

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



IPCC
IPCC



Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change



SPPI REPRINT SERIES



August 15, 2012

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 | August 15, 2012

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.

CLIMATE
CHANGE
is also a
FREEDOM
ISSUE.



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 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 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

The mainstream
media were almost
entirely silent about
the implications of
the Treaty for the
loss of national
sovereignty.

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.

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

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.

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:

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

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

Regardless of your beliefs about the main cause of climate change, this episode clearly raises some disturbing questions.



The supporters of the theory of manmade global warming are mainly financial beneficiaries, believers in big government, or Greens.

They don't like the
market place, basically
because the marketplace
doesn't like them. The
marketplace doesn't
reward them as much as
they think it should.

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.

the marketplace. Arguably they are a class of parasites enriching themselves at the expense of producers, because they are rewarded out of proportion to the value they create—value as determined not by themselves, but by voluntary transactions in the marketplace.

They don't like the market place, 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

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.

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

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.

mainstream media, especially the government-owned channels,
and adopting the trendy beliefs being pushed there. "Oh, I feel so
superior to all those idiots and racists out there because I have
these shiny new beliefs as validated by the superior regulating
class with whom I now identify myself." Share their beliefs, show
them off to your friends, and you too can feel superior and of
high status—even though your situation or remuneration may be
modest. It is a cheap grab for status that costs almost no effort to
earn.

Most of the larger
media organizations,
while not economic
members of the

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.

On the other side of the argument stand those doubting the
CO₂ theory. The skeptics are overwhelmingly from the private
sector. People who work with the real physical world but are
not employed by government are usually skeptics. The
mainstream media is largely denied to skeptics, so they
communicate via the Internet and talkback radio.

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

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.

Any global system is
prone to tyranny taking
over forever.



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.

interests the regulating class. To regulate CO₂ emissions effectively you must regulate nearly all energy use, and thus most of the economy, in every nation of the world.

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.

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

The new regulating
class – bureaucrats,
academics, greenies
– look down on
others as stupid and
morally inferior.



The push towards a
global bureaucracy,
using climate change
as an excuse, is a
clear and present
danger to freedom
everywhere.

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.



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.



Climate change is
the Trojan Horse.

Cover art of chained wrists from dakhlanews.net.

