

## 8.1 Global warming – the critical view

General theses of the alarmists:

- 6 meters sea-level rise would flood major cities around the world (during this century)
- some claim that sea level will rise in 24 meters

Inconvenient truth:

- over the past 2 years global sea level has not increased, it has slightly *decreased*
- the global temperature has not risen over the past 10 yrs., it has declined precipitously in the last 18 months (since 1/2007) and studies show that it might not rise again before the middle of the next decade

### No global warming?

The more CO<sub>2</sub> we emit, the temperature will moderately increase over time, causing the sea to warm and expand.

Sea-level will rise ☹ UN climate panel: the best models indicate a sea-level rise in the century at 30 cms = it is how much the sea rose over the last 150 yrs.

But the globe's real problem is not a series of inconvenient facts ☹ we have blocked out sensible solutions through an alarmist panic, leading to bad policies.

### Bio-fuels

- They take food from mouths and put it into cars.
- 30% of this (2008) year's corn production in the USA will be burned up on the US highways. This has been possible only through subsidies that globally will be worth \$15 billion this year alone.

The grain required to fill the tank of an SUV with ethanol is enough to feed 1 African for a year.

Because increased demand for bio-fuels leads to cutting down carbon-rich forests, the net effect of using them is not to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but to *double* them. The rush towards bio-fuels has also strongly contributed to rising food prices, which have tipped another 30 million people into starvation.

### Kyoto protocol and other

= among the most expensive global public policies ever enacted. EU: the policy of cutting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 20% by 2020. This reduction would merely postpone temperature increases due to global warming from 2100 to 2102 ☹ the costs would be about €60 billion annually. EU wants also to increase the share of renewable energy in the Union by 20% by 2020 what leads to other immense costs.

### Case study: Denmark

Annual expenditures of an increase in renewable energy of 18% by 2025 = >€2.5 billion. The benefit: Denmark will spend >€200 billion during the century to postpone global warming by 5 days. The total advantage to the world would be about €11 million. For every euro spent, the benefit is half a cent.

Perspectives: €2 billion could halve the number of malaria infections, saving 850 million lives this century. People in affected countries would live much better and become more productive, benefiting their (grand)children in 2100. The last €500 million could fund an 8-fold increase in R&D aimed at improving CO<sub>2</sub>-efficient energy technologies, enabling everyone in the long run to reduce emissions much more dramatically, and at much lower costs. Moreover, the €2.5 billion estimate assumes that politicians choose the cheapest renewable energy alternative.

### So what?

Using the Danish figures to calculate EU-wide costs, the total is likely to be more than €150 billion annually, with every euro doing just half a cent worth of good. We will waste hundreds of billions of dollars, worsen global warming and dramatically increase starvation. The only solution is to start investing in smart, long-term R&D. The same money could triple the global development aid budget. It could easily provide clean drinking water, sanitation, education, and health care to every human being on the planet, while increasing CO<sub>2</sub>-reducing R&D ten times.

### Keywords:

global warming, Kyoto protocol, CO<sub>2</sub>, costs, expenditures, energy efficiency, bio-fuels

Source: [www.project-syndicate.org](http://www.project-syndicate.org)