

September 11, 2007

FINDINGS

'Feel Good' vs. 'Do Good' on Climate

By [JOHN TIERNEY](#)

After looking at one too many projections of global-warming disasters — computer graphics of coasts swamped by rising seas, mounting death tolls from heat waves — I was ready for a reality check. Instead of imagining a warmer planet, I traveled to a place that has already felt the heat, accompanied by Bjorn Lomborg, the Danish political scientist and scourge of environmentalist orthodoxy.

It was not an arduous expedition. We went to an old wooden building near the Brooklyn Bridge that is home to the Bridge Cafe, which bills itself as “New York’s Oldest Drinking Establishment.” There’s been drinking in the building since the late 18th century, when it was erected on Water Street along the shore of Lower Manhattan.

Since record-keeping began in the 19th century, the sea level in New York has been rising about a foot per century, which happens to be about the same increase estimated to occur over the next century by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The temperature has also risen as New York has been covered with asphalt and concrete, creating an “urban heat island” that’s estimated to have raised nighttime temperatures by 7 degrees Fahrenheit. The warming that has already occurred locally is on the same scale as what’s expected globally in the next century.

The impact of these changes on Lower Manhattan isn’t quite as striking as the computer graphics. We couldn’t see any evidence of the higher sea level near the Bridge Cafe, mainly because Water Street isn’t next to the water anymore. Dr. Lomborg and I had to walk over two-and-a-half blocks of landfill to reach the current shoreline.

The effect of the rising temperatures is more complicated to gauge. Hotter summer weather can indeed be fatal, as [Al Gore](#) likes us to remind audiences by citing the 35,000 deaths attributed to the 2003 heat wave in Europe. But there are a couple of confounding factors explained in Dr. Lomborg’s new book, “Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist’s Guide to [Global Warming](#).”

The first is that winter can be deadlier than summer. About seven times more deaths in Europe are attributed annually to cold weather (which aggravates circulatory and respiratory illness) than to hot weather, Dr. Lomborg notes, pointing to studies showing that a warmer planet would mean fewer temperature-related deaths in Europe and worldwide.

The second factor is that the weather matters a lot less than how people respond to it. Just because there are hotter summers in New York doesn’t mean that more people die — in fact, just the reverse has

occurred. Researchers led by Robert Davis, a climatologist at the [University of Virginia](#), concluded that the number of heat-related deaths in New York in the 1990s was only a third as high as in the 1960s. The main reason is simple, and evident as you walk into the Bridge Cafe on a warm afternoon: air-conditioning.

The lesson from our expedition is not that global warming is a trivial problem. Although Dr. Lomborg believes its dangers have been hyped, he agrees that global warming is real and will do more harm than good. He advocates a carbon tax and a treaty forcing nations to budget hefty increases for research into low-carbon energy technologies.

But the best strategy, he says, is to make the rest of the world as rich as New York, so that people elsewhere can afford to do things like shore up their coastlines and buy air conditioners. He calls Kyoto-style treaties to cut greenhouse-gas emissions a mistake because they cost too much and do too little too late. Even if the United States were to join in the Kyoto treaty, he notes, the cuts in emissions would merely postpone the projected rise in sea level by four years: from 2100 to 2104.

“We could spend all that money to cut emissions and end up with more land flooded next century because people would be poorer,” Dr. Lomborg said as we surveyed Manhattan’s expanded shoreline. “Wealth is a more important factor than sea-level rise in protecting you from the sea. You can draw maps showing 100 million people flooded out of their homes from global warming, but look at what’s happened here in New York. It’s the same story in Denmark and Holland — we’ve been gaining land as the sea rises.”

Dr. Lomborg, who’s best known (and most reviled in some circles) for an earlier book, “The Skeptical Environmentalist,” runs the Copenhagen Consensus Center, which gathers economists to set priorities in tackling global problems. In his new book, he dismisses the Kyoto emissions cuts as a “feel-good” strategy because it sounds virtuous and lets politicians make promises they don’t have to keep. He outlines an alternative “do-good” strategy that would cost less but accomplish more in dealing with climate change as well as more pressing threats like [malaria](#), [AIDS](#), polluted drinking water and malnutrition.

If you’re worried about stronger [hurricanes](#) flooding coasts, he says, concentrate on limiting coastal development and expanding wetlands right now rather than trying to slightly delay warming decades from now. To give urbanites a break from hotter summers, concentrate on reducing the urban-heat-island effect. If cities planted more greenery and painted roofs and streets white, he says, they could more than offset the impact of global warming.

The biggest limitation to his cost-benefit analyses is that no one knows exactly what global warming will produce. It may not be worth taking expensive steps to forestall a one-foot rise in the sea level, but what if the seas rise much higher? Dr. Lomborg’s critics argue that we owe it to future generations to prepare for the worst-case projections.

But preparing for the worst in future climate is expensive, which means less money for the most serious threats today — and later this century. You can imagine plenty of worst-case projections that have nothing

to do with climate change, as Dr. Lomborg reminded me at the end of our expedition.

“No historian would look back at the last two centuries and rank the rising sea level here as one of the city’s major problems,” he said, sitting safely dry and cool inside the Bridge Cafe. “I don’t think our descendants will thank us for leaving them poorer and less healthy just so we could do a little bit to slow global warming. I’d rather we were remembered for solving the other problems first.”

[Copyright 2007 The New York Times Company](#)

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Search](#) | [Corrections](#) | [RSS](#) | [First Look](#) | [Help](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Work for Us](#) | [Site Map](#)

BOOKS & ARTS

A challenge to Kyoto

Standard cost-benefit analysis may not apply to the economics of climate change.

Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist's Guide to Global Warming

by Bjorn Lomborg

Knopf/Cyan-Marshall Cavendish: 2007.

272 pp./256 pp. \$21/£19.99

Partha Dasgupta

Bjorn Lomborg's *The Skeptical Environmentalist* created a sensation six years ago. The author offered figures to dismiss claims that the ecological-resource base in many parts of the world is deteriorating, and argued that the costs of reducing ecological losses are usually higher than the benefits. Never mind that several of the world's foremost environmental scientists expressed more than mere scepticism towards Lomborg's grasp of their science: prominent publications such as *The Economist* promoted the book vigorously and wrote sermons on how scientists should practise their craft. People learning of my own work in developing ecological economics would ask, "And have you read Lomborg?" — implying, "Why have you thrown away so much of your working life?"

Things have changed over the past year. Former US vice-president Al Gore's film *An Inconvenient Truth* and the Fourth Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have given rise to great public concern, and many now regard global warming to be the central problem facing humanity. Lomborg's latest book, *Cool It*, is a response to that change in public perception. He doesn't question the science, which says that rising concentrations of greenhouse gases in Earth's atmosphere are affecting our climate system; he questions whether we should do much about it. If *The Skeptical Environmentalist* was the relentless prosecuting counsel, *Cool It* is the hard-headed but caring economist.

The book is a series of exercises in cost-benefit analysis, interspersed with quotes on climate change from the writings of famous people who should know better than to speak in hyperboles. Lomborg produces figures to show that it would be better to replace the Kyoto Protocol with strategies that encourage economic growth and blunt the harmful effects of climate change. Here is a sample: did you say Kyoto would result in fewer floods? Maybe, but it would reduce flood damage by only US\$45 million a year, whereas building appropriate infrastructure could lower it by



B. MCNEELY/GETTY IMAGES

Should we be spending more on protecting ourselves against the adverse effects of global warming?

\$60 billion a year. Didn't you also say that global warming would cause additional deaths from heatwaves? Yes, but what about the greater numbers who would not die of cold? Are you worried about deepening poverty in the tropics without Kyoto? You shouldn't be, because Kyoto would reduce the number of undernourished people in 2080 by only 2 million, whereas the United Nations proposes in its Millennium Development Goals to reduce the number by 229 million by 2015. What about more severe hurricanes? Well, Kyoto would reduce the increased annual damage by only 0.6%, whereas taking better precautions could lower it by 250%. And so on.

Lomborg reports that Kyoto's annual cost would be \$180 billion in foregone output, whereas the smart strategies he outlines, which would include an annual expenditure of \$25 billion on research and development in clean technologies, would cost a mere \$52 billion a year. By his reckoning, those strategies would limit the rise in concentration of carbon dioxide to 560 parts per million (p.p.m.) and the accompanying temperature rise to 4.7 °C. Smart strategies would cost far less than Kyoto, deliver higher economic growth worldwide, and markedly reduce poverty. From the vantage point of Kyoto, there is a free lunch to be had wherever you look.

You might say that the Kyoto Protocol

was misconceived and that the world should develop a bolder programme of action, with much higher carbon taxes, international cooperation to reduce hunger, disease and habitat destruction, and development of clean technologies and ways to sequester carbon. But in Lomborg's view, doing more of a bad deal is rarely smart, so he doesn't countenance going beyond Kyoto. All this is spelt out in such a breezy, engaging style, it's hard not to find the arguments entirely reasonable.

Unfortunately, Lomborg's thesis is built on a deep misconception of Earth's system and of economics when applied to that system. The concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere is now 380 p.p.m., a figure that ice cores in Antarctica have revealed to be in excess of the maximum reached during the past 600,000 years. If there is one truth about Earth we all should know, it's that the system is driven by interlocking, nonlinear processes running at different speeds. The transition to Lomborg's recommended concentration of 560 p.p.m. would involve crossing an unknown number of tipping points (or separatrices) in the global climate system. We have no data on the consequences if Earth were to cross those tipping points. They could be good, or they could be disastrous. Even if we did have data, they would probably be of little value because nature's processes are irreversible. One

implication of the Earth system's deep nonlinearities is that estimates of climatic parameters based on observations from the recent past are unreliable for making forecasts about the state of the world at CO₂ concentrations of 560 p.p.m. or higher. Moreover, the nonlinearities mean that doing more of a bad deal (Kyoto) may well be very good.

These truths seem to escape Lomborg. His cost-benefit analysis involves only point estimates of variables (interpreted variously as 'most likely', 'expected', and so forth), implying that he believes we shouldn't buy insurance against potentially enormous losses resulting from climate change. His concerns over the prevalence of malaria, undernutrition and HIV in today's world show that he is an egalitarian. There is, then, an internal contradiction in his value system, because if you are averse to inequality you should also be averse to uncertainty.

The integrated assessment models of Earth's system on which Lomborg builds his case are arbitrarily bounded on either side of his point estimates. It can be shown that if those bounds are removed (as they ought to be), even a small amount of uncertainty — when allied

to only a moderate aversion to uncertainty — would imply that humanity should spend substantial amounts on insurance, even more than the 1–2% of world output that has been advocated. If the uncertainties are not small, standard cost-benefit analysis as applied to the economics of climate change becomes incoherent, even if those uncertainties are judged to be thin-tailed (gaussian, for example); this is because the analysis would say that no matter how much humanity chooses to invest in protecting Earth from passing through those later tipping points, we should invest still more.

Economics helps us to realize what we are able to say about matters that will reveal themselves only in the distant future. Simultaneously, it helps us to realize the limits of what we are able to say. That, too, is worth knowing, for limits on what we are able to say are not a reason for inaction. Lomborg's seemingly persuasive economic calculations are a case of muddled concreteness. ■

Partha Dasgupta is professor of economics at the University of Cambridge and fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. He is author of *Discounting Climate Change*, forthcoming in *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.

in terms of priority; he made a number of significant mistakes; his major discoveries are not easily understood by the layperson; and he lacked the forceful manner of a Crick or Bernal. But as the father of protein crystallography — arguably one of the greatest scientific advances of the last century — and the founder of the Medical Research Council (MRC) Laboratory of Molecular Biology in Cambridge, UK, his influence was enormous.

Ferry succeeds in bringing what could, in lesser hands, be considered a somewhat drab character sharply to life. As an Austrian Jew born during the First World War, Perutz left for Cambridge in 1936, where he joined the laboratory of one of the larger-than-life figures of modern science, John Desmond Bernal. Together with Dorothy Hodgkin, Bernal had, just two years earlier, taken the first X-ray diffraction photograph of a single crystal of a protein molecule, the digestive enzyme pepsin. This showed that, in principle, the extraordinary power of crystallography could reveal the atomic details of even large biological molecules. Undeterred by the scale of his task, Perutz ventured to use crystallography to unravel how haemoglobin could bind oxygen tightly enough to transport it around the bloodstream, yet release it when and where it was needed.

I doubt whether most people, even today, understand how pioneering this was. Determining the three-dimensional structure of proteins was a goal of Nobel-prize potential

for several powerful research groups of that time, but none particularly cared what the protein was. Only Perutz had a greater aim. He wanted to understand the function of haemoglobin, which meant solving all the problems presented by this large, flexible protein. What would he have made of the recent International Structural Genomics Initiative, I wonder, which aims to turn out massive numbers of protein crystal structures without regard to biological or biochemical function?

Perutz's greatest achievement was demonstrating that the method of 'isomorphous replacement', previously used to solve the structures of small organic compounds, could be used to crack the 'phase problem' in protein crystallography. This is the problem of how to deduce a wave's phase component in diffraction patterns. This method made it possible to sum up the scattered X-ray waves in proper registration with each other and therefore to reconstruct the molecule's structure. It opened the way to solving the structure of any large crystalline molecule. Ferry explains the many false starts, and embarrassing errors, that led up to that moment, while allowing the reader to feel the frustrations and joys along the way. It's as good an account of a scientific breakthrough as you will find.

Haemoglobin's structure followed. More

Max in three dimensions

Max Perutz and the Secret of Life

by Georgina Ferry


Chatto & Windus/Cold Spring Harbor

Laboratory Press: 2007. 304 pp. £25/\$39

Gregory A. Petsko

I have a problem with the title of this book, but it's almost my only quibble with this marvelous biography of one of the least known of the twentieth century's great scientists. By no measure could Max Perutz be said to have discovered the secret of life — a claim that might be defended for Gregor Mendel, or Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace, or James Watson and Francis Crick. The mechanism of oxygen's reversible binding to haemoglobin, which Perutz elucidated in 1970 after more than 25 years of work, doesn't even apply to most living organisms (and oxygen is deadly to most anaerobes). That said, Perutz did many extraordinary things, including winning the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1962 for solving haemoglobin's three-dimensional structure.

It is hard to write a biography of someone only recently deceased (Perutz died in 2002). The biographer must accurately portray someone who was known personally to many readers, yet at the same time expose previously hidden aspects of his or her character. Georgina Ferry achieved both in her biography of Dorothy Crowfoot Hodgkin, and now she has done it again in her engrossing account



Perutz the showman: Max continued to captivate audiences well into his eighties.

of the life and work of Max Perutz.

Perutz, whom I knew well for 30 years, can't have been an ideal subject. No scandal colours his career; his personal life was stable and happy; his accomplishments were clear