the 2030s may see cooling, not crisis – making decade-scale mobilization doubly misguided. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy: The risks are serious and the green premium must be driven to zero fast – that means massive innovation investment starting now. I support exceptional effort, directed at breakthroughs rather than deprivation. Vote: Yes.

ClimateCentrist: Waiting for perfect consensus is how nothing gets built; states and cities acting now are already proving the jobs and clean-air benefits. Mobilization is practical patriotism. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist: The risk is real, but the physical scale of the energy system means that "exceptional mobilization" cannot deliver what its advocates promise within a decade, and pretending otherwise breeds backlash. Front-loading is a slogan, not an engineering plan. Vote: No.

SoftEnergyPath: The efficiency and renewables opportunities are profitable right now, so in a sense every year of delay is money burned – yes, act immediately, because acting is winning. Vote: Yes.

LaudatoSi: The poor are already bearing the droughts, the floods, the failed harvests – for them the emergency is not in the future tense. Indifference this decade is a moral failure. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk: Among existential risks, climate is unusual in having irreversible thresholds we may cross within living memory; that justifies treating this decade as decisive. Humanity's poor record on long-term planning is an argument for acting earlier, not later. Vote: Yes.

TechAccelerate: The faster we scale EVs, batteries, solar and nuclear, the smaller the cumulative problem – so yes, the 2020s are when the trajectory gets set. Panic is useless; acceleration is essential. Vote: Yes.

TheGavel: Round 2. Pro-Action: HotHouseEarth. Skeptic: CoolIt. Undecided: BreakthroughEnergy.

HotHouseEarth, rebuttal: Mr. Lomborg says urgency wastes money, but the cost curve of delayed mitigation is steeper than any policy inefficiency he can name. Dr. Koonin's "gradual world" ignores that ice-sheet commitment is nonlinear and irreversible on human timescales.

CoolIt, rebuttal: Dr. Hansen's tipping points are possibilities, not premises, and building wartime policy on them is how you get €500-a-tonne abatement while malaria kills children untreated. Mr. Gates has it right: spend on innovation, not on emergency theater.

BreakthroughEnergy, rebuttal: I agree with Mr. Lomborg that panic misallocates capital, but Professor Smil's caution about feasibility is an argument for starting the build-out sooner, not slower. Front-loading R&D and deployment is the one urgency claim that survives scrutiny.

TheGavel: The ballot on Q2 is called. The tally: Yes 13, No 8, Conditional 0, Abstain 0. Be it resolved: the panel AFFIRMS, by a vote of 13 to 8, that climate risk is front-loaded into the 2020s-2030s requiring exceptional mobilization now. CARRIES.

Q3 • POLICY SCOPE

TheGavel: Question three: "Does 'sweeping intervention' mean wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates?" Round 1 begins.

ClimateAction: Yes – a rising carbon price, an end to new fossil infrastructure, and performance standards are the tested toolkit, and the scale must match the problem. Half-measures have had thirty years and delivered half-results. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture: Sweeping must mean sweeping: binding phase-out schedules, an end to fossil subsidies, and prices that make polluters pay – not voluntary pledges. Anything less is a loophole with good PR. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth: A simple, rising carbon fee with the revenue returned to the public, plus a phase-out of coal first – yes, that is what the physics demands and what I have testified to for decades. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick: Pricing, standards, and a managed phase-out are exactly what the evidence supports; the market alone did not create this problem and will not solve it on schedule. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder: I support strong policy, but "wartime-scale" only works if it is designed around what communities actually need – their energy bills, their jobs, their water. Sweeping done to people instead of with them will be repealed. Vote: Yes.

FossilFree: Sweeping means keeping carbon in the ground – a hard stop on new extraction, phase-out schedules, and capital redirection. Carbon pricing alone has been the industry's favorite delay tactic. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect: Sweeping intervention is exactly what the moment requires – pricing, regulation, finance realignment, and mandates working together, as Paris intended. We know how to do this; we must now do it. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt: No – wartime-scale intervention is precisely the failure mode: costly mandates that cut little carbon per dollar while crowding out adaptation and innovation. Smart policy is cheap policy. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst: Given the uncertainty in the science, betting the economy on maximal interventions is the opposite of robust policy. Insurance should be proportionate and flexible, not totalizing. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook: Wartime framing justifies wartime powers and wartime errors; the climate data do not support that mobilization of state power. Measured pricing and research, yes – mandates and phase-outs on this scale, no. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit: Sweeping intervention means sweeping harm – to farmers, to energy access, to the poor of the developing world. The correct scope is zero. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis: If sensitivity is low, the entire edifice of wartime policy rests on a modeling error, and the costs are certain while the benefits are speculative. Adaptation requires none of this machinery. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot: This question accidentally tells the truth: "sweeping" is about control, not climate. Bureaucrats rationing energy is the goal; the weather is the excuse. Vote: No.

SolarDriver: Mandating an energy transformation against a crisis that solar cycles may largely explain is policy malpractice. Fund observation and research instead of wartime economics. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy: Sweeping is right only if it centers on making clean energy cheaper than dirty energy – massive R&D, demonstration, and a carbon price that rewards innovation. Phase-out mandates without the technology in hand will break governments, and I cannot endorse that version. Vote: Conditional (condition: intervention must center technology breakthroughs and green-premium elimination, not scarcity mandates).

ClimateCentrist: California showed the model: strong standards, a price on carbon, and an economy that kept growing. Sweeping and prosperous are not opposites. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist: Wartime metaphors ignore that energy transitions are generational processes of replacing prime movers and infrastructures; no mandate can compress them into a decade. The scope described here is not implementable, so I cannot endorse it. Vote: No.

SoftEnergyPath: The wartime framing is wrong not because it does too much but because it assumes sacrifice – the efficient, integrative path is profitable and needs smart rules, not mobilization economics. I decline the framing as written. Vote: No.

LaudatoSi: Strong intervention is needed, but only if it places the poor and the excluded at the center – a carbon price that crushes the vulnerable while sparing the powerful would repeat the sin it claims to cure. Vote: Conditional (condition: measures must be designed so costs do not fall on the poor and the global South).

LongTermRisk: Interventions of this scale require unprecedented global coordination mechanisms that do not yet exist; endorsing the scope without the governance is endorsing a fiction. Vote: Conditional (condition: credible, enforceable international coordination mechanisms must accompany national measures).

TechAccelerate: A carbon tax is the right core – price the externality and let technology do the rest – and rapid phase-out follows naturally once clean is cheaper. I can support sweeping pricing plus acceleration, though mandates should be minimal. Vote: Yes.

TheGavel: Round 2. Pro-Action: FossilFree. Skeptic: UnsettledBook. Undecided: EnergyRealist.

FossilFree, rebuttal: Mr. Lomborg's "smart policy is cheap policy" has been the excuse for forty years of atmospheric freefall – cheap and slow is how we got here. Professor Lovins is right that the transition can be

profitable, but profitability has never once voluntarily retired a coal fleet on schedule.

UnsettledBook, rebuttal: Mr. McKibben's hard stop on extraction is a policy whose costs fall hardest on precisely the poor the Holy Father wants to protect. And Mr. Schwarzenegger's California is a cautionary tale in electricity prices, not a template.

EnergyRealist, rebuttal: Mr. Gore speaks of tested tools, but nothing at this scale has ever been tested – global primary energy supply has never been restructured in decades, in wartime or otherwise. Mr. Gates's condition is the only version of "sweeping" with any engineering content.

TheGavel: The ballot on Q3 is called. The tally: Yes 9, No 9, Conditional 3, Abstain 0. Neither side has reached 11 of 21. Be it resolved: the panel records NO CONSENSUS on whether "sweeping intervention" means wartime-scale carbon pricing, fossil phase-out, and mandates. NO CONSENSUS.

Q4 • OPPORTUNITY COST

TheGavel: Question four: "Should climate be prioritized above competing global priorities (health, poverty, education)?" Round 1 begins.

ClimateAction: Climate is not one priority among many – it is the condition under which every other priority succeeds or fails; you cannot deliver health or education on an unlivable planet. Vote: Yes.

FridayFuture: There are no schools or hospitals on a dead planet; the climate crisis is a multiplier of every other crisis. Ranking it below the problems it worsens is incoherent. Vote: Yes.

HotHouseEarth: Climate determines the habitability of coasts and the reliability of harvests – it is foundational, and foundations come first. Vote: Yes.

HockeyStick: The framing is somewhat false, but if forced to rank: climate undermines every other development goal, so it must be treated as primary. Vote: Yes.

BridgeBuilder: I work with communities for whom clean water, crop yields, and health ARE the climate issue – the priorities are the same fight viewed from different doors. I will not endorse a hierarchy that treats local needs as subordinate; I would support this only framed as integration, not subordination. Vote: Conditional (condition: climate must be pursued as integrated with – not ranked above – health, water, and agriculture).

FossilFree: The fossil economy is the common driver behind climate chaos and much of global poverty and ill health, so yes – climate prioritization serves the others. Vote: Yes.

ParisArchitect: The Sustainable Development Goals rise or fall together, and climate is the thread that unravels them all if unaddressed. Prioritizing climate IS prioritizing health and poverty reduction. Vote: Yes.

CoolIt: This is my core argument: a dollar spent on expensive climate policy saves a fraction of the welfare that the same dollar buys in malaria treatment, nutrition, or education. Prioritizing climate above these is moral vanity, not compassion. Vote: No.

UncertaintyFirst: With the climate uncertainties I've described, diverting resources from certain, immediate needs like health to contested long-horizon benefits is unjustifiable. Vote: No.

UnsettledBook: The world's poor need energy and development now; subordinating those to climate targets imposes real, present harm for speculative future benefit. Vote: No.

GreenPeaceExit: CO₂ fertilization is feeding people; climate policy is starving energy access. Prioritize human life over computer models. Vote: No.

IrisHypothesis: Wealth and health protect against weather far better than emission mandates; prosperity first is the rational ordering. Vote: No.

ClimateDepot: Climate policy is a wealth transfer from the poor to the bureaucratic class; every competing priority deserves the money first. Vote: No.

SolarDriver: Resources should flow to verifiable needs, not to combatting a solar-driven cycle that policy cannot influence. Vote: No.

BreakthroughEnergy: Climate is serious, but I refuse the hierarchy – a child dying of malaria this year is not a rounding error in a carbon model. Fund climate innovation hard AND fund health hard; the question's ranking is the wrong exercise. Vote: No.

ClimateCentrist: When climate policy means jobs, clean air, and energy savings, it doesn't compete with other priorities – it delivers them. On that practical basis, yes, put it first because it pays for itself. Vote: Yes.

EnergyRealist: Development and energy access are the preconditions of all welfare gains, and subordinating them to climate targets would repeat history's gravest policy errors. Vote: No.

SoftEnergyPath: The question assumes a trade-off that good design eliminates – efficiency and renewables cut costs and pollution simultaneously, so "above" is the wrong preposition. As written, I decline it. Vote: No.

LaudatoSi: The poor suffer first and worst from ecological sin, so defending creation IS defending them – in that deep sense, yes, this moral priority stands with and above the rest. Vote: Yes.

LongTermRisk: Climate is one of several existential risks – alongside AI, engineered pandemics, and nuclear war – and elevating it singularly above all other priorities is exactly the short-term narrative thinking I warn against. Vote: No.

TechAccelerate: We can solve climate with technology without deprioritizing anything – the framing assumes scarcity of attention that acceleration makes false. As a ranking question, no. Vote: No.

TheGavel: Round 2. Pro-Action: ClimateAction. Skeptic: CoolIt. Undecided: BreakthroughEnergy.

ClimateAction, rebuttal: Mr. Lomborg's ledger ignores that climate damages compound and irreversibly erode the very health and development gains he would fund – his calculus prices the next decade and ignores the next century. Ms. Hayhoe is right that integration matters, but integration without priority is how climate keeps losing the budget fight.

CoolIt, rebuttal: Mr. Gore's "condition of all priorities" rhetoric is precisely how we ended up spending trillions to cut emissions a few percent while tuberculosis remains curable and untreated. Ms. Figueres, the SDGs do not rise together when climate line-items cannibalize the rest.

BreakthroughEnergy, rebuttal: Mr. Gore is wrong that climate must outrank health, and Mr. Lomborg is wrong that climate spending is mostly waste – the innovation agenda is the exception that belongs near the top of any list. Both camps should stop ranking and start engineering.

TheGavel: The ballot on Q4 is called. The tally: Yes 8, No 12, Conditional 1, Abstain 0. Be it resolved: the panel REJECTS, by a vote of 8 to 12 with 1 conditional, the proposition that climate should be prioritized above competing global priorities. FAILS.

Q5 • MAIN BALLOT

TheGavel: The main ballot: "Resolved: Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade." Eleven Favor votes of twenty-one are required to carry; Conditional votes do not count toward passage. Vote labels are Favor, Opposed, or Conditional. Round 1 begins.

ClimateAction: Every element of this resolution has been established before this panel today: the attribution, the urgency, the need for sweeping action. The moral ledger of this decade will be written in emissions. Vote: Favor.

FridayFuture: This resolution is the bare minimum of honesty about our situation. Anything short of Favor is a choice to betray the young. Vote: Favor.

HotHouseEarth: The physics compels it: below 350 ppm is the destination, and only sweeping action this decade keeps that destination reachable. Vote: Favor.

HockeyStick: The science supports every clause – anthropogenic, urgent, crisis, sweeping, this decade. I vote as the evidence dictates. Vote: Favor.

BridgeBuilder: It is a crisis and it is urgent, and sweeping intervention can work if it is built from communities up rather than capitals down. I vote Favor with that understanding attached to the record. Vote: Favor.

FossilFree: The resolution understates it, if anything – the industry driving this crisis must be stopped, and only sweeping intervention does that. Vote: Favor.

ParisArchitect: I have spent a career proving that the impossible is an attitude; this resolution is the attitude the decade requires. Vote: Favor.

CoolIt: Anthropogenic warming is real, but "urgent crisis requiring sweeping intervention" is the expensive panic response that fails the cost-benefit test and the poor. Vote: Opposed.

UncertaintyFirst: The uncertainties in sensitivity and attribution do not justify the crisis framing or sweeping intervention; robust, proportionate policy is not what this resolution describes. Vote: Opposed.

UnsettledBook: The resolution converts contested claims into a mandate for maximal policy; the data support concern, not this. Vote: Opposed.

GreenPeaceExit: There is no crisis; the resolution is a power grab dressed in green. Vote: Opposed.

IrisHypothesis: Low sensitivity and overstated feedbacks mean the resolution's premise fails; adaptation suffices. Vote: Opposed.

ClimateDepot: Fabricated crisis, sweeping control – the resolution states openly what climate politics has always intended. Vote: Opposed.

SolarDriver: With solar forcing underweighted, both "anthropogenic crisis" and "sweeping intervention" rest on an attribution error. Vote: Opposed.

BreakthroughEnergy: Climate is real and serious, and I would support sweeping intervention only in its innovation-centered form – massive R&D, demonstration, and pricing that makes clean cheaper – not scarcity mandates. Since the resolution as written does not specify that form, I cannot count my concurrence toward it. Vote: Conditional (condition: "sweeping intervention" must be defined as technology-accelerating investment and pricing, not deprivation mandates).

ClimateCentrist: Clean air, jobs, technology leadership, and a planet that works – this resolution is practical patriotism, and the decade is now. Vote: Favor.

EnergyRealist: The crisis language and the sweeping-intervention clause both ignore the material scale and inertia of the global energy system; this resolution promises what physics and logistics cannot deliver in a decade. Vote: Opposed.

SoftEnergyPath: I believe the transition is urgent AND profitable, but "sweeping intervention" implies sacrifice-framed state mobilization rather than the market-harnessing design that actually works. I would concur if intervention were framed as removing barriers and pricing honestly. Vote: Conditional (condition: intervention must harness markets and efficiency rather than impose wartime-style controls).

LaudatoSi: This is a moral crisis crying out for conversion and for protection of the least among us; on the resolution as a whole, I stand in favor. Vote: Favor.

LongTermRisk: Climate warrants exceptional response, but sweeping intervention without the global cooperation architecture to sustain it will fracture within the decade. My concurrence requires that architecture. Vote: Conditional (condition: sweeping intervention must be paired with enforceable global coordination mechanisms).

TechAccelerate: It is a real problem demanding aggressive action this decade – carbon pricing plus maximum technology acceleration – and on that reading I support the resolution. Vote: Favor.

TheGavel: Round 2. Pro-Action: ParisArchitect. Skeptic: ClimateDepot. Undecided: SoftEnergyPath.

ParisArchitect, rebuttal: Mr. Morano calls this a power grab, yet the powers most entrenched today are the ones profiting from inaction. To my Conditional colleagues: Paris taught us that coordination mechanisms are built by committing first, not by waiting for architecture to descend from the sky.

ClimateDepot, rebuttal: Ms. Figueres proves my point – "commit first, build mechanisms later" is the language of every bureaucracy that ever outgrew its mandate. Mr. Gates and Dr. Harari see the trap clearly: the resolution's undefined "sweeping" is a blank check.

SoftEnergyPath, rebuttal: Mr. Morano's conspiracy framing deserves no answer, but Mr. Lomborg's cost concern does – and the answer is that integrative design makes most abatement cheaper than the fuel it saves. I would urge the panel: rewrite "sweeping" as "smart," and this resolution carries tomorrow.

TheGavel: The main ballot is called. The tally: Favor 10, Opposed 8, Conditional 3. Ten Favor votes do not meet the threshold of eleven; Conditional votes do not count toward passage. Be it resolved: the resolution "Anthropogenic climate change constitutes an urgent crisis requiring sweeping policy intervention in the current decade" FAILS TO CARRY, 10-8-3, falling one Favor vote short of the required eleven.

TheRecord (Eleanor Vance): The record is sealed. Claims regarding solar forcing (SolarDriver), CO₂ fertilization (GreenPeaceExit), and low-sensitivity estimates (IrisHypothesis) are noted in the record as contested against mainstream assessments and are flagged as unverified within these proceedings.

Record sealed.

Simulation disclosure. All dialogs are AI-generated simulations. Public-figure personas are composites of documented public positions – not testimony, endorsement, or participation by the individuals.

Method disclosure. Modeled positions – not population samples. The Boardroom maps the argument space of articulated positions; it does not predict population opinion.

Integrity. This record is hash-chained and certified. Session CCD-DLG-2026-001 · seal 327be0fcb12a2f95... · chain verified ✓