



# **Climate Change Alarmism: Bureaucratism vs. Adaptation**

**Bienvenido “Nonoy” Oplas, Jr.**

**February 10, 2009**

Below are three papers on the subject. The first two are my essays that I recently contributed for the online magazine, [www.thelobbyist.biz](http://www.thelobbyist.biz). The third paper, a long one, is a series of comments and exchanges on the subject. Here, ideas are raw and frank, questions are more pointed, and some humor is injected. Read on!

## **(1) Climate change alarmism vs. economic recession**

12 December 2008

[http://www.thelobbyist.biz/column\\_detail.php?id\\_article=1033&id\\_category=25](http://www.thelobbyist.biz/column_detail.php?id_article=1033&id_category=25)

Today, the United Nations’ 14th Session of the Conference of Parties on Climate Change (UN COP-14) ended its nearly two weeks of meetings in Poznan, Poland. Top UN leaders, top environment and climate change officials and bureaucrats of many countries attended that meeting. Their main goal was supposed to hammer a common agreement for “new emissions cut,” among others, when the Kyoto Protocol expires in 2012 -- just four years from now.

They did not succeed in such a goal as the few “climate rebels,” energy and environment ministers from some countries who oppose drastic emission cuts, like

killing coal and other cheaper energy sources and rush renewable but more expensive energy sources, became more assertive.

It is true that there is climate change. The same way that people change, cars and mobile phones change, sports and culture change, cities and communities change, the world and its geography change. Sunspots and solar rays change, expansion or contraction of the universe change, and earthquake belts change. So do climate change. And there are dozens of different factors that contribute to climate change, not just humanity's economic activities.

Instead of planning how to "stop" climate change, humanity's energy and efforts would be better diverted to discussing how to adapt to climate change. People from the tropics adapt to weather and freezing temperatures in the north and southern parts of the globe. And vice versa.

But some environment regulators and bureaucrats are salivating at new taxes, fees and fines, regulations and prohibitions to invent, to "stop" climate change. They will also plan what to do with existing high petroleum taxes, whether to retain or further hike them or not. Or plan what power sources to be allowed and subsidized, and what to be heavily-regulated, if not killed. Or plan and propose what new environmental bodies and commissions to be created, complete with big funding and big staff, or what new powers to be vested in existing environmental bureaucracies. People should be afraid of these bureaucrats instead.

The Philippine government recently added a new bureaucracy under the Office of the President called the "Presidential Adviser on Global Warming and Climate" with Cabinet position. The head of this new bureaucracy is a former Senator and former Environment Secretary. He also went to Poznan with a very ambitious Philippine goal of "A 50% reduction in CO2 emissions by 2050." See the news report [here](#).

Here in the Philippines, there are very few people and groups who are not enamored by the "principally human-induced climate change" theory. One of them is Dr. Perry Ong, the Director of Institute of Biology of the University of the Philippines (UP). In May this year, he presented in one of UP's big "centennial lectures" a paper entitled "Anthropogenic Global Warming: Beyond the Hype, Doing the Right Thing for the Right Reason".

In that paper, Dr. Ong said "GHGs spawned by humans contribute merely 33% to global warming compared to the 67% traced to natural causes, which include changes in solar radiation, volcanic eruptions and the shifting of the earth's tilt and orbit... Climate change has become a convenient excuse when there are other [environmental] issues that need to be addressed... If we disproportionately blame ourselves for [climate change], our response will be different ... we should look at the [bigger picture] and address other issues." The news report can be viewed [here](#).

Perhaps the world's biggest coalition of independent think tanks and civil society groups that recognize there is climate change but does not believe in more government

intervention and regulation to “stop global warming”, is the Civil Society Coalition on Climate Change (CSCCC). Our think tank, [Minimal Government Thinkers, Inc.](#) is the only Philippine-based institute that is one of the 50 member-organizations of this coalition from 38 countries, all of which are non-profit institutes and independent of political parties and government.

The CSCCC recently released its newest report, “[Which Policy to Address Climate Change?](#)”, authored by Prof. Julian Morris, Executive Director of International Policy Network (IPN). Prof. Morris argued that, “A cap on emissions of carbon would do little to protect humanity against the threat of climate change but would drastically increase the threat of global economic catastrophe.... For Ministers in Poznan to agree to cap carbon emissions in the near term would be economic lunacy. It would divert resources into ‘low carbon’ technologies and away from more productive uses – thereby slowing economic growth and harming the ability of the poor to address the real problems they face every day, such as diseases, water scarcity and inadequate nutrition.”

Incidentally, the Heartland Institute in the US will hold its second “International Conference on Climate Change 2009” on March 8–10, 2009 in New York. It has the subtitle, “Global warming crisis Cancelled: Was it ever really a crisis?” Visit [here](#) for details.

The current global financial turmoil would seem to be the biggest hindrance to new regulatory and bureaucratic plans by climate change alarmists. To pressure developing and emerging countries to cut their carbon emissions by over-regulating, if not killing, coal and other non-renewable but cheaper energy sources within a short period of time, would be asking the humanity to further hasten economic recession to spread to more countries in the world.

At the back of the minds of the hard core climate change alarmists, economic growth from developing countries that use more energy, more mobility of trucks, cars and buses that spew out more pollution as they consume more petroleum products, is bad. They would rather see lack of growth and more unemployment, more poverty, in those countries than see more carbon emissions added to the planet’s atmosphere.

People should expose and reject this kind of climate change alarmism.

## **(2) Global warming cancelled**

30 January 2009

[http://www.thelobbyist.biz/column\\_detail.php?id\\_article=1056&id\\_category=25](http://www.thelobbyist.biz/column_detail.php?id_article=1056&id_category=25)

Recently, the US and Europe experienced some of their most nasty and icy winters on record. Even tropical countries like the Philippines also experienced a long and oftentimes nasty "cold front" the past two months and until early this month.

Consequently, news stories about global warming (GW) and climate change (CC) were not as frequent and virulent as last year.

The GW and CC scare, while supposedly a "wake-up call" for the rest of humanity to mend their ways so they can help "combat" GW and CC, is actually a very expensive and dangerous move. Expensive because all governments, rich and poor alike, are talking about several hundred billion dollars of funding and new foreign aid, to kill "dirty" energy sources and subsidize "clean" ones. Dangerous because GW and CC scare is being used as a convenient excuse to increase government control over the citizens' lives, income and decision making.

The government will now be producing new rules and regulations, new bureaucracies outlining what acts by the citizens will be penalized with taxes and fees -- if not imprisonment, what acts to be given government subsidies, and so on. This is effectively a new form of social engineering where the State further shapes our lives, our working and spending habits and our relationship with other people.

Meanwhile, governments continue to set up dozens of new agencies and bureaucracies that require regular funding from tax money. In the Philippines for instance, the government created a new and big bureaucracy called the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change (PTFCC). This body has also created 14 "task groups" to cover wide issues from rainwater conservation to outdoors and rooftop structures, including regulating and penalizing some activities and providing incentives to others. The amount of new government personnel to be hired just to monitor, who are violating certain regulations and who deserves incentives like subsidies, will be huge.

Lucky though, there is a growing number of people, especially scientists and policy makers, NGOs and think tank leaders around the world, who are not enamored by the continuing GW and CC scare. They recognize that there is climate change, the same way that people change and cultures, communities and technologies change. But they do not believe that the answer is more government environmental and taxation regulations, but rather adaptation by the people to the changing climate and its consequences, changing hydrologic pattern, changing agricultural production, and so on.

One of such international think tanks that does not believe in the GW scare, is the Heartland Institute in Chicago. It is sponsoring the 2nd International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC), and it will be supported by more than 40 other independent think tanks including Minimal Government Thinkers, Inc., as co-sponsors. The event will be held in New York on March 8 to 10, 2009.

Among the speakers in the conference will be Vaclav Klaus, Jose Maria Aznar and Dr. Jack Schmitt. Vaclav Klaus is the President of the Czech Republic, and the current president of the European Union. He wrote a recently-published book, *Blue Planet in Green Shackles*, where he argued that the debate over GW has "become a symbol and example of the clash between truth and propaganda."

Jose Maria Aznar is the former Prime Minister of Spain. He calls GW alarmism as a form of "new religion". Dr. Jack Schmitt is a retired astronaut, the last living man to walk on the moon. Other speakers in the Conference will be Willie Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics; and Richard Lindzen of MIT and one of the world's leading experts in dynamic meteorology, especially planetary waves.

The current global financial turmoil proved to be an ally and a friend of GW scare. A friend because demand for petroleum products in many countries around the world has plummeted, resulting in lower oil consumption and lower air pollution. But it is also an enemy of GW scare because even governments of rich countries are running out of money for huge subsidies for "clean" energy sources, as governments are diverting huge amount of tax money for fiscal stimulus and to bail out their collapsing huge banks and corporations.

Adaptation by people, not more government environmental regulations and taxation, remains the best measure to cope with climate change.

### **(3) Comments and Exchanges**

I posted the above 2 articles in [pilipinasforum@yahoogroups.com](mailto:pilipinasforum@yahoogroups.com), an online discussion group, and it generated the following exchanges. All these comments are posted with the permission of all authors.

*February 4, 2009*

Hi Noy, others,

The same happens every year in which there are greater than normal number of typhoons in the Pacific or hurricanes in the Atlantic. The scare mongers immediately blame global warming and predict more to occur the following year. When the following year has a lower than normal number of severe typhoons these people become very quiet and hope nobody remembers their predictions. Similar to those who were predicting the price of oil to surpass \$200 per barrel by the end of 2008.

I believe that we are in a period of climate change and will continue to see instability in our weather patterns, but I have my doubts that carbon dioxide is the primary contributor. Yes, the levels of CO<sub>2</sub> have increased over the last century but the question of whether this is the cause of any climate change or is incidental to it remains in question. I believe too many scientists and groups saw this as a 'cause celeb' which could draw financing and attract attention. These were of course followed by various politicians and celebrities who saw a cause they could jump onto. This all reminds me on the millennium bug which was supposed to make cars stop operating, elevators to stop working, and public utilities to grind to a halt on January 1st, 2000.

With that all said, I don't believe we should ignore climate change, but to throw billions in public funds all in the basket of CO2 reduction seems ridiculous. I firmly believe we should be looking into reduction of pollutants of all sorts, preservation of the natural habitat, sustainable development and renewable energy sources. These just make sense and should make for a more healthy and pleasant living environment.

One place that I don't necessarily take the minimal government and pure market driven viewpoint is that the market drives for constant efficiency and elimination of excess. I believe we need to invest into establishment of emergency stocks of food and sufficient excess capacity in utilities to ensure that when natural (or manmade) disasters occur in one location or another there is global capacity to fill the void.

-- Cynthia Diaz

You're right on the money, Cyn! I believe there is climate change, our partner think tanks and institutes also believe there is climate change. What we don't believe or agree with, is that we need more government environmental regulations, more taxation, to "fight" climate change. We believe that human adaptation – by individuals, companies, communities, etc. – is the more practical, least costly and least interventionist way to deal with climate change.

-- Nonoy Oplas

Noy, just a comment on the terms.  
I consider myself a climate change alarmist.

I think alarmist is just too strong a term for us. It unnecessarily brands us as modern day bearded placard-bearing doomsday prophets.

Adaptation is one solution, usually attractive to those resistant to climate change mitigation measures because of its economic impact (less coal, gas, fossil fuel, less development, more regulation). But mitigation is equally important. Of course, when fish stocks disappear due to sea level rise, we can always ask the fisherfolks to adapt to hunger.

And I honestly believe that not all climate change work is merely for the sake of making a trend out of a cause over which people can make a killing. Ask the scientists. I really don't think any of them have turned millionaires overnight just for doing "alarmist" research for the UNFCCC.

I respect equally the opinion of Perry Ong, as much as I respect honest government efforts towards more regulation for greener energy (compact fluorescents for your incandescent bulbs, anyone?) Some of these do make sense, and so do a lot of the alarmist research on global warming and its anthropogenic source. I really don't know where these attacks on global warming efforts are coming from. Although I am sure several, if not most of them, are also primarily funded by fossil fuel companies. I think it's equally fair to say that many "experts" are also making a killing out of their "non-

anthropogenic" , "non-alarmist" studies and opinions on climate change peddled to counter the "cause celeb" of the UNFCCC thrust on mitigation. More than the alarmists making a killing, I think quite the opposite is true. It is the de-alarmists who stand to make more money out of research supporting the safety of continued reliance on fossil fuels, or the propagation of adaptation strategies, to the point of claiming that climate change might actually be good for the world (the Arctic ice melts, new shipping lanes open, cheaper trade routes, more oil for exploration under the Arctic sea).

When the ice melts, it has to go somewhere. And when the sea rises, I don't think adaptation simply means building better houses on stilts, or learning to plant a super rice hybrid that can grow under a feet of seawater, or growing taller Filipinos (although that might be a boon for our basketball-crazed rural areas). It means real problems of diminished fish stocks, dying corals, and reduced sea harvests.

I for one, as an alarmist, do not see the point of waiting for the Arctic to melt first before realizing that adaptation can only take us so far. Or maybe humans after all can grow gills and start living in the oceans as another adaptation measure?

-- Jojo Garcia

Hi Jojo, clear, frank, counter-comments, I appreciate that.

If the term "alarmists" would hurt you, apologies then, but I feel that it's the appropriate word. Just here in the Philippines, 2 new national bureaucracies were created: (1) Presidential Adviser on Global Warming and Climate Change, under the Office of the President, headed by ex-sen. Heherson Alvarez, and (2) Presidential task force on Climate Change (PTFCC) under the Dept. of Energy, headed by DOE Sec. Angelo Reyes. Sen. Loren Legarda is proposing the creation of a separate Climate Change Commission. Some provincial Governors (like Albay Gov. Joey Salceda), city Mayors, have their own local government level task forces on climate change.

All these newly-created agencies are slurping new taxes and fees to maintain an ever-expanding army of climate change bureaucrats on top of DENR bureaucrats. When world oil prices were hitting \$150 or higher, the government was nowhere to be convinced to simply drop and abolish the excise tax (on top of VAT) for gasoline products because petroleum in the first place, is a "public bad" that creates pollution and contributes to global warming and hence, must be taxed as much as possible.

These new bureaucracies, these insensitivity to high and inflationary local oil prices because of multiple oil taxes, are a result of alarmist perspective. "We should be alarmed of man-made emissions, hence we should cap and limit such emissions, never mind declining economic activities and job creation due to distortionary and inflationary oil and environmental taxes and regulations, " goes the argument.

About companies and researches that develop clean and renewable energy sources, fine. We don't need government "support and subsidy" for them to prosper and

develop, alongside government not over-taxing them (how would you feel paying 47 different taxes and fees that constitute 50 percent of your commercial profit every single year?). Why, because there is big consumer demand. So many people now consider themselves "greens" and would be more than willing to patronize clean and renewable energy sources. If the demand is there, supply will follow. Market and price equilibrium says when the price is right, demand meets supply, and both consumers and producers are happy. There is zero need for government intervention there, except in cases of violation of people and enterprises' right to private property, right to life.

If you wonder where the attacks come from, it's from people -- like me -- who hate to pay additional taxes and fees to maintain additional govt. bureaucracies, people who hate additional environmental regulations that push the cost of dealing and complying with existing regulations.

Consider that "smoke emission test" (PhP 300/car x hundreds of thousands of vehicles) every year before one can renew his vehicle registration. Other government agencies themselves do not believe in the accuracy and truthfulness of such tests, so they put up random checks in highways to flag down (and cause unnecessary delays to) many vehicles (especially older ones) for emission tests. What if the climate change bureaucrats will later demand that all vehicles must undergo smoke emission test twice a year, that you need to present the result of those 2 tests to LTO before the latter will renew your car's registration? It's not being done yet, but it's possible. Why, because we should be alarmed of man-made pollution.

-- Nonoy

*February 5, 2009*

Hi Jojo,

While you may prefer to believe that the 'alarmists' are not the ones getting rich, you may not have noted that the global warming scare has engendered multibillion dollar global industries. Carbon credits and carbon trading organizations alone have become huge financial entities internationally. There are industries selling products and services related to global warming who have become major employers. There are global NGOs who use the fear of global warming to fill their coffers. Noy has also commented the increase in governmental bureaucracies which have been established worldwide to develop policies and regulations to counter global warming. Global Warming and its adherents have certainly developed a growth industry which all rely on convincing the public that carbon dioxide is the main culprit so don't bother to look deeper.

As I mentioned earlier, I am happy with research on developing better pollution control technologies and also on alternative energy resources. I just have a problem with the mindset that it is all due to carbon dioxide so we should impose taxes, add to already bloated bureaucracies and develop huge regulatory regimes which will heavily impact our economic development.



In recent years I have also read articles by astronomers who have reported that Mars also appears to be warming. I find hard to believe was caused by manmade carbon dioxide unless the two mars rovers managed to do it.

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/02/070228-mars-warming.html>

-- Cynthia Diaz

*February 6, 2009*

Noy, Cynthia,

I think my disagreement has just been defined.

When the science of anthropogenic climate change (upheld by the UNFCCC) is lumped together with all this government bureaucratic as well as private corporate and NGO "trends" of maximizing and using (or squeezing the hell out) of this climate change capital, it is greatly unfair to the former. I just get the impression that the latter is being used to discredit the former, using the bureaucrats and their taxes and regulations, and the financial institutions and their carbon credit trading mechanisms, to bash the scientists and the science. This is ad hominem argumentation.

Noy cites smoke emission tests as an example. LTO smoke emission tests have nothing to do with climate change science. LTO smoke emission tests are conducted for purposes of regulating air pollutants that have nothing to do with greenhouse gases that cause climate change, i.e., CO2 and methane. Smoke emission tests are mandated under the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Air Act has nothing to do with climate change or greenhouse gases. It deals with a totally different class of chemical air pollutants. But when you lump your disenchantment with smoke emission tests to climate change mitigation efforts, even when the former totally has nothing to do with the latter, you consciously attack mitigation strategies and the science that supports them. This is a non-sequitur argument.

If you intend to invalidate or discredit climate change science and the climate change mitigation militancy it inspires, I think you have to argue on the basis of scientific evidence, not on the basis of how the science equally inspires overzealous government regulatory reaction. It's simply not the science's fault, it is the fault of people in government, of bureaucrats, of GMA, of Angelo Reyes and his personal wish to take the DENR's mandate together with him to the DoE. Fault the bureacracy as the Bonapartist state, not the studies and research of hundreds of scientists arguing for active intervention to reverse incontrovertible evidence of anthropogenic climate change and its dire consequences. Fault incompetent public officials, not the Einsteins of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

If you argue the proposition for non-anthropogenic sources of climate change, argue the science behind it. Do not argue it by showing how climate change has been used by bureaucracies to expand regulations and impose more taxes, or how corporations

have jumped into the bandwagon for whatever profits it brings. It simply is not fair, or worse, logical. When you discredit climate change science and mitigation militancy per se (and call it alarmist) by showing how governments have used the same to expand their regulatory powers or private business to make money out of it, you are not being candid. I hate to point this out, but it dangerously treads on intellectual dishonesty.

Anthropogenic climate change is not accurate science. In fact, it is a myth, an alarmist fable imposed upon us by hundreds of scientists the world over who fare no better than Pisay ((Phil. Science High School) dropouts. Fine. Argue it. (Apologies to Pisay dropouts.)

Bureaucracy and government and business used climate change science as an excuse for less noble intentions other than truly effective mitigation efforts. Fine. No question about it.

Just don't lump the two together and argue how unreasonable the science is by giving examples of bureaucratic and capitalist opportunism. It's ad hominem, it's non-sequitur.

You just make it plainly sound like that the whole science of anthropogenic climate change is simply an invention for a neo-atavistic, non-progressive, anti-development ideology ironically championed by the bureaucracies, private enterprises and financial institutions of the most advanced and most developed capitalist countries in the world, particularly the EU. I hope you realise the gross contradiction and the patent fallacy in this position.

Please feel free to post this and the previous post.

-- Jojo Garcia

*February 9, 2009*

Jojo,

I guess you got confused on this tread. There was nothing in my earlier postings, as well as in my 2 articles, that said, "climate change science is wrong, a myth, a fable."

On the contrary, I wrote in my reply to Cynthia's posting,

"I believe there is climate change, our partner think tanks and institutes also believe there is climate change. What we don't believe is that we need more government environmental regulations, more taxation, to 'fight' climate change."

So all my previous postings and arguments was not "to bash the scientists and the science", to "invalidate or discredit climate change science", and "argue how unreasonable the science" is. Where did you get that impression or quotation?

The world climate can be +5 celsius or -5 celsius, or +15 or -15 celsius, by the end of this century. That is climate change, and I believe there is climate change. The same way that people change, communities change, sports and culture change, solar activities change, plants, animals and human evolution continue.

Also, I argued in my previous post that I favor market-driven CC mitigation innovation and business. I favor it because they are still part of human adaptation to CC. What I am against is additional government intervention, regulation and taxation, to "fight and mitigate" CC and global warming. If more companies will join the race to produce more effective solar panels, more efficient windmills, etc., fine. Then let governments abolish corporate income tax, dividend and capital gains tax, documentary stamp tax, etc. on those firms, in exchange for government not giving them "incentives" and subsidies. As demand for green and renewable energy sources increase, and as government distortion through multiple taxation and regulation decrease, suppliers of those commodities will find the sector highly profitable, and more players will come in, and the Greens, adaptationists and alarmists will both be happy.

The volume of human-induced CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere and in the planet is directly a function of economic activities. That is, we can say that

$$(\text{human-induced}) \text{ CO}_2 \text{ emission} = \text{GDP size} \times \text{Emission Intensity (EI)}$$

A country can have less emission intensity due to modern and less polluting technologies but if the GDP size is big, like the US and combined EU GDP, CO<sub>2</sub> emission will still be big.

Governments-inspired mitigation policies that target -30 percent (or higher) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within 20 or 30 years can only mean that (a) EI will significantly decline, or (b) GDP size will have to decline, or both. Since (a) cannot happen in a short period of time as various government-initiated distortions discourage the entry of so many investors and businesses into the sector (eg, coal companies closing their operations and running towards solar farms and wind farms production), the unexpected victim or sacrificial goat will be economic growth. Less trips by cars, jeepneys, trucks, buses, ships and airplanes = less pollution.

Meanwhile, as thick-icy winter still slam-dunk many parts of North America and Europe, and as tropical countries like the Philippines continue to have scattered rains even until February, global warming scare has mellowed.

With the on-going global financial troubles, people are very conservative in their spending. If energy price from "dirty" sources is cheap and energy price from "clean and renewable" sources is expensive, many self-declared Greens people will choose the former.

-- Nonoy

Hi Jojo,

I do not dispute that we are in a period of climate change. What I disagree with is the rush of politicians and actors who have jumped on the bandwagon espousing that it is due to CO<sub>2</sub> without having any idea of the science involved or having taken time to read counter-arguments. Unfortunately the anti-CO<sub>2</sub> crowd denigrates any counterarguments by simply claiming that their opponents must have been bought and paid for by the oil or coal industry so they are not worth considering – ‘discussion ended’.

The Earth has had many periods of climatic instability over the previous millennia and has swung from ice ages into hotter periods and back into ice ages with no notice of mankind’s presence. I can even agree that human activity has increased the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere but I am not convinced that it is the cause of the climatic instability.

Yes Jojo, please feel free to quote from various climate scientists, but there are plenty of other legitimate climate scientists who dispute the findings that you call ‘incontrovertible’. I am sorry, but incontrovertible means ‘impossible to deny or disprove’. The theory that CO<sub>2</sub> is causing climate change is far from incontrovertible as there are plenty of scientists who deny that it is fact. Even Dr. James Hansen who is known as the “father of global warming” and the guru from whom Al Gore learned of it, seems to have second thoughts about the subject when he said “The burning of fossil fuels produces a pall of particle haze that reflects as much of the sun's energy back into space as the release of carbon dioxide has trapped in the air,” according to The New York Times.

Reid Bryson, who is Emeritus Professor of Meteorology, Geography and of Environmental Studies. Senior Scientist, Center for Climatic Research, The Gaylord Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies (Founding Director), the University of Wisconsin, Madison, said that the theory of manmade global warming is ‘absurd’.

On the other side of the dispute there is a study by NOAA that indicates that even if CO<sub>2</sub> release is abruptly reduced the effects of climate change would be irreversible for the next 1000 years.

In effect, what I argue is that the chance that CO<sub>2</sub> is the culprit in climate change AND the chance that reducing it can counter the effects, is not sufficiently proven to further wreck our economic development. There are plenty of pollutants that we have been placing into our atmosphere which are far more harmful to our immediate health than CO<sub>2</sub>. Some of the better pollution control devices and industrial scrubbers actually produce CO<sub>2</sub> instead of the poisonous chemicals that they have managed to reduce from our atmosphere.

I support the reduction and elimination of harmful pollutants and am an enthusiastic advocate of the development of alternate energy sources. I am not willing to

jeopardize our economy or the environmental improvements that have been made in other areas by dropping everything to focus on the controversial theory that CO2 is causing global warming.

-- Cynthia

I still believe that the scientists of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change carry much credibility and scientific evidence behind them. And since I am not a scientist, I leave it to the best minds of the field to find out and prove whether or not we and our fossil-fuel burning generation is responsible for bringing us to a brink of environmental destruction from where there is no chance of recovery.

Dissenters are free to dissent of course. In the end its an issue of who gets to be believed, and who convinces the most policy-makers. That is why there is the UNFCCC and the militant EU advocates of quantified emission reduction. They who believe the IPCC scientists. And then there are the others.

-- Jojo

I do agree with you Cynth, that there are just as many scientific minds out there that believe that CO2 is not necessarily the culprit.

Graphs shown in Al Gore's "Inconvenient Truth" show some cyclical manifestations of global warming even before the exponential growth of the human populace, and there is good logic in believing that it does not only entail irresponsible humans to warm up a planet.

I will hazard a guess that all scientific minds in this planet will agree that the earth used to be one hot mama. And then somehow, it began cooling down, until the primordial soup formed and the first amoeba came to life, which later evolved into complex creatures like window-shoppers, paparazzis and political pretenders. To which factor are we attributing the cooling down? To people? No.

And so if things begin warming up again, to whom shall we attribute it? To people? Couldn't it be that it is just the nature of things in the universe. Maybe people and its intensive industries do contribute to the greenhouse effect, but how much does it really impact the natural cycle of things? This is the point which the scientific community continues to debate about.

The only definite thing that is unarguable right now is that people do emit some methane once in awhile. People do fart. I will admit to that. Now if the UNFCCC will allow people to claim CDM credits for not farting in a year, that'll be great!

Seriously, the science of climate change is not infallible. It is the same science that encouraged us to plant trees, but the same science now explains that tree-planting does not necessarily contribute to making the planet less warm by helping capture the CO2 in the atmosphere. Because these trees, they do not live like an immortal. Eventually

they die. And as soon as they are dead, they emit the equivalent amount of CO<sub>2</sub> that they captured when they were still alive.

At the end of the day, I think I will not worry about things that will kill me in a thousand years. I would rather worry about so many other things that can kill me tomorrow, like the Manila Filmfest, or bad debaters that are fond of citing fallacies of argumentation but who are as guilty making excessive appeal to the emotion.

-- Rudy

Noy,

When I wrote about you bashing climate change science, I always refer to you bashing the kind of climate change science that argues that this particular climate change is anthropogenic, the man-made kind, the kind caused by the burning of fossil fuels which only man can achieve due to his invention of the internal combustion engine. The kind which argues that after being stored under the earth for millions of years, all that carbon stored up in fossil fuels is now being burned as oil, gas and coal by none other than man and released in the atmosphere thereby trapping heat within the atmosphere and thereby warming the earth, hence the term "global warming", and therefore can never be called as being "natural" climate change, the kind you believe in. Thus the term "anthropogenic" to refer to its 20th century human technology caused character, a term I have used a million times since the start of this tread to distinguish it from your "natural" sunspot, volcanic eruption-caused climate change.

Our "alarmist" anthropogenic climate change science is not your "Science" of natural climate change caused by volcanic eruptions and natural human exhausts (breathing and farting) which have been around for thousands of years.

I am talking about you bashing the "alarmist" climate change science which you don't believe and don't buy, because the climate change science you believe in is the one which says that all of this is natural, that whether man had burned fossil fuels or not, we're bound to have this climate change. There is a great world of difference between the "alarmist" science of climate change we believe in and your science of natural climate change.

I think I was clear about that, and so were you. Your natural climate change "science" is a million years apart from our "alarmist" anthropogenic climate change science. An Ice age apart. This is why you had to call us "alarmist" in the first place, because we believe in the singularity of anthropogenic (man-made, fossil-fuel burning) climate change as a surefire way of ending life as we know it if left unheeded by itself without active government intervention to cut down emissions (mitigation) which is what the whole Kyoto Protocol and any successor agreement of the UNFCCC is all about. And that is why you focus on adaptation, because you believe that all of this climate change is natural.

And of course you've been bashing the "alarmist" version of climate change science

since the start of this tread. Why else call it alarmist in the first place? I don't think my mind has really already wandered that far away from our debates in UP so as not to realize what I am talking about and what you are actually saying.

And yes. I'd rather pay taxes for active government mitigation regulations than leave my daughter a world of minimal government without anything else much left (hence the word "minimal"?). (Hey, I think after all you're right in calling us alarmists.)

But then you suddenly shift to computing anthropogenic climate change as a function of economic activities after making clear your position that all of this climate change is natural and not induced by human fossil-fuel burning, CO2 emitting activities. Which is which then? Natural or anthropogenic? You might be the one getting confused. :-)

-- Jojo

Local scientist, Dr. Perry Ong of UP, in his centennial lecture last year, said the following, among others:

-- GHGs spawned by humans contribute merely 33 percent to global warming compared to the 67 percent traced to natural causes, which include changes in solar radiation, volcanic eruptions and the shifting of the Earth's tilt and orbit.

-- Going back to basic sound science could help in understanding and eventually addressing bigger problems in the environment, The water cycle, for instance, would explain the frequent occurrence of droughts and flash floods rather than the concept of human-caused global warming.

See that news report here,

<http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/inquirerheadlines/nation/view/20080518-137249/Blaming-man-convenient-excuse-UP-prof-cites-Gore-errors>

So, two points:

1. There is no "consensus" among scientists that anthropogenic climate change is the main cause or secondary or tertiary cause of global warming.

2. Even if we assume that Dr. Ong and other scientists like him are wrong, that climate change is due to 2/3 (or higher) due to humanity-caused emissions and only 1/3 (or lower) natural cause, governments' high taxation, regulation and alarmism are still not justified to "fight" CC and global warming. I argued it earlier, market-driven adaptations like innovations by private enterprises to develop renewable energy sources, more fuel-efficient cars, lights and appliances, etc., do not need additional government taxation and bureaucratism. On the contrary, private enterprises developing, innovating and marketing such technologies need de-taxation and de-bureaucratism.

Besides, there was nothing in my previous postings where I said, "all of this (CC) is

natural, that whether man had burned fossil fuels or not, we're bound to have this climate change." Again, where did you get that impression or quotation? I am no scientist nor science pretender to make such a categorical statement.

And if people like you are more than happy to pay more taxes to governments to "fight" CC -- like higher oil taxes, higher vehicle registration tax, etc. -- can you do it on your own, and spare our pockets and savings from your bright idea?

The formula or framework to estimate human-induced CO2 emission that I mentioned ( $\text{CO}_2 \text{ emission} = \text{GDP size} \times \text{EI}$ ) was actually to help the alarmists, not the adaptationists, decide which factor on the right side of the equation they will sacrifice or increase.

From my reading of the advocacies of some alarmists, they seem to favor a world of less economic growth (for instance, less trips by trucks, buses, ships and planes that transport people and goods across islands and countries), less pollution, more taxation, more subsidies to favored industries. Great stuff.

-- Nonoy

---

**Minimal Government Thinkers, Inc.** will be one of the many international co-sponsors of the Heartland Institute in its 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC) 2009 that will be held in New York, USA next month.

