

Towards a small family ethic

Travis Rieder

Without children we humans have no stake in the future of the planet.

I want children I want them to be of my own flesh and blood, not those of a random stranger. Kids inherit temperament and intelligence in their genome. My chances of having successful kids is higher if they are my own. This is how evolution works. If I am better fit for survival in the modern world, I should be able to pass on the qualities that made me successful. I have no interest in nurturing the offspring of less intelligent people who follow evolution's dictate and reproduce with no regard for, no awareness of their impact on the future of humanity, heedlessly filling orphan asylums.

As a conservative, my first instinct is to conserve. We should all be sparing in our use of energy. We should not live in big houses. We should avoid private vehicles when public transport will do. We should not emulate Al Gore's hypocrisy, going by private jet to do-gooder conferences and living large in sprawling mansions I am optimistic that alternative energy sources, mainly solar, driverless transportation, better insulation, more efficient lighting and so on will reduce per capita energy consumption. Less energy use overall, less of it carbon-based, combined with sub-replacement fertility levels that already exist throughout the developed world will significantly decrease CO2 emissions.

CO2 may not even be the problem. I grant that it has risen from 280 ppm to 400 since the industrial revolution. The theory is that this ought to create a "greenhouse effect" raising temperatures radically. It has not happened. Dire warnings of the Arctic Ocean thawing, glaciers melting and so on have simply not come true. Ice thins in some places, thickens in others. Nobody can agree how to measure temperatures, and certainly not how to model it. Read [\[\[ASIN:0262518635 A Vast Machine\]\]](#) and [\[\[ASIN:B004YPJ8ZU Global Warming Gridlock\]\]](#) for balanced, non-polemic views on the magnitude of the problem of even understanding what is happening. Humility is in order. Lifelone environmentalist Stewart Brand gets it about right in [\[\[ASIN:0143118285 Whole Earth Discipline\]\]](#).

The IPCC has politicized the issue, often faking results as in the East Anglia email scandal, in order to advance a globalist agenda – the New World Order of income redistribution and curtailment of freedoms in the guise of saving humanity. I review two books by scientists that became disenchanted with the IPCC and write realistically about global warming: [\[\[ASIN:1934791288 Climate Change Reconsidered\]\]](#) and [\[\[ASIN:B00YW3GQAE The Neglected Sun\]\]](#)

It is irresponsible to let CO2 levels continue to grow. But, on the other hand, there was five times more CO2 in the age of the dinosaurs, and they did not suffocate. Greenhouse gases are a worrisome unknown. Global warming is a likely hypothesis, but nothing more. Anybody with an ounce of humility has to concede that the effects of more CO2 and a warmer climate are unpredictable. There would undoubtedly be some benefits to offset the downside. However, the IPCC, with their bureaucratic power and salaries, cannot afford humility.

The best argument is that we should not gamble with our children's future. We should continue with practical measures such as the Montreal Protocol and the follow-on HFC limits negotiated this week. As David Victor argues in "Global Warming Gridlock," above, such steps are politically possible. Last week's negotiated limits on emissions through air travel are also within the realm of the doable, and should thus be attempted. But without children the argument is absurd. Rieder puts the cart before the horse.