



Delft University of Technology

Climate activists — rethink fossil-fuel subsidy cuts

van den Bergh, Jeroen; van Beers, Cees; King, Lewis C.

DOI

[10.1038/d41586-023-01620-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01620-x)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Nature

Citation (APA)

van den Bergh, J., van Beers, C., & King, L. C. (2023). Climate activists — rethink fossil-fuel subsidy cuts. *Nature*, 617(7961), 465. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01620-x>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

Correspondence

Climate activists — rethink fossil-fuel subsidy cuts

Climate activists in several countries are calling for an end to fossil-fuel subsidies. However, estimates of the extent to which this tactic would cut global emissions depend on how subsidies and the social cost of carbon are calculated. From a pricing perspective, it could be more effective to charge sources for their carbon emissions directly.

The social cost of carbon (the externality, or economic damage to society of emitting one tonne of carbon dioxide) is unpriced, because the emitter isn't charged for it. Genuine (that is, pre-tax) subsidies and unpriced externalities are often combined to calculate total subsidies. In 2015, these were estimated to exceed US\$5.3 trillion, of which 6.3% was pre-tax subsidies (D. Coady *et al. World Dev.* **91**, 11–27; 2017).

The social cost of carbon used in such subsidy estimates has been estimated at US\$25.0–42.3 per tonne, but could be much higher (K. Rennert *et al. Nature* **610**, 687–692; 2022). The relative monetary value of pre-tax fossil-fuel subsidies would then be close to 1% of the unpriced externalities. Activists and policymakers should therefore prioritize carbon pricing to capture unpriced climate externalities.

Jeroen van den Bergh Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
jeroen.bergh@uab.es

Cees van Beers Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.

Lewis C. King Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.

Chronic pain: try new routes to more tailored treatments

Many people with chronic pain do not respond to the treatments available (see *Nature* **615**, 782–786; 2023). Clinical practice therefore needs more specific, evidence-based approaches to mitigating long-term pain.

Chronic pain is biologically complex, prevalent and subjective. When maladaptive, it forces a person to focus on their suffering body, thereby diminishing their connection with the world beyond. General analgesics for pain, such as opioids or drugs designed for other pathologies, tend not to be particularly effective. Ideally, treatments should target the underlying mechanisms and take into account how the individual experiences pain, but both these factors are poorly understood.

For example, immune, glial and other non-neuronal cells are fundamentally involved in the modulation of pain (H. Starobova *et al. J. Neurochem.* <https://doi.org/j872>; 2022). Translational research is needed into how such cells and affected tissues (nerves, muscles) contribute to pain pathways (N. T. Fiore *et al. Nature Rev. Neurol.* **19**, 199–220; 2023). And variations in the ways in which people experience pain should be considered when developing personalized, non-pharmacological strategies (L. M. McCracken *Eur. J. Pain* <https://doi.org/j873>; 2023).

Pablo R. Brumovsky, Mariano Asla, Marcelo J. Villar Universidad Austral, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
mvillar@austral.edu.ar

Marine heatwaves: definition duel heats up

Changing the commonly used definition of a marine heatwave from a fixed to a shifting temperature baseline (D. J. Amaya *et al. Nature* **616**, 29–32; 2023) would be inconsistent with current trends and confuse communications relating to extreme conditions.

A fixed-baseline definition reflects the increasingly frequent and devastating biological impacts of marine heatwaves (K. E. Smith *et al. Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **15**, 119–145; 2023). A shifting baseline artificially decouples processes that act on different timescales, so it cannot reveal the increasing risks caused by climate change. This could create the false impression that temperature extremes and their associated impacts will remain almost unchanged.

In line with the World Meteorological Organization's recommendations for comparing the effects of climate extremes over time (see, for example, IPCC *The Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate* <https://doi.org/j8q8>; Cambridge Univ. Press, 2022), the fixed-baseline approach has been widely adopted by the scientific community and policymakers. This ensures consistency across disciplines in comparing the evolving impacts of atmospheric heatwaves, sea-level changes and marine heatwaves. This consistency should be maintained to minimize stakeholder and public confusion.

Alex Sen Gupta* University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
a.sengupta@unsw.edu.au
*On behalf of 13 signatories. See go.nature.com/3pdrhgs

HOW TO SUBMIT CORRESPONDENCE

Please consult the full author guidelines and policies at go.nature.com/cmchno before e-mailing your submission to correspondence@nature.com. It should not be sent as an attachment.

The following cannot be considered: technical comments on peer-reviewed research papers; responses to articles published in journals other than *Nature*; contributions that present primary research data; and submissions that do not comply with the section's strict length and style requirements. Submissions must not be under consideration elsewhere.

Please make clear in your proposed text its pertinence to *Nature's* global readership. Ensure that you include a link to any article under discussion and references or links for fact-checking of all statements, in addition to the limited number of references necessary for publication.