

CONTENTS

ON THE EDITORIAL PAGE

READER RESPONSES

TASTE

BOOKSTORE

## CONTENTS

## ON THE EDITORIAL PAGE

♦ Today's Featured Article

♦ Also on WSJ.com

♦ International Opinion

## BEST OF THE WEB TODAY

## E-MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS

♦ Political Diary

♦ Free Updates

## JOHN FUND ON THE TRAIL

## PEGGY NOONAN

OPINIONJOURNAL  
FEDERATION

♦ Featured Article

♦ Poll Watch

THE JOURNAL EDITORIAL  
REPORT

## PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

## AMERICAN CONSERVATISM

ELECTORAL COLLEGE  
CALCULATOR

## POETRY FOR THE WAR

## A MARINE'S JOURNAL

## READER RESPONSES

## OUR FAVORITE SITES

## SPECIAL FEATURES

## ARCHIVES

## TASTE

## LEISURE &amp; ARTS

## COLUMNISTS

♦ Pete du Pont

♦ Daniel Henninger

♦ Brendan Miniter

## RSS FEED

## ABOUT US

♦ Our Philosophy

♦ Who We Are

♦ Terms &amp; Conditions

♦ Privacy Policy

♦ Contact Us

♦ How to Subscribe

♦ How to Advertise

♦ Op-Ed Guidelines

## CLIMATE CHANGE

## Stern Review

The dodgy numbers behind the latest warming scare.

BY BJORN LOMBORG

Thursday, November 2, 2006 12:01 a.m. EST

The report on climate change by Nicholas Stern and the U.K. government has sparked publicity and scary headlines around the world. Much attention has been devoted to Mr. Stern's core argument that the price of inaction would be extraordinary and the cost of action modest.

Unfortunately, this claim falls apart when one actually reads the 700-page tome. Despite using many good references, the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change is selective and its conclusion flawed. Its fear-mongering arguments have been sensationalized, which is ultimately only likely to make the world worse off.

The review correctly points out that climate change is a real problem, and that it is caused by human greenhouse-gas emissions. Little else is right, however, and the report seems hastily put-together, with many sloppy errors. As an example, the cost of hurricanes in the U.S. is said to be both 0.13% of U.S. GDP and 10 times that figure.

The review is also one-sided, focusing almost exclusively on carbon-emission cuts as the solution to the problem of climate change. Mr. Stern sees increasing hurricane damage in the U.S. as a powerful argument for carbon controls. However, hurricane damage is increasing predominantly because there are more people with more goods to be damaged, settling in ever more risky habitats. Even if global warming does significantly increase the power of hurricanes, it is estimated that 95% to 98% of the increased damage will be due to demographics. The review acknowledges that simple initiatives like bracing and securing roof trusses and walls can cheaply reduce damage by more than 80%; yet its policy recommendations on expensive carbon reductions promise to cut the damages by 1% to 2% at best. That is a bad deal.

Mr. Stern is also selective, often seeming to cherry-pick statistics to fit an argument. This is demonstrated most clearly in the review's examination of the social damage costs of CO<sub>2</sub>--essentially the environmental cost of emitting each extra ton of CO<sub>2</sub>. The most well-recognized climate economist in the world is probably Yale University's William Nordhaus, whose "approach is perhaps closest in spirit to ours," according to the Stern review. Mr. Nordhaus finds that the social cost of CO<sub>2</sub> is \$2.50 per ton. Mr. Stern, however, uses a figure of \$85 per ton. Picking a rate even higher than the official U.K. estimates--that have themselves been criticized for being over the top--speaks volumes.

Mr. Stern tells us that the cost of U.K. flooding will quadruple to 0.4% from 0.1% of GDP due to climate change. However, we are not told that these alarming figures only hold true if one assumes that the U.K. will take no additional measures--essentially doing absolutely nothing and allowing itself to get flooded, perhaps time and again. In contrast, the U.K. government's own assumptions take into account a modest increase in flood prevention, finding that the cost will actually *decline* sharply to 0.04% of U.K. GDP, in spite of climate change. Why does Mr. Stern not share that information?

But nowhere is the imbalance clearer than in Mr. Stern's central argument about the costs and benefits of action on climate change. The review tells us that we should make significant cuts in carbon emissions to stabilize the concentration of atmospheric carbon dioxide at 550 ppm (parts per million). Yet such a stark recommendation is not matched by an explicit explanation of what this would mean in terms of temperature.

The U.N. Climate Panel estimates that stabilizing at 550 ppm would mean an increase in temperature of about 2.3 degrees Celsius in the year 2100. This might be several degrees below what would otherwise happen, but it might also be *higher*. Mr. Nordhaus estimates that the stabilization policy would reduce the rise in temperature from 2.53 degrees Celsius to just 2.42 degrees Celsius. One can understand the reluctance of the Stern review to advertise such a puny effect.

Most economists were surprised by Mr. Stern's large economic estimates of damage from

November

3:35p

RESPOND TO

READ RESPON

E-MAIL THIS

PRINT FRIEND

ARCHIVE



Search

GO

OpinionJournal

WSJ Online

Wall Street Journal  
Online Subscribers  
GO DIRECTLY TO

Select a Page

WSJ.com Network

Wall Street Journal

CareerJournal

CollegeJournal

RealEstateJournal

StartupJournal

## VIEW

**Patriot**  
Harvard P  
says, "The F  
a surprising  
charge into  
Internet!"

**PoliticsNat**  
The one-st  
politics anc  
natic

**The Americ**  
The voice  
conservativ  
the Washing  
R. Emmet

**Keep Our I**  
Investing i  
from a c  
perso

**Promote Y**  
Distrib

[WSJbooks](#)  
[CareerJournalAsia](#)  
[CareerJournalEurope](#)  
[MarketWatch](#)



global warming. Mr. Nordhaus's model, for example, anticipates global GDP if nothing is done over the coming century, taking into account catastrophes. The Stern review purports to show that the studies suggested."



On the face of it, Mr. Stern acknowledges the risks of climate change. Even including risks of climate change, he agrees that an increase in costs of about 3% of GDP. But he wants to pump out carbon far into the 21st century given the falling costs of carbon, especially if some of his predictions about the end of this century. Thus the temperatures of eight degrees Celsius, costing 11% to 14% of GDP.

The Stern review then analyzes everyone in the present and the future. The cost estimate is not 0% of GDP right now and forever. If the cost is certainly underscored by the fact that an extremely low discount rate makes the future much more ominous now.

But even 11% is not the last word. Mr. Stern suggests that the cost of global warming will be higher than the top end of the U.N. estimates, in effect, a "worst-case scenario" even worse than the current estimates. Therefore, the estimated damage to GDP jumps to 15% from 11%. Mr. Stern admonishes that poor people count for less in the economic calculations, 15% to 20%.

This figure, 20%, was the number that rocketed around the world after much-massaged reworking of the standard 3% GDP cost that most economists to be a reasonable estimate.

Likewise, Mr. Stern readjusts the cost of dealing with climate change. The cost of 550 ppm stabilization would be somewhere around 1% of GDP. He reports that costs could lie between -4% and 15% of GDP. His suggestion that cutting carbon emissions could make us richer, that we could address inefficiencies in taxation--but the alleged inefficiencies addressed no matter what the policies about climate change. Nevertheless, he finds a very low cost estimate is because he uses the so-called Induced Technological Change. These models are two percentage points because carbon cuts lead to an increase in economic development, which again makes further cuts cheaper. The costs are on average 1% of GDP, and in the summary act as a maximum cost.

The Stern review's cornerstone argument for immediate action is the suggestion that doing nothing about climate change costs something only costs 1%. However, this argument hinges on assumptions.

First, it assumes that if we act, we will not still have to pay the cost. It actually tells us that his solution is "already associated with the cost of action to be as cheap as he tells us--at best overly optimistic. Third, and most importantly, it is not to be a realistic assumption: But the 20% of GDP figure is a pessimistic vision of the 22nd century, and by an extreme rate. According to the background numbers in Mr. Stern's report, the cost is 0% now and 3% of GDP in 2100, a much more informed estimate now and forever.

In other words: Given reasonable inputs, most cost-benefit analyses show that early carbon reductions cost more than the good they challenge that understanding is based on a chain of unlikely assumptions.

Moreover, there is a fourth major problem in Mr. Stern's analysis. It seems naive to believe that the world's governments will implement Mr. Stern's multitrillion-dollar, century-long plan to avoid its obligations. Why would China and India even part with their money, would it be able to implement the policies? In 2002, China's dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emissions by 10%--they are now 27% higher than in 1990. A much bigger health and environmental problem than climate change.

Why does all this matter? It matters because, with clever headlines, the Stern review is about to edge its way into the public eye. The suggestion that flooding will overwhelm us has already been going back to the background reports properly shows the world's climate change is a much bigger health and environmental problem than climate change.

fewer people at risk. The media is now quoting Mr. Stern's suggestion that climate change will wreak financial devastation that will wipe 20% off GDP, explicitly evoking memories of past financial catastrophes such as the Great Depression or World War II; yet the review clearly tells us that costs will be 0% now and just 3% in 2100.

It matters because Gordon Brown, Tony Blair and Nicholas Stern all profess that one of the major reasons that they want to do something about climate change is because it will hit the world's poor the hardest. Using a worse-than-worst-case scenario, Mr. Stern warns that the wealth of South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa will be reduced by 10% to 13% in 2100 and suggests that effect would lead to 145 million more poor people.

Faced with such alarmist suggestions, spending just 1% of GDP or \$450 billion each year to cut carbon emissions seems on the surface like a sound investment. In fact, it is one of the least attractive options. Spending just a fraction of this figure--\$75 billion--the U.N. estimates that we could solve all the world's major basic problems. We could give everyone clean drinking water, sanitation, basic health care and education right now. Is that not better?

We know from economic models that dealing just with malaria could provide economic boosts to the order of 1% extra GDP growth per capita per year. Even making a very conservative estimate that solving *all* the major basic issues would induce just 2% extra growth, 100 years from now each individual in the developing world would be more than 700% richer. That truly trivializes Mr. Stern's 10% to 13% estimates for South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Last weekend in New York, I asked 24 U.N. ambassadors--from nations including China, India and the U.S.--to prioritize the best solutions for the world's greatest challenges, in a project known as Copenhagen Consensus. They looked at what spending money to combat climate change and other major problems could achieve. They found that the world should prioritize the need for better health, nutrition, water, sanitation and education, long before we turn our attention to the costly mitigation of global warming.

We all want a better world. But we must not let ourselves be swept up in making a bad investment, simply because we have been scared by sensationalist headlines.

*Mr. Lomborg, author of "The Skeptical Environmentalist" (Cambridge, 2001), teaches at the Copenhagen Business School and is director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center.*

---

[RESPOND TO THIS ARTICLE](#) [READ RESPONSES](#) [E-MAIL THIS TO A FRIEND](#) [PRINT FRIENDLY  
FORMAT](#)

[HOME](#) [TOP OF PAGE](#) [ARCHIVE](#)

[SUBSCRIBE TO THE WALL STREET JOURNAL ONLINE](#) OR [TAKE A TOUR](#)

[SIGN UP TODAY FOR FREE MARKETWATCH MEMBERSHIP](#)

Copyright © Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.  
By using this site, you agree to the [Terms of Use](#) and [Privacy Policy](#).

[RSS](#) [XML](#)

ADVERTISERS LINKS | [WHAT'S THIS?](#)

**Trade Online as Low as \$6.95**

Get \$6.95 online trades. Plus, apply online and get 25 free trades.  
[www.usaa.com](http://www.usaa.com)

**Register For Free Commodities Website**

Register and receive free access to quotes, charts, news and research.  
[www.thecommoditychannel.com](http://www.thecommoditychannel.com)

**Forex.com - Free 50K Practice Account**

Trade your strategy in the Forex Market. 24 hour forex trading.  
[www.forex.com](http://www.forex.com)