

APPENDIX G

THE POLITICS OF GLOBAL WARMING

In preparing the basic technical portion of *Global Warming 101*, I have tried to present facts and arguments about the technical issues. This is as it should be, however I cringe when I see supposedly factual scientific magazines, such as Scientific American, Science News, National Geographic, and Discover mixing scientific data with political agendas. Science does not have any agenda other than the continuing search for the truth. True Science (as opposed to Junk Science) encourages debates, discussions, contrary points of view, presentations of data, and experiments in its search for the truth. Experiments are still being conducted on Einstein's Theory of Relativity, including the search for gravitational waves and the time differences in clocks traveling at different accelerations. On the other hand, the IPCC, and proponents, such as Al Gore, will not debate their information with the scientific community. It has been reported that, in preparing the latest IPCC report, the Conclusion section was written by a small elite team *before* the basic volumes of the report were written. Then, small sections of the basic report were assigned to different writers. Their texts were reviewed for conformance to the Conclusion section, and changed, as necessary, to conform to the IPCC Conclusion section. ***This is not Science, this is Politics!***

There is no global warming crisis. The Earth is merely behaving as it always does. Man has not affected the climate to any measurable extent. Carbon dioxide is ***not a pollutant***, but one of the molecules of life, without which, we all would die. Channel 4 of the BBC, in early 2008, prepared a film attacking Al Gore's assertions. The film, entitled "The Great Global Warming Swindle" is one-hour long. (I haven't seen the film.) A judge in England prevented the showing of Al Gore's movie "An Inconvenient Truth" to students in school, unless nine exaggerations or conflicts were changed.

John B. Christy, a participant in the IPCC from the University of Alabama in Huntsville, wrote an editorial for the Wall Street Journal entitled "My Nobel Moment" shortly after Al Gore and the IPCC were awarded Nobel Peace prizes. In this article he states "I neither see the developing (global warming) catastrophe nor the smoking gun proving that human activity is to blame for most of the warming we see. Rather, I see the reliance on climate models (useful, but never "proof") and the coincidence that changes in carbon and global temperatures have loose similarity over time."

On October 17, 2007, Daniel Boktkin wrote an editorial for the Wall Street Journal entitled "Global Warming Delusions". He states, "contrary to the latest

news, the evidence that global warming will have serious effects is very thin". He is the President of the Center for the Study of the Environment, and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

John Coleman, founder of the TV Weather Channel and currently TV meteorologist in San Diego, on November 18, 2007, discussed global warming. He stated, "It is the greatest scam in history. I am amazed, appalled, and highly offended by it. Global warming! It is a SCAM! Some dastardly scientists with environmental and political motives manipulated long-term scientific data to create an illusion of rapid global warming."

The list goes on and on of reputable scientists, climatologists, and weather experts decrying this sham. In December 2004, a German professor, Dennis Bray, summarized his survey of climate scientists regarding whether global warming was caused by man. Only 9.4% of the respondents strongly agree that man is complicit in global warming. A similar portion strongly disagrees. Only 22.8% of the respondents strongly agree the IPCC report accurately reflects a consensus of climate change (Reference 3).

Al Gore and the IPCC tell the world that there is nearly full agreement by climate scientists on the global warming issue. ***This is absolutely false.*** Gore often cited a letter circulated by the environmental group, Ozone Action, which offers the names of 2600 alleged experts on climate change who agreed with the global warming issue. Analyses of the signatory, carried out by Citizens for a Sound Economy, shows that ***fully 90% of those "scientists" who signed the letter are not scientists and have no qualifications on the issue.*** Only one person on the list is actually a climatologist. The list includes landscape architects, a practitioner in Chinese medicine, a hotel administrator, etc. In the next appendix you will find a petition signed by 19,000 American scientists ***against*** the Kyoto Protocol.

In early March, 2008, a conference was held in New York City with world-wide climate experts, entitled, "***International Conference on Climate Change--- Global Warming: Truth or Swindle.***" (Thomas Sowell editorial 2/29/08 entitled, "More Cold Water on Global Warming.") Finally opposition is speaking out!!

Al Gore will not debate global warming with any technical person, though repeatedly challenged. Any technical expert would simply tear him apart. Al is a spokesman, not a technical expert on the subject. In his book, *An Inconvenient Truth*, he states, "***Scientists have an independent obligation to respect and present the truth as they see it.***" Yet, he professes that there is no dissention. His chief technical advisor, Jim Hansen, a Director at NASA Goddard, was quoted by the Associated Press on September 24, 2006 as saying: "***Some of this noise won't stop until some of these (skeptical) scientists are dead.***"

Why would reputable organizations and scientists try to sell us on global warming, if it is a scam? There are at least four reasons: a resentment of technology and man's use of energy, power, money, and a desire for world socialism.

Resentment of man's use of energy. This is best characterized by such ecological elitist as Paul Erlich and Amory Levins. Paul Erlich stated, "Giving society cheap, abundant energy.... would be the equivalent of giving an idiot child a machine gun". This was reported in "An Ecologist's Perspective on Nuclear Power" published in 1978. Amory Levins, in an interview for The Mother Earth in 1977 stated, "If you ask me, it'd be a little short of disastrous for us to discover a source of clean, cheap, abundant energy, because of what we would do with it."

Political Power. The Greens have paralyzed this country's drilling for oil in Alaska and off the US coast by using scare stories of oil spills, ecological damage, threats to various species, etc. They have prevented us from building new oil refineries for the past 30 or so years. Meanwhile we spend \$400,000,000,000 (400 billion dollars) each year to buy oil from foreign countries. The Greens have kept us from building more nuclear energy plants, and even storing nuclear wastes more safely. They oppose coal-fired power plants. They have forced us to use far more expensive forms of alternate energy—solar power, windmills, etc. which must be government subsidized and drive up energy costs.

They have pushed for renewable biofuels, such as ethanol, which has only about 75% of the energy of gasoline per gallon, yet costs \$1.29 for every one dollar's worth of fuel. The editorial page of the Wall Street Journal on February 13, 2008, published an article detailing some of severe environmental consequences. The biofuels are worse than fossil fuels. Citing two studies in *Science*, a peer reviewed journal, they point out carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere are double those from fossil fuels because tilling the soil releases stored carbon dioxides and results in a loss of future carbon dioxide sinks. Further, deforestation to produce palm oils, results in a net loss of carbon dioxide uptake by plants.

Add to this, the cost increase in agricultural products due to acreage being devoted to corn, the increase in cattle and pork feed cost, etc. and the consumer is taking a major economical hit, and requiring we import additional grains that we used to export. Wheat is now \$24 per bushel.

Our Congress has surrendered to the Greens. Every energy bill is a sick joke, relying on energy conservation and alternate energies rather than increasing our independence on foreign oil. It's hard to believe our Congress does so little homework before they agree to a bill. ***In virtually every instance, we would have been better off without any legislation.*** Congress no longer represents the American people but the Green lobby. If Congress will let the marketplace decide

the energy selection, we'd be infinitely better off, for here is where the real energy experts work. After all, we rejected the Kyoto Protocol, so we are not bound by carbon dioxide restrictions as a nation.

Money. Why would reputable organizations and scientists try to sell us on global warming, if it is a scam? The answer to this is "follow the money". The UN has increased its budget from 2.9 billion dollars annually in 2004 to 4.17 billion dollars in 2008. The UN would like to be in the position of taxing governments on their carbon footprints, for they figure the rich nations, the carbon dioxide generators, can afford it. They manage the Kyoto Treaty and have power to fine nations tens of billions for non-compliance. To whom these fines go is a question for which I have yet to find answers. But, obviously, they are in it for the money and power to control the world's countries. *We saw how corrupt they really were when the Iraqi "Food for Oil" Program was managed by the United Nations.*

They are also trying to pass a new international law called the "Law of the Seas", which they will administer. It will allow them to collect a percentage from all minerals mined from the sea, direct shipping traffic, and even forbid the US Navy ships from entering certain areas. For the UN, this is another grab for power and money. Can you imagine United States agreeing to let an international organization set fees and taxes on them and control their military! Yet, unless we protest, some in our government are going to agree to it.

How about the scientist in the IPCC? What benefit is there to exaggerate the crisis. Research dollars and prestige! If you put on your résumé that you worked as a member of the IPCC, you have enhanced your ability to get research dollars for your climate studies. In other words, "you have to play the game". If you blow the whistle, you will be slandered and demonized. Every attempt will be made to discredit your credentials. This has been happening!

If you are an environmentalist, you are probably idealistic. Further, you may believe that man is responsible for all pollution, that man threatens nature, and that the "sky is falling". You do not have the facts, but your emotions direct your course of action and you want to make a "meaningful contribution" to the world. I'm sure many well-intentioned environmentalists have blindly accepted the IPCC exaggerations. A tremendous quantity of green dollars is available to environmental groups by similarly uninformed Americans who feel guilt and believe in those scientist and politicians who will not debate the global warming issue. The environmentalists have acquired a great deal of power in such organizations as Green Peace, the Sierra Club, and others. They must have a crisis to keep the funds coming.

If you are in the press, TV, or other media, you are aware that only bad news sells. The more you can make people believe an actual crisis exists, the more

newspapers you will sell. There are so few good investigative reporters these days. By your control of the news, you seldom let the opposite points of view be expressed, because they don't fit your preconceived social templates.

If you are a Senator or Representative, you feel that you must acquiesce to the "Green" point of view to get votes. At least one Senator, James Inhofe, dares speak his mind on environmental issues. He, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, described global warming as "the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people, and uses McCarthy-like tactics to threaten and intimidate scientists." That to challenge the "Green" is tantamount to committing political suicide. That's why the Senate, for example, has yet to pass a decent energy bill. We need to be self-sufficient from an energy standpoint and drill for oil offshore, in the Arctic or wherever it exists. We, the public, support self-sufficiency. We watch China drill offshore in Cuba; however, we are prohibited from drilling offshore in Florida. Technology, today, is excellent and very few oil spills occur from drilling, yet our politicians have let the environmentalists control the energy field by promoting the development of government subsidized windmills and subsidizing producers of a very inefficient fuel, ethanol, from corn. Surprisingly, energy companies promote the global warming theme for two reasons: 1. They don't want the negative reputation of being anti-environment. Advertizing a pro-environmental posture takes the pressure off, 2. They wish to cash in on the future products. GE And Phillips sell windmills and miniature fluorescent light bulbs. They won't tell you their fluorescent light bulb life depends on not turning it on and off very often (very low cyclic life), or that the mercury in the bulbs presents a formidable problem with safe disposal. They won't tell you about the diseases that are acerbated by the non-natural light of fluorescents. (Type into Internet: "health effects of fluorescent lighting). And, besides, they can get more money for fluorescent bulbs.

As a concerned member of the public, we watch a politician, whose carbon footprint is huge, get a Nobel Prize, *yet many of us question whether his true ignorance on the subject of global warming is only exceeded by his arrogance.* In an interview with Grist magazine, Al Gore stated, "I believe it is appropriate to have an over-representation of factual presentations on how dangerous it (global warming) is, as a predicate to opening up the audience to listen to what the solutions are, and how hopeful it is that we are going to solve this crisis."

I urge those of you who want the truth about global warming to research the subject yourself. Check the history of the climate on the Earth, listen to and evaluate the counter arguments to global warming, scan the books in my reference list, inquire about your global warming concerns on internet, and, armed with facts, make up your own minds.