WHY I AM SKEPTICAL GLOBAL WARMING IS MAN-MADE, AND YOU SHOULD BE TOO

Harvey M. Sheldon
Amherst College Class of 1964
Reunion Presentation
May 30, 2009
The Hypothesis of Man-Made Global Warming
Carbon Control Advocates

- **Man’s activities that add carbon to the atmosphere are creating an actual threat of dangerous climate change, i.e. global warming, that will have many more seriously negative than positive effects.**

- (Debatable policy conclusion if above is true: Carbon control regulation and emission reduction is necessary for the welfare of the Earth and mankind.)
The Question for Today

THE QUESTION TODAY IS NOT:

- Not Energy Efficiency
- Not Energy Independence
- Not Alternative Energy needs.
- Not having to prove global warming from causes other than mankind.
- Not whether Antarctica is melting, the oceans are acidifying, or polar bears are threatened with extinction.
The Question for Today

- The only issue on point here is whether man is endangering the earth with greenhouse gas emissions of carbon dioxide.
  - If you really understand that question, you will see that, if the answer is yes, carbon control will greatly complicate effective response to the other energy issues we face as a nation.
  - Conversely, if human carbon emission is not a threat of consequence, solving our energy and economic problems becomes a lot easier.
  - Please put aside your pre-judgments, open your minds to facts and explanation, and you will understand that human CO2 is not a threat to Earth.
Rebuttal to Dr. Knox

- Bob Knox has bought the “party line” (as it were) and argued from “authority”.
- The IPCC process was and remains flawed
  - Here are some examples:
    - Slide 4: is it “peer review” if the authors of the UN’s report simply rejected those comments they found inconvenient?
    - Slide 5: IPCC Summary says human influence is clear, but the opinions of scientists who compiled the 1995 report came to precisely the opposite conclusion, and stated that opposite conclusion in at least five places.
    - Leipzig Declaration: Hundreds of dissenting protesting scientists in 1995 and since: “-- there does not exist today a general scientific consensus about the importance of greenhouse warming from rising levels of carbon dioxide…”
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Rebuttal to Dr. Knox

Slide 5: 2007 UN climate assessment says that “warming of the climate system is unequivocal”. What is not explained is that the warming began more than 300 years ago, in 1695; that the warming rate between 1695 and 1745, before the Industrial Revolution even began, was eight times greater than the warming rate in the 20th century; that the warming rate from 1975-1998, when we might in theory have had some small influence, was no greater than the warming rate from 1860-1880 and from 1910-1940, when we could not have had any influence; that the mere fact of warming tells us nothing of its cause; that solar physicists (e.g. Scafetta & West, 2008) attribute more than two-thirds of the warming of the past half century to the Sun; that Prof. Richard Lindzen of MIT attributes nearly all of the recent warming to natural climate variability (including the influence of the Sun). There has been no statistically-significant warming for 15 years; and that there has been a rapid (though largely unreported) global cooling trend for eight and a half years –
Rebuttal to Dr. Knox:

Global monthly temperature anomalies, January 2001 to March 2009
IPCC predicts warming at +2.4, +3, +3.9, +4.7, +5.3 C/century
The observed cooling trend is equivalent to 1 C/century

For eight and a half years, global temperatures have exhibited a pronounced downtrend. The IPCC's predicted warming path (pink region) bears no relation to the global cooling that has been observed in the 21st century to date. Source: SPP1 global temperature index.
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Rebuttal to Dr. Knox:

No anthropogenic signal: The world warmed at the same rate from 1860-1880 and from 1910-1940 as it did from 1975-1998 (see the three parallel magenta trend-lines). Therefore there is no basis for the IPCC’s assertion that the warming rate is accelerating.
However, it is not explained that the computer models relied upon by the UN predict that in the tropical troposphere the warming rate will be 2.5-3 times the warming rate at the tropical surface: yet, as slide 9 shows quite clearly, there is virtually no differential between the tropical surface and tropospheric warming rates.
Rebuttal to Dr. Knox:

- **Claim: GCMs Using AGW Best Match Temperature History**

- This is Make Believe. The slides of GCMs showing a human factor “matching” the past are contrived, after the fact, non-science. The fact is GCM’s do not and cannot predict the future from real historic data. They fail miserably, repeatedly.
Real Science vs. Alarmism

- Reason and free inquiry are the only effectual agents against error.
  - *Thomas Jefferson*

- No science is immune to the infection of politics and the corruption of power.
  - *Jacob Bronowski*

- The strongest arguments prove nothing so long as the conclusions are not verified by experience. Experimental science is the queen of sciences and the goal of all speculation.
  - *Roger Bacon*
I am Skeptical, and You Should Be Too

- As a lawyer dealing with environmental law and related questions, I have spent my professional life trying to help people understand and address a variety of serious questions of environmental policy, health and science that life puts in front of us.
- If you are an educated person you should know you do not need to be a scientist to see the flaws in a theory or hypothesis that explains the world.
- To render scientific hypotheses invalid, all you need to have are good contradictory facts or data.
My Reasons for Skepticism: Overview

- Carbon dioxide: Its nature, history and sources are often misrepresented
- The IPCC referenced computer models are inherently incompetent and proven wrong
- Rational alternative reasons for climatic change and carbon release are available
- Problematic Temperature Reporting
- Concern by scientists and others that climate science and IPCC are co-opted for and by political and ideological agendas
Carbon Dioxide: Its Nature and its Misrepresentation

- CO2 is a trace gas in the atmosphere. At 385 ppmv CO2 is less than four hundredths of one percent of the atmosphere by volume.
- CO2 is a limiting and essential element for plant growth. It is at a low ebb in terms of it’s share of the Earth’s atmosphere over the life of the planet.
- CO2 does have a capacity to retain energy; it is a so-called “greenhouse gas”; some human emission effect on Earth is bound to occur
Carbon Dioxide Misstatements

- **Claim:** CO2 Causes Temperatures of the Earth to Rise
- **Fact:** Over Eons of Time, Temperature Rise Preceded Rises in CO2 Concentration
- **Fact:** A British Court Ruled Al Gore got the causation backwards in Inconvenient Truth
Temperature Rises Before CO2 Rises

Source: Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center  http://cdiac.ornl.gov
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World Temperatures Falling Whilst CO₂ Keeps Rising

Temperature variation in °C.

Carbon Dioxide level in part per million by volume

© Joe D’Aleo - 2008
More CO2 Misstatements

- **Claim:** CO2 is at Historically High Levels in the History of Civilization
- **Fact:** CO2 was higher at times during the last two centuries, and commonly was higher Eons Ago
- **Fact:** CO2 was in fact over ten times higher than it is now during an ancient Ice Age
- **Fact:** In the last 600 million years of Earth's history only the Carboniferous Period and our present age, the Quaternary Period, have witnessed CO2 levels less than 400 ppmv.
CO₂: Higher During the Great Depression

Figure 4: CO₂ measurements in the troposphere and stratosphere (0.5-22 km since 1897 –1973 during balloon, aeroplane and rocket flights [23].
A strong variation in the atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration since about 1800 is shown in figure 5 showing three maxima around 1825, 1857 and 1942. This is in severe contrast to the publications by the IPCC and the ice core reconstructions. The pre-Keeling CO$_2$ data show, the CO$_2$ curve lags temperature by about five years. A 19th century average of 321 ppm can be calculated from these data. Combining the

![Figure 5: The atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations of the northern hemisphere compared to the average northern hemispherical temperature and reconstructed CO$_2$ from ice core records of Antarctica. Data prepared from the historical measurements since 1812–1961 as a 5 years average (red line) out of 138 yearly averages [19] (red dots), the Keeling Curve in violet, the temperature of the northern hemisphere according to CRU 2006 in blue, the CO$_2$ concentration of Antarctica from ice core records after Neftel et al. 1984 [27].](image-url)
Millennia Without Correlation of CO2 and Temperature

No correlation between CO2 concentration and temperature

Global temperature bears no relation to CO2 concentration over the past 600 million years. Left scale: Atmospheric CO2 concentration (parts per million by volume, from Berner & Kothavala, 2001). Right scale: δ18O (parts per thousand, 1 ppt = 1.5 °C temperature change, from Veizer et al., 1999). For most of the past 600 million years, CO2 concentration was greater than 1000 ppmv, peaking at 8000 ppmv (approximately 20 times today’s concentration) in the Cambrian era, 550 million years ago. Today’s CO2 concentration is less than 400 ppmv. Temperature, too, is lower today than at almost any time in the past 600 million years.
Claim: Only Man’s activity explains the dramatic rise in CO2 since WWII

- FACT: You need to understand oceans and other non-modeled sources (e.g. volcanoes, deep vents) to know where CO2 is from.

- GCMs do not currently accurately model the globe’s deep-water ocean circulation. Accurately modeling the global ocean’s deep circulation is fundamental to any realistic understanding of global temperature change, as this circulation appears to be the primary control of global surface temperature. The global warming we have seen since the mid-1970s and over the last 100 years is likely largely due to reductions in the rate of global ocean deep water circulation (or the MOC) which is viewed as being driven by global ocean salinity variations. CO2 changes play no role in these ocean changes.
General Circulation Models (GCM)

- As many as 20 or more GCMs exist
- GCMs function by pre-set assumptions and equations for variable interaction
- The uncertainty range for assumptions on negative feedback (dampening) from aerosols are magnitudes greater than the forcing assumed for CO2
- GCMs fail to replicate the real world when fed real world data
GCMs are Incompetent and Wrong

- In point of fact, the impact of man remains indiscernible simply because the signal is too small compared to the natural noise. **Claims that the current temperatures are ‘record breaking’ or ‘unprecedented’, however questionable or misleading, simply serve to obscure the fact that the observed warming is too small compared to what models suggest.** Even the fact that the oceans’ heat capacity leads to a delay in the response of the surface does not alter this conclusion.

- **Source: Dr. Richard Lindzen, Prof. Atmospheric Physics, MIT, paper at Yale 2005**
GCMs: Overwhelming Uncertainty

Figure 4. The Special Report on Emission Scenarios (SRES-SPM-5) A2 projection from Figure 1 showing the physical uncertainty of the projected temperature trend when including ±10.1% cloud error (light shading), or the uncertainty in greenhouse gas forcing (dark shading). Inset: A close-up view of the first 20 years of the A2 projection and the uncertainty limits.
Throughout the past 600 million years, almost one-seventh of the age of the Earth, the mode of global surface temperatures was ~22 °C, even when carbon dioxide concentration peaked at 7000 ppmv, almost 20 times today’s near-record-low concentration. If so, then the instability inherent in the IPCC’s high-end values for the principal temperature feedbacks has not occurred in reality, implying that the high-end estimates, and by implication the central estimates, for the magnitude of individual temperature feedbacks may be substantial exaggerations. (Lord Monckton of Brenchley, Forum on Physics & Society, July 2008 (APS)
The primary implication is that for over 25 years, we have based not only our worst case scenarios but even our best case scenarios on model exaggeration.

As far as I can tell, the main question we ought to be confronting is how long the momentum generated by this issue will prevent us from seeing that it has been an illusion based on model error.

In the mean time, we can continue to play our parts in the modern version of “The Emperor’s New Clothes.” Our descendents will be amused for generations to come.

(From Richard Lindzen, Sloan Prof. of Atmospheric Physics, MIT)
GCMs: Incapable of Prediction

On the credibility of climate predictions

D. KOUTSOYIANNIS, A. EFSTRATIODIADIS, N. MAMASSIS & A. CHRISTOFIDES

Department of Water Resources, Faculty of Civil Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Heron Polytechniou 5, GR-157 80 Zographou, Greece
dk@itia.ntua.gr

Abstract Geographically distributed predictions of future climate, obtained through climate models, are widely used in hydrology and many other disciplines, typically without assessing their reliability. Here we compare the output of various models to temperature and precipitation observations from eight stations with long (over 100 years) records from around the globe. The results show that models perform poorly, even at a climatic (30-year) scale. Thus local model projections cannot be credible, whereas a common argument that models can perform better at larger spatial scales is unsupported.
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GCMs: Predictions Contradicted by Real World Observations

- Climate models all predict that, if GH gases are driving climate change, there will be a unique fingerprint in the form of a warming trend increasing with altitude in the tropical troposphere, the region of the atmosphere up to about 15 kilometers (Figure 6A). Climate changes due to solar variability or other known natural factors will not yield this characteristic pattern; only sustained greenhouse warming will do so.

Graphic Proof of GCM Failure: The Heat that is Not There

- Predicted tropospheric warming is not there

Figure 7: Greenhouse-model-predicted temperature trends versus latitude and altitude; this is figure 1.3F from CCSP 2006, p. 25, and also appears in Figure 6 of the current report. Note the increased temperature trends in the tropical mid-troposphere, in agreement also with the IPCC result [IPCC-AR4 2007, p. 675].

Figure 8: By contrast, observed temperature trends versus latitude and altitude; this is figure 5.7E from CCSP 2006, p. 116. These trends are based on the analysis of radiosonde data by the Hadley Centre and are in good agreement with the corresponding US analyses. Notice the absence of increased temperature trends in the tropical mid-troposphere.
GCMs Greatly Overstate the Greenhouse Effect

In this obscure diagram we actually have a crucial piece of information that tells us that models are greatly exaggerating climate sensitivity.

It tells us that the greenhouse blanketing effect in models is about 7 times greater than it is in nature.

From Wielicki, Lin et al, 2002

Figure 1
GCMs Wrong on Ocean Temperature Direction

Five years’ global ocean cooling: reality yet again disobeys models

Projected ocean warming vs. observed ocean cooling (x 10^2 Joules; left scale): During the 5+ years since the deployment of 3300 automated benthothermograph buoys throughout the world’s oceans, the oceans have not warmed as predicted by NASA/GISS: they have cooled, as shown in papers by Willis, and also by Loehle. In short, the models overestimate the anthropogenic effect on ocean heat sixfold to eightfold, in line with similar model-driven exaggerations of the diminution in outgoing long-wave radiation owing to additional atmospheric carbon dioxide, and in line with calculations (e.g. by Monckton, 2008) of the IPCC’s overestimate of climate sensitivity. The ocean cooling, when steady warming would be expected, proves the “high-climate-sensitivity” hypothesis false. Source: William DiPuccio.
Rational alternative reasons for climatic change and carbon release are available

- Climate is too complex for anyone to claim they know what will happen for sure; climate is always in flux, it has essentially chaotic aspects, and it is driven by multiple unrelated forces.

- Plainly, it is not a one button carbon triggered system; numerous forces can elevate or reduce temperature

- I am not saying I know what is coming; I do however say I know that the IPCC is wrong to rely on models proven to be simplistic and inaccurate. No amount of “improvement” in GCM’s will change that, given the impossibility of capturing numerous unknowns and uncertainties regarding climate.
Other Reasons for Warming and Cooling Exist

- Solar Irradiation
- Geological/volcanic forces
- Cosmic Radiation
- Ocean Warming
  - A study of ocean temperatures in the last twenty years shows that most of the land warming can be attributed to ocean warming affecting land, not GHGs
- Ice Ages dominate the Climate History
  - The Recovery from the Little Ice Age (A Possible Cause of Global Warming)
- The Multi-decadal Oscillation (The Recent Halting of the Warming)
Earth’s Temperature Variation Correlates Most Directly with the Sun’s Energy Variation

This graphic shows Arctic temperature falling while fossil fuel use was rising

Source: Robinson, AT& Soon, W.
Sun and Temperature Agreement Thousands of Years Ago

Figure 14: Values of carbon-14 (produced by cosmic rays – hence a proxy for solar activity) correlate extremely well with oxygen-18 (climate proxy); data are from a stalagmite in Oman [Neff 2001]. The time interval covers more than 3,000 years, from about 9,600 to 6,200 years before present (BP). The lower graph shows a particularly well-resolved time interval from 8,350 to 7,900 years BP. It would be difficult to explain this detailed correlation except through the modulation of galactic cosmic rays by changes in the solar wind and solar magnetic activity [Singer 1958]. The mechanism whereby cosmic rays influence terrestrial climate is most likely a change in cloudiness, as suggested by Svensmark [2007a, 2007b].
How about: Same old, same old?

Figure 2b: The figure shows that the linear trend between 1880 and 2000 is a continuation of recovery from the LIA. It shows also the predicted temperature rise by the IPCC after 2000. Another possibility is also shown, in which the recovery from the LIA would continue to 2100, together with the superposed multi-decadal oscillation. This possible progress beyond the peak of an oscillation could explain the halting of the warming after 2000. The observed temperature in 2008 is shown by a red dot with a green arrow.
Encountering the Milky Way: Cosmic radiation influences cloud cover

8: Four switches from warm “hothouse” to cold “icehouse” conditions during the Phanerozoic are shown in variations of several degrees K in tropical sea-surface temperatures (red curve). They correspond with four encounters with spiral arms of the Milky Way and the resulting increases in the cosmic-ray flux (blue curve, scale inverted). (After Shaviv and Veizer 2003)
Temperature Trends Are Steady

Figure 4: Annual mean surface temperatures in the contiguous United States between 1880 and 2006 (10). The slope of the least-squares trend line for this 127-year record is 0.5 °C per century.
How about “Never Mind”? 

- Recent studies show little upside to CO2 temperature rise potential
- Most of the upward influence of CO2 on temperature has already occurred
- Serious science shows likely cooling ahead in next decades
- Yet the Alarmism Gets More Intense!  ???
- Is Something More than Science Going On?
Problematic Temperature Reporting

Contrary to the IPCC predictions, global temperature has not risen appreciably in the last 20 years. Most surface temperature data free from the influence of surrounding buildings and roads show no warming. Data from satellites support this. Sea level has been rising since the end of the last ice age, long before industrialization, but historical records show no acceleration in sea level rise in the twentieth century. Increases in carbon dioxide appear to pose no immediate danger to the planet. The gas is not a pollutant. (C.R. De Freitas, 2002)
Problematic Temperature Reporting

- **The Infamous Hockey stick of the recent temperature rise is BUNK.**

- A claimed piece of ‘evidence’ for AGW was the assertion that the twentieth century was unusually warm, the warmest in the past 1,000 years.

- In IPCC’s Third Assessment Report [IPCC-TAR 2001], the latest IPCC report the IPCC asserted the ‘hockey-stick’ analysis by Mann (Figure 1), which failed to show either the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) or the Little Ice Age (LIA).
Anthony Watts’ Work: Surface Station Bias

Surveyed CRN Site Quality Rating

- CRN=4: 58% (Rating: <1°C)
- CRN=5: 11% (Rating: <1°C)
- CRN=1: 3% (Rating: >=1°C, CRN=2)
- CRN=2: 8% (Rating: >=2°C, CRN=3)
- CRN=3: 20% (Rating: >=5°C, CRN=5)

807 stations rated as of 1/25/2009

surfacestations.org
A resource for climate station records and surveys
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SPPI on the Numbers Game Problem

How the UN bloats CO₂’s warming effect

HOW has the UN’s climate panel, the IPCC, overstated CO₂’s effect on global temperature by the year 2100? It has made small, individually innocuous-seeming increases (hype factors) in the values of four key parameters. These hype factors, when multiplied together, produce a very large overstatement – possibly as much as a 15-fold exaggeration – in the predicted temperature response to increased CO₂ in the atmosphere. Our true effect on global temperature by 2100 could be below 0.3 Celsius degrees (0.5 Fahrenheit degrees), not the 3.9 C° (7 F°) imagined by the IPCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter (2100 vs. 2000)</th>
<th>IPCC value</th>
<th>True value</th>
<th>Hype factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln(proportionate increase)</td>
<td>ln(836/368)</td>
<td>ln(575/368)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ radiative forcing coeff.</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planck parameter</td>
<td>288/(4 x 230)</td>
<td>0.9 x 254/(4 x 236)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback multiplier x.92</td>
<td>1/(1 – 2.16 x .313)</td>
<td>1/(1 – 1.17 x .269)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCT x .92</td>
<td>3.9 C°</td>
<td>0.26 C°</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Alarmist Message is accomplished by co-option of process and distortion of science, in order to try to speak from authority (Leroux, Monckton, Lindzen, Singer, Plimer, Gray, Soon, and others).

The IPCC was and is politicized, but its statements have been exaggerated by ideologues.

Numerous Highly Competent and Concerned Scientists Believe the climate Crisis is Phony.
Australia's top earth scientist: 'A high CO2 content brings prosperity and lengthens your life'

Saturday, April 18, 2009
By Marc Morano

'The IPCC process is related to environmental activism, politics and opportunism'

Article Excerpt from The Australian – By Jamie Walker - April 18, 2009 -
Prize-winning Geologist Dr. Ian Plimer of the University of Adelaide's school of environmental sciences, is also an emeritus professor of earth sciences at the University of Melbourne and the author of seven books and 120 scholarly papers. Plimer's latest book is titled: Heaven and Earth: Global Warming, the Missing Science

Article Excerpt: IAN Plimer calls himself an old-fashioned scientist. That means you question what others won't. You marry yourself to the data; you buck the received wisdom and political correctness of your colleagues. When it comes to climate change, you say: "I was trained to be sceptical." […]

"The science is now based on consensus, and we have thousands of scientists who have got everything to gain by saying the world is going to end. We have lost the tie to evidence. So I make great comparison ... between the way creationists operate and the way some of the rabid environmentalists and global warmers operate. The parallels are quite similar."

Plimer reserves his sharpest criticism for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has driven the international debate. Very much for the worse, in the professor's judgment. "The IPCC process is related to environmental activism, politics and opportunism," he writes in Heaven and Earth.
WASHINGTON, Dec. 21 (UPI) -- A report released by the ranking Republican member of a U.S. Senate environment committee refutes claims by Nobel laureate Al Gore on man-made climate change.

In the report, more than 400 scientists expressed doubt over the claims made by Gore, a former U.S. vice president, and the United Nations that man-made climate change endangers the planet, The Washington Times reported Friday.

The report is available on the U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Web site, whose ranking minority member is U.S. Sen. Jim Inhofe, R-Okla. The panel involved in the report includes members of the U.N. panel on climate change that shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Gore and issued its report on the heels of a U.N. conference on climate change in Indonesia.

David W. Schnare with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency said in the report he was wary of Gore's claims because "conclusions about the cause of the apparent warming stand on the shoulders of incredibly uncertain data and models."
Many Senior Scientists Say IPCC is Politicized

- Example: Dr Gray, you have stated that you consider IPCC as being corrupted. What is the basis for that criticism?
- It is difficult to answer this in a few words. They were corrupt from the start, as they are a political organization set up to provide evidence for “Climate Change”, defined by the Framework Convention on Climate Change as being exclusively caused by humans. The science is selected, distorted, and occasionally fabricated to support this view, and to downplay or marginalise any other climate influences. Their reports have to approved by the politicians who set them up and the Lead Authors are all chosen because they are willing to carry out their orders.

Dr. Vincent Gray is a New Zealand-based climate scientist and an official expert reviewer of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scientific reports. Dr. Gray has a Ph.D. in Physical Chemistry from Cambridge University, England and has had a long career as a research scientist in Britain, France, Canada, New Zealand and China. Dr. Gray has published over 100 scientific papers on energy and materials, plus a dozen in climate science.
The cost of CO2 control is staggering.

Per Lord Monckton: The cost of each 1 K of “global warming” prevented by the Waxman/Markey Bill, even if it were fully implemented, would thus be $60-$600 trillion. It is highly questionable whether the economic costs of simply allowing “global warming” to take its course, even if that “global warming” were to occur on the exaggerated scale imagined by the IPCC, could possibly exceed the monstrous and crippling cost of fully implementing the Waxman/Markey Bill.

Many critics agree the cost of carbon control will fall disproportionately on the poorer people in the world.
Vaclav Klaus, President of the Czech Republic Warns:

“They invoke the image of apocalyptic imminent danger in order to trigger the need in others to have a savior -- a messiah,” Klaus contends. Then he adds: “The constraints of political correctness are tougher than ever. They are being enforced and only one permitted truth is -- yet again -- imposed on us. Everything else is being denounced.”

Klaus contends that global warming has also become “a false identity for the failed United Nations which seeks power over governments and the citizens of the world.” Although he concedes that environmentalism evolved from humble and legitimate origins, Klaus calls Al Gore’s claim -- that Earth is headed toward “a planetary emergency” -- absurd. He labels it as “scaremongering.” “What is being attempted now (by the environmentalist movement) is a form of human behavioral modification, not for purposes of improvement, but for political power.”
In Conclusion

- That is, briefly, why I do not believe that mankind is causing a global warming crisis on account of carbon emissions.
- The best science is saying there is no crisis, and man’s impact from CO2 is insignificant.
- Good websites to visit for information are:
  - www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org
  - www.icecap.us
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