

FROM JESSE SKIDMORE TO RANDALL: Sorry to bring this up twice but I was anxious to hear what you would think of this.

## **A giant corporation lied about science and got caught. By their own employees. Burn.**

- August 31, 2015

## **An amazing new trove of fossil fuel industry documents was released in summer 2015.**

FROM RANDALL TO JESSE SKIDMORE: Hey Jesse. Been on overload the last couple of weeks and have only looked into this superficially. What first struck me is that their work relied on computer models and were exploring worst case scenarios. Given that current computer models have failed to accurately represent what is occurring now, particularly in terms of the divergence between projections and actual global temperatures, the computer models from the 70s and 80s must have been notoriously inept at producing realistic projections of the future. I think that at least some of the scientists involved in this realized that there were too many variables to determine precisely the role of CO<sub>2</sub> to any high level of confidence. What I see here is too typical of the fear mongers who are trying to paint a picture of some vast conspiracy to "deny" science, when what they mean by "science" is big government funded, officially sanctioned science that was created in pursuit of an agenda that does not allow dissent or alternate points of view. The United Nations Framework convention on Climate Change is pretty unambiguous in its mandate to the I.P.C.C. to make the case for anthropogenic climate change to the exclusion of all other factors. And given that congressional investigations have revealed that Exxon contributed only around \$20 million to various groups over a decade, only some of which had anything to do with climate change, and this was the supposed primary source of funding for the nefarious "astroturf" groups that, it is claimed, are misleading the poor gullible public, I would suggest that one consider the billions, yes billions, that the global warming zealots have received in one form or another in the same time period. There is a lot more I could say but due to constraints of time and space that will have to wait for now. I will only say that the treatment of this "disclosure" by the pro-warming factions is a prime example of propaganda in the service of an agenda rather than an attempt to understand the reality of the situation.

FROM ART GIBERT to Randall. Randall, I'm quite shocked at what I see here. Not the further accumulation of evidence that the fossil fuel industry has long been aware of and funding denial of anthropogenically-caused global warming, as this has long been obvious to anyone who understands the fundamentals of climate

and the simple notion of gases trapping heat in the atmosphere, along with the simple fact that money corrupts. How could it not, as you once said to me. No, what's astonishing is your denial of this wealth of science and evidence of both climate change and corporate malfeasance in favor of a conspiracy theory on the part of government rather than by the mega-corporations whose monetary incentive combined with their corporate muscle simply cannot logically be denied. Boiled down to the essential analysis, your convoluted reasoning here does not withstand comparison to the available facts and information- though you may simply deny them- in short, you're wrong about this. That said, I don't dismiss the concept of government conspiracies in multiple other areas of society.

## RESPONSE to Art Gibert

Art, at the outset of a discussion of this important issue I would request of you to provide the evidence for fossil fuel industry malfeasance of which you speak. You say “further accumulation of evidence that the fossil fuel industry has long been aware of and funding denial etc.” I would be interested if you could supply details - specifically the money trail and where it leads, which scientists received payoffs and most importantly some examples of fraudulent science funded by this money. You say that this is obvious to anyone who understands the fundamentals of climate change. Really? The potential of CO<sub>2</sub> to influence the climate has been recognized long before Exxon funded some research in the 1980s, going all the way back to Svante Arrhenius in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. (See **On the Influence of Carbonic Acid in the Air upon the Temperature of the Ground**, *The Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, April 1896, p. 237) I notice that you couldn't help throwing in the word “deny,” as if I am denying some facts and information which you apparently presume I haven't considered.

Having now gone through the supposed scandalous documents purporting to prove Exxon's disreputable behavior I find virtually nothing of substance. I will repeat: they funded several in-house computer studies to try and predict the long term influence of CO<sub>2</sub> on the climate and realized what many, many scientists outside of the IPCC have realized (and not a few inside) - that the climate system is chaotic and not amenable to simple single parameter computer projections, not now and certainly not in the 1980s. They acknowledged that there could be consequences to the unrestrained addition of

CO<sub>2</sub> to the global atmosphere, but at the same time were confronted with the enormous complexities of integrating multiple factors that could drastically alter the outcome of their models.

Your entire response to my comments is a statement of opinions. I would like to see some hard facts. I do completely agree that money has the potential to corrupt. So if Exxon's paltry \$20 million or so has corrupted climate change science how about the \$7 billion+ assets raised by Generation Investment Management, which stands to profit handsomely from global warming remediation schemes such as Cap and Trade? How about the \$300 million pledged by Google to SolarCity, one of GIM's investments, in late Feb. of this year? How about Tom Steyer's nearly \$100 million to NextGen Climate, an unabashedly pro global warming group? How about the US government's yearly subsidies of \$2.5 billion to the Global Change Research Program, a giant pro warming bureaucracy? To dispel any doubt as to what their position is here is a quote from the intro to their National Climate Assessment (NCA) report: "Global climate is changing. Most of the warming of the past half-century is due to human activities. Some types of extreme weather are increasing, ice is melting on land and sea, and sea level is rising." It then goes on to describe a litany of all the ills that are going to befall us if we don't turn over the control of all energy production, distribution and consumption to the government. The above list barely scratches the surface of the vast complex of vested interests that stand to gain through implementation of carbon remediation measures. I have not even touched upon the billions that flow to various environmental groups that promote global warming hysteria. I'll get back to that.

The first sentence in the above NCA quote is absolutely true. Of course the global climate is changing! From your statements I would assume that you believe you have a degree of climate science education. So tell me, when has the global climate not been changing? What actual empirical evidence, independent of adjusted computer models, is there that most of the warming of the last century is due to human activities when the global climate actually began warming at the end of the Little Ice Age in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, nearly a century before significant introduction of fossil fuel derived CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere? Glaciers began receding worldwide in the early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century after having grown to their greatest extent in 10 thousand years during the Little Ice Age. Throughout the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century they continued

doing what they had been doing for at least a century, shrinking back from their LIA maximum. Of course, you must know this. Right?

What types of extreme weather are increasing? I would challenge you to show some examples. Hurricanes? Not hardly. Floods? Not any more than has been normal throughout the centuries. Drought? We have not seen anything like some of the well-documented droughts that have occurred around this planet for thousands of years, long before we humans were driving SUVs.

To this date half of all US states, that is 25 of the 50, have all-time high temperature records which were set in the 1930s and have not been exceeded since. The last high temperature record set in any US state was in Connecticut in 1995. Since 1975 only 6 other states have seen high temperature records broken. This data is directly from the National Weather Service and has been spared the endless “adjusting” such as the IPCC performs on the raw HadCRUT data in order to proclaim “the hottest year on record” (by not much more than a hundredth of a degree)– a record, I might add, that is barely over a century old, and appallingly incomplete. The statement in the NCA report that “Most of the warming of the past half-century is due to human activities” is duplicitous. This conclusion is derived from computer models that are programmed only to factor in anthropogenic effects, specifically CO<sub>2</sub>, to the exclusion of other possible variables, including the Sun - computer models designed to confirm the pre-ordained conclusion that humans are causing irreparable and disastrous global warming, oh, excuse me, “climate change.”

Are we seriously supposed to believe that complicated natural variables that have driven extreme climate change over and over again, long before a significant anthropogenic influence, have suddenly, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century ceased to operate? Is sea level rising? Well, yes it has risen roughly 8 inches during the past century. This is about the same as the century before. It rose nearly 400 feet at the Pleistocene-Holocene transition ca 12 thousand years ago and has been fluctuating up and down ever since. Not infrequently it has stood many feet higher than present. Are we to assume that sea level would never change absent an anthropogenic influence?

Now let me state for the record: It is my belief that humans ARE influencing the climate in multiple ways, not only through introduction of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere but through deforestation, agricultural and industrial activities, and

expansion of urban areas. But here is the undeniable fact: the climate of this planet has changed profoundly, dramatically, even catastrophically and has done so repeatedly, on any scale that we care to measure, and it has done so without any help from humans. Don't call me a climate change "denier" or even imply the same because that will be a complete mischaracterization of my position on the matter. I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the climate changes. In fact, it is my opinion that the real climate change deniers or "denialists" or whatever the hell you want to call them are those who refuse to look at the palaeoclimatological record of natural variability, and choose instead to believe that a slight increase in an atmospheric trace gas portends our doom.

Here is something to ponder. Carbon Dioxide comprises .0004 of the total atmospheric composition. The natural contribution to the total ambient atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is 250 times greater than the human contribution, about 750 gigatons naturally compared to 3 gigatons of anthropogenically sourced CO<sub>2</sub> residing in the atmosphere at any given time. So, the human contribution to total atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is .004, which means that anthropogenic sourced CO<sub>2</sub> comprises only 4 one thousandths part of 4 ten thousandth part, or 0.0000016 part of total atmospheric composition, that is 16 parts out of 10 million. This is what is known as a TRACE GAS, a gas, which, by the way, is absolutely essential to all life on Earth. A gas which has now been declared a "pollutant" by the EPA for purposes of regulatory control.

To prevent this miniscule change in atmospheric composition we are supposed to basically shut down modern civilization? Impose energy rationing? Bring every aspect of our individual and social life under the control and scrutiny of some new, bloated, government carbon dioxide bureaucracy? There is no way that the declared goals of CO<sub>2</sub> mitigation would not require energy rationing. We absolutely need more open discussion and debate about the social and economic consequences of carbon mitigation policies being proposed, not less, and let all sides be heard.

I welcome Exxon's contribution, just as I welcome any and all intelligent contributions to the discussion, including energy companies, environmentalists, private sector and independent scholars and scientists, as well as scientists on the payroll, directly or indirectly, of the government. The thing I absolutely oppose is that a big-government funded climate change bureaucracy should be

the sole source of information, which is certainly what the proponents of Anthropogenic Global Warming seem to want, at least to the extent that they believe it serves their agenda.

Here is how the strategy works: Science and scientists are appropriated to the service of the all-powerful state; exclusive organizations are formed and charged with a predetermined mandate; enormous sums are spent on propaganda while posturing as an objective entity disinterested in outcomes; all independent or dissenting voices are stifled or marginalized through a campaign of intimidation, ad hominem attacks, smear campaigns, character assassinations, name calling and through guilt by association with some disreputable group such as tobacco corporation CEOs, as if that is anything at all remotely relevant to the science of climate change. To implement this tactic set up a network of front groups, and websites such as Skepticalscience, Realclimate, DeSmog Blog, while accusing anyone who questions the legitimacy of the science, or of the process, of doing what the pro warming factions are themselves doing. Of course tactics like these are not intended to foster real debate or deeper understanding of the actual science of climate change but instead to limit discussion to the exclusion of all but the officially sanctioned point of view. The belief is promoted that all private sector research is tainted by self-interest and can therefore be ignored while government funded science is impeccable and only scientists on the government payroll, or with approved or affiliated organizations are “real scientists.”

We should be encouraging all points of view but the whole climate change non-debate has been about the establishment of a government monopoly on the flow of information.

It seems consistent with most, if not all, government programs and policies that the politicians only look at the projected benefits and ignore the long-term costs of their rules and regulations, since the political/governmental sector exempts itself from the natural checks and balances that operate in the private sector - no one is ever held accountable for the failures of government. But that is another discussion.

If the government gets out of the way carbon mitigation will come about naturally. Green roofs, rainwater harvesting, urban agriculture, mixed use development that allows people to walk to work, rooftop solar collectors, and

more, are all things that the free market will provide if governments would just get out of the way and stop squandering 4+ trillion dollars' of the wealth and resources of America every year, wealth, which if returned to the people, would go towards all of these things, and more.

We need to make our buildings more energy efficient, absolutely. However, government policy has so distorted the housing market that it has put severe constraints on the ability of builders, architects and developers to provide the growing demand for energy efficient housing. Zoning, licensing and permitting regulations have pushed up the cost of building by at least 15% of construction costs without any commensurate gain or overall improvement in energy efficiency, instead, merely adding to the burden of administrative and regulatory costs, which further inhibits the implementation of strategies and technologies that would actually reduce the carbon footprint of our residential infrastructure. Hopefully this is starting to change, but, as a builder I can testify to the enormous amount of red tape and regulatory hurdles people encounter when attempting to go "green." We can save discussion of the horrendously wasteful and inefficient government managed and run transportation system for another day.

We don't need special tax breaks or government subsidies to encourage people to install insulation or weather stripping in their homes and businesses, or install energy efficient windows, or rooftop solar collectors. Just let people keep the income they earn and they will do all of these things when they realize the gain that can accrue. It may begin with those who have a moral commitment to the environment but will spread to others when the economic benefits of reduced reliance on centralized energy distribution are realized. But who is going to put a solar collector on their roof when they can barely pay their mortgage? Or when local zoning regulations prohibit it? Of course those on the receiving end of government payoffs, subsidies, and hand-outs aren't going to like the idea of people keeping their earnings at all.

The overreach of government is exemplified in this story of zoning officials turning people into criminals for trying to get off the grid. Sadly, this is becoming too typical.

“Costilla County, CO — Across the U.S., local zoning officials are making it increasingly difficult for people to go off the grid, in some instances threatening people with jail time for collecting rainwater or not hooking into local utilities.

As zoning laws have increasingly targeted the off-grid lifestyle, many have moved to the Southwestern U.S. as an escape from overzealous zoning officials.

In Costilla County, Colorado, there has been a major influx of off-grid residents to the San Luis Valley. The combination of lax zoning regulations, cheap property, and an already thriving community of self-reliant off-grid homesteaders has led to many new residents.

The off-grid lifestyle, enjoyed by an estimated 800 people, is now being threatened as county officials have recently made moves to essentially regulate and license the lifestyle into oblivion.

Tensions boiled over during a county commissioners’ meeting in San Louis, Colorado, devolving into a shouting match between homesteaders and police. One of the major points of contention is the county’s attempt to ban camping on your own property, in an effort to force the off-grid homesteaders back onto the grid.”

Read more at <http://libertyupward.com/camping-on-your-own-land-is-now-illegal-govt-waging-war-on-off-grid-living/#DophMUWV9u0bdFTC.99>

We will continue to see these kinds of oppressive tactics more and more frequently until people reassert their independence and self-reliance, and stop falling for government manufactured scams.

There are indeed pressing environmental issues. We need to develop more effective means of minimizing the flow of both synthetic and biological wastes into the oceans. We absolutely must come up with strategies for minimizing or eliminating the 8 million tons of plastic trash ending up in the oceans each year. This is a global problem and cleaning up the oceans of this massive amount of accumulating trash is a far more pressing environmental problem than carbon dioxide. Particulate emissions in developing countries is a growing global problem, which, if not addressed, could soon be affecting the quality of life of Americans, since air-borne particulates don’t recognize national boundaries.

Almost 800 million people worldwide don't have access to clean drinking water. Two and a half billion people don't have hygienic toilet facilities. Improvements in global sanitation have stagnated for the past decade while inadequate sewage disposal leading to water-borne illnesses are killing an estimated 760,000 children under the age of 5 every year. These are real, observable problems that don't require elaborate, byzantine computer programs for their recognition.

Meanwhile the US war machine marches on, causing truly massive amounts of environmental and human destruction around the world, toppling governments, destabilizing and uprooting whole societies, squandering over a trillion dollars of resources every year in the vain pursuit of global hegemony and compromising our true national security in the process. Meanwhile the neoliberal, environmentalist left obsesses over an utterly miniscule change in atmospheric composition. The pipeline of lies coming from Washington is running at full capacity. And this includes the lies about global warming and climate change, while those telling these lies accuse anyone who expresses an alternate opinion, whatsoever, of doing exactly what they are, in fact and in reality, doing themselves.

Do I exaggerate?

How about big, fat lie number 1: There is a 97% or 97.5% or 99% or whatever, consensus among scientists about the causes and consequences of global warming, or excuse me again, climate change, or excuse me again, "climate disruption". I really hope somebody challenges me on this one.

How about big, fat lie number 2: All voices that disagree with the government manufactured consensus are part of an insidious "denial machine" secretly funded by fossil fuel industry supplied "dark money."

How about big, fat lie number 3: Weather and environmental events such as storms, hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, wildfires, etc. are more extreme and more numerous than they were before fossil fuel consumption.

How about big, fat lie number 4: Enactment of even more rules and regulations coming out of Washington is going "stop climate change." This lie would be laughable if the consequences of it weren't so depressing.

Blind belief in these lies on the part of millions of people testifies to the epidemic of gullibility and scientific illiteracy infecting our country that can only be the result of the government's de facto monopoly of education, which now exists primarily, in the words of John Taylor Gatto, "to dumb us down," spoon feeding students with an insipid and intellectually debilitating pabulum of propaganda whose main purpose is to circumvent the development of critical thinking skills, ultimately to further the passive submission of once proud and independent Americans to government designated "authorities."

You stated, in response to my comments, that "Boiled down to the essential analysis, your convoluted reasoning here does not withstand comparison to the available facts and information- though you may simply deny them- in short, you're wrong about this."

Okay Art, tell me, and anyone else reading this, just what are the available facts and information that I am "denying." Spell out this essential analysis that you have boiled down. If you accuse me of "convoluted reasoning" I hope you are prepared to back up that accusation with something other than the usual talking points propagated by global warming advocates and mainstream media.

It is too bad that the term "denial" has become such a weasel word, invoked whenever a global warming proponent attempts to avoid any real debate. But what does this name calling say about the intellectual integrity these modern pharisees?

Before concluding this humble homily, I think it would be valuable to look a little closer at some of these claims about big, bad Exxon.

In 2006 the new chairman and CEO of ExxonMobile, Rex Tillerson, received a letter co-signed by Olympia Snowe, Republican senator from Maine, and John D. Rockefeller IV, Democratic senator from West Virginia. It was cosigned by a number of government, corporate and academic luminaries including several former officials of Exxon.

Among these co-signers were

Walter V. Shipley, former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Chase Manhattan Bank and its predecessor Chemical Bank, at the time in the process

of acquiring ClimateCare, a U.K. based company poised to exploit the carbon offset market.

Samuel J. Palmisano, Chairman of IBM, at the time engaged in a collaboration with Tokyo Ohka Kogyo Co., Ltd. (TOK) to invest heavily in solar energy products based on Copper-Indium-Gallium-Selenide solar cell modules. Clearly the bottom line of these investments stood to be directly affected by the outcome of the climate change debate.

James R. Houghton: Former Chairman of the board and CEO of Corning Incorporated. Corning Incorporated was, at the time, in the pipeline for a \$30 million tax credit under the auspices of the Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit, to develop government approved green energy technologies.

William R. Howell, at the time serving both as director of Pfizer Pharmaceutical and Lead director of the Halliburton Company. Enough said.

William W. George: CEO of Medtronic, on the board of directors of both ExxonMobile and Goldman Sachs and formerly senior executive with Litton Industries, a large defense contractor then in the process of being acquired by Northrup Grumman Corporation. Goldman Sachs was at the time engaged in acquiring the portfolios of, or investing in, several carbon offset companies including E+Co, Bluesource and APX, the corporate developer of the Renewable Energy Credit Registry. Again, companies whose bottom line would be directly affected by the outcome of carbon dioxide regulation schemes.

And so it goes.

Now I am not trying to spin some grand conspiratorial scenarios here. What I am saying though, while not judging the good intentions of any of these co-signers, is that they cannot be looked upon as disinterested parties to the climate change discussion. All of them are involved in corporate/government alliances that stand to profit handsomely in the event of major CO<sub>2</sub> regulation, regulation that only attains validity if CO<sub>2</sub> can successfully be redefined as a dangerous pollutant.

Now as to the letter itself. After a series of laudatory introductory comments, Snowe and Rockefeller get to the business at hand.

“We are writing to appeal to your sense of stewardship of that corporate citizenship as U.S. Senators concerned about the credibility of the United States in the international community, and as Americans concerned that one of our most prestigious corporations has done much in that past to adversely affect that credibility. We are convinced that ExxonMobil’s longstanding support of a small cadre of global climate change skeptics, and those skeptics access to and influence on government policymakers, have made it increasingly difficult for the United States to demonstrate the moral clarity it needs across all facets of its diplomacy... It is our hope that under your leadership, ExxonMobil would end its dangerous support of the ‘deniers.’ We fervently hope that reports that ExxonMobil intends to end its funding of the climate change denial campaign of the Competitive Enterprise Institute are true. Similarly, we have seen press reports that your British subsidiary has told the Royal Society, Great Britain’s foremost scientific academy, that ExxonMobil will stop funding other organizations with similar purposes.”

This diatribe is so blatantly dishonest it almost takes one’s breath away. It should be abundantly clear to anyone reading this, unless they are hopelessly blinded by their allegiance to neoliberal, environmentalist ideology, that what we have here are politicians attempting to intimidate and silence all critics of the official version of climate change. The claims about a “climate change denial campaign” are utterly specious. So here we have Senators, using their authority to pressure Exxon into ceasing their funding of the C.E.I., an organization that had the audacity to give a voice to legitimate criticisms of the IPCC’s so called “consensus.”

Are there to be no dissenting voices allowed? None whatsoever?

Apparently you are okay with this.

And how on Earth does having a real debate about an issue as complex as climate change affect US diplomacy? Even more preposterous is that it is not enough to try and stifle debate here in America but it must be shut down in Great Britain as well.

But it gets worse.

“Exxon is not alone in jeopardizing the credibility and stature of the United States. Large corporations in related industries have joined ExxonMobil to provide significant and consistent financial support of this pseudo-scientific, non-peer review echo chamber. . .The climate change denial confederacy has exerted an influence out of all proportion to its size or relative scientific credibility. Through relentless pressure on the media to present the issue “objectively,” and by challenging the consensus on climate change science by misstating both the nature of what “consensus” means and what this particular consensus is, ExxonMobil and its allies have confused the public. . .”

No, the poor confused, scientifically illiterate public cannot be allowed to hear any dissenting views, lest it damage our credibility abroad. What? As to the nature of the “consensus,” it does not exist anywhere but in the cloistered halls of big government bought and paid for science. The “relentless pressure” on the poor media by a “climate change denial confederacy” to once in a while present something other than government manufactured and approved science is as blatant a lie as reprehensible politicians have ever concocted.

To anybody reading this who has not sunk into complete ideological insensibility ask yourself this: When and where have you ever heard the voice of solar physicists, atmospheric physicists, palaeoclimatologists, geologists, glaciologists, astronomers, geochemists, oceanographers or a whole host of other scientists outside the IPCC who have raised valid questions about one aspect or another of the global warming dogma? Even minimal reflection should make it obvious that these voices have not been heard in any measure remotely close to the constant drumbeat of global warming dogma, which is now being spoon-fed to schoolchildren while college students are being required to watch Inconvenient Truth to graduate (which of course was the instrument that led to Al Gore receiving a highly publicized Nobel Prize, with the film itself winning an Academy Award for best documentary.) Hey, if you want to talk about pseudo-science look no further than this slick piece of bald-faced propaganda. The appropriate category for Inconvenient Truth should have been for slickest propaganda film of the year, that award it would have deserved. I certainly could say a few things about the science in Inconvenient Truth but I’ll save that for another time. Global warming dogma has made it onto the covers of Time Magazine, National Geographic, Newsweek, New York Times, The Washington

Post, USA Today, and on and on and on. It has been regularly featured on CNN, NBC, ABC, CBS, BBC, Msnbc, the Weather Channel, virtually all mainstream media outlets. Big budget Hollywood movies, such as *The Day After Tomorrow* have been seen by millions of people. Barack Obama regularly makes pro global warming statements to the media who dutifully report it widely. When was the last time anyone ever heard Obama mention even one of the many valid questions that have been raised about a science of global warming based exclusively on computer models? I think the answer to that would be never. Everyone has seen pictures of a polar bear apparently trapped on an ice floe as evidence of global warming, but how many have heard of the work of polar bear biologist Mitch Taylor which proves that polar bear populations are on the increase and thriving in northern Canada which is most of their customary territory. Everybody has heard that global warming is supposed to cause an increase in hurricanes and extreme weather, but how many people have seen, in any mainstream media outlet, the graphs of Accumulated Cyclonic Energy demonstrating that hurricanes have been at their lowest frequency in well over 30 years. I could site dozens of such examples. (And, it looks like we've just about made it through yet another Hurricane season without a major storm making landfall.)

If not for the Internet there would be virtually no outlet for alternative points of view.

Apparently any coverage at all of an opposing viewpoint is too much for the global warming zealots.

I must say here that if the "climate change denial confederacy" has exerted an influence "out of all proportion to its size," because it is after all, as the letter describes, only a "small cadre," then it can only be because sooner or later the truth of the matter will find a way to be heard and will eventually prevail. Take careful note that here is an unintended admission that the "confederacy" is trifling in its size when compared with big government approved science and their billions, else how could its influence be so out of proportion to its size? Note also that these politicians are accusing the "deniers" of putting "relentless pressure" on the media while they themselves are right here with this letter exerting political pressure on a company that gave just above \$20 million to a wide variety of groups that those politicians don't approve of. Many of the

recipient groups in question did little or no research at all into matters of the climate, and a few of them, in fact, actually supported the global warming scenario. Think about what you have just read. Politicians are attempting to use the power of their office to close down contributions to groups that may directly, or indirectly even, challenge the IPCC status quo. It doesn't matter that the money comes from Exxon, what matters is does it fund climate science specifically, and if so, is there any evidence that the science has been falsified, or fabricated, or skewed in some way in a deliberate attempt to deceive. Where is the evidence, besides hearsay, innuendo, exaggeration and ad hominem attacks? Where is the falsified data? I say Exxon, or any other corporation, or organization, or group, or individual has the right to donate to whomever they want, free of government interference, threats, or coercion.

Of course, I wouldn't guess you know, or care, about any of this.

But, I am going to ask you to consider this anyway. The carbon dioxide remediation strategies are far-reaching in their consequences. The impact on modern society will be profound for generations to come. Energy rationing is not something to be taken lightly. Conversion to alternate forms of energy can and will happen. The most effective and moral way to implement that conversion is not by bureaucratization and centralization under a hierarchical, autocratic, command and control system, (which is exactly what we will end up with if we allow politics to dominant the process of policy implementation based upon a contrived dogma) but through enterprise, invention, experimentation and decentralization in a free market. It is this that the politicians and their cronies seek to suppress, the emergence of an organic system that they cannot control.

If the politicians are making available billions in subsidies, billions in tax credits, billions in tax payer provided R & D money, and so on, of course big corporations are going to get on board, just as they get on board when the politicians offer billions upon billions to develop the technologies of war.

I absolutely want sources of alternative energy to evolve, but NOT by government fiat.

I say it's time to have the debate that is not over, out front, in public, with all sides heard, including the dissenters – the debate that the proponents of

globalwarming / climatechange / climatedisruption etc. etc. are desperate to avoid. An extensive debate, conducted over the course of multiple sessions, covering in depth all the issues and dimensions related to the science of climate change. In the debate let's have eminent skeptical scientists like Roy Spencer, Judith Curry, Vincent Gray, Richard Lindzen, Richard Tol, John Christy, Robert Carter, Robert Balling, Zbigniew Jarorowski, William Gray, Nir Shaviv, Freeman Dyson, Tom Segalstad, Willie Soon, Syun-Ichi Akasofu, Christopher Landsea, Sami Solanki, Ross McKittrick, Lawrence Solomon, Antonino Zichichi, (accomplished scientists all who have been demonized by the AGW hucksters for having the temerity to question the "consensus.") and many possible others on one side making their best case, and let's have Michael Mann, Kevin Trenberth, Phil Jones, James Hansen, Gavin Schmidt, Ben Santer, Al Gore, (if you can coax him out of his oceanfront mansion) Naomi Oreskes, James Hoggan, Ross Gelbspan, John Cook, Dana Milbank, John Holdren and the whole crowd of global warming promoters on the other side. (Oh, and let's not forget to put Bernie Sanders up there with them since, after all, he is making global warming dogma a central part of his campaign.) Let's broadcast it widely through diverse media outlets and encourage as many people as possible to take a break from Keeping Up with the Kardashians to tune in. It ought to be a great show. But, regrettably it won't happen, and apparently you see no irony in the fact that the critics and skeptics are eager to debate while the proponents of global warming declare the debate over and hide behind their so-called consensus.

I have a question for you, Art. Are you afraid to actually look at what some of the above mentioned critics are saying? I am talking about highly qualified, reputable scientists and other qualified individuals, reputable, at least, until the global warming faction began its smear campaigns.

Repeating your statement when you talk about the "accumulation of evidence that the fossil fuel industry has long been aware of and funding denial of anthropogenically-caused global warming." Show me some documentation that any of the above mentioned skeptical scientists have received payoffs from the fossil fuel companies to publically deny anthropogenically-caused global warming, show me how much they were paid, show me the papers they wrote or the research they conducted in deference to their paymasters, and most importantly, show me where they falsified or deliberately skewed the data.

SHOW ME!

Getting back to the Exxon “disclosures.” The letter goes on:

“Climate change denial has been so effective because the “denial community” has mischaracterized the necessarily guarded language of serious scientific dialogue as vagueness and uncertainty. Mainstream media outlets, attacked for being biased, help lend credence to skeptics’ views, regardless of their scientific integrity, by giving them equal standing with legitimate scientists. Exxon is responsible for much of this bogus scientific “debate”. . . “

Oh, that’s it. The “denial community” has “mischaracterized the necessarily guarded language of serious scientific dialogue” Yes, the serious dialogue that can only be conducted in the sequestered halls of official, government funded, politically driven science and their cossetted scientists. And again, the poor mainstream media, having been “attacked” by those dreadful skeptics with their heretical views, must be suffering from PTSD after such a traumatic assault.

Where and when have we been privileged to witness skeptics given equal standing with “legitimate scientists?” I’ll ask again – Where? When? Take special note of another unintended disclosure from the letter: “Exxon is responsible for much of this bogus scientific “debate.”” Think about what this statement implies. That’s right, the paltry sums donated to these pariah groups represents the bulk of the so called “dark money” funneled to the nefarious “denial machine” and any debate or discussion outside of approved circles whatsoever is, according to these people, simply “bogus.”

But the distortions of this letter go on:

“A study to be released in November by an American scientific group will expose ExxonMobil as the primary funder of no fewer than 29 climate change denial front groups in 2004 alone. . .The study will estimate that ExxonMobile has spent more than 19 million since the late 1990s on a strategy of “information laundering,” or enabling a small number of professional skeptics working through scientific-sounding organizations to funnel their viewpoints through non-peer-reviewed websites. . .The internet has provided ExxonMobil the means to wreak its havoc on U.S. credibility.”

Here it is in black and white. Horror of horrors! Exxon is the primary funder of no fewer than 29 “climate change denial front groups.” Apparently funding by groups other than Exxon to “deny climate change” was so paltry that they weren’t worth naming. And how much did Exxon donate to these 29 groups? As the letters’ authors say, the sum, over almost a decade, is somewhat in excess of \$19 million. Let’s assume that amount is divided equally among the 29 groups. That works out to about \$65,000 to each group per year, perhaps enough to pay the annual salary of one mid-level employee. How does that compare with donations to Greenpeace, one of the largest organizations in the world promoting global warming dogma, that are in excess of \$350 million per year? Or Natural Resources Defense Council? They are the recipients of some \$19 million every year from wealthy donors and corporations, and, for the past decade and a half, have received a total of almost \$290 million. In 2012 alone, according to their publically available tax return, NRDC received donations worth over \$90 million dollars. Or how about the Sierra Club? It has been the recipient of well in excess of \$400 million since 1999. The Environmental Defense Fund, over the same period, received donations in excess of \$290 million. This is all publically available information. And all of these groups actively promote the idea that anthropogenic global warming is a crises that demands an immediate government response. If it is true as you say, that money corrupts, then is there not the slightest possibility that there might be corruption on the pro-global warming side?

Now here’s the thing. I actually support many of the activities and goals of these environmental organizations. But obviously I part company with them in regards to their endorsement of the global warming dogma, and, in most cases, the means by which we get to the end goal. Here’s one hint (among many) that may suggest where corruption has crept in among these once principled organizations. Rockefeller affiliated organizations such as The Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller Family Fund and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, have since 2003, donated almost \$5 and a half million to NRDC alone. You will of course note who co-authored the letter I am quoting from. It should further be mentioned that NRDC is helping to shape Obamas carbon dioxide/global warming policy. No quid pro quos here.

Oh, and one other thing, as far as their remarks about “professional skeptics,” I should remind these self-serving politicians that it is a good scientists’ job to be a skeptic.

The promoters of global warming propaganda are counting on the fact that the vast majority of people will simply accept, without question or further thought, authoritative sounding but unsubstantiated statements about “scientific consensus” and about a secret “denial machine” funded by fossil fuel companies obfuscating the public discourse with lies propagated by scientists bought and paid for by the fossil fuel industry. Yet the purveyors of such baloney are doing exactly what they accuse the critics of doing without ever coming up with a single example of fraudulent science on the part of the skeptics!

But again, where is the hard evidence of Exxon malfeasance? About the best they can come up with is that Exxon gave somewhat in excess of \$20 million to 29 different groups, only some of which used any of that money towards climate change research, and, that the Koch brothers (the very incarnation of evil to the global warming true believers) gave about the same to over 30 different groups who also spent it on a whole variety of issues and projects other than climate change. Oh, and they also like to make a big deal about the fact that Fred Singer once wrote an article questioning some of the assumptions being made about second hand tobacco smoke. It’s quite impressive how much mileage the pro-warming factions have squeezed out the Big Tobacco association, as if that has anything whatsoever to do with the question of the climatic consequences of raising the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration of the atmosphere by a couple of hundred parts per million. This constant tobacco refrain is the very definition of a “red herring,” something thrown into an argument for no other purpose than to distract attention from the real issues. But what does this say about the parties that find it necessary to employ such tactics?

I think more and more people are starting to see through the scam. Here’s a sure fire way to recognize that the global warming promoters are phonies: as soon as they start throwing out jargon like “Astroturf groups” “deniers” “denialists” “denial machine” “contrarians” “consensus” “Big Tobacco” “mainstream scientists” “legitimate scientific community” “tipping points” etc. etc. ad nauseam, they are admitting that they are not going to talk about the

highly complex science of climate change from a broad and balanced perspective, but are instead going to attempt to divert the discussion with just about every logical fallacy that exists.

The devious letter continues:

“Indeed, while the group of outliers funded by ExxonMobil has had some success in the court of public opinion, it has failed miserably in confusing, much less convincing, the legitimate scientific community. Rather, what has emerged and continues to withstand the carefully crafted denial strategy is an insurmountable scientific consensus on both the problem and causation of climate change. Instead of the narrow and inward-looking universe of the deniers, the legitimate scientific community has developed its view on climate change through rigorous peer-reviewed research and writing across all climate-related disciplines and in virtually every country of the globe.”

The implication of all this couldn't be more in your face obvious. The “legitimate scientific community” consists of the government approved scientists and computer modelers working for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and only them. Anyone else who questions, or critiques, the findings and assertions made by the IPCC, no matter their qualifications or expertise, is nothing more than an “outlier” and can be ignored, they are purveyors of a “carefully crafted denial strategy.” And how many times must it be said, over and over again, that consensus is meaningless in science.

Do you need any more evidence that this is politics, not science?

Only government scientists, on the payroll of agenda driven politicians, their hired bureaucrats and crony capitalists, are considered “legitimate scientists.” Isn't it great that here we have politicians from both parties dictating what constitutes “legitimate science.”

The “rigorous peer-reviewed research and writing,” that is invoked by the distinguished Senators in support of their claim of “consensus” proves beyond any doubt that they are completely clueless about what is actually in the peer-reviewed research and writing. Or they do know, or suspect, in which case they are knowingly lying. I'll give them the benefit of the doubt and assume they are clueless. I would be more than happy to supply them with several thousand

references from the peer-reviewed literature that are inconsistent with their claims of consensus, including from the IPCC itself.

Very few people understand how the peer review process works within the IPCC. Elaborate computer models are developed by the hired scientists and modelers, working from data supplied by the Climate Research Unit at East Anglia University. This is the gateway institution for the bulk of the climate data utilized by the IPCC scientists in erecting their computer models, and, of course, the computer models will be no better than the data upon which they are built. Let us be clear on the function of the IPCC. It is a politically contrived organization for the purpose of scientifically demonstrating a predetermined conclusion -- that the actions of humans are causing dangerous climate change through their consumption of fossil fuels.

By implication, this threat, being so dire, requires a massive increase in political/executive power over the private economy along with massive wealth transfers to politically favored groups, organizations, corporations and individuals. See for example the boondoggle that is the Sanders/Boxer Climate Protection Act of 2013. i.e. a carbon tax. This piece of legislation is so filled with delusions that by itself it disqualifies Bernie Sanders from the presidency. (It was Senator Barbara Boxer who proclaimed: "In California we can just look out the window and see climate change's impacts," displaying her sophisticated understanding of the complexities of global climate change. It is gratifying to know that this politician is so endowed with insight and acumen that by simply looking out the window she is qualified to craft legislation that will stop the Earth's climate from changing once and for all.)

Once the IPCC has developed models from the data provided by CRU they make "projections." These projections make their way into regularly published Assessment Reports that contain the science and technical information, and the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM). These reports and summaries are then provided to a variety of government officials with the EPA, the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, among others. These agencies develop rules and regulations based on the information in the reports, rules that increasingly impact upon our lives in a myriad of ways. (This is an issue worthy of another discussion.) In addition the IPCC participants cherry pick their way through the published literature selecting work that supports their conclusion of

catastrophic global warming while ignoring anything that doesn't support it. Together the CRU data and the selective utilization of the scientific literature forms the basis of the Assessment Reports that are published approximately every 5 or 6 years. During the interim between publication dates the IPCC scientists and officials constantly adjust, amend and modify the basic data until they arrive at the desired outcome.

But it is not the ARs that generally make it into the hands of politicians, officials, mainstream media and environmentalists. It is the Summary for Policy Makers. To devise the SPMs the IPCC selects a number of politically approved scientists, who, along with some 270+ politicians and bureaucrats from 115 different countries form a Working Group, who then assemble to haggle over the information contained in Technical Reports line by line until they reach an agreement that is politically acceptable to all – in other words, reach a consensus. If this isn't science subordinated to politics then there is no such thing. This process of bureaucrats picking through the science line by line is the origin of the highly publicized consensus, it is a creature of politics pure and simple. Also, it needs to be pointed out, there is actually a 3 month delay between the release of the SPM and the Assessment Reports. The SPMs are released first and the ARs some three to four months later so that the hired scientists have time to go back over them, making adjustments, additions, deletions and so forth in order to render them consistent with the Summary for Policymakers, again, to subordinate the science of climate change to the politics of climate change.

The SPMs are developed through a process that has basically nothing to do with scientific veracity and everything to do with bureaucratic preferences. If you think I am making all this up read for yourself the IPCC procedures, section 4, in regards to Technical Reports acceptance:

“Changes made after acceptance by the Working Group or the Panel shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers or the Overview Chapter.”

Changes made AFTER ACCEPTANCE by the Working Group in order “ensure consistency” with the political document that is the Summary for Policy Makers.

It couldn't be more obvious than this. Right there in that single sentence the fraud is exposed.

Now one more thing that needs to be emphasized if there are any doubts about the duplicity of this process. The entire negotiation process just described for developing the SPM's is completely opaque. The doors are closed to the public and to the news media. No outside cameras or recorders or news cameras are allowed. I think any rational person would be forced to ask why the secrecy? If there is nothing to hide let it be transparent. Clearly if the process was open to public scrutiny the whole scheme would soon unravel.

There you have it, the priorities are obvious. The scientific data is manipulated after the fact to conform to the political priorities of the SPM, to "ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers." I also need to mention that the raw data originally fed into the IPCC pipeline was and is tainted from the beginning, as was clearly and convincingly confirmed by the leaked emails from CRU, in spite of the so-called "investigations" whose sole purpose, from the outset, was to exonerate these disreputable East Anglia scientists and paint the whistle blower, whoever he or she was, as the bad guy. But this person, probably someone from within the IPCC itself, deserves accolades for having a conscience and wanting the truth to get out about this tainted process.

One of the most egregious examples of scientific dishonesty perpetuated by the IPCC (among many) was the exclusion of a graph that had been featured in earlier reports that showed the relation between computerized projections of future temperature increases compared with actual instrumentally measured temperatures. What this graph displayed was the increasing discrepancy between the IPCC computer projections and the real world, which are seen to diverge more and more each year as the global climate fails to exhibit any statistically significant warming. (Some 18 years now).

But in spite of that, as the models have consistently failed to match what the real climate is actually doing, the IPCC spokespersons and their cronies continue to push the idea of a carbon dioxide triggered catastrophe. The eminent Dr. Judith Curry, professor and former chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology pointed out that "As temperatures have declined, and climate models have failed to predict this decline, the IPCC has gained confidence in [its predictions of] catastrophic

warming.” As the frequently maligned Paul Driessen has correctly commented “the more they are wrong about nearly everything, the more confident IPCC officials have become that they are right about nearly everything.”

And here is the ultimate irony. Based upon this debased science, the global warming proponents want to use the force of government to drastically curtail the use of fossil fuel derived energy in the wealthy, advanced countries, thereby seriously hobbling their economies, while at the same time forcing a massive wealth transfer from those countries to favored developing nations in the name of “climate justice.” Once the wealthy nations have been economically impoverished, how they will continue to pay climate “reparations” to the victim nations is anyone’s guess.

And of course, history has shown that massive, politically motivated wealth transfer is always accompanied by massive corruption.

Am I guilty of hyperbole when I say that global warming advocates want to use the force of government to shut down dissent? Not hardly. If you are “shocked” at something I said in my original comments, here is something that should really addle your sensibilities: (but then again, probably not). On May 9, 2015 the Washington Post published a letter by Sheldon Whitehouse, Democratic Senator from Rhode Island.

“Fossil fuel companies and their allies are funding a massive and sophisticated campaign to mislead the American people about the environmental harm caused by carbon pollution. Their activities are often compared to those of Big Tobacco denying the health dangers of smoking. Big Tobacco’s denial scheme was ultimately found by a federal judge to have amounted to a racketeering enterprise.

Here we go again, repeat the Big Lie often enough and hopefully enough people will believe it. Declare an atmospheric trace gas that is absolutely essential to life itself to be “pollution” and before anyone can actually get around to questioning the truthfulness regarding “a massive and sophisticated campaign to mislead the American people” throw in the Big Tobacco diversion. Whitehouse continues with his mendacity:

“The Big Tobacco playbook looked something like this: (1) pay scientists to produce studies defending your product; (2) develop an intricate web of PR experts and front groups to spread doubt about the real science; (3) relentlessly attack your opponents.”

More irony. What he is describing is exactly the tactics employed by the big government, pro-global warming faction. Of course, we see no specifics, no data, no evidence that what he says is actually true about the massively funded “denial campaign.” But then, as it goes on, we see in this letter the totalitarian mindset on full display. For what Whitehouse is advocating is nothing less than marshalling the power of the almighty state to utterly suppress any dissent from the proclamations of official science. I also think it quite significant that this proposal is originating from a Democrat. Why am I not surprised at that? Not to wax partisan here but it sure seems that a lot of Democrats are willing to cast stones at Republicans, (and deservedly so) but refuse to engage in even the most rudimentary examination of themselves, their beliefs or the policies they promote.

This is what Whitehouse thinks is the solution to politically incorrect research and speech in regards to climate change:

“Thankfully, the government had a playbook, too: the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, or Rico. . .The parallels between what the tobacco industry did and what the fossil fuel industry is doing now are striking. In the case of fossil fuels, just as with tobacco, the industry joined together in a common enterprise and coordinated strategy. In 1998, the Clinton administration was building support for international climate action under the Kyoto Protocol. The fossil fuel industry, its trade associations and the conservative policy institutes that often do the industry’s dirty work met at the Washington office of the American Petroleum Institute. A memo from that meeting that was leaked to the New York Times their plans for a multimillion-dollar public relations campaign to undermine climate science and to raise “questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.”

So where is any real evidence of fraudulent science? Is it in the hundreds of studies published in the peer-reviewed literature with evidence of higher than present sea levels? Is it in the hundreds of studies in the peer-reviewed literature on periods of Earth history as warm as or warmer than present? Is it in hundreds of studies published in the peer-reviewed journals demonstrating extreme climate change long before any meaningful anthropogenic influence? Is it in numerous studies showing that CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have, for most of Earth history, been higher than now?

No, all we get here is hyperbole about a multimillion dollar public relations campaign, a lot of diversionary references to the tobacco industry, and not one word about the billions flowing to pro-global warming groups. Think about what Whitehouse is advocating: Laws that were put on the books to combat organized crime being used to prosecute dissident scientists. It doesn't get sleazier than this. Let's be clear about where Whitehouse and his ilk are coming from – it isn't science they are promoting but religious zealotry. He states outright that one of the objectives of this “multimillion-dollar” campaign that he is attacking is to raise questions “among those who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.” Well yes, esteemed Senator Whitehouse, that is exactly what scientists are SUPPOSED to do – raise questions – that's how science works. And if the science is being employed to drive policy then that questioning is more important than ever. How can any rational person read this letter and not see in it a tactic for suppressing dissent while maintaining a monopolistic privilege on the part of government sanctioned climate science? Somebody needs to remind Senator Whitehouse that the First Amendment applies to everybody, including those who disagree with his version of scientific reality.

Following the distinguished Senator's lead, a group of government affiliated and IPCC scientists wrote a letter to the Obama Administration supporting Whitehouse's' call for persecution of global warming skeptics. Here are a couple of selections that exemplify the mindset of the New Inquisition:

Letter to President Obama, Attorney General Lynch, and OSTP Director Holdren, Sept. 1, 2015

“As you know, an overwhelming majority of climate scientists are convinced about the potentially serious adverse effects of human-induced climate change on human health, agriculture, and biodiversity. . .We appreciate that you are making aggressive and imaginative use of the limited tools available to you in the face of a recalcitrant Congress. One additional tool – recently proposed by Senator Sheldon Whitehouse – is a RICO (Racketeer Influence and Corrupt Organizations Act) investigation of corporations and other organizations that have knowingly deceived the American people about the risks of climate change, as a means to forestall America’s response to climate change. . .We strongly endorse Senator Whitehouse’s call for a RICO investigation.”

All I can say is Senator Joe McCarthy had nothing on these guys.

This is what awaits us at the end of YOUR convoluted reasoning Art: witch-hunts, pogroms, “investigations” of anyone who disagrees with the edicts of big government official science, a new inquisition whose main purpose is to shut down debate, stifle discussion, deprive any critics of government climate policy of the resources needed to conduct basic research and to publish the results of that research. Of course the “peer reviewed” papers published in approved journals will have to meet government standards, or the threat of an investigation will hang over the head of any heretic who dares question the infallibility of official government climate science.

And let’s be clear that the statement “an overwhelming majority of climate scientists” means the majority of IPCC and affiliated climate scientists, which ironically, but not unexpectedly, has had some major and important defections from the consensus, as well as whistle blowers whose testimony needs to be acknowledged and widely publicized. These defectors from the IPCC propaganda machine are the real scientists and should be celebrated, not denigrated.

Yup, this is what we get when we allow the government (i.e. politicians) to fund science, along with the corruption that is an ever-present virus in virtually all politics. Don’t forget what the letter I stands for in the acronym IPCC: INTERGOVERNMENTAL, in case you need reminding. It is sad that so many on the liberal side of the political spectrum believe that they traverse the moral high road by accepting without question the decrees of government funded,

politically motivated science and endorse policies based upon emotion rather than reason.

And, of course, the letter writers had to invoke you know who: “The methods of these organizations are quite similar to those used earlier by the tobacco industry. . .”

The letter concludes with these detestable remarks:

“If corporations in the fossil fuel industry and their supporters are guilty of the misdeeds that have been documented in books and journal articles, it is imperative that these misdeeds be stopped as soon as possible so that America and the world can get on with the critically important business of finding effective ways to restabilize the Earth’s climate, before even more lasting damage is done.”

“Guilty of misdeeds!?” So which official in the Obama administration would have the responsibility to define and identify “misdeeds?” And what constitutes a misdeed in the minds of these climate despots? The answer is simple: disagreeing with or challenging the monolithic consensus that they have so carefully contrived at great monetary cost to society. Would corporations that agreed with the government approved consensus ever be investigated, or only those who question, criticize or disagree? I think the answer to that question is a foregone conclusion. And who are “their supporters,” who might be guilty of misdeeds, other than anyone else who questions or disagrees with the IPCC’s overhyped consensus? They made sure to leave the definition wide open as to who constitutes a threat to their monopoly. And how, exactly, would these “misdeeds” be stopped?

The belief that a bunch of politicians, bureaucrats, and environmentalists are going to “restabilize the Earth’s climate” by forcing down atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations by maybe a hundred parts per million has to be one of the greatest, if not *the* greatest delusion of our time. What they will succeed in doing, however, if they have their way, will be to utterly suppress the forward momentum and progress of civilization, leaving our nation, and the world, unprepared for real climate change, NATURAL climate change. Change that comes on hard, fast and unexpectedly and has virtually nothing to do with CO<sub>2</sub>. For here is a truth that the High Priests of Official Climate Change and their

followers don't want you to know, and prefer not to know themselves: As important as it is, there is a hell of a lot more to climate change than just CO<sub>2</sub>.

And that's the 800 pound gorilla in the room that nobody notices because they are too easily distracted by the mendacious superficiality of mainstream media and lulled into complacency by a steady diet of government propaganda and lies.

One of the founding fathers of modern climate science the great Herman Flohn (1912-1997) grasped the true nature of the problem decades ago. In **The Climate of Europe: Past, Present and Future** (1984) Hermann Flohn and Roberto Fantechi. *Atmospheric Sciences Library*, D. Reidel Publishing Co. from Chap. 2: *Climate in the Last Thousand Years: Natural Climatic Fluctuations and Change*, he writes:

“Climate –even under its natural development alone- varies continually. Each year, each decade, each century, each millennium, since long before any question of impact of human activity...It is important to gauge the magnitudes and time-scales of these variations, since planning should not be based on expectations of return to some non-existent norm. And the magnitude and extent of any changes attributable to Man's activities –or even whether any such effects are occurring on more than a local scale- cannot be determined without knowing the range, and the likely timing, of changes due to natural causes.”

The wisdom and common sense expressed in these words, which need to be read and reread by independent minds and anyone who is truly interested in the big picture of climate change, has been ignored by the IPCC scientists in their appointed mission of laying the blame for climate change on the activities of man.

In 1979 Flohn conveyed a message that should be heeded by all those who would presume to concern themselves with climate change and the future of the planetary environment:

“From the viewpoint of the climatologist, the most important result of these investigations is the fact, that within the “human” time scale of about 100 yr or less, our climate is...much more variable than hitherto

assumed. Especially important, and indeed disquieting, is the evidence of abrupt cooling's within warm (interglacial) periods apparently as rare events with a recurrence interval of  $10^4$  yr." (**On Time Scales and Causes of Abrupt Paleoclimatic Events: *Quaternary Research*, 1979, vol. 12, #1, pp. 135-149)**)

Ten to the 4<sup>th</sup> power is 10,000 years. The reason Professor Flohn finds the evidence "disquieting is simply that from the record of the last several hundred thousand years of climate change then in hand, it had become apparent that by 1979, interglacial periods, such as the current one we are now in, the Holocene, had seldom, if ever, lasted more than 10 thousand years, usually less. And the Holocene interglacial period is now over 11 thousand years in duration.

As of this writing, there is no consensus as to what force of natural climate change drives the planet into and out of ice ages and does so "within the human time scale." But since Flohn wrote those words the record of natural climate change now in hand reveals that global climate has repeatedly changed and has done so profoundly, dramatically and rapidly over and over again. And it has done so without human help. And in all well documented cases where phase relations are discernable, carbon dioxide changes in the atmosphere lag behind changes in temperature by decades and sometimes centuries, which points to a truth that is absolutely anathema to global warming dogma: Temperature is driving the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere and not the other way around. This relationship is well documented in the PEER-REVIEWED LITERATURE.

Disturbed by what the evidence revealed for abrupt natural climate change, Flohn goes on to remark that

"The problem of abrupt intense coolings during an interglacial climate similar to the present climate resembles, to some extent, the Damocles' sword hanging high above the globe and its inhabitants. Because of its possible consequences for the human race, its study deserves a much higher priority."

But with the rise of government promoted global warming dogma the study of climate change was hijacked to focus exclusively on anthropogenic forcing's to

the virtual exclusion of natural factors. Instead of receiving a much higher priority as Flohn hoped for, natural climate change was relegated to the fringes and became the province of independent and underfunded scientists, who, by publishing their work, are now being attacked as “climate change deniers,” smeared in the neoliberal press, and are being threatened with government investigations. How revealing it was then when the climategate email releases showed that CRU and IPCC scientists were placing pressure on various science journals to reject articles from critics of the IPCC consensus. YES they did show that.

So in order to maintain the illusion that climate change is only driven by human activities the global warming advocates become the true “deniers,” because they can only maintain their allegiance to this fiction by denying natural climate change.

14 years after Hermann Flohn penned his warning climate scientists had access to the paleoclimatic record provided by Greenland ice cores. These cores, extracted from the very summit of Greenland’s great ice sheet, revealed a record of climate change unprecedented in its accuracy. What they revealed was a succession dramatic climate swings far beyond anything experienced in modern times. In many cases these climatic shifts could only be characterized as catastrophic. One of the lead scientists studying these cores, J.W.C. White had this to say in the prestigious, peer-reviewed journal, *Nature*:

“The new ice core results bring rapid climate change to our doorstep: changes of up to 10°C in a couple of decades, or perhaps in less than a decade, appear possible in interglacials...the speed with which the climate system can shift states gives us pause...”

Yes, changes of up to 10°C in less than a decade really ought to give us pause! (10 degrees Celsius is 18 degrees F.) White goes on to point out that

“We humans have built a remarkable socio-economic system during perhaps the only time when it could be built, when climate was stable enough to let us develop the agricultural infrastructure required to maintain an advanced society. We don’t know why we have been so

blessed, but **even without human intervention**, the climate system is capable of stunning variability.” (J.W.C White, 1993 *Nature*, vol. 364)

These words ought to be pondered deeply by the global warming proponents before they make the ludicrous claim that the debate is over, because, to reiterate what J.W.C. White realized back in 1993 was that “even without human intervention the climate system is capable of stunning variability” and we do not yet know why.

#### EVEN WITHOUT HUMAN INTERVENTION!

This truth needs to be shouted into the ears of the global warming true believers until it finally registers that no matter what we do, even to the extent of entirely shutting down modern civilization and leaving the planet, the climate is still going to continue to change, and sometimes catastrophically.

I think a legitimate question to ask at this time is who really is guilty of “misdeeds” – the scientists and independent thinkers who believe we should look at all the variables and accept nothing without question, or those who are actively trying to shut down debate? I think the answer to that question is crystal clear. And if Exxon or whoever wants to put up a few million to fund climate change research I say more power to them. I think that in America at least, there are enough smart people to see through fraudulent science if Exxon tries to perpetuate it, as long as it is spared being propped up by the government propaganda machine. How is it that the global warming promoters can think that the industry that would be the most severely affected by global warming regulation should be denied a voice in the discussion? Are we not seeing here exactly the mentality of true believers, zealots and fanatics?

Whether the global warming proponents are honest enough, or sophisticated enough, to realize that the policies they promote will, if fully implemented, lead to a long, slow national suicide, is doubtful, because they don’t understand the difference between freedom and totalitarianism, imagining that we can solve the “climate crises” through the creation of politically mandated, totalitarian control systems. Yeah, good luck with that.

Autonomy, decentralization and liberty are the keys to successfully advancing technologically, environmentally and morally.

Let's have the debate. Let's discuss the carbon cycle, and carbon dioxide's role in photosynthesis and the processes of Life; let's discuss changing sea levels; let's discuss the frequency of extreme weather; let's discuss the role of the Sun; let's discuss all the other natural factors that might be influencing the climate in addition to CO<sub>2</sub> such as ocean currents, atmospheric currents, cosmic rays, volcanism, cosmic dust, changing orbital geometries, the geomagnetic field etc. etc.; let's discuss the cause, or causes, of cycling glacial-interglacial ages; let's discuss the relationship of CO<sub>2</sub> to climate change throughout Earth history; let's discuss the role of changes in the circumpolar vortex; let's discuss the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age; let's discuss the Climatic Optimum; let's discuss the accuracy of ice cores as a climate proxy; let's discuss the numerous, well documented natural climate catastrophes that have happened in Earth's history; let's discuss the effects of warm vs cold periods on the stability of historical societies. Let's discuss all these things, and more.

Oh, that's right, I almost forgot, the debate is over; the science is settled; there is nothing more to discuss.

I'll make a final comment. I totally believe that climate change is very real and I am totally in favor of studies being performed on the human influence on climate. I think they are important and necessary, and definitely part of the big picture of climate change. And I have no doubt that carbon dioxide does indeed play an important role, up to a point. What I object to is the monopolization of climate science by political, academic and corporate forces that stand to gain as a direct result of carbon remediation policies, who then employ the tremendous political resources at their disposal to marginalize, ostracize and denigrate dissenting voices, whatever their source. I think it will be an error of monumental proportions to put all of our eggs into the anthropogenic carbon dioxide basket while ignoring all of the other natural factors that have been operational for as long as this planet has existed. The policies derived from the science of climate change had better reflect the realities of climate change and not a politically contrived model or we could find ourselves in a world of hurt.

For make no mistake, most of the policies being proposed will have major effects on civilization and the consequences of draconian policies that force a reduction of energy consumption will absolutely impede economic growth and affect our standard of living in profound ways. This is why it is absolutely crucial that a vigorous debate take place with all voices heard. Finally, I am entirely in favor of developing alternative forms of energy and minimizing reliance on fossil fuels. But government mandates, forced upon society by an autocracy of imperfect individuals in pursuit of various agendas, are not the way to get there. In fact, the reality is the opposite: governments, politics, and bureaucracies are the greatest roadblock to effecting this transition, by consuming and wasting astronomical sums of the wealth and resources of this nation in particular, wealth which could, and would be used in the private sector by entrepreneurs, builders, architects, designers, engineers, scientists, inventors, farmers, artists, visionaries, healers and all creative individuals who understand the necessity of evolving a civilization in harmony with the Earth.

The question never seems to be asked, by those who favor political solutions to social problems, about the role of politics in creating those problems in the first place, and how, if there is not enough popular support in the private sector, a political solution could ever conceivably and realistically hope to succeed, and refusing to recognize that if there is sufficient support in the private sector then the political solution is superfluous, redundant, and counter-productive.

I will finish this diatribe with a superlative quote from the great 19 century philosopher and journalist Henry George. Based upon your deference to the authoritarian state, you will most likely not relate to the opinion expressed in these words, but for the sake of others, not so shackled by ideology, I will here include it, because it speaks eloquently of the remedy for what ails this nation and points us towards the only path to a prosperous, peaceful and sustainable future.

“We speak of Liberty as one thing, and of virtue, wealth, knowledge, invention, national strength and national independence as other things. But, of all these, Liberty is the source, the mother, the necessary condition.

She is to virtue what light is to color;

to wealth what sunshine is to grain;  
to knowledge what eyes are to sight.

She is the genius of invention, the brawn of national strength, the spirit of national independence.

Where Liberty rises, there virtue grows, wealth increases, knowledge expands, invention multiplies human powers, and in strength and spirit the freer nation rises among her neighbors.”