CLIMATE CHANGE AND

FREEDOM

How the regulating class is using claims about climate change to entrench and extend their economic privileges and political control.

by Dr. David M.W. Evans
Climate change is also a freedom issue. We are being presented with only one “solution” to the “problem” of climate change, namely a lot more regulation by our governing bureaucratic class.

The Copenhagen Treaty was an Attempted Coup

Nearly all the world’s leaders met in Copenhagen in late 2009, expecting to sign the “Copenhagen Treaty” to limit CO₂ emissions. But China and India torpedoed the negotiations, citing concerns about whether warming is manmade and refusing to commit to any quantified emissions reduction targets. The much weaker “Copenhagen Accord” was signed instead.

The draft Copenhagen Treaty is still available in a few corners of the Internet. It is 181 pages of dense, convoluted, bureaucratic language, slow and difficult to read. The draft contains options and blanks to be filled in. Nonetheless, it is clear enough.

The regulating class at work in Copenhagen. President Obama of the US [Credit: AP/Susan Walsh], Ban Ki-moon the Secretary General of the United Nations [Credit: China Daily], British PM Gordon Brown [Credit: Reuters/Ints Kalnins], presided over by Connie Hedegaard, the Danish climate and energy minister [Credit: EPA].
The Treaty would have set up a new global bureaucracy with the power to regulate CO₂ emissions worldwide, able to regulate any market, over-riding national governments as required. It could also fine and tax any signatory government. In the hands of a judge sympathetic to the regulating class, it could be interpreted to give this new global bureaucracy the power to tax every signatory nation and regulate its energy use almost completely—just look at how the US Constitution has been extended by interpretation over the years, and that’s a much clearer document. A hint or ambiguity in the Treaty could become the basis for a full blown mechanism to do almost anything the bureaucrats wished.

The mainstream media were almost entirely silent about the implications of the Treaty for the loss of national sovereignty. From experience with the monotonic growth of centralized power in federations of states, such as the United States or Australia, it is almost inevitable that within a few decades this new body would be parlayed up into a strong global bureaucracy regulating more than just CO₂ emissions.

The mainstream media are very talkative about elections, when power changes hands. And they are extremely interested in wars, when outside groups impinge on a nation’s sovereignty. Yet they were almost entirely silent about the implications of the Treaty for the loss of national sovereignty. If something like the draft Treaty had been signed, it would have been the biggest transfer of sovereign power in recorded human history: nearly all the nations of the world would have ceded much of their sovereign power all at once. Yet the media scarcely raised an eyebrow.

All of that national sovereignty would have been ceded to an unelected group of global bureaucrats: Never in the field of human administration would so much power have been transferred

This was a narrowly averted global coup, an attempt to seize a great deal of power by stealth without the knowledge or explicit consent of the world’s people.
by so many to so few. *This was a narrowly averted global coup, an attempt to seize a great deal of power by stealth without the knowledge or explicit consent of the world’s people.* It can only have been kept silent with the active support of the world’s media. But because of that silence, the attempted coup has never been acknowledged, so the people of the world are unaware of it and further attempts could be made.

Regardless of your beliefs about the main cause of climate change, this episode clearly raises some disturbing questions. Climate change is being used as an excuse for a massive power play. But who benefits, and why climate change?

**The Regulating Class**

Consider the array of forces active in the climate argument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Believers</th>
<th>Doubters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN (including the IPCC)</td>
<td>Independently-funded scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western governments</td>
<td>Private sector middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major banks and finance houses</td>
<td>Amateurs (from <em>amore</em>, the Latin for love)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s and Greenies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalitarian leftists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-funded scientists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables corporations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream news media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The supporters of the theory of manmade global warming are mainly financial beneficiaries, believers in big government, or Greens. They are usually university educated. They generally prefer the methods of government, namely politics and coercion, rather than the voluntary transactions of the marketplace—especially when it comes to setting their own remuneration.

They are an *intellectual upper class of wordsmiths*, who regulate and spin rather than produce real stuff. There is little demand in the economy for their skills, so they would command only modest rewards for their labor in
They don't like the marketplace, basically because the marketplace doesn't like them. The marketplace doesn't reward them as much as they think it should. They prefer a system where people like them form the government and bureaucracy, where they take a large slice of everyone else's income by threat of force, and then they pay themselves what they think they are worth out of those taxes. This stands in stark contrast to most people, who are generally paid only what the market will allow.

Their shared economic basis makes them a class, the “regulating class”. (It seems like a trivial thing, but this argument is bedeviled by the lack of a widely-accepted name for this class. We use “regulating class” because regulation is their core action, their standard tactic to advance their interests.)

Beware the power of the regulating classes’ word-smithing and spinning. They take the postmodern view that perceptions are reality, and they change people's perceptions with words. Annoy a member of this class sufficiently to strip away their veneer of politeness, and soon you will be called an “idiot” and eventually a “racist”.

The regulating class also attracts people who are not part of it for strictly economic reasons, but who identify with it because of similar backgrounds, or culture and beliefs. The regulating class does not try to hide its belief that it is cleverer, and morally superior too. Annoy a member of this class sufficiently to strip away their veneer of politeness, and soon you will be called an “idiot” and eventually a “racist”. Who has not at times felt the siren call and ego boost of feeling superior to one’s fellow man? Viewers can get a very real sense of superiority by watching the
People who work with the real physical world but are not employed by government are usually skeptics. Most of the larger media organizations, while not economic members of the regulating class, are clearly sympathetic because they relentlessly promote its views.

Beware the power of the regulating classes’ wordsmithing and spinning. They take the postmodern view that perceptions are reality, and they change people’s perceptions with words. Remarkably, they can tell a story without making any technical errors (lies of commission); yet give the listener an impression that is the exact opposite of the truth. This is a danger to the regulating class too, because they tend to believe stories of their own class and then lose touch with reality.

The theory of manmade global warming is not a conspiracy. It is a confluence of vested interests in increased political regulation of the economy and rejecting market forces.

Why Global Warming is So Important to the Regulating Class

If human emissions of CO₂ are causing a major planetary problem, then there are only two plausible solutions: wait and adapt, or regulate and reduce. Only the second solution
Any global system is prone to tyranny taking over forever. The regulating class promotes the dual beliefs that the “problem” of global warming is very scary and that it is caused by human emissions of CO₂. The only solution they offer just happens to be complete regulation of the whole world’s economy by ... the regulating class. “Enlightened” self-interest doesn’t come any bigger than this.

The theory of manmade global warming is not a conspiracy. It is a confluence of vested interests in increased political regulation of the economy and rejecting market forces. Bureaucrats, academics, government scientists, utilities, renewables manufacturers, bankers, most politicians—all have a shared financial interest in imposing their solution to “manmade” global warming. While the theory has a kernel of scientific truth, skeptics claim the role of CO₂ has been greatly exaggerated.

A Global Bureaucracy Would Be Bad

If a bureaucracy is global, there is nowhere to run to from high taxes, persecution, exploitation, selective enforcement of regulations, and so on. It would bring an end to the competition that keeps sovereign nations in check and makes them treat their productive citizens decently. Furthermore, any global system is prone to tyranny taking over forever, because if it is global there is no possibility of outside help or refuge for those under its yoke—so the tyranny is harder to dislodge.

A global bureaucracy would end all that by simply imposing conditions on the miners, take it or leave it—and miners would effectively become serfs.

Currently there is a world marketplace in mining, a system of voluntary agreements between nations and mining companies. It is competition in human affairs that keep people and organizations “honest”, fueling dynamism and progress. Monopolies are bad for customers. Of course we all want to escape from competition for ourselves, to be monopolists in our own little ways. But we all know that we benefit from competition among those who provide us with goods and services, including bureaucratic services.
A global bureaucracy is especially bad for industries that have traditionally relied on competition between nations to prevent being exploited. Nations are in competition with each other for their services. For example, if a nation make conditions too hard or is too taxing, then its miners move to a different jurisdiction. Currently there is a world marketplace in mining, a system of voluntary agreements between nations and mining companies. A global bureaucracy would end all that by simply imposing conditions on the miners, take it or leave it—and miners would effectively become serfs.

Climate Change: What’s At Stake for You

If you are an economic member of the regulating class, a global bureaucracy instigated by the alleged need to regulate CO₂ emissions would be terrific: more jobs, power, and money for bureaucrats and their allies. You would be part of what would effectively become a ruling class, free to tax a captive population whatever they could bear and pay yourselves whatever you “know” you’re worth.

If their “solution” to global warming ushered in a global bureaucracy, people like these would be setting regulations worldwide, with no escape for anyone: The President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, Chairman of the UN’s IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri [Credit: Mikhail Evstafiev], and Tim Flannery, Australian environmentalist [Credit: Mark Coulson].

For everyone else, what’s at stake is freedom from the demands of a hostile ruling class, as well as more disposable income, more choice, less red tape, and a better quality of life. The new regulating class—bureaucrats, academics, greenies—look down on others as stupid and morally inferior. They don’t like people who make real stuff, and they don’t like the private sector or the
marketplace. Their regulations would be global so there would be no escape, and competition between nations vying for our services and taxes would shrivel.

**Conclusions**

The push towards a global bureaucracy, using climate change as an excuse, is a clear and present danger to sovereign nations, to the competition between nations for productive citizens, and to freedom everywhere. The new regulating class is stealthily globalizing bureaucracy without our consent, demanding the privilege of taxing and paying itself whatever it thinks is worth, while the rewards for the rest of society are instead set by competition in the marketplace.

The real issue here is a grab for absolute power by those who already govern. They have grown tired of democracy and would like to do away with it, without ever giving the game away by actually saying so. This is the age-old divide between the totalitarians and libertarians. Coalitions like the current regulating class have always been instinctively totalitarian, desirous of interfering in every tiny detail of our lives—for our own good of course, and prodigiously at our expense. They are now even telling us what kind of light-bulbs we can use. With the rise of democracy, it looked like the regulating class would be subject to the will of the people. The US Constitution explicitly defines the obligations of government to the people and not of people to the government. However, liberty, democracy, and the free market are now again at grave risk, and climate change is the Trojan Horse the regulating class hopes to ride to victory over the people.

Climate change is the Trojan Horse.
Cover art of chained wrists from dakhlanews.net.