

The text that follows is a PREPRINT.

Please cite as:

Fearnside, P.M. 1999. Bogging Down In the Sinks. World Watch 12(3): 6-7.

ISSN: 0896-0615

Copyright: Worldwatch Institute

The original publication is available from

BOGGING DOWN IN SINKS

The question of sinks in mitigating global warming is an important one. The article by Ashley T. Mattoon explains some of the pitfalls in the ongoing debate about what will be counted under protocols to the Framework Convention on Climate Change. Mattoon concludes that forests should not be included in mitigation plans. I have reached the opposite conclusion. Perhaps some additional information would help.

Mattoon has lumped all forestry measures into a single generalization when, in fact, options such as silvicultural plantations and maintenance of tropical rainforests have radically different carbon benefits, in addition to difference in their social and environmental effects. The argument that allowing carbon "sinks" in forests permits more carbon to be added to the active pool (atmosphere + biosphere + wood products, etc.), therefore providing a loophole to permit more fossil fuel burning applies to plantations but not to forest maintenance, so long as the credits are calculated realistically. The main questions are how the "baseline" for the forestry activities is specified and what (if any) value is given to time.

Preventing deforestation in countries with large areas of remaining forest, such as Brazil, is much more akin to avoiding fossil fuel emissions than it is to planting eucalyptus for pulpwood. When the burning of a barrel of oil is avoided (due to increased energy efficiency, for example), the gain is considered to be a permanent one, even though the same barrel of oil will be pumped out of the ground and burned the following year. This is because the effect cascades forward in each successive year's emission. The same is true of avoided deforestation if a country's forest is far from coming to an end.

Time is the second question. Because global warming is not a one-time catastrophe, but rather changes the probability of events such as droughts and famines from the time of the warming onward, postponing a given amount of warming, even for a single year, has a permanent value (by the same logic as that by which postponing the burning of a barrel of oil has a permanent value). Time is given value by means of a discount rate or other equivalent mechanism. Plantations, which keep carbon out of the atmosphere for a limited time, deserve some credit, the amount of which will depend on the value given to time (a moral and political decision, not a scientific one).

I was surprised by the dismissal of the Noel Kempff reserve project in Bolivia as not a "real world" project because "a horde of problems ... awaits such projects on the ground. Many of the countries that would presumably be invited to host such projects have weak legal systems, weak forest management agencies, and growing populations of rural poor who live by subsistence agriculture." I can assure the author that Bolivia has all of these problems, and that poverty there would certainly meet the most demanding standards for what constitutes the "real world"! The Bolivian project brings some important innovations, including the retention of half of the carbon credits for the Bolivian government to sell later at market prices (thereby defusing the argument sometimes heard in Brazil that tropical countries should wait until the price is right before entering the carbon market with forest maintenance projects).

The conclusion that "managing the world's forests to mitigate climate change is not a realistic or an ecologically healthy ambition" is, fortunately, not justified. Some of the most

important possibilities are both realistic and healthy. What could be more "ecologically healthy" than keeping tropical forests standing? In addition to great environmental benefits for biodiversity, reducing tropical deforestation would have substantial benefits for global climate. Tropical deforestation, in the aggregate, releases even more carbon annually than the most notorious fossil fuel burning nation of all: the United States. Of course, global warming is a sufficiently large problem that much more than forestry is needed to fight it, and there can be no escape for industrialized countries facing up to reducing their profligate use of fossil fuels.

Philip M. Fearnside
National Institute for Research
in the Amazon-INPA
Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil