



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on January 5, 2015

Published in the January 5, 2015 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 31, No. 01

---

## Correction, Please!

### Collaborating With China in Climate Con Game



**Need for negotiation skills:** Under an agreement between President Obama and China to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, China will continue building a new coal-fired power plant every 10 days, while the United States will cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 26 to 28 percent of the 2005 rate. It's practically U.S. economic suicide. *(Photo credit: AP Images)*

**Item:** A "Fact Sheet" from the White House announced on November 11, 2014: President Obama announced a new target to cut net greenhouse gas emissions 26-28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. At the same time, President Xi Jinping of China announced targets to peak CO<sub>2</sub> emissions around 2030, with the intention to try to peak early, and to increase the non-fossil fuel share of all energy to around 20 percent by 2030."

*These actions "are part of the longer range effort to achieve the deep decarbonization of the global economy over time."*

**Item:** The Obama administration, reported the Washington Post for December 2, "is hoping for fresh momentum toward a climate treaty during international talks" in the Peruvian capital of Lima.

**Item:** During a November 13 interview with Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy, MSNBC host Andrea Mitchell touted the "major breakthrough with China." Mitchell asked if the deal was "lopsided in China's favor."

*To the China question, the EPA administrator said, "I don't think so." China, she insisted, "clearly is making a strong commitment. And we're actually going to take action that's meaningful in both countries." McCarthy concluded: "But most importantly, our domestic action under this president is sparking the kind of international effort that we wanted it to spark."*

**Correction:** That's one way to put it — if you are trying to sell a "green" pig in a poke. A more accurate way to describe these dealings would be to acknowledge that China won't do anything that isn't in its interests; "undeveloped" nations will put their hands out for kickbacks from "developed" nations before making largely empty promises; and the Obama administration will do everything it thinks it can get



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on January 5, 2015

Published in the January 5, 2015 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 31, No. 01

---

away with in order to claim an environmental victory, no matter how much it hurts the U.S. economy.

Oh, yes, and the horribly expensive deals in the works, both internationally and domestically, are meant to accrue more power to central governments, but will do little or nothing to affect “global warming” or “climate change.”

The Obama administration’s EPA is already rolling out more edicts to burden businesses in the name of regulating carbon. One, sporting 656 pages and a 575-page index, covers regulations on ozone. The powers-that-be waited for four years and then slipped it into the public record with a plethora of other decrees on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. That’s over and above EPA’s proposed rules mandating carbon dioxide cuts for existing power plants that heat homes and help run businesses; those rules, if implemented, could cost a million jobs.

The power-plant diktats — among the domestic rules that we will deal with in more detail in our next column — have been called costly, illegitimate, and unlawful by free-market organizations and unconstitutional by Lawrence Tribe, a very “liberal” Harvard law professor. As noted by the professor, the EPA power plant rules demonstrate “the risk of allowing an unaccountable administrative agency to ‘make’ law and attempt to impose the burden of global climate change on an unlucky and unfortunate few.”

Professor Tribe, in a filing dated December 1, charged that the EPA plan also “violates principles of federalism and seeks to commandeer state governments in violation of the Tenth Amendment.” He further explained the agency’s action “hides political choices and frustrates accountability. It forces states to adopt policies that will raise energy costs and prove deeply unpopular, while cloaking those policies in the garb of state ‘choice’ — even though in fact the polices are compelled by EPA. The Supreme Court has strongly condemned such arrangements, because ‘where the Federal Government directs the States to regulate, it may be state officials who will bear the brunt of public disapproval, while the federal officials who devised the regulatory program may remain insulated from the electoral ramifications of their decision.’ ”

The Communist Chinese no doubt appreciate how Washington, chockablock with unelected authoritarian bureaucrats, views its subjects. For example, in discussing the strategy involved in the climate compact made with China, a “senior administration official, who requested anonymity,” explained to the *Los Angeles Times*: “It would be nice if we had some help and support from the Congress. But we think we have the ability under laws that have already been passed by Congress — principally the Clean Air Act, but others as well — to get these reductions ... with authorities we already have.” This is how eels speak — when they think they are whales and beyond accountability.

The incoming chairman of the Senate committee that deals with environmental policy, Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.), isn’t buying the establishment line, having observed:

In the President’s climate change deal, the United States will be required to more steeply reduce our carbon emissions while China won’t have to reduce anything. It’s hollow and not believable for China to claim it will shift 20 percent of its energy to non-fossil fuels by 2030, and a promise to peak its carbon emissions only allows the world’s largest economy to buy time. China builds a coal-fired power plant every 10 days, is the largest importer of coal in the world, and has no known reserves of natural gas. This deal is a non-binding charade.



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on January 5, 2015

Published in the January 5, 2015 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 31, No. 01

---

No doubt there will be support ginned up for an international agreement of some sort. From the Obama administration's point of view, it would be better if the Senate has no say in the matter. No doubt we will be told the United States should pay the freight charges of this out-of-control global-warming train. Below is a clue how support may be obtained. As noted by Rupert Darwell, author of *The Age of Global Warming: A History*, the so-called developing nations have their own gambit:

For the developing world ... the climate negotiations have always been about how much money they get. From the outset, the talks were predicated on massive aid transfers from north to south. Climate became the most potent bargaining chip in a decades-old demand for aid to allegedly avoid permanent Third World impoverishment....

If the West wants a fig-leaf climate agreement, however, it will have to at least promise to pay for one. At Copenhagen, developed nations pledged \$100 billion a year of climate aid by 2020. The U.N. is having as little success raising money as it had in cutting emissions. So far it has recovered only \$9.3 billion of one-time pledges.

Beijing probably can't believe its good fortune in its negotiations with this administration. As Reuters reported on November 12: "For China, the targets add little to its existing commitments to wean itself off carbon, environmental experts said. 'The statement is an upbeat signal to motivate other countries, but the timeline China has committed to is not a binding target,' said Li Junfeng, an influential Chinese climate policy adviser linked to China's state planning agency, the National Development and Reform Commission."

Here is the conclusion of a decidedly "non-climate-denier," who has long pushed "for a global agreement to curb carbon," as he has acknowledged. Yet, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer pulls no punches in calling this deal with China a "fraud of major proportions." As he writes:

Its main plank commits China to *begin* cutting carbon emissions *16 years from now*. On the other hand, the United States, having already cut more carbon emissions than any nation on earth since 2005, must now double its current rate of carbon cutting to meet a new, more restrictive goal by 2025. In return for which, China will keep *increasing* its carbon emissions year after year throughout that period — and for five years beyond.

... It becomes even more absurd when you realize that, according to the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, China was on track to plateau its carbon emissions around 2030 *anyway*.

And what about the momentous effects on the climate? Well, on the home front, the Obama gang is pushing rules that, just for one example, have been estimated to cost an additional \$173 billion a year for energy customers by 2020. And what does that buy? Using a climate model (that was developed with EPA support), scientists have gauged that the EPA's power plan would result in averting less than 0.02 °C of global warming by 2100. Maybe.



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on January 5, 2015

Published in the January 5, 2015 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 31, No. 01

## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.