

Freedom Matters

A Weekly Newsletter

Dane County, Wisconsin

Vol. 3, No. 22

Friday, May 30, 2003

We are a free people in a republic, under a constitution which limits the powers of government to those necessary to secure the unalienable rights of each person to their life, liberty and property. Yet, when a legislature is in session, no one's life, liberty or property is safe. It's the curse of a democracy. That's why we have a republic instead. *Freedom Matters* dedicates itself to the fight to restore our republic. Most of the press and courts fail to do so. They've forgotten that freedom matters.

Sustainable Development Is Unsustainable. Part 8. Blowing Hot and Cold on Climate

by Bob Bowman

Beckerman, in *A Poverty of Reason*, devotes a chapter to the part of Sustainable Development that deals with climate change. The current fad of scientists is to trumpet that we are threatened by global warming. Fifty years ago, their fad was to threaten a new ice age. So you see, even scientists are gullible.

Sustainable development was invented as a way to "rescue" humankind from the Malthusian threat that was raised in the 1972 book *The Limits to Growth*, namely, that population would overwhelm the resources of the earth. That was an old theory by Malthus, newly revived by processing it through a COMPUTER MODEL. In our modern age, computer models are accorded the reverence previously reserved for tablets from Mt. Sinai.

How apropos, then, that the global warming fad rests most heavily on the results of processing weather data through a COMPUTER MODEL. Actually, there are competing computer models, with material differences in their presumptions, and in the results they yield. One simply picks the model that fits best. Fits what? Fits one's wishes, it seems, as you will see.

Beckerman is good at boiling down issues to their essence. For global warming, he says that for society to know what action to take, the following three key points need to be established:

1. that predictions of climate change are reliable;
2. that the damage from such change will exceed the costs of limiting or of preventing it; and
3. that such costs are distributed equitably.

He notes that only the first point gets much attention, because it is the only one with any strength at all. On that one, he says he is not qualified to discuss the science of it, because he is not a scientist nor a film star nor a former U.S. vice president. He does note that it is a contentious issue, but he opts to assume that the majority scientific consensus is correct, that man-made emissions of carbon dioxide will produce some rise in mean global temperature over the course of the 21st century.

Beckerman is an economist, not only in fiscal matters, but in verbal debate. He skips the debate about what is causing our warmer weather as not worth it, because the amount of global warming projected by the majority scientific consensus appears unlikely to cause enough adverse effects to justify the costs of trying to curb carbon dioxide emissions. The projected global warming, Beckerman cites, will impose a 1% cost on the world economy (about \$5 trillion), meaning that people will have to wait until 2101 to be as rich as they would have been in 2100. To try to restrain the temperature rise to 1.5 degrees C, on the other hand, would cost over \$37 trillion; i.e., it's not worth it.

Furthermore, Beckerman says, societies that are highly developed can adapt far better to climate change than can societies that are poorly developed, based on both theory and data. The costs of drastic efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions now would also fall disproportionately on the poor, and the attempts by elitists in the highly developed countries to impose such efforts on the world economy has been characterized as a modern form of imperialism. How ironic, that those who claim the moral high ground for their global warming agendas turn out to be as exploitive as the Old Order they despise.

Finally, Beckerman notes, all of these calculations, including those related to Point 1, are highly speculative. This is true even of, or especially of, the **politically produced** "scientific" voice on climate change, namely the reports of the IPCC (The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change).

These IPCC reports were touted as the consensus report of 2000 climate scientists. They are not, testifies Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, MIT professor and lead author of the IPCC Third Assessment Report. Lindzen said that only a few of the 2000 scientists who contributed to the IPCC reports have done significant scientific research; the rest are routine weather service functionaries from many nations, because the concern in setting up the IPCC was to get a wide political base rather than scientific excellence. Lindzen reportedly said of the IPCC report that it: "uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say; uses language that means different things to scientists and laymen; exploits public ignorance over quantitative matters; exploits what scientists can agree on while ignoring disagreements to support the global warming agenda; and exaggerates scientific accuracy and certainty and the authority of undistinguished scientists." (see www.globalwarming.org, its RIP_files).

Lindzen is not alone in exposing the global warming theory as uncertain. A superb intellectual account is provided in "A Global Warming Primer" by Gerald E. Marsh, a physicist at Argonne National Laboratory.

Next issue will address Marsh's article.

[Errata: Vol. 3, # 17 - 21 were incorrectly dated 2002. They are 2003. Please correct your copies.]

Want back issues of Freedom Matters?

Two web sites carry some of them.

<http://www.fairnessinlaw.org/>
<http://www.takebackwisconsin.com/>

Help!

Help keep *FreedomMatters* a weekly: send cash, ideas, or articles you would like to see published. Any donations by check make payable to: Freedom Matters, Inc.

Readers' Bulletin Board. e-mail us your comments. Include your name, for publication by *Freedom Matters*

*** Published by Freedom Matters, Inc., Cross Plains, WI. 53528, Michael Byrne, Editor ***
To subscribe or unsubscribe, e-mail to rebshar@chorus.net, or call Bob at (608) 831-6653.
Our e-mail subscriber list is confidential. We will not sell it or reveal it.

Back Issues of Freedom Matters are available, as e-mail.