

**Lawson:** I don't know how much it would cut their emissions, but it would certainly do far more good for the people. It would certainly relieve these problems they do have, of hunger, and drought, and malnutrition, and disease, and premature death. It would certainly help them far, far, more. And it would also actually cost considerably less.

**EIR:** Yes, that's the sense I had. You've written in your book, and said in your other presentations, that the biggest problem right now in the developing world is massive poverty.

**Lawson:** That's right.

**EIR:** And impeding their use of carbon-based fuels to further their development, will actually do more harm to them, than global warming ever could.

**Lawson:** That's absolutely right. And that is why I think it is most unlikely, that either China or India—I think it sounds like Russia will, too, or one or two other big countries—but it's certainly most unlikely that either China or India will agree to cut back their emissions drastically, which is what they're told they should do, as we are told we should do. And I think it's most unlikely. And even if they were to sign up for it, for a quiet life, I'm quite sure they wouldn't, in fact, implement it.

And if they take that view of signing up and not implementing it, they are doing no worse than those of us who did sign up to ratify the Kyoto agreement, and have done [nothing]—because that was only a 5% reduction of carbon dioxide emissions, but, in fact, it is quite clear that if anything, there is going to be at least a 5% *increase* [in emissions] by the end of the Kyoto period. And, of course, it really wouldn't be much bigger than that.

I think this is something people don't fully realize, and I don't think I spelled it out with sufficient clarity in my book: The reason that the Kyoto signatories have missed the target by a relatively small amount—instead of a 5% reduction, it's something like a 5% increase—is because they have, in a sense, outsourced their emissions. Because so much of manufacturing industry has moved from the developed world to China and India, and parts of the developing world, that the emissions are no longer coming from the developed world, which has made it relatively easy for us to have a lower growth of emissions. But if you are seeking—which they are in the G8 meetings—a global cutback, there's no way the globe can outsource its emissions to Mars or wherever.

### Selling Indulgences

**EIR:** When you think about these emissions-cutting schemes, it brings the medieval indulgences back to mind. It's really: You can sin all you want, but as long as you can pay, you're okay, and somehow that's going to solve the problems: And that was not the case then, nor is it the case now.

**Lawson:** No, I think that, looking back, the sale of indulgences by the medieval Church, was much less damaging, much less harmful, than what is proposed now.

**EIR:** Yes, definitely. Considering now, you have a rise of this, what you described as “eco-fundamentalism,” this moving into the Age of Unreason—

**Lawson:** Yes, which is very worrying.

**EIR:** Yes, you have [global warming alarmist scientist] James Hansen, the other day, making statements that skeptics and oil executives should be put on trial for crimes against humanity!

**Lawson:** It is, it is. It's a very alarming trend.

---

## Book Review

---

# Questioning the Global Warming Religion

by Gregory Murphy

---

### **An Appeal to Reason: A Cool Look at Global Warming**

by Nigel Lawson

New York: Overlook Duckworth, Peter Mayer Publishers, 2008

149 pp., hardcover, \$19.95

---

Lord Nigel Lawson's latest book is short, but polemical, attacking the orthodoxy of the “new religion” of global warming. Lawson's previous book was a diet book (co-written with his daughter, the chef and television personality, Nigella Lawson), and now it appears that he wants to reduce the hysteria around Al Gore's global warming swindle. As such, it should be required reading for all policy-makers.

In particular, Lawson's arguments against the fraud of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) needs to be understood by all the policy-makers of the world before they pass an international agreement to cut carbon emissions, which would kill billions of people both in the developed and the developing world. On this point, Lawson, who was the treasury secretary in the Thatcher government, doesn't directly call the policies of the IPCC genocidal, which is the major shortcoming in his book.

Lawson's book has been attacked for saying that the science of global warming is uncertain. Most of the attacks on the book have been focussed on his statements that there has been no global warming this century. But, in fact, the temperature records from Britain's leading climate research center, the Hadley Center and the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, indicate that global warming ended in 1998, a

fact noted by Australian Climate Researcher Bob Carter.

Al Gore's warmaholic friends have attacked Lawson for not being a scientist, but these people cannot have read the whole book, or they would have noticed that Lawson states very clearly that he is not a scientist—but then, neither are the vast majority of those who espouse the currently fashionable madness of global warming.

## The 'Dodgy Dossier' of Warming

The book is an extended version of a lecture that Lawson gave to the Center for Policy Studies in London in 2006. In it, Lawson says that a constructive parallel for the British government's so-called Stern Report on the economic effects of climate change is Tony Blair's notorious "dodgy dossier" of sexed-up intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Lord Nicholas Stern, he says, "sexed up" his report by claiming that global warming would cause more damage than the two world wars and the Great Depression combined.

The strongest feature of the book is Lawson's view that the only solution for global warming, if warming were, in fact, a problem, is to pursue the policy of adaptation. The IPCC tries to ignore this as much as possible, and it only gives honorable mention to this type of solution. The IPCC's own scenarios are actually written by the Austrian-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), which denies the existence of human creativity. That is why it is important that Lawson pushes the adaptation possibility, because that solution is based on the idea that human creativity can find solutions to any problems that may arise in the future.

Furthermore, the policy of adaptation is not one that has to wait until there is an international agreement, as required by the IPCC carbon-emissions cutting scheme. The presumed problems that the IPCC points out—like sea-level rise and severe drought conditions—could actually be solved right now: The developed nations could help the developing nations to build better sea defenses, and to start building nuclear desalination plants to supply potable water.

Lawson estimates that for the cost of cutting carbon emissions, the world could have all the fresh water, public health care, and increased food production needed, which would be a better solution to what he calls the largest environmental problem today: widespread, and growing poverty throughout the world. And unlike global warming, the problem of poverty is not a hoax.

Lawson has said that these small-minded solutions that Al Gore promotes, such as changing your light bulbs and driving a hybrid car, "are trivial to the point of total irrelevance. What would be required is for all transport to be 100 percent electric, and all electricity to be generated by nuclear power."

One problem with Lawson's book is that he presents the

global warming hoax as a post-Cold War "red is now green" outlook. This is the same view taken by other free-marketeers, including the President of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus. Klaus has gone so far as to say that environmentalism is the new communism. This erroneous outlook severely misses the point that the environmental movement is really just an anti-human extension of the financial oligarchy's drive to reduce the world's population to 2 billion people and create a feudal fascist world empire as a solution to the onrushing global economic meltdown.<sup>1</sup>

Otherwise, Lawson's critique of environmentalism hits the mark. He attacks the march of unreason represented by the rise of the new religion of global warming as part of the larger rise of eco-fundamentalism, or, more simply put, eco-fascism. Lawson writes: "So the new religion of global warming, however convenient it may be to politicians, it is not as harmless as it may appear. Indeed, the more one examines it, the more it resembles a 'Da Vinci Code' of environmentalism. It is a great story, and a phenomenal bestseller. It contains a grain of truth—and a mountain of nonsense."

Lawson continues, "We appear to have entered a new age of unreason, which threatens to be as economically harmful as it is profoundly disquieting. It is from this, above all, that we really do need to save the planet."

As a prime example of what Lawson is talking about, one only need look at the briefing that NASA's resident global warming nut case, James Hansen, gave to the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and

Global Warming June 23, in which he declared that climate skeptics and oil executives should be put on trial for "crimes against humanity."

This little book is a refreshing reminder that not all of the world's policy-makers are in league with Al Gore and his backers among the financial elites, in rolling the world's population back to dark age levels. His short presentation of the uncertainty of the climate science is very accurate, and he makes the point that computer models cannot forecast the future because they are based on failed assumptions generated by anti-human Malthusians who deny human creativity, which is the greatest force for defeating poverty.

In all, Lawson's book, even with its few shortcomings, is a much needed attack coming from a policy-maker on Al Gore's global warming swindle.

1. The registered British charity Optimum Population Trust issued a statement on July 11, stating that the optimum world population would be 2 billion people. Optimum Population Trust's board of directors is a collection of malthusian genocidalists which includes Sir Crispin Tickell, former U.K. Permanent Representative to the United Nations Security Council, and a leading promoter of the fascist global warming hoax; primatologist Jane Goodall, and "population bomb" freak Paul Erhlich.