

## Memo 50/07

### Bali report #3

Will Alexander [alexwjr@iafrica.com](mailto:alexwjr@iafrica.com)

**Bali. Monday evening 10 December 2007**

**Continued:**

**Adelaide. Friday, Saturday and Sunday 14 to 16 December 2007**

The future welfare of hundreds of millions of people of the world will depend on the outcome of the Bali conference. But neither they nor their interests were represented at the conference. There were no voices of protest by the scientific community other than a few of us who questioned the underlying science. We were told in no uncertain terms that we were not welcome at the conference.

I started writing this in Bali on Monday but the events were too hectic in the following days. After a week in Bali I had heard enough, seen enough and endured enough. It was thoroughly depressing. I returned to my family in Adelaide on Wednesday where I slowly recuperated.

It is now Friday 15:00 local time. Within the next three hours the fate of this whole climate change issue will have been settled. Several months ago I predicted that climate alarmism would collapse by the end of this year. This is what the UNFCCC chief had to say in this morning's newspaper *The Australian*.

Yvo de Boer said he was very concerned about the slowing pace of the Bali talks, and set a deadline for negotiations to conclude by noon local time today.

He said the negotiations had developed into an all-or-nothing situation, and if agreement could not be reached by today, then "the whole house of cards basically falls to pieces" and developed countries might be left with nothing more than an extension of the Kyoto Protocol.

However, one thing is certain. This will not be admitted in the concluding statement issued by the conference.

### Double speak

[Written on Monday]

The discussions during the next four days will be decisive for the success of the whole climate change initiative. All the signs are that the conference will not meet its objectives. However, it can never admit this. So expect some double speak. This is a good example from today's local newspapers. The heading of the article was **Climate change a new focus for WTO** (the World Trade Organisation). These are a few extracts.

The Indonesian Trade Minister said that they had agreed to intensify high-level engagement on trade and climate change.

This will include continuing meetings...

A deal on climate change can not be struck through the organisation but should come through an environmental forum.

Until truly global consensus emerges on how best to tackle the issue of climate change, WTO members will continue to hold different views ...

... the members agreed to continue to study trade and climate change ...

[It is now Friday 14 December.]

## Impossible targets

If the Bali negotiations fail, the blame will solely be the foolish policy adopted by the world scientists in this field. They marched under the banner of environmentalism regardless of the economic and sociological consequences.

Over the years their claims of the environmental consequences of anthropogenic global warming (AGW) increased in both magnitude and imminence. Counter-measures consequently increased in parallel. Now the implementation of these measures is impossible to achieve without severe damage to national economies, particularly those of the rapidly developing major economies of China and India, and the slowly developing economies of the majority of countries of the world.

The differences in both the present status as well as future objectives of the nations of the world are far too great to expect agreement on the levels of implementation of the proposed restrictions in dangerous greenhouse gas emissions (GGEs), principally carbon dioxide emissions from coal-burning power stations.

The aim of the conference was to set clear objectives now, (called a road map), then spend the next two years on the means to achieve them. Everything has to be agreed before the end of 2009 so that nations can pass the necessary legislation by the end of 2012 when the Kyoto Protocol lapses.

The principal proposal now on the table at Bali is that all nations agree to adopt **emission reduction targets of between 25% and 40% by 2020**. This is crazy for South Africa and other developing economies of the world. We cannot possibly sustain economic growth under these conditions.

## Conflicting objectives

This achievement of this ambitious target has to overcome the problem of conflicting objectives of the principal groupings of the nations. The following is a very short summary that captures the essence of the differences.

### EU including the UK.

- Former colonial powers whose influence is on the decline.
- Instigators of this whole issue.
- Will lose credibility if Bali collapses.
- Using threats of intimidation if other nations fail to comply.
- Manipulating the science (eg Stern Review and Royal Society.)

- Scientific criticism is increasing in some continental countries but strangely, with a few exceptions, not in the UK.

## **USA**

- Large population.
- High standard of living.
- High energy-based technology.
- Highest per capita GGEs at both domestic and international level.
- Highest investments in scientific research in this field.
- But research disproportionately in favour of the adverse effects of AGW.

## **China and India**

- Largest developing nations.
- China will soon become the world's largest greenhouse gas emitter, overtaking the USA.
- But lowest per capita GGE levels.
- Priorities are poverty alleviation and rapidly increasing international trade.
- These can only be achieved by continued economic growth.
- Developed nations see China as a growing threat to their own interests.
- China considers that developed nations are using GGE control measures as a means to restrict China's economic competitiveness.

## **Rest of the world**

- About 130 of the 190 nations at Bali are in this category.
- They are not the cause of the postulated adverse effects of global warming, either now or in the foreseeable future.
- There is no logical basis for insisting that these countries should also reduce their GGEs.
- They are also the poorest in scientific studies. They have to rely on the honesty and impartiality of scientists from the wealthy nations. This is a misplaced trust.
- But there is growing realisation that if AGW is real then they have a legitimate claim for compensation, not just assistance to implement GGE reduction measures themselves.
- Promises of financial assistance made in the past were not fulfilled. Consequently future promises will not be trusted.

## **Here and there**

Here are some terse comments quoted in recent news media reports. They are not in any particular order.

- A major split emerges as the US, Japan and Canada are resisting pressure to adopt dramatic targets to cut greenhouse gas emissions.
- Business and industry warn of catastrophic economic effects if the ambit claims of 25-40 percent emission cuts by 2020 are adopted at the conference.
- Some developing countries remain opposed to including mention of interim 2020 targets in the draft document.
- “By adopting unrealistic targets, there is a real risk that we would impose these extraordinary costs on ourselves, generate no environmental benefits and undermine the consensus to take domestic action to reduce emissions.”
- BUT: “It is time that we made peace with the planet. We must mobilise our civilisation with the urgency and resolve that has previously been seen only when nations mobilised for war. “ Al Gore.
- BUT: The US has completely opposed the inclusion of any targets in the Bali negotiations. The US negotiator said that the 25-40 percent range was based on many uncertainties and on a small number of studies examined by the IPCC. [This has long been my view.]
- China tells the west: “What part of ‘NO’ don’t you understand?”
- “The debate about binding commitments for developing countries is not off the table, but it’s crawling towards the edge.”
- The fight over who pays most and who sacrifices most underscored every discussion in Bali this week.
- Among some countries there is a very hard line emerging that there should be no concessions until the developed world takes the lead on cutting emissions, agrees to technology transfers and puts serious money to fund the world’s adaptation to climate change.
- “Bali is the most important international meeting in history. Accelerating climate chaos threatens global peace, security and progress. From now on the negotiating process needs to reflect this.”
- To conclude talks in Bali without agreeing binding emissions targets would be a major setback to the race to prevent climate chaos.
- Africa tells Europe: send us your carbon \$billions now!
- Whatever you do, don’t forget to panic.
- Climate change cannot be used to boost exports from the rich countries to the developing world.
- “Developing countries are making it very clear that it’s inconceivable for them to accept legally binding targets,”
- There is a huge disagreement over carbon trading.
- Developing countries say no to “disguised protectionism.”
- China the victor as Europe fails to secure trade deal with Africa.

- “This is the week that the world has been waiting for.”
- Japan business chief opposes Kyoto-style hara-kiri.
- Bali: the long arduous road to nowhere.
- “The scientists’ mask of optimism is beginning to slip.”
- Pope Benedict XVI has launched a surprise attack on the climate change prophets of doom, warning them that any solutions to global warming must be based on firm evidence and not on dubious ideology. [This has always been the essence of my research and experiences.]

## Not there yet

Now 21.30. News from Bali is that the deadline has been extended and that a watered-down resolution is expected. It is worth waiting for after all these months. I will close down now and start up again tomorrow.

## Saturday 15 December

Talks deadlocked all day.

## Sunday 16 December

US backed down late yesterday evening and agreed to a much watered down consensus view. Here are some quotes from this morning’s local newspapers.

United Nations-led climate talks in Bali **agreed last night to launch talks** [my emphasis on this double speak!] on a new global warming deal to succeed the Kyoto Protocol, after the US dropped last-minute opposition.

The talks in Bali came to a tense climax as angry disagreements broke out between nations. The US representative was booed from the floor for refusing to accept the final draft. She was immediately attacked by the South African delegation, which said her words were “most unwelcome and without any basis.”

Anger from China and the developing nations led by India, Pakistan and South Africa boiled over after the US succeeded in cutting critical scientific advice from the draft deal. That advice said the rich countries would have to cut their greenhouse emissions by between 25% and 40% by 2020.

The European Union had said that the scientific advice was “indispensable” but compromised to keep the US from walking away. An hour later the US delegation eventually promised to come to a consensus, opening the way for the Bali road map to be signed.

Afterwards, some of the negotiators who emerged bleary-eyed and dishevelled from the 36 hours of talks were agreeing with Gore. “We might have a piece of paper we can call an agreement, but we lost almost all the scientifically determined emissions reduction targets that would have made it worthwhile.”

The following is a very perceptive editorial in the UK *Daily Telegraph* of 16 December.

In the end, as in all good comedies, the "baddies" came round to the side of light, the US representative made her "climbdown" by saying that her country was now ready to join the "consensus", and everyone could go home happy. The reality of Bali, however, was that all this vilification of America as the "world's worst polluter" was only displacement activity - to disguise the fact that, when it comes to the crunch, no one is really prepared to step off the bandwagon of economic growth, by making the unthinkable sacrifices which would be required if any of them

actually meant what they said. They are all happy to work themselves into an intense state of excitement by chanting their quasi-religious mantra: that there is now "absolute scientific consensus" that Planet Earth is doomed unless we cut our carbon emissions by 50 per cent by 2050. But no one is prepared to take any serious step towards that inconceivable goal unless everyone else jumps too.

--Editorial, The Daily Telegraph, 16 December 2007

One thing is very certain. **The world communities are still a long way from reaching a binding international agreement on the way forward.**

This is a great personal relief.

Regards

Will