



Smog in China.

# CLIMATE CHANGE 3

**June 24, 2015**

José Cruz: OK, well then I'll change the question, Let's say just uh uh "**devil's advocate**" Let's say, because recently there has been a lot more talk than there was around the time of the Kyoto Protocol, to get governments to get together, and recently, I think it was America and a bunch of other countries that had said, uh by 2050, "we're going to move away from a completely- completely move away from a carbon-based energy regimen." Have you heard that news? 2050, they set a deadline for themselves. Uh and- but it hasn't been ratified **through** Congress, it hasn't been ratified through parliament, etc. But at least the leaders of the countries said, "2050's the target. We're going to get away from carbon-based energy production." Now if that holds true for other things like OK well, so China India everybody raise their hands. We're **going to** enforce laws that says air conditioner use and and indoor climate control use is going to be strictly controlled by the government, and everybody was on board, and that meant no air conditioner for you, because China and India and everybody else was doing it, could you live more happily with the idea of not having any air conditioner in the summer time?

Chris O'Sullivan: Yes.

José: OK so as long as everybody else is on board (Yes) You're with it, too? OK. OK.

Chris: Yeah um, but um, I would even question tho- It's a good idea of kir- of course, but I would even question the idea of, these countries they're not going to stop burning coal, oil, and gas to generate their electricity. They are building obviously nuclear power stations (Mm-hmm) in those countries (Mm-hmm) and that takes away their dependency on fossil fuels. Fine that's great, but I can't see it- these countries giving up on burning fossil fuels anytime soon. So by 2050 I think it's just a pipe dream. Who knows, these countries might change and as they get richer ah- they might want a cleaner environment. They might want clean air, clean water. Research has shown that when a country's GDP becomes up to \$15,000.00 This (Per capita) Per capita, this- the citizens of that country start to care more about their environment and do something to clean it up, but before that, that that uh target of **US\$15,000.00** they actually just want to develop (Mm) and screw the environment, (Mm) we just want to develop and get rich and we'll suffer the bad air the dirty water, (uh-huh) you know the you know, the streaming eyes, you know the the asthma, the eczema whatever,

José: I can understand that because even on an individual level \$15,000.00 really isn't that much, and probably if you're below that, you're actually at poverty level and you're thinking more about, how am I **going to** feed my six kids. I **got to** eat. Uh uh it's- uh I'm

not really that concerned about recycling plastic bottles at this point.

Chris: No, for a lot of families specially you know if you've got that many kids and you haven't got a great income but you're just holding your, your head above water, it's really just about survival, (Mm) I mean hopefully you want your kids to have a better life, but hey at the time we have to live the way we're living and we have to do what we do to survive. And the environment really comes second to survival.

José: And that's why I think, when I was reading what I was reading too, that it's true, if we don't do this hand-in-hand with changes in economic distribution systems, wealth distribution systems, population- I go- got to say it- control. We can't just go on the way that we are where everybody can have 19 children like those idiots down in America with the reality TV show thinking, "Oh but my religion says that I need 18 kids." Huh? And you just can't do that anymore, now that we're going to be at seven billion and we're not going to institute any kind of population control. We're going to create this problem even bigger even if we did change economic

and wealth distribution systems, just the number of people that are on the planet.

Chris: But the rate of growth of population is actually declining. But that's the rate of growth. But before you say "no, it's not" The rate of growth (I wasn't) is declining, but the population of course, is- is still rising (Right) Global population is due to peak at nine billion people. (Mm-hmm) Due to peak, and after that is actually supposed to, according to- to all the experts, to slowly decline. They they're assuming of course that developed-developing countries have developed. There's a change of attitude and policy in governments. And people actually as they get richer, they don't want as many kids, etc. The actual rate of population growth peaked I think in the 1970s, when the actual rate of growth was the highest in the world I mean globally (Sure) But it's actually still growing, but the rate of growth is slowing down...

José: The rate of growth is starting to plateau.

Chris: ...and when it gets to nine billion it will actually be the decline.

[word count: 885]

Pointers:

**devil's advocate:** a thought and discussion method where a person takes the position opposite the one held by their discussion partner (0:03)

**through:** José made a mistake, The correct preposition for "ratified" is "by" (0:32)

**going to:** pronounced "GONNA" (0:47)

**US\$15,000.00:** note the writing protocol for currency (2:06)

**going to:** pronounced "GONNA" (2:32)

**got to:** pronounced "GOTTA" (2:34)

Discussion:

Are you optimistic or pessimistic about the future?

What is a more important problem than climate change?

What do you think will be the world's peak population number?

VOA ARTICLE: "MELTING ARCTIC SEA ICE SHOWS GLOBAL WARMING"  
<http://bit.ly/2hhTs0n>

IMAGE COURTESY ERHARD.RENZ  
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/28237570@N08/11233700294/>

<http://goldfish365.com/>

